

WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE JOURNAL.

EDITED BY LYDIA E. BECKER.

VOL. VII.—No. 79. PUBLISHED MONTHLY.
REGISTERED FOR TRANSMISSION ABROAD.

SEPTEMBER 1, 1876.

PRICE ONE PENNY.
BY POST THREE HALFPENCE.

THE annual review of the session which appears in the columns of the *Times* affords a convenient summary for reference as to what has been done or left undone with regard to legislation in which women are directly concerned. No attempt has been made to amend the law with regard to any of those particulars in which, according to Lord COLERIDGE, it is more worthy of a barbarian than of a Christian country, or in which, according to Mr. GLADSTONE, the law does much less than justice to women. The *Times* characterises the debate on Mr. FORSYTH'S Bill to admit women to the Parliamentary franchise as a "useless debate," "redeemed from insignificance by the opposition to the project of Mr. BRIGHT, who had formerly voted for the change. He candidly stated that his support of the scheme had been given in deference to Mr. MILL, who had, by an excusable error, recorded in his Autobiography Mr. BRIGHT'S supposed conversion to his doctrines. Between Mr. BRIGHT and Mr. MILL there were some points of political sympathy, but no two men of eminence could be more dissimilar in character and mental condition. Mr. MILL understood little of human nature, and his theories about women were extravagantly fantastic. Mr. BRIGHT has practical sense as well as genius, and it would be impossible to disturb his conviction that women differ intellectually and morally from men. His testimony against Mr. FORSYTH'S scheme was given unwillingly, but it was exempt from doubt and hesitation."

The above statement is very remarkable, and would seem to prove that the writer had not read Mr. BRIGHT'S speech. Mr. BRIGHT stated distinctly that his vote against the Bill was based upon doubts, and so far from opposing political rights for women on the ground that women differed intellectually and morally from men, he did so on the precisely opposite ground—"They are as ourselves." In fact the more strenuously men insist on differences, moral and intellectual, between women and men, the more completely they prove their own incapacity to legislate irresponsibly for women, the more conclusively do they show cause for the representation of women, and the more trenchantly do they cut away the ground from the argument of identity of thought, feeling, and interest,

on which Mr. BRIGHT and others ground their denial of the need for it. The writer in the *Times* assumes a difference, morally and intellectually, between Mr. BRIGHT and Mr. MILL, but he does not thereby prove that one of these two eminent men ought to be disfranchised; and the establishment of the fact of the existence of even an extreme degree of diversity of intellectual gifts between women and men would not, of itself, prove that the intellect of women should be rejected in the formation and expression of national political opinion. The writer in the *Times* says Mr. MILL'S theories about women were extravagantly fantastic; he does not give any theory of his own which the subjects of it might compare with those of Mr. MILL, and we are not sure whether he would admit that women are competent to criticise the theories men form concerning them.

But though the House of Commons refused to admit that women were competent to form a judgment in the election of members of their body, they have passed a measure which although it may have very little practical result in regard to its special object, is of overwhelming importance in its theoretical bearing on the arguments by which the exclusion of women from political rights is maintained. The Bill introduced by the Right Hon. the RECORDER OF LONDON and Mr. BRIGHT, to "remove restrictions on the granting of qualifications for Registration under the Medical Act on the ground of sex"—has become law. It enacts that "the powers of every body entitled under the Medical Act to grant qualifications for registration shall extend to the granting of every qualification for registration granted by such body to all persons, without distinction of sex, provided always that nothing herein contained shall render compulsory the exercises of of such powers; and that no person who but for this Act would not have been entitled to be registered shall by reason of such registration be entitled to take any part in the government, management, or proceedings of the Universities or Corporations mentioned in the said Medical Act." By this Act the Legislature has deliberately recorded its judgment that whatever be the differences, mental and moral, between women and men, they are not such as to disqualify women from forming an adequate

opinion on cases of emergency where life and death may depend on the accuracy of their judgment and coolness of their decision, nor from the legal responsibility for the exercise of judgment in such momentous issues. After this declaration it will be hard for the Legislature to maintain, with any show of consistency, that women are capable of performing these duties, and incapable of judging between two candidates at a Parliamentary election. We may have the anomaly that a duly qualified medical practitioner is excluded, on the ground of mental and moral incapacity, from a function which may be exercised by the most drunken, degraded, and depraved of patients.

