

WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE JOURNAL.

EDITED BY LYDIA E. BECKER.

VOL. IV.—No. 46. PUBLISHED MONTHLY.

MANCHESTER, DECEMBER 1, 1873.

PRICE 1d.—By Post 1½d.

Contents :

Leading Articles by the Editor.

Election Intelligence:—Haverfordwest, Exeter, Edinburgh and St. Andrew's Universities, Oxford.

School Board Elections:—Manchester, Birmingham, London, Leeds, Brighton.

Public Meetings:—Stroud, Cirencester, Cricklade, Malmesbury, Chippenham, Bristol, Monmouth, Bridgewater, Oswestry, Holmfirth, Dover, Ryde,

Newport, Southampton, Andover, Basingstoke, Petersfield, Horsham, Woolwich, Chichester, Lewes, Poole, Bournemouth, Ventnor. Scotland: Edinburgh, Galashiels, Selkirk, Dumbarton, Airdrie, Markinch, Taysport, Huntley, Peterhead, New Deer.

Members of Parliament on Women's Suffrage.

Letter from the late Mr. J. S. Mill.

Correspondence:—Taxation without Representation.

A Woman Refuses to be Taxed.

Municipal Elections:—Bath.

Treasurers' Reports and Announcements:—Married

Women's Property Committee. Manchester National Society for Women's Suffrage; Bristol and West of England Branch. Central Committee. Edinburgh National Society for Women's Suffrage.

THE question of the extension of the household franchise to counties is becoming widely discussed, and at most political gatherings of the Liberal party it forms a conspicuous item in the enumeration of measures pressed on the consideration of the Government. It behoves all who are interested in the prior question of placing household suffrage on a just basis within its present limits, by securing the franchise to all householders who comply with the conditions prescribed by the electoral law as to occupation and payment of rates, to take care that this aspect of the principle shall not be lost sight of, and that every resolution urging ministers to support household suffrage in counties shall contain a recommendation that the privilege shall be extended to all householders, without distinction of sex. The opportunity is most favourable for the acceptance of the principle. The municipal franchise for women was obtained by an amendment on a Bill dealing with the conditions of the municipal franchise generally; and Mr. JACOB BRIGHT will doubtless find his task greatly facilitated by the introduction of any proposal to extend the principle of household suffrage. The arguments used in favour of the one change are similar and in many cases identical with those urged in favour of the other. For instance, Mr. TREVELYAN, speaking at Sheffield a short time ago, with respect to his own proposal said, "He was ashamed to detain an audience " who knew something of political affairs at home and " abroad, by reasoning to them against the maintenance " of a distinction in civic rights between the one half of " the people and the other, a distinction which could be " defended by not one single argument grounded on " common sense, common justice, or common consistency. " . . . They (*i.e.*, the householders in towns which " are not Parliamentary boroughs, and the assertions are " true for both women and men) elected the municipal " officers who managed their local finances, they elected " the school board which superintended the education of " their children, they elected the guardians who dispensed

" the public charity of their district, they attended " lectures, they carried home books from free libraries, " they subscribed to mechanics' institutions, trade schools, " benefit clubs, and co-operative stores, and yet they were " excluded from the privilege of citizenship, which every " full-grown negro in the United States has already enjoyed for the space of eight years." What Mr. TREVELYAN proceeded to say of the plight of the agricultural labourer—"who not only had himself no voice in the " government of his country, but did not even belong to a " class which could in any real sense of the word be said " to be represented in Parliament," is tenfold more applicable to women. The agricultural labourers are merely omitted from the representation because they do not possess the requisite geographical qualification for the exercise of household suffrage. They are not expressly disabled from the exercise of the franchise which others similarly qualified enjoy *because* they are agricultural labourers. If they were, questions affecting their status as such would have as little chance of obtaining attention from Parliament as questions affecting the property and status of women have now.

In the debate in the House of Commons last April, Mr. JACOB BRIGHT said that the proposal to equalise the county with the borough franchise would give an addition of 1,000,000 voters, whereas the Bill which he was proposing would give an addition of about 300,000. While he acknowledged the justice of the former proposal, he said that if justice demands that 1,000,000 of men shall be added to the register, which already contains the names of 2,000,000, justice even more urgently demands the admission of 300,000 women, seeing that up to this time women have not a particle of representation. There was not a single argument that ever has been used or that ever will be used with regard to the County Franchise Bill which does not tell with even greater force with regard to the Women's Disabilities Bill. We believe that these remarks are not only absolutely true, but that their

truth would be generally admitted by those who are seeking to extend the representation of the people; and that if the question were put to the test at every public meeting called together to discuss the County Franchise Bill, by submitting a resolution affirming that the reasons for supporting the County Franchise Bill were equally applicable to the Women's Disabilities Bill, and urging on the Government the recommendation to give their support to the proposal to extend the franchise to all householders, without distinction of sex, the result would be that in almost all, if not in all, cases the meeting would accept such a resolution. We are confirmed in this belief, by the circumstance that Mr. TREVELYAN himself is a supporter of Mr. JACOB BRIGHT'S Bill, and that most of the speakers who have as yet taken a prominent part in meetings in support of the County Franchise Bill are also supporters of Women's Suffrage. We therefore earnestly exhort such of our friends as may have the conduct of meetings called for the purpose of recommending measures for the attention of the Government, to follow the example of the Liberal Association of Birmingham, by including in their list the removal of the political disabilities of women. We believe that the omission, where it exists, is owing more to want of thought than to want of goodwill, and that its cause is simply the neglect and indifference with which all matters concerning the interests of women are treated, and must continue to be treated, so long as they are denied representation. We have sufficient confidence in the general sense of justice and desire for fairplay which characterises our countrymen, to believe that they will usually be willing to do right in this matter when it is fairly brought before them. If the suggestion is made in the original resolution enumerating the measures which the friends of reform desire to see adopted, it would doubtless be accepted by the meeting; but if it should be omitted, it becomes a duty of all friends of our cause to propose it, whether the meeting be one for general political purposes, or one for the special object of promoting the County Franchise Bill. In the latter case the meeting should be asked to approve and urge upon the Legislature the course of taking advantage of the occasion of extending the principle of household suffrage to the whole area of the country, to apply it to the whole nation which inhabits that area, by making it a complete and final measure including all the householders in the kingdom. A little timely effort now, a little promptitude and presence of mind on the part of our friends in bringing

forward our question at the right place and time, may call forth such a demonstration of opinion from those to whom ministers naturally look for indications as to the questions most ripe for solution, as may have the result of convincing them that the removal of the electoral disabilities of women is in this final stage; and we may reasonably hope to see Mr. JACOB BRIGHT'S Bill and Mr. TREVELYAN'S Bill holding equal rank in the aims and efforts of those politicians whose professed object is to extend representation to all classes of the community.

WE beg to call attention to the announcement of the annual meeting of the Manchester National Society for Women's Suffrage, which appears in another column, and invite the attendance of all friends who have it in their power to be present.

THE SCHOOL BOARD ELECTIONS.

THE triennial election of School Boards in England took place in various districts during the past month, and will continue in other places for some time to come. Three years' experience of the work of women as members of School Boards has amply justified the action of the Government in admitting them to a share in the duty of superintending the education of the people. The arduous and absorbing labours of the London School Board have been performed by Mrs. GARRETT ANDERSON and Miss DAVIES in a manner that leaves nothing to regret but that the new board will be deprived of their services and of the experience they have gained. They have sustained without shrinking a burden which has proved too much for some of their male colleagues; and their experience has conclusively proved that women are capable of hard and continuous administrative work. They retire, not to repose, but to other fields of labour, and they carry with them the thanks of all who are interested in seeing talent, energy, and ability in women, devoted to the public service.

