

WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE JOURNAL.

EDITED BY LYDIA E. BECKER.

VOL. XIV.—No. 162. PUBLISHED MONTHLY.

JULY 2, 1883.

PRICE ONE PENNY.
By Post THREE HALFPENCE.

Contents :

Leading Articles:—A Place secured for Mr. Mason's Resolution; Meetings in Support of the Resolution; Respect of Work since last Debate; Town Councils Petitions; Change of Circumstances since 1-st Debate; Women's Suffrage and the coming Reform Bill; Women and Public Work; Comparison of Claimants for the Suffrage; Canvassing Women Electors; Injustice of leaving out Women in the Reform Bill; Assaults on Wives during June; Wife-beating *versus* Husband-beating.

Election Intelligence:—Derby, Peterborough.
Parliamentary Intelligence:—The Home Secretary on the Opinions of Women, Lady Poor-Law Inspectors, Protection of Young Girls, Criminal Law Amendment Bill.
Town Councils:—Kirkcaldy, Huddersfield, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Bury.
Local Boards:—Moss Side (Manchester), Heckmondwike.
Public Meetings:—Grantham, Birmingham, London, Hammersmith.
Municipal Election:—Croydon.

Debating Societies:—Weston-super-Mare, Society for Promoting the Election of Women Poor-Law Guardians.
Canadian Women's Suffrage Association.
The Movement for Women's Suffrage in Paris.
Curious Operation of the Married Women's Property Married Women as Ratepayers. [Act.
Income-Tax on Married Women's Property.
Obituary:—Miss Ann Sykes Swaine.
Treasurers' Reports:—Central Committee: Manchester; Bristol and West of England; Notts. Branch.

GREAT MEETING IN ST JAMES' HALL.

A PUBLIC MEETING will be held in St. James' Hall, Piccadilly, London,
THURSDAY, JULY 5TH, 1883,

In support of the Resolution to be moved by Mr. Mason in the House of Commons, on July 6th, for extending the Parliamentary Franchise to Women who possess the qualifications which entitle men to vote.

Mrs. FAWCETT.
Dr. CAMERON, M.P.
Miss TOD.
J. P. THOMASSON, Esq., M.P.
CHAS. B. McLAREN, Esq., M.P.
Mrs. E. CADY STANTON.
Miss SUSAN B. ANTHONY.

W. S. CAINE, Esq., M.P.
Mrs. FENWICK MILLER.
ARTHUR ARNOLD, Esq., M.P.
Miss BECKER.
A. ILLINGWORTH, Esq., M.P.
Miss MULLER.
C. H. HOPWOOD, Esq., M.P.
Professor LINDSAY, D.D.

Mrs. OLIVER SCATCERD.
R. P. BLENNERHASSETT, Esq., M.P.
Miss ELIZA STURGE.
THOS. ROE, Esq., M.P.
J. A. BLAKE, Esq., M.P.
W. SUMMERS, Esq., M.P.
THOS. BURT, Esq., M.P.

Mrs. ASHFORD, Birmingham; Mrs. BEDDOE, Bristol; Mrs. COWEN, Nottingham; Mrs. J. R. FORD, Leeds; Miss LUTON, Bradford; Mrs. McLAREN, Edinburgh; Miss E. SMITH, Hyde; Mrs. J. P. THOMASSON, Bolton; Miss LAURA WHITTLE, Liverpool; Miss BEWICKE, Miss C. A. BIGGS, Miss CODDEN, Mrs. ORMISTON CHANT, Mrs. HOGGAN, M.D., Mrs. LUCAS, Miss FRANCES LORD, Mrs. PATERSON, Miss STACPOOLE, London; and other Ladies and Gentlemen are expected to be present.

The Chair will be taken at Eight o'clock by
WILLIAM WOODALL, Esq., M.P.

Numbered Sofa Stalls, 2s. 6d. Balcony and Reserved Seats, 1s. Body of the Hall and Gallery, FREE. Tickets may be obtained at the Office of the Society, 29, Parliament-street, S.W., and at the Ticket Office, St. James' Hall. Doors Open at Seven o'clock. Organ Recital, Seven to Eight.

ISLINGTON.—A Public Meeting will be held in the Myddleton Hall, on Monday, July 2nd. The meeting will be addressed by Mrs. Fenwick-Miller, M.S.L.B., Mrs. Frances Hoggan, M.D., Miss C. A. Biggs, Miss S. Ward Andrews, Mr. Lucraft, M.S.L.B., J. P. Torr, Esq., J. R. Shearer, Esq., and others. The Chair will be taken at eight o'clock, by Mrs. SURR, M.S.L.B. Admission Free.

CHELSEA.—A Public Meeting will be held in the Vestry Hall, King's Road, on Tuesday, July 3rd. Mrs. Lucas, Mrs. Ormiston Chant, Miss C. A. Biggs, Miss Laura Whittle, Edmund Routledge, Esq., Wm. Pennack, Esq., J. H. Raper, Esq., H. R. Cobb, Esq., Alfred Oakley, Esq., and other ladies and gentlemen are expected to be present. The Chair will be taken at eight o'clock, by JOSEPH F. B. FIRTH, Esq., M.P. Admission Free.

TOWLE'S CHLORODYNE

Pleasant and effective remedy for Coughs, Asthma, Bronchitis, Consumption, and Diarrhoea, 1s. 6d. and 2/9, of Chemists; also in 6d. and 1s. boxes.

Towle's Chlorodyne Lozenges. Towle's Chlorodyne Jujubes.

LAMBETH.—A Public Meeting will be held at "The Horns," on Tuesday, July 3rd. Miss Müller, Miss Lord, Miss Whitehead, Mrs. E. Cady Stanton, Mrs. Walter McLaren, Miss Isabella Cooper, Miss Jessie Craigen, John Mann, Esq., Geo. Hill, Esq., — Lille, Esq., and other ladies and gentlemen are expected to be present. The Chair will be taken at eight o'clock, by the Rev. C. E. BROOKE, M.A., M.L.S.B., Vicar of St. John's, Brixton. Admission Free.

PADDINGTON.—A Public Meeting will be held in the Vestry Hall, on Wednesday, July 4th. Mrs. Arthur Arnold, Miss Orme, Miss Stacpoole, and others are expected to address the meeting. The Chair will be taken at eight o'clock, by ARTHUR ARNOLD, Esq., M.P. Admission Free.

HACKNEY.—A Public Meeting will be held in the New Town Hall, Hackney, on Wednesday, July 4th. The meeting will be addressed by Mrs. Chant, Miss C. A. Biggs, Miss Tod, James Hart, Esq., Chas. Hancock, Esq., B.L., M.A., James R. R. Elliot, Esq., R. Bishell, Esq., B.Sc., and others. The Chair will be taken at eight o'clock, by Mrs. FENWICK-MILLER, M.L.S.B. Admission Free.

THE MARRIED WOMEN'S PROPERTY ACTS.
With an Introduction and Notes on the Act of 1882. By H. N. Mozley, M.A.—BUTTERWORTH, 7, Fleet-street, London, E.C.

It is always safe
to use
**Reckitt's
Blue.**

NOTICE.—To the Nobility, Clergy, Gentry, and all whom it may concern in the United Kingdom. By sending Eightpence in stamps you will receive a bottle of
OGDEN'S UNSURPASSED REAL OLD ENGLISH FURNITURE CREAM,
by which you can produce a brilliancy on all kinds of Furniture, unrivalled by none.

J. E. OGDEN,

65, Tennyson Place, Bradford, Yorkshire.

THE HISTORY OF WOMAN SUFFRAGE.
Illustrated with steel engravings. Edited by Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Susan B. Anthony, Matilda Joslyn Gage. Complete in three octavo volumes. Vols. I. and II. now ready. Price, cloth, two pounds.

The question of Woman Suffrage, the rights and status of Woman, has already become one of the vital political issues of the day; therefore, its relation to political, social, and religious questions should be thoroughly understood.

The *Phila. Evening Bulletin* says: "The magnitude of this history prevents us from giving even a sketch of it, but we simply and honestly say that it is a noble production, honourable to its editors and to its subject, and fairly representing the characters of the really great women, like Mrs. Stone, Lucretia Mott, Harriet Martineau, and scores of others in England and this country, who made the claim of equal rights of suffrage a part of their political and religious creeds."

The *N. Y. Observer* says: "The able editors present this work as an arsenal of facts, to which all interested in the subject may resort and find whatever is worth knowing in regard to the movement. The history of such a movement is full of interest, and while the material is at hand and easily gathered, the editors have done well to gather it into these thick volumes, and preserve it as a part of the record of this remarkable age. The portraits of women here presented make us acquainted with the features of some who have become famous."

To be had from the office of this Journal, 28, Jackson's Row, Manchester.

THE ENFRANCHISEMENT OF WOMEN
THE LAW OF THE LAND. By SIDNEY SMITH. Price Threepence.—London: Trübner and Co. Manchester: A. Ireland and Co. May be had also at 28, Jackson's Row, Manchester.

WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE JOURNAL.—Communications for the Editor and Orders for the Journal to be addressed to Miss BECKER, 29, Parliament-street, Westminster, London, S.W.; or to the Office, 28, Jackson's Row, Albert Square, Manchester.

PETITION! PETITION! PETITION!—

Friends of Women's Suffrage are earnestly exhorted to aid the cause by collecting signatures during the recess for petitions, to be presented in support of Mr. Mason's Resolution, which will come on for discussion in Parliament on July 6th. Petitions from women householders or others who possess the qualifications which entitle men to vote are particularly valuable. Special forms of petition to be signed by such women, as well as general petitions, ready for signature, will be supplied on application to Miss BECKER, 29, Parliament-street, London, S.W., or 28, Jackson's Row, Albert Square, Manchester; Miss BLACKBURN, 20, Park-street, Bristol; or Miss KIRKLAND, 13, Raeburn Place, Edinburgh.

PETITIONS.

WOMEN'S DISABILITIES.—For Removal. ELEVENTH REPORT, 9—25 May, 1883.

Table listing petitions for removal of disabilities, including entries for Dumfries, Leeds, Sheffield, Derby, Harcourt, Inverness, Budleigh Salterton, Grimsby, Leeds, York, Taunton, Isabella Gwynne, Downton, and Darlington.

Total number of Petitions 184—Signatures 5,108. The Petitions marked thus (*) are substantially similar to that from Plymouth (APP. 5). The Petitions marked thus (C) are from public meetings, and are signed officially.

PARLIAMENTARY FRANCHISE.—For Extension to Women. ELEVENTH REPORT, 11—25 May, 1883.

Table listing petitions for extension of parliamentary franchise to women, including entries for Dunfermline, Peebles, Helensburgh, Galashiels, Dundee, Aberdeen, and Saint Andrew's.

PARLIAMENTARY FRANCHISE.—For Extension to Women. TWELFTH REPORT, 28 May—5 June, 1883.