We have said that the Act just passed will probably not have much practical value. It merely enables any examining body that pleases to examine all comers without distinction of sex, while excluding women from any share in the government of the corporations. Had it been likely to be very effective it would hardly have been allowed to pass without more protest from the opponents of the right of women to practise medicine. Moreover, it is extremely doubtful if any enabling Act was needed as regards many of the corporations. The Society of Apothecaries and Royal College of Surgeons have each been forced to acknowledge not only that they have always had the power to examine women, but that they were under an obligation to exercise it, though in each case this obligation has been virtually evaded by the creation of insuperable practical difficulties; in the one case by the deliberate enactment of a bye-law with which it was known that no woman could comply; and in the other by the unanimous resignation of a whole Board of Examiners at the first moment when they were required to examine them. We believe indeed that if most of the other Boards had wished to examine women they could have done so; but the new Act takes away the last excuse they can make on the ground of doubts as to their powers, and now it remains to be seen whether the will is wanting.

This Act illustrates the curiously exceptional way in which women are dealt with by the Legislature. Mr. BRIGHT says women are not a class, yet this, his own Bill, treats them as a class to be legislated for on different principles from men. The Medical Corporations are bound to examine men students, and cannot refuse them such licences or degrees as entitle them to registration if they pass the usual examinations, but the Legislature has just confirmed, or at least recognised, the right of corporations to refuse to examine women students who have passed

through the same course of study as the men, and who ask to have their fitness tested, and the gates thrown open to enable them to enter that profession in which they look to the reward of the labour and cost they have expended in qualifying themselves for it. If women have a right to study medicine at all, this distinction between their right and that of men to claim examination and registration is supremely illogical and utterly indefensible. Nevertheless, women may have been wise in asking or accepting such a Bill, since a better was not to be had. Better to get the gate opened in an illogical fashion and only ajar, than that it should remain hopelessly closed in their face by the hand of might overcoming right.

During the debate on Mr. POTTER'S Real Estate Intestacy Bill, on June 28, several illustrations were incidentally given as to the operation of the existing law on the interests of women. Mr. OSBORNE MORGAN said it was very often a toss-up whether a man died possessed of real or personal property. For instance, a farmer in his neighbourhood who had just invested all that he was able to scrape together in the purchase of a little real estate, on his return from the solicitor's office, and before he had made a will, was run away with by his horse and killed. The whole of his property went to his eldest son, and the widow and children were thrown on the parish; but if the man had been killed while going to the solicitor's office the property would have been divided among his widow and children. Mr. LEVESON GOWER said the case of daughters was a very cruel one. Many daughters brought up in luxury were often reduced to a position bordering on beggary, but if the law gave to those children a right to a certain portion of the property of their father in case of intestacy, it would probably dispose him to consider his responsibility in regard to them. Sir W. HARCOURT asked the House to consider whether it was fair that when a man died intestate, and where the whole of his property was in land, that his widow and younger children should be altogether unprovided for. Mr. HERSCHELL said that by the law as it first stood there was a provision made for the widow by way of dower, but *every piece of land was now conveyed in such a way as to deprive her of this dower*. The ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Sir J. Holker) said that in the event of the owner of real estate dying intestate, the real estate, subject to the widow's right to dower *which was too often forgotten*, went to the eldest son.

Wives were deprived of their right to dower by the Statute 3 and 4 WILLIAM IV., entitled "An Act to amend

the Law relating to Dower;" the effect of which was to amend the right altogether out of existence, and to render it entirely subject to the will of the husband. The practical effect of this Act is that which was stated by Mr. HERSCHELL.