As we go to press, the fate of the five lady candidates who seek places on the new board is unknown, but we are not without significant indications of the progress of public opinion in this matter in the circumstances of the elections for Manchester and Birmingham. In Manchester, three years ago, the political parties who propounded lists of candidates did not work in concert with women candidates. The only lady who came forward did so as an independent candidate. The result of the polling proved

that there was no advantage in the policy of excluding women, a lesson which was not lost. Next time, the list of "national unsectarian" candidates, which was supported by the Liberal party generally, included the name of Miss BECKER, one of the members of the retiring board, and she was one of the five successful candidates of the party. In Birmingham, three years ago, the unsectarian party not only rejected women's names from their proposed list, but succeeded in preventing the independent candidature of any lady. But they, too, have learnt their lesson, for last month they issued a list of eight candidates, which included Miss STURGE, and that lady obtained the third place on the poll. In Manchester, Birmingham, and Brighton, perhaps also in other places, ladies have been adopted by distinct political parties to represent definite political principles on the School Board, instead of appealing to the electors specially as women, on an individual and independent footing. We think the course pursued by these great constituencies, in choosing women to represent them in matters of grave import and strong controversy, marks a distinct advance in the political position of women.

Another noteworthy circumstance is the fact that ladies, whether they appear as independent candidates or as representing a party, have to go through exactly the same ordeal in the way of public meetings, addresses, and questions as men. In both Manchester and Birmingham ward and district meetings were organised, in which the candidates expounded their views exactly in the same manner as Parliamentary candidates; while at Birmingham the excitement is described as equal to that at a Parliamentary election. Questions were addressed to the lady candidates as freely, and they answered them as frankly, as the men. If a woman can take her place on this very pinnacle of publicity without being "unsexed," and without forfeiting one particle of her dignity as a lady, or one fraction of the respect and consideration accorded to her as such; and if hundreds and thousands of her sisters of all ranks in society can come forward and record their votes for her or for other candidates of their choice without a thought that they are thereby discrediting the womanhood which binds them in a common sisterhood—and the experience of the recent School Board elections proves both these propositions—then, indeed, is it an idle mockery to assert that the publicity of the ballot box is detrimental to the character of woman, or that the possession of a vote in the election of a member of Parliament, as well as of a member of a School Board,

would be a degradation and an injury to her. The Administration which has voluntarily placed women in the public and responsible position of members and electors of School Boards, cannot with any show of reason and consistency refuse their demand for the Parliamentary suffrage on the ground that public duties or public elections are unsuitable to the character of their sex.

LIBERTY, EQUALITY, FRATERNITY.

(Continued from our last issue.)

Mr. STEPHEN says, "Follow the matter a step further "to the vital point of the whole question—marriage. All "that I need consider in reference to the present purpose "is whether the laws and moral rules should regard it as "a contract between equals or as a contract between a "stronger and a weaker person involving subordination for "certain purposes on the part of the weaker to the "stronger." Now, we say that the special relations of man and woman in marriage are *not* the vital point of the whole question as to the political and personal rights of women. Women are women before they are wives, and have rights independent of and antecedent to the latter relation. If it is just to place the wife in the status of legal subjection, to whom does the unmarried woman owe obedience? We say that the personal and political rights of unmarried women ought to be equal and similar to those of unmarried men, and that the conditions of the marriage contract ought to be determined by the free consent of both the sexes who are parties to it, and not arbitrarily imposed by one sex on the other by physical force. But Mr. STEPHEN says, "If the parties to a contract of marriage are treated "as equals it is impossible to avoid the inference that "marriage, like other partnerships, may be dissolved at "pleasure." To us it appears that instead of being impossible to avoid, it is impossible to draw such an inference from such premises. It would be equally easy, and equally untrue to say—if marriage is regarded as a contract between a stronger and a weaker person, involving subordination on the part of the weaker, it is impossible to avoid the inference that marriage might be dissolved at the pleasure of the stronger party. The fact is the permanence of the marriage contract does not depend upon the strength or the pleasure of either of the parties to it, but upon the law of the land; and the law would be equally powerful to enforce its permanence, whether it were regarded as a contract between equals or as a contract between persons of unequal antecedent rights. The law secures the permanency of the marriage tie by refusing its

sanction to other engagements contracted by one party during the lifetime of the other, and by enforcing on appeal the compulsory "restitution of conjugal rights." This sanction could be maintained quite as well whether marriage was considered as a contract between equals or unequals in personal right.

Mr. STEPHEN is good enough to allow that "No one contends that a man ought to have power to order his wife about like a slave, and beat her if she disobeys him." We are very much obliged to him for the concession, but we do not see how it is to be defended on his own principles. We are afraid that as a matter of fact a great many men do order their wives about like slaves, and beat them if they disobey, sometimes even if they do not disobey. What answer would Mr. STEPHEN make to a man who treated his wife in this manner, and who turned his own arguments on him? If physical force is the foundation of personal rights, the man who beats his wife establishes his right to do so by that which Mr. STEPHEN considers the foundation of all law. Put a case in which a man orders his wife to do something which she considers that he has no right to command. Here the issue is a difference of opinion, and a conflict of will, between husband and wife. Granted that the wife ought to obey her husband and give way. But suppose she will not, what has the husband a right to do in such a case? After exhausting all peaceable means of persuasion, he may either beat his wife till she obeys, or he may, on finding all persuasion useless, give way to her rather than resort to physical force. Is the first course justifiable? and if not, why not, on Mr. STEPHEN'S principles, when the man has no alternative between submitting to his wife's will, or coercing her by physical force? Suppose that it is a case in which even Mr. STEPHEN would admit that the wife was in the right and the husband in the wrong, as in the instance he adduces of the captain giving an order to the lieutenant which the latter, who is the better seaman, knows to be wrong. There is no doubt that the captain in such a case would be justified legally and morally in the employment of any degree of physical force necessary to enforce obedience in case of contumacy on the part of the lieutenant. He would betray his trust if on being satisfied that his own judgment was right, he were to refrain from putting his subordinate in irons, or even proceeding to stronger measures in a case of emergency. But is there any corresponding right in a husband to enforce his commands by similar means? Mr. STEPHEN says "no;" but what would he say to a man who addressed his wife, stick

in hand, in the following words quoted from "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity"—"It is impossible to lay down principles of legislation at all, unless you are prepared to say 'I am right and you are wrong, and your view shall give way to mine, quietly, gradually, and peaceably, but one of us two must rule and the other must obey, and I mean to rule'—and who applied this reasoning practically by means of the stick?"

It may be said that this is an extreme case, but the soundness of a principle can only be tested by applying to an extreme case. If it breaks down when pushed to its legitimate conclusion it cannot be a right one.

There are two principles on which the subjection of women to men in marriage can be maintained. The one considers the parties to it as having antecedently unequal personal rights; divides the people into two classes according to sex, and decrees that the one class shall be subject to the other irrespective of the personal relations of contract between individual men and women. The other considers that all human beings, whether male or female, have the same inherent personal rights. As the principle is more directly expressed by a reviewer of Mr. STEPHEN'S book in the *Quarterly Review*, "That women have an equal right with men to recognition as persons, and to every civil right following on that recognition, is no longer likely to be disputed in any quarter." In passing we may be allowed to express our surprise that such an assertion should be made in reviewing a book, one of the main objects of which is to dispute the proposition that women have equal civil rights with men. The recognition of equal antecedent rights between men and women is perfectly compatible with the recognition of subordination for special purposes of women to men in the marriage relation, just as the recognition of the equal personal rights of all men is compatible with the recognition of subordination for special purposes of some men to others in the relations of commanding and subordinate officers and men, and masters and servants. There is nothing degrading in such a relation, nothing humiliating in the obedience so rendered. It is a case of voluntary association for a special purpose, which can only be carried out by allowing legal authority to rest somewhere, and the obedience is limited to matters which concern the business of the partnership. The rights of masters and servants are unequal in the affairs of the household; they are equal in matters outside this domain. A man may lawfully order his coachman to drive him in a given direction, but if the coachman be an elector the master may not lawfully

order him to vote for a particular candidate. A husband may lawfully order his wife to do certain things; he may not lawfully order her to go to a particular church, or profess any particular creed, against her own convictions. A man whose wife is a physician, or a member of a school board has no authority over her with respect to the treatment of her patients, or the administration of the Education Act. It is perfectly possible to maintain the expediency of the subjection of wives to husbands for the special purposes of family government, along with the recognition of the equal rights of men and women who do not hold these relations to one another, and of husbands and wives in matters unconnected with family affairs. The *Quarterly* reviewer, to whom we have previously alluded, says, very justly, that there are two questions about women's rights which have been a good deal confused—the reviewer says by Mr. MILL and his friends—we say by Mr. STEPHEN. The first—which the reviewer says should never have been a question at all—is whether the legal nullity of women under the old Roman and under the feudal law, should be the legal doctrine of days of more advanced civilisation; the second is whether marriage involves or does not involve a subjection of woman to man which is natural and necessary, and not legal and artificial in its origin. Mr. STEPHEN'S arguments are addressed mainly to the latter question, and when he has, as he believes, proved his case, he says he has established the general proposition that men and women are not equals, and that the laws which affect their relations ought to recognise that fact.