Table listing petitions for extension of parliamentary franchise to women, including entries for Harrow and Derby.

Table listing petitions for removal of disabilities, including entries for Forest Hill, Chelsea, Edinburgh, Shepherd's Bush, Bromley, Holloway, Canworthy, Saint Columb, Bodmin, Par, Paisley, and Cricklade.

Total number of Petitions 207—Signatures 5,611

PARLIAMENTARY FRANCHISE.—For Extension to Women. THIRTEENTH REPORT, 8—11 June, 1883.

Table listing petitions for extension of parliamentary franchise to women, including entries for Scotland, Ebbw Vale, Hammersmith, Kennington, Lochmaben, Oxford, and Exmouth.

Total number of Petitions 214—Signatures 5,703

FOURTEENTH REPORT, 14—19 June, 1883.

Table listing petitions for extension of parliamentary franchise to women, including entries for Kirkcaldy, Grantham, Sanquhar, Manchester, Pontnewydd, Crofton, Henry Rundle, and Portland.

Total number of Petitions 223—Signatures 5,787

APPENDIX TO THE TENTH REPORT.

App. 208. Mr. Mackintosh. Seal. Sig. 1. 15,682. The petition of the Provost, Magistrates, and Town Council of the Royal Burgh of Forres, Humbly sheweth, That under the second section of "The Municipal Elections Amendment (Scotland) Act 1881," the municipal franchise has been conferred on the women of this country holding the necessary property and occupancy qualifications. That, in the opinion of your petitioners, it is desirable that the Parliamentary franchise should be also conferred upon women similarly qualified. Your petitioners therefore pray your honourable House to amend the election laws of the country accordingly. And your petitioners will ever pray, &c. Signed in Council assembled, in name and on behalf of the Council, and the seal of the burgh affixed hereto, on this twenty-fifth day of April, eighteen hundred and eighty-three, JOHN BURN, Provost.

WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE JOURNAL.

EDITED BY LYDIA E. BECKER.

VOL. XIV.—No. 162. PUBLISHED MONTHLY.

JULY 2, 1883.

PRICE ONE PENNY. BY POST THREE HALFPENCE.

SINCE our last issue the aspect of affairs as regards Parliamentary action has undergone a sudden change. After two sessions of unsuccessful efforts to obtain a night for the discussion of his Resolution, Mr. MASON has at last secured the first place at the evening sitting on Friday next, when he will move his Resolution in the following terms: "That, in the opinion of this House, the Parliamentary franchise should be extended to women who possess the qualifications which entitle men to vote, and who in all matters of local government have the right of voting."

Our friends will have observed the announcements in the newspaper press that Mr. MASON had secured his day, and they will doubtless have taken such measures as the shortness of the notice would allow to give to the measure all the support they could. We urge them to press these efforts up to the very day of the debate, to continue to send petitions and letters, and to leave no means untried by which they may influence their Parliamentary representatives to give their support to Mr. MASON'S resolution.

OUR readers will observe from our advertising columns that a series of meetings in support of Mr. MASON'S Resolution is announced for the first days of July, in various districts of London, culminating in a large meeting in St. James' Hall, at which delegates and representatives from the various societies throughout the country will be present. Friends both in London and elsewhere will do good service to the cause by attending the meetings; and those who intend to be present at St. James' Hall, on July 5th, should at once apply for tickets to the Secretary, at the offices of the Society, 29, Parliament-street, London.

THE last debate in the House of Commons on the franchise for women took place on March 7th, 1879. At that time none of the great demonstrations of women in support of their claim for enfranchisement had taken

place. But, after the defeat in the expiring Parliament which was dissolved in 1880, this mode of manifesting the magnitude and earnestness of the demand of women for the suffrage was adopted. The example was set at Manchester, in the historical Free Trade Hall. The whole of the vast area, galleries, and platform was thronged with a dense crowd, with the exception of the reporters and a few men in the gallery, exclusively of women. An overflow meeting had to be arranged to accommodate the crowds of women who were unable to find admittance.

The same words might serve to describe the succeeding gatherings that speedily followed in the same year in St. James' Hall, London, and in the Colston Hall, Bristol; in 1881 at the Albert Hall, Nottingham, at the Town Hall, Birmingham, and at St. George's Hall, Bradford; in 1882 in the Albert Hall, Sheffield, and in St. Andrew's Hall, Glasgow. These meetings were unique and unprecedented in character, and were all characterised by the greatest enthusiasm and earnestness in support of the claim of women to political rights. To have been present at one of these gatherings is an experience never to be forgotten.

Besides these great and special demonstrations, many large and enthusiastic meetings have been held in many large towns and Parliamentary boroughs, at all of which resolutions in favour of the principle were adopted.

Among the more recent of these may be mentioned a great meeting in January, in the Town Hall, Birmingham, also important meetings in March at Malton and Scarborough, at York and Wakefield in April, and at Grimsby, Derby, and Grantham in May. The chairman of the meeting at Derby, Mr. Alderman ROE, has since been returned to Parliament as member for the borough.

EIGHTEEN Town Councils in Scotland have already petitioned the House of Commons in favour of extending the Parliamentary franchise to women—Edinburgh, Galashiels, Aberdeen, Forres, Dingwall, Dumfries, Inverness, Paisley, St. Andrews, Peebles, Helensburgh, Dunfermline, Dundee, Lochmaben, Kirkcaldy, Sanquhar, and North

Berwick. The Commissioners of the Royal and Parliamentary Burghs have petitioned. Comparatively few of the English Councils have met since Mr. MASON obtained a day for his Resolution, but already petitions have been adopted in its favour by the Councils of Huddersfield, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Jarrow-on-Tyne, and Lincoln. The Birmingham Eight Hundred and Local Boards in many districts have also adopted petitions in favour of the Resolution.

THE four years that have elapsed since the last discussion in Parliament on the franchise for women, which took place on Mr. COURTNEY'S Resolution in April, 1879, have been fruitful of so many changes that, in again presenting the subject for the consideration of the Legislature, we seem to be doing so under new conditions and in a new world. It seems like ancient history to recall the days of 1879, when Lord BEACONSFIELD was Prime Minister, and the Parliament elected in 1874, which gave him his large majority, was still in existence. At that time there seemed no immediate project of any attempt being made to alter the representation of the people, and the demand for the enfranchisement of the county householder, though pressed with earnestness by the more advanced Liberals, had not yet received the formal adhesion of the leaders of the party. Under these circumstances it was hardly to be expected that Parliament would assent to a measure dealing with the enfranchisement of women. Then there seemed no likelihood of the near approach of any measure of Parliamentary Reform. Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE, at that time leader of the House of Commons, gave this as his reason for not then supporting Mr. COURTNEY'S Resolution, although he had on former occasions voted for it; but he added that, whenever the question of enfranchising householders in counties came up for settlement, the case of the women should be dealt with along with the others.

THE time indicated in this utterance seems now at hand. The Ministry and the Parliament of 1874 are things of the past. A new Parliament and a new Ministry have taken their place, both pledged deeply to the introduction of a measure for extending the operation of household suffrage in the counties. We may, therefore, assume that Parliament has practically conceded the principle that a householder, who under the existing law would be entitled to vote if he lived in a Parliamentary borough, shall not be denied the vote because he lives in a county. From this principle it does not seem a wide step to take to

admit that a householder, whether in a borough or county, who under the existing law possesses every statutory qualification for the franchise, shall not be debarred from the exercise of the franchise simply by reason of being a woman.

The Memorial presented lately to Mr. GLADSTONE, signed by one hundred and ten Liberal members of Parliament, sets forth this principle distinctly. It states that no measure for the assimilation of the County and Borough Franchise will be satisfactory, unless it contains provisions for extending the suffrage, without distinction of sex, to all persons who possess the statutory qualifications for the Parliamentary franchise.

The Resolution to be moved by Mr. MASON should command the support of all who have signed this Memorial, and of large numbers of friends on both sides of the House, who have in other ways signified their assent to the principle.

THE surest guarantee for political liberty is the possession of civil liberty, and the best school of political knowledge is the smaller round of parish or district duties. In the "History of the Rise of the Dutch Republic," MOTLEY justly points out that the foundation of the independence of the Netherlands was laid in semi-barbarous ages by the civic offices and their consequent training to public duty, which included so large a body of the citizens. The political liberties of England have similarly grown out of the local liberties; St. Stephen's has risen out of local parliaments; nor can there be a surer test of fitness for the onerous responsibilities of political life than the steady performance and intelligent comprehension of the smaller duties belonging to local public work. Those who are "faithful over few things," shall be made rulers over many things.

This truth seems to be ignored by that large section of politicians who, while admitting that women are capable of doing good service by their faithful use of the lesser franchises with which they have been entrusted, are afraid to confide to their hands that last franchise which crowns the whole. But such policy has been singularly short-sighted. There is no man, we may safely say, who would withdraw, if he could, the vote for the school board, which ever since the law was passed has been in the hands of women jointly with men. If mistakes have from time to time arisen in its exercise, politicians are satisfied that the voters, men and women alike, will learn by experience, and that the education franchise is in itself an

educative measure. It would be a bold member of either House who would now rise to say that women were unfit to exercise a vote for poor-law guardians, or a vote for local boards, or for vestries, &c.; they have had these votes from immemorial times just as men have had them, and have learned the same lessons that men learned from them. Similarly, no one comes forward to deny that women have, in the vast majority of cases, proved themselves capable of exercising the municipal vote—nay, more, the present Parliament has endorsed the principle of women's suffrage by extending the municipal vote to Scottish women, and by placing, by implication at least, municipal offices within the reach of women. But all history teaches that national rights are the outgrowth of local rights. That is to say, that men having themselves learned Parliamentary knowledge and acquired legislative capacity in the school of local, municipal and parish rights and duties, have voluntarily for years opened the doors of this same school to women.

This school for public duty covers an extended area. In England and Wales there are more than 240 municipal boroughs, and about 800 local board districts. In all of these women have the vote. There are in the same area 649 unions for the relief of the poor, with an army of about 20,000 guardians to administer local relief. In this army women are slowly but surely making their way, and in London and other cities are thus sharing in the enormous power for good or evil wielded by poor-law guardians. In the remotest districts in England they may be found taking their seats at the school board. They have submitted to the slow drill of public business; they have acquired the technicalities of public discussion; they have comprehended that public duty is not a fact for men and only a meaningless phrase for women, but that the common country has claims upon the time and the knowledge and the strength of women as well as men.

Women are responding to this claim. During the seventeen years of untiring efforts to obtain the Parliamentary franchise—during the preceding years of patient waiting and prayerful endeavour to secure, one after another, some tardy measures of justice, women have been strengthening and training themselves for the exercise of public duties. They have been faithful over the "few things" that were confided to them. They have had lessons in patience, in toleration, in social and national economy; they have learned the value of combination and co-operation. They have been educated for the

exercise of the franchise slowly, but more surely than any other class of voters hitherto admitted; and they will exercise it as a right indeed, but as a right coupled with a duty and a responsibility to be used for no selfish ends.