Thus we see that the law-makers themselves passed an Act depriving their own wives of property rights enjoyed by these from the earliest period of our history; and it is a most remarkable and significant circumstance that this Act of spoliation of the property rights of women should have been passed the very next session after the first introduction into statutes dealing with the franchise of the word "male" as a qualification for the suffrage. Before the Reform Act of 1832, all the laws regulating the Parliamentary franchise were couched in the same general terms as those regulating the franchise in local governments which women exercise on the same conditions as men; and there can be little doubt that had the claim of women to be placed on the Parliamentary register, in virtue of the qualification which gave them the local vote, been argued in the law courts before the introduction of the limiting word "male" into a statute regulating the franchise, their claim must have been allowed. In asking for the removal of this limitation, we are asking for the restoration of an ancient constitutional right, of which we hold that we have been unjustly, arbitrarily, and recently deprived.

THE month's list of outrages on women is unabated in numbers and atrocity. We give a few cases taken at random from such papers as we happen to have seen. These may therefore be regarded as samples of innumerable others of constant occurrence. "A case was heard at the Chorley County Court, which illustrates the cruelties to which many colliers' wives are subject. A collier, named WILLIAM WALSH, was sued for £18, for necessaries supplied to his wife by her father, JAMES NAYLOR. Defendant was married to his wife in 1874, and on the night of her confinement in June, she asked him to get up and fetch her assistance, but he replied that he was not going to lose his rest for her. She was told by defendant's grandmother to go home to her mother who lived eight miles away, and she started on her way, but was taken ill and was actually confined in the garden, without any assistance. She was ill for some time after that, when her husband treated her cruelly, and subsequently, while living next door to her father, defendant left her, and has not since lived with her. She was almost naked, and had to be supplied with

both food and clothing by her friends. Previous to going away defendant abused and kicked her. It was urged in his defence that he left his wife because her mother sometimes occupied his bed when she was drunk.—The Judge (Mr. HALTON) gave a verdict for £5. 8s., the defendant's wife having earned some money as a collier girl." From this decision it would seem that a husband is not bound to maintain his wife if she can earn money for her own maintenance.

At the Manchester County Police Court, GEORGE BANKS, a striker living in Britannia Street, Openshaw, was charged with assaulting his wife. The facts appeared to be that the prisoner was in the habit of ill-using his wife, and that, on Tuesday, without the slightest provocation, he hit her and kicked her in the face. The Bench characterised the assault as a brutal and very cowardly one, and sent the prisoner to gaol for one month with hard labour, ordering him at the expiration of that term to enter into his own recognizance in £20, and find two sureties in £10 each to keep the peace for six months.

"At Lambeth, WILLIAM HOBBS, 26, cab-driver, living in Henshaw Street, Walworth, was charged on remand before Mr. ELLISON with violently assaulting his wife. A police-constable said that about half-past one o'clock on Wednesday morning he heard cries for help in Henshaw Street, and found the prosecutrix lying on the pavement covered with blood. The prosecutrix was now in attendance, and exhibited marks of considerable violence. She stated that on Tuesday night the prisoner came home the worse for drink. He asked her if she had got any money, and upon her replying she had only a shilling, said, 'If you have been out all the evening you ought to have more than that.' After some more words he struck her several times in the face, knocked her down, knelt upon her, and seizing her by the throat nearly strangled her. She implored him to let her get up, and said she would go out again. He allowed her to rise, but immediately afterwards took hold of her, dragged her to the middle of the room, again threw her down, and bit her on the nose and lip most severely. She became unconscious shortly afterwards, and on being brought to she found herself in the hospital. The prisoner scarcely ever did any work, and made her lead an immoral life to support him. He had often ill-treated her, but she had forgiven him. Police-sergeant WEBB said the prisoner bore a very bad character. The prisoner, in defence, said he had been drinking and was sorry for what he had done. Mr. ELLISON sentenced him to six months' hard labour, and at the end of

that time to find two bail in £20 each to keep the peace."