(To be continued.)

ELECTION INTELLIGENCE.

HAVERFORDWEST.

Lord Kensington, who vacated his seat on taking office, and was re-elected on November 24th, voted in 1870 in favour of Mr. Jacob Bright's Bill. At a meeting held on November 13th, in the Masonic Hall, Haverfordwest, Colonel Peel, the Conservative candidate, after declining to give any pledges as to the manner in which he would vote on any subject, said "There is one matter upon which I entertain rather a strong feeling in favour of, though I don't pledge myself to vote for it, because I will pledge myself to nothing—and that is women's suffrage. (Cheers.) I think all those ladies who have property and pay rates are as much entitled to vote as I am myself. (Hear, hear.)"

EXETER.

The elevation of Sir John Coleridge to the bench, deprives the cause of a firm and consistent supporter in the House of Commons, and causes a vacancy in the representation of Exeter. The Liberal candidate, Sir Edward Watkin, is a supporter of women's suffrage. He voted for Mr. Mill's amendment in 1867.

EDINBURGH AND ST. ANDREW'S UNIVERSITIES.

The re-election of Dr. Lyon Playfair, who has accepted the office of Postmaster-General, is to be unopposed. Dr. Playfair's name is on the back of the Women's Disabilities Bill, in conjunction with those of Mr. Jacob Bright and Mr. Eastwick, and the fact of his taking office in the present government is a favourable indication of the progress of the cause.

OXFORD.

The re-election of Mr. Vernon Harcourt for the city of Oxford, consequent on his becoming Solicitor-General, takes place unopposed.

SCHOOL BOARD ELECTIONS.

MANCHESTER.

Miss Becker, who was the first woman elected as a member of a school board under the Act of 1870, was re-elected on November 12th. She was one of a list of seven "national unsectarian" candidates, whose platform was national as opposed to denominational education in public schools. Five of the seven candidates were returned, including Miss Becker and two other members of the retiring board.

BIRMINGHAM.

Miss Sturge was one of eight candidates selected by the party of the National Education League to represent their principles on the school board. The election caused great excitement, and the interest was equal to that of a Parliamentary election. The eight league candidates were highest on the poll, Miss Sturge being third with 36,505 votes. The first place was gained by Mr. George Dixon, M.P., the second by Mr. Chamberlain (Mayor of Birmingham), the third by Miss Sturge, as we have stated. The election took place on November 17th.

LONDON.

Mrs. Garrett Anderson and Miss Emily Davies some time since signified their intention not to offer themselves for re-election on the London School Board. In four out of the nine divisions which return members, ladies have been nominated for the new board. They are—Mrs. Herbert Cowell, sister of Mrs. Garrett Anderson, and Miss Jane A. Chessar, in Marylebone; Miss Emily Guest, in Greenwich; Mrs. Arthur Arnold, in Chelsea; and Mrs. William Burbury, in the city of London. Miss Rees was nominated for Finsbury, but withdrawn. The city of London is, we believe, the only school district in Great Britain where there are no women electors. The gentlemen have therefore an opportunity of showing their gallantry, which we hope they will seize in order to return Mrs. Burbury at the head of the poll. The election took place on November 27th, but the result had not reached us as we went to press.

LEEDS.

Mrs. Buckton, whose labours as a lecturer on hygiene and physiology to the working women of Leeds for two seasons have been attended with such remarkable success and beneficial results, has been placed third on the poll in the recent election of the School Board. She was an unsuccessful candidate in 1870, and we congratulate the people of Leeds on the progress they have made in appreciating the value of the co-operation of ladies in the duty of superintending the education of the people.

BRIGHTON.

Miss Ricketts, who was returned at the head of the poll at the last School Board election, is again a candidate. She is nominated as one of seven selected to contest the borough on behalf of the friends of national and unsectarian education.

PUBLIC MEETINGS.

STROUD.

A public meeting in connection with the Bristol and West of England Branch of the Society, was held in the Subscription Rooms, Stroud, on 27th October, to advocate the movement for conferring the franchise on women, the principal speakers being Miss Liliashworth and Miss Beedy. There was a large attendance, but the bulk of the audience took no part in voting on the resolutions. The chair was occupied by Mr. Dickinson, M.P., who was supported by Revs. W. J. Hall and H. Austin, Messrs. J. Sibree, R. Bragg, J. Clapham, and the ladies of the deputation.—The Chairman, on rising, was received with loud applause. He said: Ladies and gentlemen, you have been invited to come here this evening in order to hear a discussion upon a question of considerable importance, that of allowing women to have a voice in the election of representatives to Parliament. There are several questions of importance affecting women and their rights now in course of discussion, and on which public opinion is somewhat divided. To many of you I dare say it may not seem of very great importance how these questions are settled. You may think over them in your studies, and not feel called upon indeed to form an opinion upon them. You will be asked this evening, however, to express an opinion upon one of those subjects. I am somewhat differently situated, because where I am called for a part of the year I have of necessity to express an opinion on all questions of public importance. I cannot shirk that duty, and among other questions I have been forced to give my opinion upon that which will be submitted to you to-night, namely, whether it is or is not right that women who pay rates and are called upon to perform the functions of citizens, paying rates and carrying on business in this country, and helping to bring about the prosperity of this country, whether they should not have certain rights granted to them. There are many who think this question before you this evening is one of the greatest importance, because they will argue, and with great justice, that to obtain a law in their favour there is no such powerful weapon as having a voice in the selection of those who make those laws. We might say with great truth that laws will bear the impress of those who make them; and it is not an untruth to say that men who make laws will make them more to their own interest than to that of women, and by not forming the opinion of women, who will form opinions for themselves. We look upon them in a very conventional light. I do not feel called upon, occupying the chair this evening, to carry on the discussion to any length. I have voted on the various occasions that have offered in Parliament in favour of giving women their rights of voting. I look upon this as fair, just, and right, and have never heard an argument to show why they should not have this law granted, though as to the law of property I feel more strongly in favour of it, but to-night we will confine ourselves to the one subject. You will have the pleasure of listening to ladies who will advocate their own cause, and I am sure they will advocate it in a manner that will commend itself to you. You will, I doubt not, give them a fair hearing, and I feel certain that they will before long obtain that for which they ask. A resolution affirming the principle was moved by Mr. J. Sibree, seconded by Mr. Clapham, supported by Miss Beedy, and carried.—A resolution adopting a petition was moved by the Rev. W. J. Hall, seconded by Miss Ashworth, and carried. A vote of thanks to the chairman concluded the proceedings.—*Abridged from the Stroud Journal.*

CIRENCESTER.