C. A. B.

THE adoption in recent years of the method of Comparative Zoology is supposed to have done great things for modern science in the department of Natural History. Let us hope that the approaching debate by forcing on the Legislature some analogous process of comparison between the different claimants to an extending-suffrage will effect a parallel advance in Politics. Hitherto the removal of the disabilities of women has been argued in Parliament as an abstract problem, not by comparing the female sex with other claimants to the same privileges, but treating it as if its appearance upon the stage bore no relation to any previous entry, and must be judged as if there were only two classes politically speaking in existence; namely, Man invested with all rights and powers, and Woman asking, for the first time in history, to be allowed to share them. Now it will be hard if our advocates do not compel the most obtuse of our opponents to remember that it is not by any means *all* men who now possess or have ever possessed political rights, even in our free country, but that one section of the male community after another has been admitted into the pale of the constitution; and that the point has now been reached when comparison must be instituted between the last class of male claimants and the female claimants who, side by side, ask admittance. When it comes to comparing the class of women who possess the present property qualification (from the millionaire heiress to her laundress) with the agricultural labourer, whose demand for a vote will certainly be conceded, we need be under no particular apprehension either on the scores of intelligence or of moral fitness. The Tea-drinking and the Beer-drinking constituencies may be safely left to vie in their selection of trustworthy senators for the British nation.

F. P. C.

THERE is an argument connected with the suffrage question which has never been mentioned and never will be mentioned in Parliament, but which weighs with some of our legislators, perhaps more than any abstract sense of either justice to women or expediency for the public weal. That *argumentum ad hominem* may be popularly rendered: "What a bore it will be to canvass the women voters before every election, and to be pestered with their

silly letters afterwards on every Bill about which they may take a whim into their heads!"

True, these legislators have hitherto canvassed the wives of their constituents pretty diligently, but it has been done in a free and jocose manner; dealing very little with political questions, and much with personal flattery and never-worn-out jokes about the "missus" and her legitimate influence over her spouse. This light and jovial part of past electioneering will not be merely extended by giving the suffrage to the old maids and the widows, but (our legislators perhaps tremblingly anticipate) will be rendered a graver matter altogether if the candidate be liable to be cross-questioned on his policy respecting this, that, and the other measure before Parliament by some tiresome elderly spinster or garrulous old widow, enchanted, for once in a way, to pin a "gentleman" to listen to her silly lucubrations.

Let the souls of our afflicted M.P.'s rest in peace. If some female voters be thus troublesome, they will find others at least as pleasant to deal with as HODGE, and a good deal more interested in their canvass. Perhaps nothing will tend so much to change the opinion which men now entertain of women (judging them too often we fear from unfavourable specimens with whom they have had much to do) than to pay canvassing visits to some forty or fifty of those very spinsters and widows who may now be seen recording their votes at School-board elections, and who will hereafter proceed with the same seriousness and sense of responsibility to register them at the elections of members of Parliament. F. P. C.

Of course the main argument for the approaching debate must be the cruel wrong—the *sanglant* insult which it will be to all women, if the next extension of the suffrage does not include them, while it *will* include the rudest boors who dwell on English soil. Doubly must the nation suffer from such a decision, by which a fresh contribution of political ignorance and of always possible disturbance will be introduced into public affairs (rightly or wrongly, we are not here pronouncing an opinion), while the reserve force of intelligence, morality, religion, and orderliness in the nation, will be not only kept out, but kept out under circumstances which will be accepted by many as final. If women should, after such a defeat of their legitimate aspirations, turn back from the noble path of mental cultivation and practical public usefulness which they have been following steadily for a generation, those whose *chivalry* will have defeated them will have much,

very much indeed, to answer for. But we will not anticipate evil. We have confidence in the main in the justice, the wisdom, and the generosity of our fellow country-men.

F. P. C.

THERE lie before us a series of cuttings from newspapers published between the dates of June 1st and 22nd, recounting cases of hideous assaults on women. From these we select a few taken almost at random. The words in which the nature of the assaults are described are not ours, but are in each case copied exactly from the newspaper cuttings. We have slightly abridged, but added nothing. All the assaults, and many more which are not here recorded, took place during a period of less than one month.

At Leicester, a young man named THOMAS CARTER quarrelled with his wife, struck her a violent blow on the eye, and when she went into another room to have it bathed he followed her, knocked her down, and bit off her nose; the nose was produced in court in a bottle. At Whitechurch, ELIAS EVANS was convicted for having beaten his wife most unmercifully about the arms with a poker, and kicked her in various parts of her body. At Hull, JOHN M'CORMICK, a coalyard labourer, who had already suffered two terms of imprisonment for wife assaults, was committed again for six months for a brutal assault. His wife was in the house nursing the baby, when the husband entered and with a running kick knocked her off the stool. He then seized her by the hair of the head, but was thrown down and held until the police arrived. At Manchester, a blacksmith named WILLIAM HILL was sentenced to six months' imprisonment for assaulting his wife and breaking her arm. He went home drunk one night and asked his wife for money to get some beer; she refused to give it to him. He knocked her down, and then kicked her in a brutal manner about the legs and body. When she got up again he took hold of her arm, placed it across the table, and deliberately broke it. When she wanted to go out to get medical assistance, he refused to let her go. The punishment of six months' imprisonment for such a horrible act appears to us to be totally inadequate to its enormity.

At Oldham, THOMAS REYNOLDS was sent to gaol for three months for assaulting his wife; he threatened to take her life, and ran something into her hand, which was severely cut. In this case the magistrates made an order for separation. At Leicester, JOHN FINCH was convicted for an assault on his wife; he had been drinking, and because his wife had only bread and lard for tea

he beat her and threw a poker at her with such force that it penetrated her thigh, causing a deep gash, which had to be sewn up. He was sentenced to three months' hard labour. In view of such occurrences as these it is scarcely surprising that women should sign petitions for closing public-houses on Sundays or on other days. Poor things! they are so ignorant as to fancy they would be less subject to such terrible assaults if fewer facilities were offered to their husbands to spend their money on drink; and they may also imagine that if this were the case they might be able to provide something better than bread and lard for tea.

On June 10th, JAMES HORNER, of Cradley Heath, went home drunk and committed a murderous attack on his wife, owing to his supper not being prepared for him. He knocked her down and struck her on the face until she was beyond recognition. He also struck her about the body and inflicted terrible injuries. The woman, who was in a frightful condition, would have been murdered if neighbours had not rescued her. JOHN HALEWOOD, at West Derby, was brought up charged with assaulting his wife. He fastened the door, squeezed her violently about the neck, struck her in the face, threw her down and knelt on her back, and threatened to kill her right out. EDWIN BANKS, at Greenwich, pulled his wife from under the bed by the hair, and knocked her about dreadfully. She ran into the street to avoid him, he followed and hit her till she became insensible.

At Hepburn, JAMES SMITH was charged with knocking down his wife and breaking her arm. The wife refused to prosecute, and he was discharged.

JOHN ROTHERY, of Horbury, was sent to prison for four months for a very brutal assault. He went home drunk, set upon his wife, threw a chair at her, broke a table to pieces, opened the oven door and hurled at her some loaves of bread which were baking. The poor woman rushed into a neighbour's house for refuge, but her husband followed, dragged her out, struck her several times, kicked her down some steps into the road, where he beat and kicked her till she became unconscious. Subsequently she was taken with fits, and again became unconscious.

Let our honourable legislators consider whether any of them would feel equal to the performance of their ordinary duties after having undergone such treatment as was suffered by this woman, with a prospect of a recurrence as soon as the four months are expired.

At the Birmingham Police Court, on June 20th,

WALTER PECKMORE, an architect of respectable connection, was sent to gaol for three months with hard labour for violently assaulting his wife by pounding her face while he held her head between his knees, and thrusting his fingers down her throat after threatening to choke her. The complainant said her husband had constantly ill-treated her during the three years they had been married.

JOHN CONN, at Glasgow, was fined 42s. for assaulting his wife in their own house, and striking her over the head with a poker and kicking and dragging her about the house. At Sheffield, JANE HYDES was violently assaulted by her husband. He jumped upon her and caused very serious injury. The woman was conveyed in a cab to the Infirmary.

At Matlock Bath, on June 20th, WILLIAM RATCLIFFE, who had followed up long-continued and systematic ill-usage of his wife by kicking her on the eve of her confinement, was sentenced to six months' imprisonment. A separation order was granted to the wife. The child born after the last assault was a lifeless cripple.

It is with the utmost reluctance and pain that we inflict these horrible details on our readers, but at the present time, when the question of the franchise is coming before Parliament, we deem it desirable to remind our legislators that the idyllic pictures of the safe and sheltered condition of women, which their imagination conceives as a cause why the protection of the suffrage is needless for them, are not always true to life. If at any time any of them should be disposed to treat questions involving the condition of women with levity or indifference, we conceive that a moment's consideration of these ghastly tragedies would be enough to induce even the most careless of men to give serious attention to any proposal which by raising the political and social status of women would tend to prevent their recurrence.

THE most severe of the sentences pronounced against husbands convicted of any of the violent assaults on their wives described above has been six months' imprisonment with hard labour. With this we may compare the punishment meted in the Central Criminal Court, on June 25th, against a woman, described by the newspaper paragrapher as "A Violent Wife." ELLEN RYDER was indicted for wounding her husband with intent to do him grievous bodily harm. The parties had been married twelve months. The prosecutor alleged that as he was returning home on June 2nd the prisoner had waylaid

him, tried to kick him, and then stabbed him with a knife and inflicted a number of wounds on his head and body. The prisoner was found guilty, and it appeared that she had been previously convicted of assaulting her husband. She was sentenced to twelve months' hard labour.

From this it appears that the Court holds that a wife who assaults her husband deserves twice as much punishment as a husband who assaults his wife, although a husband is at least twice as well able to defend himself from kicks and blows from his wife as a wife is to defend herself against violence from her husband; and wife-beating is, possibly for that reason, a thousand-fold more common a crime than husband-beating.

ELECTION INTELLIGENCE.

DERBY.

A vacancy occurred at Derby through the resignation of the senior member, Mr. Bass. Mr. Alderman Roe was returned in his place unopposed. Mr. Roe occupied the chair at the recent meeting at Derby, and in his first address as a candidate he stated that he was in favour of women's suffrage.

PETERBOROUGH.

The resignation of Captain Whalley caused a vacancy in Peterborough. At a meeting of the Liberal Two Hundred, Mr. Buxton, the Liberal candidate, was questioned upon the extension of the franchise to women householders, when he replied, "he could not see why women should not be allowed to vote in imperial matters, as they did in municipal."

PARLIAMENTARY INTELLIGENCE.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, May 29.

THE HOME SECRETARY ON THE OPINIONS OF WOMEN.