The *Manchester Courier* has the following:—"The magistrates at the Warrington Police Court have just adjudicated upon a case which was taken before them in a manner which is calculated at all events to subject them to some comment and criticism. A man quarrelled with his wife, and in order to convince her of his superiority he felled her to the floor. The blow by which he accomplished this feat 'literally burst her eye and made her insensible.' Some time after this display of striking affection the devoted husband again attacked the 'partner of his bosom,' and threatened to kill her, and she had to make her escape from the house in order to save herself from further violence. These are the facts of the case upon which the Warrington magistrates were called upon to pronounce judgment, and the judgment they have pronounced has caused the reporters to exclaim, 'Justices' justice.' Not only did the man literally burst one of his wife's eyes by a blow which felled her to the floor, but by so doing he has destroyed the sight of that eye for ever, and has placed the other in great danger, and for this trifling misconduct the magistrates have actually bound him over in two sureties of £10 each to keep the peace for six months." "What are we asked to make this change for?" said Mr. JOHN BRIGHT on the debate on Mr. FORSYTH'S Bill. "To arm the women against the men of this country—to arm women to defend themselves against their fathers, brothers, husbands, and sons? To me the idea seems monstrous, and I think a more baseless case was never submitted to the consideration of Parliament." Women who are systematically beaten and maltreated by their husbands would not share Mr. BRIGHT'S notion that the idea of defence was "monstrous;" and women in an independent position, who are not personally liable to such treatment by reason of not being legally subject to any man, may rightfully ask for the suffrage in order to defend their more helpless sisters.

In a recent number of the *Fortnightly Review*, GEORGE MEREDITH has a "Ballad of fair Ladies in Revolt."

"— But say, what seek you, madam? 'Tis enough
That you should have dominion o'er the springs
Domestic, and man's heart: those ways, how rough,
How vile, outside the stately avenue
Where you walk sheltered by your angel's wings
Are happily unknown to you!"

The ladies reply—

"— We hear women's shrieks on them. We like your phrase,
Dominion domestic! And that roar,
'What seek you?' is of tyrants in all days."

ONE of the latest issues of our recently-defunct contemporary, the *Hour*—a paper which has never been remarkable for its defence of women's rights—contained some remarks on the exclusion of women from the coroner's court at the Balham inquest. After stating that those excluded had a subject of grave complaint, the article continued—"Moreover, to exclude women from hearing orally to-day evidence which will be, word for word, in their hands to-morrow, is ridiculous prudery. There can be little doubt that the law of the matter is on the side of EVE'S daughters. A coroner's inquest is a court of record, and all the QUEEN'S subjects have a right to be present so far as there is room for them. It is impossible to argue that the law draws a distinction in this matter between the sexes. . . . The advocate of the ladies' right of audience might, besides, make out a case on the ground of expediency. The presence of persons of the same sex might be a check on the statements of some female witnesses or an encouragement to others. To be surrounded by a sea of faces of the opposite sex is not likely to decrease the necessary terrors of a court of law in the eyes of a timid woman. The true view of the matter is that the publicity of our law courts ought to be absolutely maintained, while the presence of women is a question to be decided by themselves alone."

There is no more striking exemplification of the tendency of men to compound for the indulgence of their own inclinations by fiercely condemning women who do the same thing, than their persistent attacks on women who exercise their right in common with the rest of the QUEEN'S subjects of being present during the public administration of justice. It never seems to occur to any of their censors that women could possibly have any other motive than the indulgence of improper curiosity, nor to attribute this motive to the men who attend such cases. When a woman is put upon the rack in the witness box, men flock eagerly to gloat over her agonies, while all of her own sex, whose presence might be some protection or solace to her, are rigorously banished. In a recent divorce case in Ireland, we learn from the Dublin papers that the respondent, "she being the only woman in court," was "subjected to a ruthless and brutal cross-examination;" one of the questions was so horrible that it caused the witness to faint. The result of the trial was that the jury unanimously and without hesitation gave a verdict for the wife on all the issues, but at what a cost to the unhappy victim!

We do not hesitate to avow our conviction that ques-

tions which are deemed fit to be put to one woman in a court of justice should be fit for other women to hear. It may be at times necessary to put questions of a painful and distressing character to witnesses; and if on such occasions the presiding officer has the power and should deem it right to clear the court of all who are not there officially, men and women alike, even-handed justice would be done. But nothing can be more unjust in itself and cruel to women, who, not being accused of any crime, come to the witness box to further the ends of justice, than the practice of clearing the court of all those whose presence might afford them some measure of protection and countenance, and crowding it with an eager mob of privileged PAUL PRY'S, who may gratify without restraint their thirst for moral vivisection.