On October 28th, a well attended and influential meeting was held, in connection with the Bristol and West of England Branch of the Society, at the Corn Hall, Cirencester. The Rev. H. Ashbery in the chair. There were present Miss L. Ashworth, Miss Beedy, the Rev. H. Austin, Mrs. Austin, Mr. Brewin, Mr. H. Alexander, and Mr. W. Newcombe. A letter of apology for absence, and expressing warm sympathy with the movement from Lady Goldsmid was read, after which the chairman gave an address, and resolutions affirming the principles were supported by the above named ladies and gentlemen, and carried unanimously. The *North Wilts Herald* and *North Wilts Standard* contained excellent reports of the meeting.

CRICKLADE.

On 29th October, a meeting was held at Cricklade, in connection with the Bristol and West of England Branch of the Women's Suffrage Society, the Rev. H. Austin presiding, Miss Beedy and Miss Liliashworth being among the speakers. Miss Ashworth, in the course of her speech, referred to the way the members for the borough had voted on the question. She said that Mr. Cadogan had voted against the Women's Disabilities Bill, although he had expressed himself last session of Parliament in favour of extending the franchise to the agricultural labourer. She read extracts from his speech in favour of the County Franchise Bill, and said that every argument used in favour of granting the Parliament vote to the labourers applied with even greater force to the claim of women. She said that the class of women who were asking for the vote were more educated than the labourer, and that women were much less protected by the law. She hoped that Mr. Cadogan would be induced by his constituents to give a more earnest consideration to the subject. Sir Daniel Gooch, she said, had never voted either for the measure or against it, and, therefore, she believed he would be in favour of justice to women if asked to vote for the Bill by his constituency. She acknowledged the consistent support given to the question by Sir George Jenkinson, who had not only voted every year on the question, but also spoken in its behalf in Parliament. She regretted that Lord Charles Bruce, the other member for North Wilts, did not follow Sir George Jenkinson into the same lobby when the division took place in the House of Commons in this Bill, but she trusted that he would also re-consider the question.

MALMESBURY.

A meeting, in connection with the Bristol and West of England Branch of the Society, was held on 30th October at Malmesbury, under the presidency of the Rev. J. Black. There was a large attendance of both sexes. The chairman read a letter of apology from Mr. Powell, M.P., which stated that he had supported the measure in the House of Commons, he being very favourable to the franchise being extended to the gentler sex. The ladies who took part in the meeting were Miss Beedy, Miss Spender, and Miss Ashworth. Great attention was paid to the speakers, who were applauded.

CHIPPENHAM.

A public meeting, which was well and respectably attended, was held, in connection with the Bristol and West of England Branch of the Society, at the Temperance Hall, Chippenham, on October 31. The Rev. W. E. Darby presided, and on the platform were Miss Beedy, Miss L. Ashworth, Miss Spender, and the Rev. H. Austin, all of whom addressed the meeting. The usual resolution was proposed by the Rev. W. J. Acomb, seconded by Miss Beedy, and supported by Miss Spender in lengthy and argumentative addresses. The second resolution,

adopting a petition, was proposed by Mr. T. Mills. This was seconded by Miss Ashworth. Discussion was invited by the chairman, but no one responded, and both the resolutions were put to the meeting and carried unanimously. A vote of thanks to the chairman concluded the proceedings.—*Abridged from the Western Daily Press.*

BRISTOL.

CONFERENCE ON WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE.

A meeting for conference, in connection with the Bristol and West of England Society for Women's Suffrage, was held on Monday evening, the 3rd November, at Hamilton's Public Room, 53, Park-street, Bristol. There was a large attendance, the majority of those present being ladies. The chair was taken by the Rev. E. Harris, of Clifton College. The Chairman, in commencing the proceedings, read letters from well-wishers to the cause which the meeting was held to advocate, which had been received from Miss Sturge, of Birmingham, Mr. Handel Cossham, and Mr. Jacob Bright, M.P. The following is Mr. Bright's letter:—

"Hungerford Park, Hungerford, Oct. 30, 1873.

"Madam,—I beg to acknowledge your note inviting me to attend your meeting on the question of women's suffrage on November 3. I regret that it is not in my power to be present, and I can only offer you good wishes for the success of your meeting. The cause in which you are interested has made great progress in a short time. New and able workers join it every year, and as the argument is all on one side the struggle should not be long. Whether, however, it be long or short, as just legislation for women can only be obtained by the representation of women in Parliament, I do not doubt that all engaged in the movement will labour with zeal and courage till the end is accomplished.—Believe me, faithfully yours,

"To the Secretary."

"JACOB BRIGHT.

After some remarks by the chairman, the meeting was addressed by Miss Beedy and Miss Spender, and discussion invited, which was started by a gentleman from the body of the room, and continued by Mr. R. D. Robjert, a lady in the audience, the Rev. W. James, Miss Beedy, and Miss Scott. A vote of thanks to the ladies was moved by Mr. Wyatt, and seconded by the Rev. J. James. A vote of thanks to the chairman terminated the proceedings.—*Abridged from the Western Daily Press.*

MONMOUTH.

A public meeting in connection with the Bristol and West of England Branch of the National Society for Women's Suffrage was held in the Borough Court on November 4th. There was a large attendance. His worship the Mayor presided. Miss Beedy, M.A., and Miss Spender attended from the Association, and there were also upon the platform Councillor T. James and the Rev. W. A. Meaton. After an address by Miss Beedy, resolutions in support of the Bill were proposed and supported by Mr. Thomas James, Miss Spender, Rev. W. A. Meaton, and carried without a dissentient. A vote of thanks was then proposed to the chairman, and the Mayor, in responding said he had had great pleasure in presiding that night, and at finding the meeting so unanimous upon the subject. The petition was then signed, papers on the subject distributed, and the meeting dispersed.—*The Beacon* contained an extended report of the proceedings, from which we extract the foregoing particulars.

BRIDGEWATER.

On November 7th a public meeting was held, in connection with the Bristol and West of England Branch of the Society, at the Town Hall, Bridgewater, presided over by the Mayor (Mr. J. R. Smith), in aid of the women's suffrage movement.

The meeting was addressed at great length by Miss Beedy, after which, on the proposition of Mr. F. J. Thompson, seconded by Miss Metford, a petition to Parliament was unanimously adopted, and signed by the Mayor on behalf of the meeting. A vote of thanks was accorded to the Mayor for presiding, on the motion of Mrs. Clark, of Street, daughter of the Right Hon. John Bright, M.P.—*Abridged from the Western Daily Press.*

OSWESTRY.

On October 28th, Mrs. Algernon Kingsford, of Hinton Hall, Shrewsbury, delivered a lecture upon some of the aspects of the women's suffrage question, in the Public Hall, Oswestry. The Rev. T. Gasquoine, B.A., in the chair. The lecture was in connection with the Manchester National Society for Women's Suffrage, and Miss Becker and the Rev. B. Glover, of Manchester, were present as a deputation. At the conclusion of the lecture, which was listened to with deep attention, Miss Becker addressed the meeting, and the Rev. B. Glover, one of the Executive Council of the society, having spoken next, the chairman stated that Miss Becker was willing to answer any questions with regard to the movement, but there was no response to the invitation.—Mr. Alderman T. Minshall moved a vote of thanks to Mrs. Kingsford.—The Rev. E. D. Wilks seconded the motion, and it was carried unanimously.—Mrs. Kingsford, in returning thanks, mentioned that she had had occasion to write to two members asking whether they would support Mr. Bright's Bill, and if they would not, to state their reasons. Both wrote back very politely, but saying they could not support the Bill, and that they thought women had an immense deal of influence at present which would be brought to bear on their male relatives. She returned a reply, expressing a wish to know the difference between bribery and corruption employed by men, which was considered wrong, and the bribery and corruption which it was recommended women should use.—On the motion of the lecturer, seconded by Miss Becker, a vote of thanks was accorded to the chairman. The meeting then ended.—*Abridged from the Oswestry Advertiser*, which contained an extended report of the meeting, and an article advocating the claim.

HOLMFIRTH.