In the course of the debate on the Durham Sunday Closing Bill, the HOME SECRETARY (Sir W. Harcourt) said: The hon. member for Bridport had cast contempt upon the petitions which had been presented to the House, and asserted that many of those who signed them were women. If there was one class more than another more entitled to express an opinion on this subject, it was the women—(hear, hear)—and if they were in favour of the measure, he knew of no stronger argument that could be brought forward.

May 31.

LADY POOR-LAW INSPECTORS.

On the vote to complete the sum of £24,509 for the salaries and expenses of the Local Government Board,

Mr. CROPPER asked whether a lady inspector was to be appointed to continue the good work that had been done by Mrs. Senior.

Mr. HIBBERT replied that the Local Government Board remembered the good results which followed the appointment of Mrs. Senior, and possibly the time was not far off when a lady would be again appointed. There was, however, no intention of appointing a lady immediately; but if the system of boarding-out were much extended the expediency of giving the post of inspector to a lady would certainly be entertained.

HOUSE OF LORDS, May 31.

PROTECTION OF YOUNG GIRLS.

The Earl of ROSEBURY, in presenting a Bill providing for the better protection of young girls, said that in 1881 it was deemed necessary to appoint a Select Committee of that House in reference to the protection of young girls, and that Committee was presided over by Earl Cairns. A great mass of evidence was taken, and it had been carefully analysed, and the Secretary of State, in preparing

this Bill, had followed as closely as possible the recommendations of the Committee. He had, in fact, embodied in the measure all the recommendations of the Committee except the one which suggested that the limit of age for illegal forcible abduction should be raised from 16 to 21 years. After giving the matter full consideration the Secretary of State had not seen his way to adopt that recommendation.

Earl CAIRNS was quite sure the Bill was one that would be received with much interest and with very general satisfaction by the House and the public.

June 25.

CRIMINAL LAW AMENDMENT BILL.

PROTECTION OF YOUNG GIRLS.

In Committee on this Bill clause 1 was agreed to. The Marquis of LOTHIAN moved an amendment to extend the operation of the measure to Scotland.

The Earl of DALHOUSIE accepted the amendment on the part of the Government, and it was accordingly agreed to.

The Bishop of ROCHESTER moved an amendment to empower the infliction of corporal punishment upon an offender. He said that their lordships would be of one mind as to the undesirableness of augmenting corporal punishments, but it would be utterly impossible to further demoralize those who were sufficiently demoralized to be capable of committing a crime of this kind. They had simply to consider what punishment was most likely to deter those who were most likely to commit the crime, or would be most painful and disagreeable to those who had committed it. Those who were acquainted with the administration of the criminal law were of opinion that no punishment was more feared or disliked by criminals than corporal punishment. If that was so, it was the best possible reason for attaching this punishment to this most atrocious crime. At present it might be inflicted for robbery from the person with violence, and it was credited with having diminished the crime of garrotting some years ago. But the crime in question was one that far more deserved that punishment than knocking a man down and stealing his watch. Not long ago, in his diocese, a man attacked a little girl and flung her away in a state of insensibility, and if that man was scourged to the bone, would it not serve him right? There was unfortunately among the lowest class a superstition as to an advantage to be gained by committing that offence, and that superstition rendered it still more desirable to prevent the commission of the crime by corporal punishment. It was emphatically a poor man's question, as the children of the poor were most liable to become the victims of this crime. For these reasons he proposed that the court might adjudge an offender to be privately whipped, "and the number of strokes and the instrument with which they shall be inflicted shall be specified in the sentence."

The Earl of DALHOUSIE said as the clause stood, there was the power of inflicting penal servitude for life. Perhaps the amendment might be more acceptable with some limits as to the age of the prisoners to be so punished.

Lord DENMAN said that if corporal punishment were authorised, it would be necessary to fix the number of lashes to prevent the power being abused.

The Marquis of SALISBURY said that the crime was one of the most horrible that could be conceived, and a widely-spread superstition made it far commoner than it would be. The men who committed it were unable to foresee what was involved in penal servitude for life, but they understood corporal punishment. If the amendment were pressed to a division, he should vote for it.

The Bishop of LONDON objected to the suggested limitation of age, because flogging was not only more deserved, but was more felt, by a hardened ruffian than by a boy.

Lord BRAMWELL said that flogging would have a more deterrent influence than other punishments upon the men who committed these crimes, and particularly upon those who committed it on defenceless children under the influence of a detestable superstition.

The Earl of SHAFTESBURY believed that flogging would have a more deterrent effect than any other punishment. He once took the opportunity to put the question to a number of the criminal classes, and he found that they preferred months of imprisonment to one flogging.

The Earl of DALHOUSIE said the Government were only too glad to be coerced in this matter, and would accept the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Earl of MILLTOWN proposed to omit the last paragraph of clause 5, which empowers the magistrates to exclude the public from the court during the hearing of a charge.

Lord FITZGERALD opposed the amendment, believing that publicity and the pressure of public opinion were necessary safeguards to the administration of the criminal law.

After some discussion,

The Earl of MILLTOWN begged to withdraw his amendment, which was accordingly withdrawn, and

Clause 5 was agreed to.

On clause 6,

The Earl of MILLTOWN said that the Government was going much too far, and was making that a crime which had hitherto been only considered a moral offence. That clause might be made a pretext for extortion. It condemned wholesale cases of real crime, and cases where girls of previously immoral character were concerned. He proposed an amendment to raise the age to 18, in cases where the girl was previously of good character.

The Earl of ABERDEEN suggested that summary jurisdiction ought to be given to magistrates in such cases.

The Earl of DALHOUSIE said that the age of consent was a question of degree. Sixteen was the age adopted by their lordships' committee.

The LORD CHANCELLOR said that the question was one of the balance of public convenience. The punishment named in the clause was the maximum that could be inflicted for the offence named, and therefore it would not be inflicted in cases where there were mitigating circumstances.

After some further discussion, the amendment was negatived without a division.

Lord MOUNT-TEMPLE moved an amendment to raise the age of consent from 16 to 17.

Lord TRURO maintained that, the law to protect girls under 12 having failed, it was useless to endeavour to protect girls up to the age of 16. He believed that they must look for improvement rather to more activity on the part of the police, and to more discreet and careful supervision by parents than to any legislation of this character.

The Earl of ABERDEEN supported the amendment, as he thought that at the age of 17 girls were more in want of protection than at any other time.

Earl CAIRNS observed that it was perfectly true that the present law with regard to the age of 12 had failed. For that reason it was proposed to increase the age, and to make provisions of a different kind. In the Select Committee on this subject he was in favour of making 17 the age, though the Committee decided against him.

The Marquis of SALISBURY said that he did not think it would be wise to extend the proposal of the Government in this matter. The Bill would have great difficulties to contend with in the House of Commons, and greater difficulties when it came to be dealt with by magistrates and juries. If they went beyond what public opinion sanctioned there would be insuperable objections on the part of magistrates and juries to enforce the law.

The Earl of DALHOUSIE hoped that his noble friend would not press the amendment. It was impossible for the Bill to go further than it did in respect of age, for otherwise public opinion would not support the measure. If the Bill went further than public opinion warranted it would make things much worse than before.

The Earl of ABERDEEN thought that a vast change had occurred in public opinion with regard to this matter within the last few years, which made people realise their responsibility in this matter.

The Bishop of CARLISLE said that a large number of persons had taken a deep and self-denying interest in this matter, and it would be a great disappointment to them if the higher age of 17 were not adopted.

Lord NORFOLK supported the amendment, being in favour of the age being raised to 17.

Their lordships divided, and the numbers were:—

Contents	140
Non-Contents	23

Majority	117
-----------------	-----

The amendment was therefore rejected, and the clause was agreed to.

On clause 7 Lord TRURO moved the addition of words providing that, where a solicitation to immorality can be proved against a girl, she should be required to enter into security for good behaviour, or be liable to fine or imprisonment. He observed that solicitation as often came from a girl as from a man, and said that it would not be just to punish a man with severity and to allow girls who were equally guilty to go scot free.

The Earl of DALHOUSIE said that the amendment did not appear to him germane to the clause.

The amendment was withdrawn, and the clause was agreed to.

Lord MOUNT-TEMPLE moved after clause 7 the insertion of a new clause to the effect that a person in authority over a girl under 18 years of age who seduced her should be guilty of a misdemeanour and be liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding two years, with or without hard labour.

The Earl of DALHOUSIE said he should accept the clause.

The Marquis of SALISBURY observed that the age on the notice paper had been originally printed as 16, and now it was moved to make it 18. The proposal might be right, but it seemed a very strong measure to start suddenly on the House so large an alteration of the law.

The Lord CHANCELLOR said the age of 16 had been put in by mistake, where 18 was intended.

Lord MOUNT-TEMPLE said he would withdraw the clause and bring it up again on the report.

Earl CAIRNS moved to raise the age for abduction from 16 to 18 years.

The amendment was agreed to, and the clause was agreed to.

On clause 12, which gave the police the power of searching premises supposed to be used for immoral purposes,

The Earl of MOUNT-EDGUMBE thought that the clause was too wide in its scope, and could hardly pass through the House of Parliament.

The Marquis of SALISBURY thought that the clause was most objectionable, as it gave the police power which might be abused and cause the most terrible injury and outrage to innocent persons, while it would prove useless against those whom it was intended to reach.

On clause 13,

The Earl of SHAFTESBURY moved an amendment with the object of rendering men as well as women liable to punishment for loitering for immoral purposes in any thoroughfare or public place within the limits of the metropolitan police district. Hundreds of thousands of poor girls who were employed in factories, and who were obliged to be out late, asked their lordships for protection in this respect.

The Earl of DALHOUSIE sympathised with the object of the noble earl, but he was afraid that the form of words proposed by the noble earl would enable any woman of bad character to bring charges for the purpose of extortion against male passers-by of having importuned her for an immoral purpose. It would be better, perhaps, if the noble earl would bring up upon the report a fresh clause calculated to secure his object. (Hear.)

The amendment was withdrawn.

Lord COLERIDGE moved an amendment, permitting a magistrate to sentence any person convicted of loitering for immoral purpose to imprisonment for any time less than six months, and if she were under the age of 16, in addition or substitution to detention in a certified home.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Bishop of ROCHESTER moved that the age during which a girl might be retained in a reformatory or certified home should be raised from 16 to 18.

The Earl of DALHOUSIE promised to deal with the point on report.—The amendment was withdrawn.

On clause 15,

Lord COLERIDGE proposed to amend it by providing that any girl or woman who might be concerned in any trial should be entitled to have present thereat any three persons she might name, and should be informed of this right. He believed that if tried in a court without any of their own sex present girls would often be at considerable disadvantage.

Lord BRAMWELL objected to the provision, as it was now in the discretion of the court to allow any friends to be present.

The amendment was adopted.

The clause was then agreed to, as were also the remaining clauses of the Bill.

TOWN COUNCILS.

KIRKCALDY.

The monthly meeting of Town Council and Police Commission took place on Monday evening, June 11th, in the Town Hall, Provost Swan presiding. There were also present Bailies Hendry and Black; Dean of Guild Douglas; Treasurer Westwater; Councillors Fraser, Mackenzie, Stark, Ramsay, Tait, Stocks, Cornfoot, Davidson, Johnston, Dowie, Dale, Tomson, Hutchison, Mitchell, Young, John Lockhart, and Barnet.

THE ELECTORAL RIGHTS OF WOMEN.

Councillor JOHN LOCKHART next moved the following motion, of which he gave notice at last meeting, viz.: "That this Council petition Parliament to extend the provisions of the 2nd section of the Municipal Elections Amendment (Scotland) Act, 1881, to parliamentary elections, and thereby confer the parliamentary as well as the municipal franchise on women." In supporting his motion, Councillor Lockhart said: Provost and gentlemen, I don't think the time of the Council should be taken up discussing such a question as this—(hear, hear)—it is so plain and so just that I think it needs no discussion; and we will not discharge our duty as Councillors unless we resolve to-night to petition Parliament upon the subject. As far as municipal elections are concerned the women in England have now had a vote for many years, and I have never heard a single objection to them voting. Then in regard to parliamentary elections, women, as I said on the last occasion, are as much dependent on good government as men, and more than that, I think they are equally as able to give a sound judgment upon any case that may come before them. I consequently advocate the giving of electoral rights to women as a simple act of justice. Moreover, as was mentioned at last meeting, there is no more difficulty in a woman recording her vote for a member of Parliament or a town councillor than there is in a woman recording her vote for a member of a School Board—and there is no more difficulty in that than there is just now in a woman taking part in municipal elections in England, or going into a bank and transacting any business there. (Hear, hear.) A woman has no difficulty in doing that; and were the banker to act in the same spirit as those who deny her those other privileges he would say, "No, you are not entitled to have that money; you must get some man-body to transact this business for you," and what, I wonder, would we think? (Laughter.) The spirit is the same. I have never heard a solid argument brought against the granting of these rights to women, and I beg to move the resolution which I have now read. (Applause.)

DEAN OF GUILD DOUGLAS: Provost and gentlemen, I have great pleasure in seconding this motion. I think those of us who read the admirable speech of Sandford Fleming, Esq., in Canada, would be very much pleased with his views with regard to the sphere of women. He took up the question of the education of women, and he is strongly in favour of women being educated to the medical profession. We honoured Mr. Fleming only very lately in this room, and it will be very strange, I think, if we don't attach some weight to his opinions in a matter such as this. (Hear, hear.) Then Mr. Fawcett, the Postmaster-General, has lately, for the first time, appointed a lady-doctor as one of the medical officers of the Post Office, where there are so many females employed; and with the advance of opinion which has recently taken place upon this subject, I don't think there are many here who are seriously opposed to this proposal—if there are, all I have to say is this, that it is a mere question of time, and that what is now being agitated for will sooner or later become the law of the land. (Applause.) With these remarks, I beg to second the motion.

Councillor BARNET: I beg to move the previous question. I am quite prepared to follow Councillor Lockhart and Dean of Guild Douglas in opening up every avenue of education, of literature, and of science to women. I do not, however, think that the political arena—especially an exciting political contest—is the place for a woman of fine feelings. It is not merely granting women a certain right we have to consider; but we also impose upon her a duty when we give her the right. Now, I would rather seek to guard our woman-kind from every fierce blast, and I would not be a party to push them into such a vortex as—and we are well aware of the fact—a parliamentary contest too often proves; and it is simply

for the reason that I would not like to see our women-kind degenerate into a sort of political Amazons—(laughter)—that I move the previous question. (Hear, hear.)

Councillor DOWIE: After Councillor Barnet's remarks, I would like very well to hear his opinion as to a lady being allowed to vote in the election of a minister? because in connection with such elections there are often more heart-burnings than there are in connection with the return of a member of Parliament. (Laughter.) I do not, however, suppose that it is intended to compel women to vote, but simply to give them an opportunity of doing so if they wish, and I see no reason why a person who is compelled to pay taxes, and who carries on business on her own account should not have a vote in municipal matters and in parliamentary matters as well. (Hear, hear.)

Councillor TAIT: I have much pleasure in seconding the previous question. Councillor Lockhart has really produced no facts to satisfy my mind that we should extend the suffrage to females, and I agree with Councillor Barnet that women would be very much better to have no active interest in election matters.

Bailie BLACK: Provost and gentlemen, it seems to me that no sufficient argument has been advanced why this concession should be withheld from the ladies, because the same argument used for upholding it might with equal force be applied to gentlemen. Another word—Councillor John Lockhart is in my opinion deserving of great credit in coming forward as he has done with this motion, which shows that his gallantry is in no way diminished since he entered the married state, and I have every confidence that when Councillor Barnet and Councillor Tait follow his example they will take a more kindly view of the matter than they seem disposed to do now. (Much laughter.)

Councillor JOHN LOCKHART having replied, and expressed the hope that the Council would petition unanimously in favour of the motion as a matter of right and justice, the Council then divided with the following result, viz.: Motion—Provost Swan, Bailies Hendry and Black, Dean of Guild Douglas, Treasurer Westwater, Councillors John Lockhart, Ramsay, Stark, Stocks, Thomson, Young, Dale, Dowie, Cornfoot, Fraser, Hutchison, Johnston, Mitchell, and Mackenzie—19. Amendment—Councillors Barnet, Tait, and Davidson—3. The motion was accordingly declared carried, and the Clerk was instructed to draw up a petition to Parliament on the subject.

HUDDERSFIELD.

The monthly meeting of the Town Council was held on June 20th, the Mayor (Alderman Brigg) in the chair. There were present Aldermen Denham (the deputy Mayor), H. Hirst, J. Jordan, J. Woodhead, J. Crosland, J. Byram, R. Hirst, J. Eccles, J. Varley, A. Walker; Councillors J. Clark, G. W. Hellawell, B. Wade, W. Murphy, G. Sykes, L. Hopkinson, J. Wimpenny, G. Brook, J. Cowgill, T. Chrispin, W. Schofield, B. Dickenson, C. Walker, G. H. Hanson, B. Hanson, A. Haigh, W. Hirst, H. Horsfall, J. Broughton, E. Mellor, B. Schofield (South), J. Sugden, J. Haigh, E. Heppenstall, C. Glendinning, J. Vickerman, J. Wilson, and D. F. E. Sykes. The Mayor introduced to the Council Alderman B. S. Brigg, Mayor of Keighley, and he was cordially welcomed. The ordinary business of the Council was transacted.

WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE.

The TOWN CLERK said he had received the usual memorial asking the Council to support a petition in favour of the Women's Suffrage Bill.

Alderman DENHAM moved, and Councillor D. F. E. SYKES seconded, a resolution in favour of the petition being adopted.

Councillor SUGDEN moved, and Councillor HANSON seconded, an amendment to the effect that the petition lie on the table.

Councillor MELLOR supported the original motion, on the ground that the ladies showed considerably more ability—(laughter)—in recording the votes they were privileged to give at municipal elections, and did not require so much persuasion to record their votes, or so much "lush." (Great laughter.)

For the amendment, 13; against, 17; and the original motion was passed by 18 votes to only a few.

The concluding resolution, "That the corporate common seal of the borough be affixed hereto, as applicable to this and the preceding resolutions," was passed, and the Council went into committee.

NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE.

WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE.

A letter from Miss Lydia Becker, of the Women's Suffrage Association, was read, asking the Council to petition Parliament in favour of Mr. Hugh Mason's resolution for granting the franchise to women. Alderman Dickinson moved that Parliament be petitioned in favour of the resolution.—Mr. Russell seconded the motion, and it was carried.

BURY.

At a meeting of the Committee of the whole of Bury Town Council on June 27th, a petition in favour of the Women's Suffrage Bill was discussed; but it was decided by 15 to 11 votes not to support the petition.

LOCAL BOARDS.

MOSS SIDE, MANCHESTER.

The monthly meeting of this Board was held on Monday evening, June 18th, at the offices, Moss Lane East; Mr. Radford in the chair. A letter was read by the Clerk (Mr. Crofton) from Miss Lydia Becker, asking the Board to petition Parliament in favour of the resolution to be moved in the House of Commons on the 6th July, by Mr. Hugh Mason, in favour of extending the parliamentary franchise to women who possessed the qualifications which entitled men to vote, and who in all matters of local government had the right of voting.—Mr. Taylor moved and Mr. Tomlinson seconded a motion in favour of sending a petition to Parliament according with Mr. Mason's resolution.—The Chairman remarked that in Moss Side there was a larger number of women than men who could vote, the ratio being about 55 to 44. The motion was agreed to.

HECKMONDWIKE.

At the ordinary meeting of the Heckmondwike Local Board, on June 18th, when there were present Messrs. Keighley (chairman), Leadbeater, Walshaw, Stansfield, Bruce, Mitcheson, Heaton, Kelley, Crabtree, Armitage, D. S. Sykes (clerk), and T. Gledhill (inspector and surveyor), a letter was read from a society in London, asking the Board to petition in favour of women's suffrage, and, on the motion of Mr. Leadbeater, seconded by Mr. Stansfield, it was decided to comply with the request.

PUBLIC MEETINGS.

GRANTHAM.

A public meeting, in support of the claim of women householders to be admitted to the franchise, was held in the Westgate Rooms, Grantham, on Thursday, May 31st. The Mayor (G. S. Hannett, Esq.) presided, and was well supported on the platform by local gentlemen, the deputation being Miss Biggs and Mrs. Chant, of London, whose addresses evidently made a most favourable impression. There was a good audience—the gentler sex being especially well represented; and the bulk of those present were evidently in entire accord with the views expressed by the various speakers. The meeting must be pronounced a very successful one.

The Mayor said when he was requested to preside over this meeting by a lady, he could not refuse to do so. It was his pleasure and good fortune to be upon the platform on the last occasion when two ladies came to advocate this cause. At that time he thought he knew a great deal about the franchise, but before the meeting was over he was possessed of some new ideas as to the interest felt by the ladies in this matter, and in various things connected with their country's welfare. He was quite satisfied that in taking the chair that evening he was in his right place. Look at the great interest which ladies had in this land—in the rising generation, in the education of the country, in various social questions, and in the making of the marriage laws. What class was more affected than the ladies on all these matters? He was quite satisfied that if the ladies had the franchise they would act with discretion and judgment.