At the annual soirée of the Liberal Working Men's Club, held in the Town Hall, Holmfirth, on November 25th, Miss Becker was invited to deliver an address. She spoke at some length on subjects relating to the general prospect of the Liberal party, and introduced into her speech a reference to the subject of women's suffrage, which was received with marked approval. The meeting was very crowded and enthusiastic.

DOVER.

A public meeting to advocate the claims of women's suffrage was held at the Wellington Hall on November 3rd. Mr. Alderman Rees presided, and on the platform were Miss Fenwick Miller, Miss Vickery, Mr. Agate, Mr. Fuller, Mrs. Wakefield, Mr. Dunbar, Miss Apps, &c. The weather was not favourable for the attendance of ladies, but the room was very well filled. After some remarks by the Chairman, Miss Vickery moved the first resolution in an able address, in the course of which she said:—During the next Parliament it was anticipated that several bills would be introduced bearing specially on the interests of women, and amongst others the amendment of the Married Women's Property Act, the Factory Act Amendment Bill, the Workshops Regulation Bill, and Mr. Thomas Hughes was about to bring in a Bill that would prevent married women from doing more than half-time in factories. If such a measure passed it would work very great injustice to women. The laws, also, for the custody of infants were very unsatisfactory. Ac-

ording to the present laws, any woman's husband's relatives had more control over her children than she had. The father by a stroke of his pen might take children from his wife and make any stranger their guardian. There were three millions of women in the United Kingdom who were supporting themselves. It was no wonder then that they should be persistent in the demand for their rights; the wonder was that their demand had not been more readily responded to. In the face of these facts they were rather astonished to hear women who were supporting themselves called "social failures." If they were social failures there were 700 thousands of such, and being such, was it not right that they should aim at success in some other way. Miss Vickery at considerable length and with much ability, then proceeded to deal with the second part of the resolution which affirmed that the exclusion of women householders from the franchise was contrary to the principles of just representation. She pointed out that women householders had the same responsibilities and liabilities as men, yet they were debarred the vote, simply on the ground of their womanhood. She quoted several eminent lawyers, including Lord Coke, in proof of the injustice of taxation without representation.—Mr. Agate seconded the resolution, which was carried with only two dissentients.—Miss Fenwick Miller moved the next resolution adopting a petition. In a few earnest and telling remarks, she showed the injustice of the present law with respect to women's personal property rights, and concluded an able address with a thrilling peroration which drew from the audience enthusiastic applause.—Mr. Councillor Fuller seconded the resolution, but he could add nothing to what Miss Miller had said because it would be as useless as to attempt to gild refine gold or paint the lily. The resolution having been carried, the meeting closed with a vote of thanks to the Chairman moved by Miss Miller and seconded by Miss Vickery.—*Abridged from the Dover News*, which also contained an able article advocating the claims.

RYDE, ISLE OF WIGHT.

On October 22nd, Miss Beedy lectured at the Victoria Rooms, Ryde. Mr. E. Thurlow occupied the chair. A petition in favour was resolved on with only one dissentient, out of about 150 who were present, and a resolution asking Mr. Baillie Cochrane to lay it before the Commons was also carried. A vote of thanks to Miss Beedy and the chairman concluded the meeting.—*Abridged from the Pilot*.

NEWPORT, ISLE OF WIGHT.

Miss Beedy lectured, on October 23rd, in the Town Hall, Newport.

SOUTHAMPTON.

On October 24th, Miss Beedy lectured in the Town Hall, Southampton. Major-General Tryon, J.P., occupied the chair.

ANDOVER.

On November 3rd, a lecture was delivered in the Town Hall, Andover, by Miss Helena Downing. There was a large attendance, but the meeting was a somewhat disorderly one. The chair was taken by T. P. Clarke, Esq. After the lecture the speaker sat down amid loud applause, and a resolution adopting a petition was moved by the chairman, and seconded by Mr. Philip Ponting. The proceedings closed with a vote of thanks to the chairman for presiding, and to the mayor for allowing the use of the hall.—*Abridged from the Andover Advertiser*.

BASINGSTOKE.

On November 4th, Miss Downing lectured in the Town Hall, Basingstoke. The Mayor, Arthur Wallis, Esq., occupied the chair.

PETERSFIELD.

Miss Downing lectured in the Corn Exchange, Petersfield, on November 6th. Mr. Elkington in the chair.

HORSHAM.

On November 12th, Miss Beedy lectured in the Town Hall, Horsham. The Rev. G. O. Frost in the chair.

WOOLWICH.

A crowded meeting in support of women's suffrage was held in the Town Hall, Woolwich, on November 13th, a large part of the audience being ladies. Dr. Rowbotham presided, and after a few remarks called upon Miss Beedy, who addressed the meeting. After the lecture Mr. E. Hughes (the local Tory agent) moved the first resolution, which was in favour of Mr. Jacob Bright's Bill. He said that he stood there in a new character; but this was not a party question. He was not prepared to give married women the Parliamentary franchise. Single women with the necessary qualification ought to have it. In East Kent several had got on to the register. The new member, Mr. Boord—(oh, oh!)—was in favour of female suffrage. He (Mr. Hughes) believed that there were some questions in particular, in respect of which the opinions and votes of women would exercise a beneficial influence. Mr. J. Wates having seconded the motion, it was put and carried with but two dissentients. Miss Biggs moved another resolution in favour of petitioning Parliament for Mr. Bright's Bill, and memorialising the borough member to support it. Mr. G. Whale, jun., the secretary of the Woolwich Liberal Association, seconded the motion. The movement to remove unfair inequalities, based upon the accident of sex, was the greatest of the age. All had seen that no class were properly treated by Parliament unless represented there. So with women. They must have a voice in choosing the member if their interests were to be protected and their claims regarded. The motion was then carried unanimously. Votes of thanks to the ladies and chairman concluded the proceedings.—*Abridged from the Man of Kent*.

CHICHESTER.

Miss Downing lectured at the Assembly Room, Chichester, on November 13th. The chair was taken by T. Smith, Esq., and Mr. Janman, solicitor, was also on the platform. Miss Downing having delivered her lecture, Mr. Janman moved that a petition to Parliament be signed by the Chairman on behalf of the meeting, and that a memorial be forwarded to Lord Henry Lennox, M.P., asking him to support the petition. Mr. Janman alluded with satisfaction to the fact that Lord Henry, who was a thorough "ladies man,"—(laughter)—had paired three times in favour of Mr. Jacob Bright's Bill. Mr. W. Dilke seconded the motion.—Upon the Chairman inviting discussion no one rose to oppose, and the motion was declared carried.

LEWES.

On November 13th a lecture was delivered at the County Hall, Lewes, by Miss Beedy. The chair was taken by the Rev. G. A. M. Little. After the lecture, Mr. Martin, jun. (Cliffe) moved that a petition to Parliament in favour of women's suffrage be signed by the Chairman on behalf of the meeting, and that a memorial be sent to Lord Pelham asking him to support it. Mr. Every seconded. Carried, as was also a vote of thanks to Miss Beedy. Mr. F. J. Holman remarked that Miss Beedy had stated that women took no part in the government of the country. He might remind that lady that a woman was the head of the nation, and that her husband was merely her subject (cheers and laughter). The meeting then terminated.—*Abridged from the Sussex Eagle*.

POOLE.

On November 17th Miss Beedy lectured in the Town Hall, Poole, Mr. Kemp Welsh, solicitor, in the chair.

BOURNEMOUTH.

On November 19th Miss Beedy lectured in the Assembly Room, Bournemouth, Admiral Sir Jas. Sullivan, K.C.B., in the chair.

VENTNOR.

Miss Beedy lectured on November 20th in the Literary Institute, Ventnor. The Hon. Evelyn Ashley (who is to contest the representation of the Isle of Wight at the next election) occupied the chair. Miss Beedy also lectured on the previous evening at Sandown.

SCOTLAND.

EDINBURGH.