Miss Biggs, after regretting the absence of Mrs. Shearer, said it was a pleasure to her to come to Grantham, because it was now ten years since she was here; and during that time, looking back upon the steps which the question had made, she thought they

might congratulate themselves, and those who had taken any part in it, that hardly had there been known in England such progress in any movement as in this so-called "Women's Rights" movement. This was only one of the rights that women wanted, but it was the most important, because it would lead up to the others. When Mr. Mill was courageous enough to bring this question forward, a very small number of members voted with him; but she remembered how a great man had said, that "one man, if he had God with him, was in the majority." At any rate, their minority was rapidly growing into a majority. She held in her hand the copy of a memorial which had been presented to Mr. Gladstone that very day. It was signed by members of Parliament—only by Liberal members, and by those who did not form part of the Government, and were therefore free to express their own opinions. No Conservative friend had been asked to sign, although a great many Conservative members were with them on this question. To this memorial the names of 107 members were attached—Liberal Independent men; and it set forth that, in the opinion of the memorialists no measure for the assimilation of the county and borough franchise would be satisfactory, unless provision was made for extending the franchise to all possessed of the statutory qualification, without distinction as to sex; this qualification referring to those who paid rates and were the heads of households. In this list she found the names of men who were very apt, when once they took up a question to carry it through. There were the names of Mr. Stansfield (who not long ago won a great victory), Dr. Cameron, member for Glasgow (to whom they were indebted for carrying through the House of Commons the Municipal Franchise for Women in Scotland), Mr. Anderson, also member for Glasgow (who carried through the House the Married Women's Property Bill for Scotland), Sir Wilfrid Lawson—(cheers)—men who were high up in the Nonconformist ranks, such as Mr. Morley, Mr. Richard, and Mr. McArthur, leading Radicals like Mr. Taylor and Mr. Hopwood, members from this county, Mr. Hinde Palmer and Mr. Buszard, and others. Miss Biggs made an earnest appeal both to the men and women present for their help and sympathy, and was heartily applauded on resuming her seat.

The Rev. F. W. B. WEEKS rose with considerable pleasure to propose the first resolution, especially after having heard the comprehensive, powerful, persuasive, and logical address of Miss Biggs. (Hear, hear.) Had he come with a feeling unfavourable to the movement, he was quite sure that under the influence of that address he should have been turned directly in its favour. The resolution he had to propose was as follows: "That in the opinion of this meeting the parliamentary franchise should be extended to women who possess the qualifications which entitle men to vote, and who, in all matters of local government, have the right of voting." It seemed to him most consistent that this resolution should be proposed by a Christian minister, for the religion of Jesus Christ recognised no difference between the sexes in respect of rights and privileges. (Hear, hear.) Irreligion would make woman the slave of man: but religion claimed her as man's helpmeet, companion, and friend. (Applause.) This claim had involved a severe and protracted struggle between religion and bigotry born of ignorance; and no one could read the history of that struggle without seeing that the advent of Christianity meant the elevation of woman. The position of respect and honour which she occupied to-day was the result of the severe contention of the Gospel; and the time was coming when the last remnant of a foolish and ignorant superstition—the last inequality—would be swept away. As a Christian nation we were rising up to a fuller recognition of the ability, power, and rights of the gentler portion of the community. So far as present indications could be traced, women were likely to outstrip men; and in the severer examinations which some of them had more recently passed, they had shown not only that they possessed equal powers, but that in many instances their powers were superior. Mr. Weeks proceeded to point out that a married woman possessed a parliamentary vote through her husband, for, as a rule, in political as in religious opinion, husband and wife are one. (Hear, hear.) But on the death of the husband, this right no longer existed; although in many cases the business of the husband was transferred to the widow, and she had to be, for the home and for the children, the bread-winner. Surely this was an injustice—an injustice which involved both wife and children in serious loss. Because of the injustice, this agitation

had sprung into existence, and many men were found willing to come to the front and to wage war in the interests of those whose rights were equal to their own. For himself, he had no special fondness for political women. He was inclined to believe that love and politics were not often found in vital union; but he must say that he was in favour of giving to women who had to wage life's rough battle a voice in the government of the country. (Applause.)

Mr. R. A. SMITHURST seconded the resolution in a speech of considerable power and ability. He commenced with a humorous reference to those who, while believing, partly at least, as they believed, yet held aloof and refused to enter into the question. It was quite time that they looked at this matter not from the standpoint of prejudice and fear, but from the high vantage-ground of justice and truth. If they had a conviction, they should not hesitate to carry it forward to its logical result. That night he felt that as the strength was given to those who had the vote, it was their duty to aid the weaker side, and to bring them up to the same level as themselves. It was a matter not for sentiment, but for real, honest, sincere truth and argument, and should be looked at fairly, logically, and consistently. A woman would know more of politics when once she felt her interest in them. When she had the power to vote, the intelligence which was now being educated as it never was before would rise to the greatness of many a national struggle. If woman's influence was good, why need it be restricted? Why cast fetters around it, and keep it in the small circle of home? This privilege for which they were now contending, woman claimed as her birthright, and she would have it yet. As her birthright she would have it, for the day was coming when men everywhere would admit the justice of her claim. (Applause.)

Mrs. CHANT supported the resolution, which was carried unanimously.

The Rev. G. B. BOWLER proposed the following resolution: "That petitions to both Houses of Parliament, based on the foregoing resolution, be adopted and signed by the chairman on behalf of this meeting, and that memorials to John W. Mellor, Esq., Chas. S. Roundell, Esq., John C. Lawrance, Esq., and Sir W. E. Welby-Gregory, Bart., members for the borough of Grantham and Southern Division of Lincolnshire, asking them to support the resolution to be moved in the House of Commons by Mr. Mason, also adopted and forwarded to them."

Mr. W. HILLIARD seconded the resolution, which was carried unanimously, after which votes of thanks to the chairman and to the deputation brought the meeting to a close.

OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

Grantham Post, June 2.

There are no reasonable grounds for the present state of the law relating to the unenfranchised women-householders. How is the recording of a vote, say, once in five years, to affect a woman's household duties? Will a drive in a cab from her house to the polling station, and the making of a mark opposite the name of her favourite candidate, so upset her intellectual equilibrium and excite her finely-threaded nervous system, that from that time to the election, five years hence, she would spoil all the puddings and serve the meat half cooked—have her house topsy-turvy—and leave her children to go in rags and tatters for the want of a darn or a patch, till she becomes a reproach rather than a credit to the circle in which she moves? We might think so, if some arguments were given credence to. But no; the arguments against it are—shall we say it?—Conservative in their character. Though taken up by Liberals most strongly this is not a party question at all, and were a pity if party spirit should enter into the matter to its detriment. Both Conservative and Liberal members of Parliament have given their warm and decided opinion that the Women's Suffrage Bill is one which in common justice ought to be passed into law. Then again, a woman is allowed to vote at a municipal election; she is granted a right to a voice in the selection of men who shall be appointed to conduct the affairs of the town in which she lives. Why, then, should she not be allowed the same liberty of British subjects with regard to the higher affairs of the House of Commons? It may be argued that though she has a certain right to vote at a municipal election because she is immediately affected by the conduct of a town's business, yet she is not sufficiently gifted with the power of intelligence to allow her to be able to use wisdom and discretion in voting on the parliamentary

list. This is a matter of opinion, and would take more space to defend than we have to spare. It cannot be sustained, however, and we fail to see any good reason why such women as we have named should be deprived of a parliamentary vote. Let each think for himself; let reason weigh individual mental deliberations, and no argument will be found sufficiently strong to debar them of the right they seek to obtain; and, if this is so, let them have it.

BIRMINGHAM.

The annual meeting of the Birmingham branch of the National Society for Women's Suffrage was held on June 6th, at the Offices, Broad-street Corner. The Rev. Dr. Crosskey presided, and there were present Mrs. C. E. Mathews, Mrs. Ashford, Mrs. Crosskey, Mrs. Cox, Mrs. A. C. Osler, Mrs. W. H. Ryland, Mrs. Timmins, Mrs. R. C. Barrow, and Mrs. Archer. The committee in their annual report stated that in November last a circular was issued, asking for increased help to enable the committee to undertake more work, and guarantee adequate funds for defraying the expenses of a paid secretary. The response to this appeal was not sufficiently large to justify the committee in engaging a secretary; but as the guarantors kindly presented their guarantees to be changed into donations, the committee were enabled to hold a large and influential gathering in the Town Hall on January 26. With the near prospect of a Reform Bill that will extend the franchise in counties, the committee felt that they must lose no opportunity of bringing the claim of women ratepayers continually before the public. They were therefore particularly glad that they had been able to engage the services of Mrs. M'Ilquham, of Cheltenham, to organise meetings for them next autumn in the midland towns and neighbourhood. The committee believed that the constant circulation of the literature of the movement tended to interest and influence many educated people who did not attend public meetings. A report of the Town Hall meeting was drawn up, and had been widely distributed, and the committee continued to supply the *Women's Suffrage Journal* to members of Parliament and others who reside in this locality.—The statement of accounts showed receipts £151. 11s. 11d., and expenditure £157. 9s. 11d. The reports were adopted, and appointments made for the ensuing year.

MUNICIPAL ELECTION.

CROYDON.

A public meeting of women electors and other women was held on Thursday, May 31st, in the Small Public Hall, Croydon. Mrs. LUCAS in the chair.

Mrs. LUCAS, in the quiet winning way for which she is so well known, opened the meeting by calling on Miss Becker to read letters of apology and regret from several candidates, including Messrs. M. L. Moss, Hobbs, Dartnell, Rymer, J. W. Jones, and others. Mrs. Lucas then proceeded to say that the day had come when women should take a more active part in municipal matters, and the present meeting was held to encourage women electors to use their privilege on the following day in the best possible manner. They must be careful to vote for those men who would do most good if they were elected, and they might also support those who recognised the claims of women to have a voice in parliamentary as well as municipal matters. The speakers that were to follow would tell them that the movement was making great progress both in this country and abroad. They were agitating for women's suffrage in parliamentary elections, and it was most important that the vote should be exercised well in municipal elections, or that argument would be used against them. The question was not a party one, but showed that the Liberal vote would probably give them what they wanted. (Applause.)

Miss BECKER then moved the following resolution: "That in the opinion of this meeting it is the duty of every woman on the burgess roll of Croydon to use her municipal vote for the general welfare of the borough, and with special regard to such measures of justice to women as can be influenced by the action of town councils."

Miss LORD, a member of the Lambeth Board of Guardians, seconded the motion. Speaking as a former resident in Croydon she referred to the want of civic life she had observed and the way in which people moved about. She thought that the borough would

do great good and hoped that women would be careful to exercise their votes to the best advantage.

The PRESIDENT, in submitting the resolution, referred to the grievous want of seat accommodation everywhere, and contended that had women more influence in public affairs that and many other matters would not be neglected as they were.

In answer to her appeal to any candidate present, Mr. J. H. MITCHNER explained that the Metropolitan District would still be under Metropolitan police government. He disapproved of public parks, but desired to see provisions as to playgrounds among cottage property. In general terms he thought it right that women should not be shut out of the management of affairs. They did good service on boards of guardians and school boards, and they had his strong sympathy. As to women's representation in Parliament he held that taxation and representation should be united.

Mr. CASTLE, as representing a candidate for the east ward (Mr. Jones), spoke of the benefits that had accrued from every extension of the constituency.

The president of the meeting (Mrs. Lucas) was also authorised to sign a petition to the House of Commons in favour of female suffrage.

THE POLITICAL RIGHTS OF WOMEN.

On Monday afternoon, June 25th, a very large and influential meeting, convened by the National Society for Women's Suffrage, was held in the Prince's Hall, Piccadilly, for the purpose of contrasting woman's elevated position in America with the restrictive legal position in England. The chair was taken by Mr. JACOB BRIGHT, M.P., and among those present were Mr. J. P. Thomasson, M.P., His Excellency the Servian Minister, Professor Newman, Lady Wilde, Mrs. Jacob Bright, Mrs. Fawcett, Mrs. M'Laren (Edinburgh), Mrs. Grant Robertson, Miss Tod (Belfast), Miss Müller, Miss Staurope, Mrs. J. R. Shearer, Mr. and Mrs. Raper, Mr. Holyoake, Mr. and Mrs. Wates, Mr. and Mrs. Moncreu Conway, Miss J. E. Cobden, Miss Becker, Miss Swanwick, Miss C. A. Biggs, Mrs. Lucas, Mrs. Fuller, Mr. Pagliardini, and many others.

The CHAIRMAN, who was loudly received with cheers, said the meeting was honoured with the presence of two American ladies, namely, Mrs. Stanton and Miss Anthony, who are widely known in America as eloquent orators, firstly in the anti-slavery movement, and subsequently as the leaders of the American Women's Suffrage Society, who, at the request of friends, had consented to address them on the existing political condition of women in the United States. The subject was one of great interest, and he had no doubt that they would gladly receive the information which would be imparted to them. The change in the position of women, not only as it is affected by law, but by custom and habit of thought, had been very remarkable during recent years. He could not do better than call the attention of the meeting and the memory of the ladies present to the great Anti-Slavery International Convention, which took place in London in 1840. William Lloyd Garrison came over from America to attend that Convention, and he was accompanied by two ladies, who had shared with him the perils of the anti-slavery agitation in America—what those perils were those only could imagine who had read Harriet Martineau's work on the subject. But when Mr. Lloyd Garrison came to the door, accompanied by the two ladies, he was told that the ladies could not be admitted at that door, as they were not eligible to take part in the proceedings. With that manhood and nobility which always characterised him, Wm. Lloyd Garrison immediately retired with the ladies to the gallery, and simply witnessed the proceedings of the day. (Cheers.) Such a proceeding would not be permitted at the present day, for there was not a meeting where their influence and culture was not received with profit and respect. (Hear.) That took place in 1840, and Mrs. Stanton, who was with them to-day, was one of those who called that Convention. From that day to this there had been a great agitation going on to obtain the political franchise of women; and, though many gains had been obtained, yet they were short of that success. In the Northern States of America a great advance had been made towards the just rights of women, because each State makes its own laws in reference to the Parliamentary rights of women. Women are admitted to their principal schools. Women there have long studied medicine. They plead in the courts, not excepting the superior courts of the United States. A similar action to obtain

these rights had been going on in this country. The first attempt that had been made in this country was when Mr. Mill tested the question of the right of women to the suffrage. That in this country has not succeeded, but step by step they had won triumphs of the greatest consequence, all leading to that final issue which they hoped to obtain. In 1869 the municipal vote was given to women. Now they can vote in all our corporate towns, large and small. That change not only simply gave the votes to women, but it also put a stop to their disfranchisement in many places, for before that Act was passed, in every town which had not obtained a municipal corporation, women could only vote where there was a local board. When that change took place (until 1869) the votes of women were destroyed. Then in 1880 they obtained the school board vote, and then, having obtained the franchise for that, they obtained seats on the board. They all knew how women were elected to that position. Well then, considering this, it must strike them as very singular that women who canvass large constituencies and who are able to vote upon these matters are yet not able to occupy the humble position of giving a vote to a member of Parliament. Then, as it regarded the subject of the higher education of women, they had seen that women are taxed to pay to support our Universities, and yet they are driven to foreign countries to obtain that education which is necessary for them to qualify themselves for the professions. Last year a great part of that Act of Parliament was passed which destroyed a husband's power over a woman's property on her marriage, and during the present session, thanks to Mrs. Butler and to Mr. Stansfeld, a law—the most scandalous to women and the most unjust to them which the world had ever seen—had received a blow from which it never can recover. (Cheers.) These changes had all taken place within the last sixteen years. Sixteen years ago it would have seemed almost incredible that such a change could take place; and, if there were any persons who could not appreciate these changes, they must be very dissatisfied people indeed. They would no doubt be able to do much more yet; but, if he were to give his advice to the council who conduct these movements for women's rights, he would advise that there should be still more movement, more activity, and more spirit. The society should be more robust and enter more into battle, and they should remember one thing, that men have never been able to win battles in kid gloves. He would not advise them to be too particular. Let them draw help from all willing to help them. Let their friends and supporters come from what quarter they may, draw their illustrations and hold meetings, and all help in the work. Next year will be a very critical time. There will be a great addition to the list of voters, and it would be very important for them to see whether women are to be admitted to the franchise. He knew the movement was growing all over the country, and he hoped they would be successful in their efforts. He would, however, now leave the speaking in the hands of the ladies who had come to address them, for he believed that a chairman should confine himself to his vocation and leave the speech-making to the speakers. He would now call upon Miss Anthony, who had been a hard worker in the anti-slavery movement, to address them. She had travelled in all parts of America, and had addressed a very large series of meetings on this important question. (Cheers.)

Miss ANTHONY, who was well received, then addressed the meeting on the progress of legal rights obtained by women in America, and cited many professions in which they had obtained distinction.

Mrs. STANTON next read an able address, which was listened to with great attention, giving an account of the achievements won since the time when she attended the great International Anti-Slavery Convention alluded to by the chairman.

Mr. JOHN THOMASSON, M.P., then moved a vote of thanks to Miss Anthony and Mrs. Stanton for their addresses, which was seconded in an able speech by Mrs. M'LAREN, of Scotland.

The proceedings then closed with a vote of thanks to the chairman.

HAMMERSMITH.

A drawing-room meeting was held at the residence of Mrs. Langdale, 62, The Grove, Hammersmith, on Wednesday, June 6th, Mr. Cobb in the chair. After addresses by Mrs. Chant and Mrs. Charles, a paper was read by Mrs. Langdale, and a petition was adopted with universal consent before the meeting dispersed.

DEBATING SOCIETIES.

WESTON-SUPER-MARE.

At a recent meeting of the Weston-super-Mare Book Club, a debate took place on women's suffrage. Several ladies were present, also some of the Town Commissioners, and three Nonconformist ministers. The discussion commenced by a reading from Mr. Mill's speeches. The course of the discussion turned decidedly in favour of the principle; one of the speakers, who had begun by expressing opinions adverse to the proposal, ended by expressing himself not only surprised at the expression of opinion evoked, but beaten.

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING THE ELECTION OF WOMEN POOR-LAW GUARDIANS.

The annual general meeting of the Society for Promoting the Return of Women as Poor-Law Guardians was held on June 22nd, at the Steinway Hall, Seymour-street, London, Mrs. Lucas presiding. The report set forth that two ladies had been elected for the first time in the poor-law history of Scotland; whilst in Bradford, Eastbourne, Birmingham, and Bristol ladies had also obtained a majority of votes, and had thoroughly won the confidence of the ratepayers. In London thirteen ladies had been elected this year, as against eleven last year.—Mr. W. S. Caine, M.P., was of opinion that the election of ladies as poor-law guardians was most advisable, especially when it was taken into consideration that they were naturally the best protectors of young girls of tender age who had just been sent out from school to take situations. In his opinion it was advisable to assimilate the qualification for lady poor-law guardians with that fixed for candidates for the school board; and he believed a bill for the purpose had recently been drafted by a member of the House of Commons, although it had not been brought forward. The Local Government Board seemed to be very desirous of seeing the admission of women as guardians, apparently recognising the useful work which might be carried out by them; and he therefore thought that Sir Charles Dilke might be asked to bring in a short Government measure to that effect. There was every reason to believe that he would be willing to do so.—The report was adopted.

CANADIAN WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE ASSOCIATION.

The following letter has been received from Mrs. Foulds, Secretary to the Women's Suffrage Association of Canada:—

Box 1,254, P.O., Toronto, Ontario, 24th May, 1883.

Dear Madam,—Our association in Toronto thanks the members of the English Women's Suffrage Association very heartily for their kindness in forwarding to us so many copies of "Extracts from Mr. Mill's Subjection of Women." They are excellent, and will be most useful to us here, where such are not to be had at all. The parcel arrived on Monday too late to be acknowledged by Cunard mail, so I hope you will excuse the apparent delay. We send you four of the Toronto newspapers, in which you will see your gift made known publicly, which is good for both your side of the ocean and ours. Our movement meets with very general favour here; the justice of it no one seems to call in question; it is the desirability and expediency of it that are doubted. The Franchise Bill, introduced by Sir John A. Macdonald, in which unmarried women and widows, properly qualified, were to be granted the suffrage, has done us great good in widely advertising the movement, and raising discussion, more or less, in all quarters. But it will not become law this session. It is, I believe, to have some amendments, and then be dropped. Our aim, then, will be to gain our cause in the Provincial Parliament of Ontario at its next session, beginning Dec., 1883, or Jan., 1884. If we are successful there, and we have every reason to hope we will be, it will go far to bring about the same favourable decision for the whole of Canada at the next Dominion Parliament. We hope soon to be called on to congratulate you in Britain on your success, those there have worked so long and faithfully in the cause of justice, and that again would aid us more than almost anything else. Again thanking your association for its practical sympathy and help, I have the honour to remain, yours respectfully and sincerely, JENNIE FOULDS, Sec. of the Canadian Women's Suffrage Association.

THE MOVEMENT FOR WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE IN PARIS.

On May 23rd, a very interesting public meeting was held at Paris under the auspices of the new French Women's Suffrage Society. M. de Gasté, an ex-deputy, presided, and M. Jules Pascaly, a young Paris journalist, was the first speaker. Dr. Verrier, a practising physician, followed, taking as his theme "Woman and Science." Mdle. Hubertine Auclert came next with a very able and well delivered argument on the "Revision of the Constitution and the Women." This was the pièce de résistance of the evening's meeting, and proved once more the force and talent of this earnest advocate of women's suffrage in France. Among the audience was Miss Susan B. Anthony, who, during her short stay in Paris, has met Mdle. Auclert twice and encouraged her in her up-hill work. This meeting is the first of a series which this newly-organised society intends holding both at Paris and in the provinces.

CURIOUS OPERATION OF THE MARRIED WOMEN'S PROPERTY ACT.

HUSBAND AND WIFE TWO PERSONS.