The first of a series of district meetings, in connection with the Edinburgh branch of the National Society for Women's Suffrage, was held on November 17th, in the Freemasons' Hall, Edinburgh, for the purpose of hearing a lecture by Miss Jane E. Tylour. There was a very large attendance of ladies, a few gentlemen being also present. Among the ladies on the platform were—Mrs. M'Laren, Mrs. Masson, Mrs. Crudeliús, Miss Stevenson, Mrs. Hill Burton, Mrs. M'Queen, Mrs. Wigham, Miss Craig, Mrs. Robertson, Miss Burton, Miss Wigham, and Miss M'Laren. Mrs. M'Laren, president of the Edinburgh society, was called to the chair, and introduced Miss Tylour to the meeting. After the lecture, Mrs. Wigham moved, and Mrs. Hill Burton seconded, a resolution affirming that as in this country taxation is the basis of representation, it is unjust in principle to exclude ratepayers simply on the ground of sex from voting for members of town councils, and of Parliament; and adopting a petition in favour of Mr. Jacob Bright's Bill, which was carried by acclamation. Votes of thanks to Mrs. M'Laren and Miss Tylour concluded the proceedings.—*Abridged from the Daily Review*.

The second meeting of the series was held on November 20th, in the Upper Hall, St. Mary-street, Bailie Cousin in the chair. There was a very large attendance. The Chairman made a few introductory remarks, expressing himself strongly in favour of the Bill, upon which Mr. G. H. Wallace asked him if it was true that he, in his position of magistrate, had disfranchised the women of Edinburgh in the late water plebiscite, in opposition to the unanimous resolution of the Council; and also, if it was a fact that when three of the ladies in connection with the Association for Promoting Women's Suffrage presented a memorial to the Council he voted that it should be consigned to the waste basket? The Chairman apologised for his action in connection with the matter, and explained that the Council had had no time to take up the question when it was brought before them. The Council had agreed to consult the electors only because they represented the ratepayers, and because there was no proper roll of the ratepayers. Mrs. Masson then read an excellent paper on the subject which had called the meeting together, and Miss Jex Blake moved a resolution in favour of the principle. Miss Tylour seconded the motion, which was carried by acclamation. Mr. J. H. Waterston moved—"That this meeting desire the chairman to sign the memorial in its name, and forward the same to the Town Council, calling upon them to petition Parliament in favour of the franchise being extended to all females who pay rates, believing that they ought to be consulted on all questions that involve taxation." Mr. Waterston said he was prepared to accept the apology given by Bailie Cousin, believing that he would do better for the

future. The reason why he pressed the motion was that the Council of Edinburgh seemed to be of opinion that it had nothing to do with politics and Parliamentary business. He held that it was the duty of the Councillors, as representatives of the people, to be interested in all questions that tended to the moral and social elevation of the country. The motion would give the Council an opportunity of expressing regret in supporting the memorial, and in having disfranchised so many thousand ladies in reference to the water question. He regretted that the chairman of the meeting should in the past have failed in his official position to support the claims of women. Councillor Wellstood seconded the motion, which was unanimously carried. After votes of thanks to the chairman and Mrs. Masson, the meeting separated, many remaining to insert their names on the list of the committee.—*Daily Review*.

GALASHIELS.

On October 22nd, Miss Stuart, of Balgonie, addressed a meeting in Union-street Hall, on the subject of women's suffrage. Miss Stuart was accompanied to the platform by Miss Tylour. Bailie Messer occupied the chair, and in a few sentences introduced the lecturer to the meeting. After the address the usual resolutions were moved by Mr. Clapperton, seconded by Mr. Bell, and carried without dissent. Votes of thanks concluded the proceedings.—*Abridged from the Border Advertiser*.

SELKIRK.

A public meeting, in favour of the extension of the Parliamentary franchise to women ratepayers, was held in the Town Hall, on October 23rd. The meeting was well attended, and was presided over by Bailie Johnstone. The chairman having introduced Miss Stuart, of Balgonie, she proceeded to address the meeting on the claims of her sex to be admitted to the franchise. For over half an hour Miss Stuart pleaded eloquently, logically, and with occasional dashes of refined humour, on the rights of ratepaying female citizens to the enjoyment of equal political privileges with men. Resolutions affirming the principles were moved, seconded, and supported by the Rev. Mr. Davidson, Mr. Richard Turnbull, Mr. George Lewis, and Mr. James Ballantyne, and unanimously carried. A vote of thanks to the chairman, on the motion of Miss Tylour, concluded the proceedings.—*Abridged from the Southern Reporter*.

DUMBARTON.

A great public meeting in support of the women's suffrage movement, was held on October 29th, in the Burgh Hall, Dumbarton. There was a large attendance, the area of the hall being comfortably filled. Provost Bennett occupied the chair, and was accompanied to the platform by Mrs. Wellstood, of Edinburgh; Miss Stuart, of Balgonie; Miss Ella Burton, daughter of the great historian, Edinburgh, who appeared as a deputation to advocate the cause of the ladies; Bailies Buchanan and Thomson, Dean of Guild Bell, and a number of other gentlemen. The Chairman, in opening the proceedings, said he had much pleasure in presiding, as the object of the meeting was one which he believed would commend itself to everyone who had given the question a thoughtful consideration. A resolution, affirming the principle, was moved by Bailie Thomson, seconded by Mr. John M. Nidder, and supported by Miss Stuart, and carried unanimously. Mr. Andrew Cochrane moved, and Bailie Buchanan seconded, a resolution adopting the petition.—Mrs. Wellstood, in support of the resolution, said there was a saying which she had read, and which she thought might very properly be repeated on the present occasion. It was made by an old clergyman, and was to this effect, "that when God made woman, He did not take her out

of man's head, because then she might rule him, neither did He take her from man's foot, because then man might tread upon her, but He had taken her from man's side, because she was equal with man." This resolution, was unanimously adopted.—Miss Burton next addressed the meeting. She viewed the question in its historical and educational aspects. They would not be content with anything short of equality with men, and the present inequality was only a matter of accident, not of intent. (Applause.) Some men fancy that because women never asked the franchise till lately they never suffered from its loss, but this was a grave error. The same arguments might have been advanced against the abolition of slavery, or, in fact, every other good work, but no one was foolish enough to do so. It was not long since the rights of working men were a political puzzle, and now the rights of women were in the same position, but they would just require to do as the workmen had done, only perhaps in a milder and more gentle form. (Laughter and applause.) She then met various objections urged against the movement, and said she thought it was better to bring the widows and maidens' mite of wisdom to the state treasury than allow it to be wasted. (Cheers.) She then pointed out the efforts which are at present being made to educate the ladies to be fit to exercise their rights, and concluded a very able address amid the cheers of the audience.—At the close the Provost moved a vote of thanks to the ladies for their addresses, and Mrs. Wellstood acknowledged the compliment, and proposed the same be given to the chairman, which was cordially done.—*Abridged from the Lennox Herald.*

AIRDRIE.

On October 30th, Miss Stuart, of Balgonie, lectured in the Town Hall, Airdrie, on behalf of Women's Rights. Mr. J. C. Adamson occupied the chair. Throughout the lecture, Miss Stuart combated various objections brought forward by M.P.'s against women being allowed to vote. At the close of the lecture, Mr. John Winning moved, "that the Chairman be authorised to sign a petition on behalf of the meeting in favour of Jacob Bright's Bill to Remove the Electoral Disabilities of Women." Mr. John Monteith seconded. There being no amendment, the motion was declared carried. On the motion of the Chairman, Mr. J. C. Adamson, a vote of thanks was accorded to Miss Stuart.

MARKINCH.

On September 30, Miss Craigen addressed a meeting at Markinch, Fifeshire, the Rev. Mr. M'Kenzie in the chair. A petition was adopted in favour of the Bill.

TAYPORT.

Miss Craigen addressed a meeting of working men at Tayport on October 5th. A petition was carried.

HUNTLEY.

On October 7th, Miss Craigen spoke in the New Hall, Huntley, Aberdeenshire. There was a very good meeting, and the petition was carried by the whole audience, one hand only to the contrary.

PETERHEAD.

On October 25th, Miss Craigen spoke in the Pavilion, Peterhead. Mr. Anderson in the chair. There was a fair attendance, and the petition was carried unanimously.

NEW DEER.

On October 29th, Miss Craigen addressed a meeting in the Town Hall, New Deer, Aberdeenshire. There was a very good attendance, and the petition was signed by a unanimous vote.

MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT ON WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE.

The following letter has been addressed by Mr. Laing, M.P., to the Rev. Andrew Macfarlane, of Lerwick:—

"Rev. Andrew Macfarlane.—Dear Sir,—I have received your letter of the 24th Sept. on my return home. I have no objection in principle to women exercising the right of voting in respect of property, which would give the suffrage if held by males. I should like, however, to see the measure in a practical shape, and see the course taken on it by such men as Mr. Gladstone, Mr. John Bright, and others who have taken the lead in recent measures of Parliamentary Reform before I give any positive pledge as to my vote on the subject in the ensuing session.—Yours faithfully,
S. LAING.

Brighton, 4th Oct., 1873."
The following reply has been returned on the part of Mr. Boord, M.P., to a memorial adopted at a public meeting at Woolwich on November 13th:—

"Distillery, Bartholomew Close, London, E.C.,
18th November, 1873.

"Joseph Wates, Esq.,—Sir,—I am directed by Mr. Boord to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of yesterday's date, together with a memorial from inhabitants of Woolwich, present at a public meeting held at the Town Hall, on the 13th inst. to procure the admission of women to the Parliamentary Franchise, and asking Mr. Boord's support to the Bill for that purpose, to be introduced next session by Mr. Bright, the said memorial being signed by the Chairman on behalf of the meeting, and in reply I have to acquaint you that Mr. Boord will be prepared to vote for any measure which would extend the suffrage to single women or widows possessing the necessary qualifications.—I have the honour to be, sir, your obedient servant,
T. E. G. GORE."

LETTER FROM THE LATE MR. J. S. MILL.

A correspondent sends us the following letter, written by the late Mr. J. S. Mill to Mrs. Rebecca Hooker, of America, and which that lady will shortly publish in a book entitled "Womanhood," which she has written.

"AVIGNON, September, 13th, 1869.

"DEAR MADAM—I beg to acknowledge with many thanks your letter of August 9th.

"You have perceived, what I should wish every one who reads my little book to know, that whatever there is in it which shows any unusual insight into nature or life, was learned from women, from my wife, and subsequently, also, from her daughter. What you so justly say respecting the infinitely closer relationship of a child to its mother than to its father, I have learned from the same source to regard as full of important consequences with respect to the future legal position of parents and children. This, however, is a portion of the truth for which the human mind will not for some time be sufficiently prepared to make its discussion useful. But I do not perceive that this close relationship gives any ground for attributing a natural superiority in capacity of moral excellence to women over men. I believe moral excellence to be always the fruit of education and cultivation, and I see no reason to doubt that both sexes are equally capable of that description of cultivation. But the position of irresponsible power in which men have hitherto lived is, I need hardly say, most unfavourable to every kind of moral excellence. So far as women have been in possession of irresponsible power, they, too, have by no means escaped the baleful consequences. With hearty congratulations on the progress of the cause of women in both our countries, and in most other parts of the civilized world, I am, dear madam, yours very truly,
J. S. MILL."

CORRESPONDENCE.

TAXATION WITHOUT REPRESENTATION.

To the Editor of the Women's Suffrage Journal.

Madam,—We shall feel obliged if you will permit us through the medium of your *Journal* to make known that we have refused payment of Queen's taxes, as a protest against taxation without representation, and that it is our intention to renew this protest next year.

We have acted thus, and shall again so act, from the conviction that in no other way can the injustice of denying the suffrage to women be so clearly and forcibly brought before the public mind. The basis of representation in this country is the ownership or occupation of land or houses, together with the payment of taxes imposed thereon. We, as owners and occupiers, bear our full share of taxation; yet we are denied Parliamentary representation. We say that this is a manifest injustice, and we cannot willingly submit to it. We must protest against it, practically, resolutely, and publicly, though at the same time peaceably. And we believe that if other women-householders would join us in this course, the effect on public opinion, and on the legislature, would be very great.

The opponents of women's suffrage are constantly saying that women do not want the franchise: that when any real demand for it is made by women themselves, it shall be granted. Now let women refuse the taxes—who will then aver that they are not in earnest? Hampden was in earnest when he refused the ship-money; our American Colonies were in earnest when they would not submit to the tea tax: the Nonconformists were in earnest when they allowed their goods to be seized for church-rates. In each of these cases was not the right thus maintained triumphant? If women-householders generally were to refuse the taxes, it may be safely predicted that the removal of their electoral disabilities would not be long delayed. Women are too often deterred by a dread of singularity from doing what they see to be right; but if any considerable number unite in a mode of action, this obstacle is removed. Among the thousands of women qualified to vote, and excluded from voting solely on account of their sex, there are many who feel keenly the injustice done to them. If any such are willing to join in our protest next year, they will aid the cause by sending their names to us.—We are, madam, yours respectfully,

CHARLOTTE E. BABB,

103, Gloucester Road, Regent's Park.

ROSE A. HALL,

Orange Hill, Hendon, Middlesex.

Nov. 1873.

A WOMAN REFUSES TO BE TAXED.

ST. LOUIS, Oct. 14.—Mrs. Virginia L. Minor, formerly President of the Missouri State Woman's Suffrage Association, has notified the Board of Assessors of this county, that she refuses to make them a return of her property subject to taxation, on the ground that under the decision of the Supreme Court of this State she, being *feme covert*, cannot own the money wherewith to pay taxes thereon, and further because she thinks that taxation without representation is the sum of all tyranny.—*Pioneer* (San Francisco).

Just Published.

THE RIGHT OF WOMEN TO EXERCISE THE ELECTIVE FRANCHISE. By MRS. HENRY DAVIS POCHIN. Reprinted for the National Society for Women's Suffrage, from a pamphlet published in 1855. Price threepence. To be had of the Secretary, 9, Berners-street, London, W.; or 28, Jackson's Row, Albert Square, Manchester.

MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS.

BATH.

Miss Lilius Ashworth was nominated for the Town Council, but the Town Clerk decided that the nomination was illegal, and refused to put her name on the ballot paper. Miss Ashworth subsequently addressed the following letter to the Bath papers:—

"MISS ASHWORTH'S NOMINATION FOR THE TOWN COUNCIL.

To the Editor of the Bath Chronicle.

Sir,—I was away from home last week, and only found on my return that an attempt had been made to nominate me for the Town Council. This was done without my knowledge. Owing to many engagements and frequent absence from home, I could not consent to become a candidate for any local board.

The Municipal Corporations Act of 1869 has the word person, instead of male person, in all the clauses relative to the qualification of Town Councillors, and, so far, there would seem to be no doubt that women are eligible, the same or similar terms being used in the Education Act, which admits women to seats on School Boards.

The terms of the clause which was inserted in 1869 in the Municipal Corporations Act for the purpose of giving the suffrage to women, appear, however, to throw some doubt on the question. I believe that legal opinion is divided.

Claverton Lodge, Nov. 5th.

LILIAS S. ASHWORTH."

THE PROPERTY OF MARRIED WOMEN.

A deputation waited upon the Right Honourable Russell Gurney, M.P., at his residence, Palace Gardens, on November 15th, to request his renewed support of the Bill to amend the law with respect to the property of married women, which was formerly introduced by him, and in consequence of his absence taken charge of by Mr. Hinde Palmer, who has given notice of it for next session. The learned recorder promised to give his name and best assistance to the Bill, but declined to take the conduct of it from Mr. Hinde Palmer, as it could not be in better hands.