The beneficial effects of the last Married Women's Property Act upon the legal position of both husbands and wives has been curiously shown in the case of In re March, deceased. There the testator, who died this year, but whose will was dated in 1880, left the residue of his estate to a man and his wife and a third person. Under the old law, husband and wife being but one person, this property would be divided into moieties and the third party would have taken one half, leaving the other for the married couple. It was now urged, however, on behalf of the wife, that by virtue of the new Act she had been endowed with a separate existence and had acquired an individuality quite apart from her husband, and that therefore the property was divisible into thirds, of which two went to the husband and wife, leaving only the other third, instead of half, for the remaining legatee. The very first few lines of the new Act makes this position almost too clear for argument outside a court of law, for they declare that a wife shall be capable of holding and acquiring property in the same way as if she were a feme sole. It was, however, contended by the other side that the last statute had not altered the general status of a wife; that man and wife were still one; that the wife took nothing under the will; and therefore, as there was no property, the new Act could not operate. But this remarkable argument was not successful, and Mr. Justice Chitty had little difficulty in holding that the wife was entitled to a third share as a distinct person and by virtue of the new Act. He also laid it down that the alterations made in the old law by the last statute were so extensive and so marked that it would be wrong even in the case of the construction of a will any longer to apply the old principle that man and wife formed one compound person. It may be hoped that we shall hear no more of this same "compound person" which, however, some lawyers seem loth to lose because of its interest as a relic of the legal system now passing away.—Manchester Guardian.

A MARRIED WOMAN'S RIGHT TO DISPOSE OF JEWELLERY.

The Master of the Rolls gave judgment in the Irish Court of Appeal on June 22 on a curious question as to a married woman's right to make a will disposing of family jewellery. The matter was brought forward on an appeal from the Earl of Charlemont against the decision of the Judge of the Probate Division, holding that the will of the late Countess, disposing of jewellery and lace estimated at £7,000 to the Hon. Mr. Spencer, spoke from the date of her death, and passed all the property she had at the time. It appeared that at the date of the will she had no separate estate, and the question was, therefore, whether the property she acquired afterwards passed under the will. The jewellery in question comprised a head ornament set with diamonds and rubies, a diamond necklace, cross and earrings, bracelets, ruby and diamond necklace, two loose ruby drops, given to Lady Charlemont's mother by George IV. on the day she was presented at Court, an amethyst necklace, a gold serpent brooch, a pendant heart, set with turquoise, and an enamelled pin representing a parrot, the two latter ornaments being a present from the Queen to the Countess when a child, and a berthe and tunic of old point l'Espagne which Cardinal Fesche received from Napoleon I. The Court upheld the decision of the other Court, and dismissed the appeal with costs.

MARRIED WOMEN AS RATEPAYERS.

The Married Women's Property Act is continually receiving extended interpretations. At Bridgwater, on June 25th, a married woman named Lovibond, living apart from her husband, was summoned for the non-payment of a rate. She pleaded her married state in proof of non-liability; but a magisterial order was made upon her, the bench ruling that under the new Act she could both sue and be sued.—Clifton Chronicle.

INCOME-TAX ON MARRIED WOMEN'S PROPERTY.

The following letter has appeared in the Times:— On the 18th inst., Mr. Justice Chitty, in giving a decision in the Chancery Division, after carefully considering the effect of the Married Women's Property Act, 1882, stated, without hesitation, "that the alterations effected by the Act in the old law of husband and wife were so extensive and so marked that it would be wrong any longer to apply the old principle of husband and wife being a compound person, and that since the passing of the Act this, so far as their rights of property were concerned, could not be said." This being so, as anyone who has studied the Act must admit, is it too much to demand that a husband shall no longer be required to pay Income-tax on the property of his wife? Unless in future the properties of husband and wife are assessed as two separate properties—in which case, of course, there will frequently be a claim for exemption from income-tax on the ground that the income is less than £150 a year, or for abatement because it is less than £400 a year—there will be good ground for concluding that the Government is unwilling to apply the principle of this Act in cases where it may be a loser. I trust the question will be taken up by some one of greater influence than your obedient servant, Cadmore Vicarage, R. BRUCE DICKSON, High Wycombe, June 20.

Obituary.

MISS ANN SYKES SWAINE.—With deep regret we record the death at York, on the 21st ultimo, of Miss Ann Sykes Swaine, which occurred very suddenly from heart disease. The deceased lady was one of the earliest workers in the women's suffrage cause in York, and also exerted herself actively in the movements for Married Women's Property, University Extension, Higher Education of Women, and in Sunday School and Cookery School work. She was a most devoted daughter to an aged father, spending the greatest part of her time in reading to him and in domestic duties—the faithful performance of which did not interfere with her ever ready help in good work outside her home. Besides her public and philanthropic work, she did a considerable amount of literary work. She did several translations from the works of the French theologian, Réville, which appeared among the publications of the Unitarian body, to which she belonged; she was also joint author of "A Winter in Corsica." She will be long and deeply lamented by her co-workers in York, and by all friends who had the privilege of knowing her.

CENTRAL COMMITTEE.

SUBSCRIPTIONS AND DONATIONS, FROM MAY 23 TO JUNE 23, 1883.

Table listing names and amounts for the Central Committee, including Mrs. S. Clegg, Mrs. Du Sautoz, Miss India Wedgwood, etc.

LAURA M'LAREN, TREASURER, 29, Parliament-street, S.W.

MANCHESTER SOCIETY FOR WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE.

SUBSCRIPTIONS AND DONATIONS, JUNE, 1883.

Table listing names and amounts for the Manchester Society for Women's Suffrage, including Mr. & Mrs. Joseph Crook, Mrs. Hetherington, Miss Edith Lupton, etc.

S. ALFRED STEINTHAL, TREASURER, 28, Jackson's Row, Manchester.

BRISTOL AND WEST OF ENGLAND.

SUBSCRIPTIONS AND DONATIONS, FROM MAY 20 TO JUNE 23, 1883.

Table listing names and amounts for Bristol and West of England, including Mrs. Hallett, Mr. Herbert Thomas, Miss General Colby, etc.

ALICE GRENFELL, TREASURER, 1, Cecil Road, Clifton.

NOTTS. BRANCH.

SUBSCRIPTIONS AND DONATIONS TO JUNE, 1883.

Table listing names and amounts for the Notts. Branch, including A Friend (don.), Mrs. Squires, Mrs. Woodward, etc.

ELIZBTH. HIND, TREAS., Alexander-st, Sherwood Rise, Nottingham.

The Empress of Germany has given a gold brooch, valued at 50 guineas, to Miss Jessie Ace, the daughter of the Mumbles lighthouse-keeper, who assisted in saving the crew of a German barque which was wrecked on a rock near the lighthouse on the 27th January.

CASH'S EMBROIDERED NAMES AND INITIAL LETTERS FOR MARKING LINEN.

Your Name or Initials Embroidered on our Fine Cambric Taps in Turkey Red, which can be sewn on to any article of dress requiring to be marked.

SAMPLES, PRICE LISTS, AND DESCRIPTIVE CIRCULARS POST FREE ON APPLICATION TO
J. & J. CASH, COVENTRY.

DO NOT UNTIMELY DIE.
Sore Throats Cured with One Dose.
FENNINGS' FEVER CURER.
BOWEL COMPLAINTS cured with One Dose.
TYPHUS or LOW FEVER cured with Two Doses.
DIPHThERIA cured with Three Doses.
SCARLET FEVER cured with Four Doses.
DYSENTERY cured with Five Doses.
Sold in Bottles, 1s. 1½d. each, with full directions, by all Chemists.
Read Fennings' "Everybody's Doctor." Sent post free for 13 stamps.

SORE THROATS CURED.

EASY TEETHING.

DO NOT LET YOUR CHILD DIE.
FENNINGS' Children's Powders Prevent Convulsions.
ARE COOLING AND SOOTHING.
FENNINGS' Children's Powders.
For Children Cutting their Teeth, to prevent Convulsions.

Do not contain Calomel, Opium, Morphia, or anything injurious to a tender babe.

Sold in Stamped Boxes at 1s. 1½d. and 2s. 9d. (great saving), with full directions. Sent post free for 15 stamps. Direct to ALFRED FENNINGS, West Cowes, I. W.

Read Fennings' "Every Mother's Book," which contains valuable hints on Feeding, Teething, Weaning, Sleeping, &c. Ask your Chemist for a free copy.

FENNINGS' EVERY MOTHER'S BOOK sent post free on application by letter or post card. Direct Alfred Fennings, West Cowes, I. W.

COUGHS. COLDS. BRONCHITIS.

FENNINGS' LUNG HEALERS.

The Best Remedy to Cure all

Coughs, Colds, Asthmas, &c.

Sold in Boxes at 1s. 1½d. and 2s. 9d., with directions. Sent post free for 15 stamps. Direct to ALFRED FENNINGS, West Cowes, I. W.

The largest size Boxes, 2s. 9d. (35 stamps post free,) contain three times the quantity of small boxes.

Read Fennings' "Everybody's Doctor." Sent post free for 13 stamps. Direct A. FENNINGS, West Cowes, I. W.

BRONCHITIS CURED.

THE UNIVERSAL HOUSEHOLD REMEDIES!!!

HOLLOWAY'S PILLS & OINTMENT

These excellent FAMILY MEDICINES are invaluable in the treatment of all ailments incidental to every HOUSEHOLD. The PILLS PURIFY, REGULATE and STRENGTHEN the whole System, while the OINTMENT is unequalled for the removal of all muscular and outward complaints. Possessed of these REMEDIES, every Mother has at once the means of curing most complaints to which herself or Family is liable.

N.B.—Advice can be obtained, free of charge, at 78, New Oxford Street. Late 533, Oxford Street, London, daily between the hours of 11 and 4, or by letter.

ESTABLISHED 1835.



By the use of which, during the last Forty Years many Thousands of Cures have been effected; numbers of which cases had been pronounced INCURABLE!

The numerous well-authenticated Testimonials in disorders of the HEAD, CHEST, BOWELS, LIVER, and KIDNEYS; also in RHEUMATISM, ULCERS, SORES, and all SKIN DISEASES, are sufficient to prove the great value of this most useful Family Medicine, it being A DIRECT PURIFIER OF THE BLOOD and other fluids of the human body.

Many persons have found them of great service both in preventing and relieving SEA SICKNESS; and in warm climates they are very beneficial in all Bilious Complaints.

Sold in boxes, price 7½d., 1s. 1½d., and 2s. 9d., by G. WHELPTON & SON, 3, Crane Court, Fleet-street, London, and by all Chemists and Medicine Vendors at home and abroad. Sent free by post in the United Kingdom for 8, 14, or 33 stamps.

Printed by A. IRELAND & Co., Pall Mall, Manchester, for the Proprietors, and Published by Messrs. Trübner and Co., 57 and 59, Ludgate Hill, London, and Mr. JOHN HEYWOOD, Manchester.—July 2, 1883.—Entered at Stationers' Hall.