The committee beg to call the attention of those interested in this matter to the urgent need of immediate pecuniary support. The accounts for the financial year just completed showed a deficiency in the shape of a small balance due to the treasurer, and the funds now in hand are insufficient to carry on the work of the committee.

The following subscriptions and donations have been received since September. The first six sums belong to the last financial year, and are included in the balance sheet presented at the annual meeting in Manchester.

	£	s.	d.
Miss J. Boucherett	3	0	0
Mrs. Harriet Martineau	1	1	0
Mr. Archibald Briggs	1	1	0
Mrs. Thos. Lindsay	1	0	0
Mrs. M'Kinnel	1	0	0
Rev. J. and Mrs. Freeston	0	5	0
Mr. Samuel Morley, M.P.	10	0	0
Mr. J. Hinde Palmer, M.P.	2	2	0
Mrs. Ogden	2	0	0
Mrs. H. Gillson	2	0	0
Mr. A. Trevelyan	2	0	0
Mr. R. R. Rathbone	1	0	0
Mr. J. Leake, Jun.	0	10	6
Miss Marshall	0	6	0
Miss H. Lupton	0	5	0
	£27	10	6

LYDIA E. BECKER, Treasurer.

28, Jackson's Row, Albert Square, Manchester.

MANCHESTER NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE.

THE ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING will be held in the Mayor's Parlour, Town Hall, King-street, on Wednesday, December 3rd, 1873, chair to be taken at three o'clock, p.m., by THOMAS THOMASSON, Esq., of Bolton. The Rev. T. GASQUOINE, B.A., of Oswestry; Dr. PANKHURST; Rev. S. ALFRED STEINTHAL; Miss BECKER; Miss WOLSTENHOLME; Mrs. LUCAS, and other ladies and gentlemen are expected to attend and take part in the proceedings. The attendance of friends is invited.

MANCHESTER NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE.

SUBSCRIPTIONS AND DONATIONS RECEIVED DURING NOVEMBER, 1873.

	£	s.	d.
Miss Praed.....	10	0	0
Sir Thomas Bazley, Bart., M.P.....	5	0	0
Mr. P. Goldschmidt.....	5	0	0
Mrs. Wm. Grey.....	2	2	0
Mr. Councillor Lee.....	2	2	0
Mrs. Long.....	2	0	0
Mrs. Chas. Bowman (for 1872 and 1873).....	2	0	0
Mrs. Hetherington.....	1	1	0
Miss Ramsbottom.....	1	1	0
R. W.....	1	1	0
Dr. Samelson.....	1	0	0
Mrs. Abel Heywood.....	1	0	0
Rev. T. Gasquoine.....	0	10	6
Mrs. Alfred Watts.....	0	5	0
Mr. Huntsman.....	0	2	6
Mad. Emilie Lohner.....	0	2	6
Mrs. Wayham.....	0	2	6
Miss F. A. Trevor.....	0	2	6
Mr. E. S. R. Trevor.....	0	2	6
Miss Mary Trevor.....	0	2	0
Miss Smith.....	0	1	0

£34 18 0

S. ALFRED STEINTHAL, Treasurer.

107, Upper Brook-street, Manchester.

Friends who have not yet sent in their subscriptions for the financial year just closing, are earnestly requested to forward them at once to the Treasurer.

Cheques and Post Office Orders should be made payable to the Treasurer, Rev. S. ALFRED STEINTHAL, and may be sent either direct to him at 107, Upper Brook-street; or to the Secretary, Miss BECKER, 28, Jackson's Row, Albert Square, Manchester.

BRISTOL AND WEST OF ENGLAND BRANCH OF THE NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE.

SUBSCRIPTIONS AND DONATIONS RECEIVED SINCE OCTOBER 18th, 1873.

	£	s.	d.
Mrs. John Robberds.....	5	0	0
Lady Goldsmid.....	3	0	0
Mr. Herbert Thomas.....	2	2	0
Mr. Handel Cossham.....	2	2	0
Mrs. Coates.....	1	1	0
Mrs. Holroyd.....	1	0	0
Mr. C. F. Tait, B.A.....	0	10	0
Mr. and Mrs. J. F. Norris.....	0	10	0
Mr. Wm. Weaver.....	0	10	0
Mr. Thos. Brewin.....	0	5	0
Mme. de St. de Manin.....	0	5	0
Mr. Lawford Huxtable.....	0	2	6
Mr. John Keal.....	0	2	6
Mr. Thomas Adams.....	0	2	0
Mrs. Stone.....	0	2	0
Mr. and Mrs. Frederick Dyer.....	0	2	0
Rev. Alfred Norris.....	0	1	0

£17 0 0

Miss ANNIE WESTLAND, Secretary.

Office: 53, Park Street, Bristol.

CENTRAL COMMITTEE.

Contributions to the funds of the Central Committee of the National Society for Women's Suffrage, 9, Berners Street, London, W., from October 20th to November 28th, 1873.

	£	s.	d.
Mrs. Thomas Taylor.....	3	0	0
W. M. Rossetti, Esq.....	1	0	0
W. S. Caine, Esq.....	2	0	0
Miss Dowling.....	1	1	0
Mrs. Thomas Taylor.....	2	2	0
Miss Bayne.....	0	2	6

£9 5 6

MARY DOWLING, Secretary.

EDINBURGH NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE.

SUBSCRIPTIONS AND DONATIONS RECEIVED SINCE AUGUST, 1873.

	£	s.	d.
Mr. Thomasson.....	100	0	0
Baillie Scott.....	20	0	0
Mrs. Scott Gordon.....	10	0	0
Hon. Miss Norton.....	10	0	0
Miss E. Stevenson.....	7	0	0
Mr. J. Morton.....	5	0	0
Mrs. Renton.....	5	0	0
Miss L. Stevenson.....	5	0	0
Miss Taylour.....	5	0	0
Mr. J. H. Renton.....	2	2	0
Mrs. Masson.....	2	0	0
R. A. Macfie, Esq., M.P.....	2	0	0
Mrs. McLeod.....	2	0	0
Mr. Whyte Millar.....	2	0	0
Mrs. Hope.....	2	0	0
Miss Hope.....	2	0	0
Miss Du Pre.....	1	1	0
Dr. McKenzie.....	1	1	0
Mr. J. Mitchel.....	1	1	0
Mrs. W. Robson.....	1	1	0
Caldwell Brothers.....	1	0	0
Mr. Brownlie.....	1	0	0
Captain Young.....	1	0	0
Mr. Murray.....	1	0	0
J. Yeaman, Esq., M.P.....	1	0	0
Mrs. Bankhead.....	1	0	0
Mr. J. D. Milne.....	1	0	0
Mr. Hill Burton.....	1	0	0
Mrs. McKinnel.....	1	0	0
Mr. A. S. Stevenson.....	1	0	0
Miss F. Stevenson.....	1	0	0
Miss M. Smith.....	1	0	0
Mrs. McQueen.....	1	0	0
Mrs. Hope.....	1	0	0
Miss Dick.....	1	0	0
Miss Crowe.....	0	10	0
Mr. Morrison.....	0	10	0
Mr. Lang.....	0	10	0
Mrs. B. Mein.....	0	10	0
Mrs. Wallstod.....	0	10	0
Sir J. Murray, Bart.....	0	10	0
Miss Stewart.....	0	10	0
Mrs. Gerard.....	0	5	0
Mr. McMicking.....	0	5	0

£206 16 0

While gratefully acknowledging past aid, the Committee earnestly appeal to their friends for funds. The expense of holding public meetings throughout Scotland for the most part devolves upon them, and unless there is an early increase of subscriptions and donations, much important work must remain undone.

Contributions will be thankfully received by the Treasurer, Miss A. Craig, 6, Carlton Street, Edinburgh.

Printed by A. IRELAND & Co., Pall Mall, Manchester, for the MANCHESTER NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE, and Published by Messrs. Trubner and Co., 57 and 59, Ludgate Hill, London.—December 1, 1873.