WE learn from the *Woman's Journal* that the constitution of the newly-formed State of Colorado provides that no person shall be denied the right to vote on questions pertaining to schools in the several school districts on account of sex; and that the first General Assembly shall, at its first session, submit the question of Woman Suffrage, on equal terms with men, to a direct vote of the qualified electors at the next general election thereafter.

The first Tuesday of October, 1877, will be the day on which this new State will decide for or against Woman Suffrage. All male persons twenty-one years old, who are not confined in any public prison at the time of the election, are qualified to vote upon it. All the male idiots, paupers, and convicts who have served out their terms of imprisonment, or have been pardoned out, all male foreigners who have declared their intention to become citizens four months before the election, whether they can read or write their own names or not, will be qualified to vote against the enfranchisement of women.

Should the vote be against women, will anyone be bold enough to maintain that a tribunal so constituted is an impartial one? Has a male idiot the right to disfranchise an intellectual woman,—a male drunkard the right to disfranchise a sober woman,—a male convict the right to disfranchise a law-abiding woman? Surely women have a right to be consulted on the question whether they are willing to entrust such men with the power of making laws for them.

CORONERS' juries sometimes return remarkable verdicts, but we have seldom met with one more strange than that which was given at an inquest held on August 23rd, at

Bethnal Green, respecting the death of ELIZABETH PLATT, aged thirteen months. We learn from the *Daily News* that the mother of the child stated that it was in excellent health. It was crying in bed, when her husband took it up and laid it beside her, asking her to take charge of it. She refused twice to do this, on which her husband threw a piece of bread at her. She laughed, and made a remark which annoyed him, meantime she took the child in her arms. The husband then threw the bread and the knife at her, but the latter missed its aim and entered the child's head. She extricated the knife, and blood flowed profusely. She took the child to the London Hospital, and remained with it all night, and afterwards removed it to her grandmother's, where it was attended by a doctor, but in spite of all the efforts of the mother and the doctor to save its life it died in a few days. The medical attendant certified that the knife had penetrated two inches deep into the brain, and that the cause of death was inflammation of the brain, produced by the wound. The jury returned a verdict of "Accidental death," coupled with "severe censure;" of whom does the reader imagine? of the man who threw the knife which killed the baby? Oh, no; of the wife for having "aggravated" him! The old ADAM must have been strong indeed in the mind of the Bethnal Green jury who gave this extraordinary deliverance of "crown's quest law."

We do not know whether this verdict will suffice to shield the man from penal consequences for his passionate act, but we should be surprised to find that the matter was allowed to rest in this conclusion. A man hurls a deadly weapon at the mother of his child who has it in her arms. Had the knife hit its mark, the wife would have been the victim, and in case of death, a verdict of murder or manslaughter, would surely have been returned. Owing to bad aim the knife hits the child instead of the mother. The accidental error in the direction of the weapon is held to reduce the death of the child to an "accidental" occurrence, and all the censure for the transaction is bestowed on the woman who has narrowly escaped being the murdered person. All killing is in law presumed to be murder, unless some provocation or other extenuating circumstance can be shown to reduce the crime to manslaughter. But it would seem that the provocation should be serious in order to be allowed. If one man kills another under circumstances which put him in bodily fear, or in returning a blow, it may be reasonable to admit such provocation in mitigation of the offence. But

that a woman's words, however "aggravating," even if accompanied by the additional heinous offence of laughter while she utters them, should be held by men to be a sufficient provocation to absolve a man from penal consequences for killing some one in the act of resenting them, would seem to prove that the quality which women call manliness must be utterly extinct in the minds of those who maintain such a proposition. It remains to be seen whether the law sanctions a theory, which, if accepted, tends to impair the security of life, and to encourage men in the indulgence of passions which lead to crime.

THE economical difficulties surrounding the question of the expediency of giving or withholding outdoor relief are sufficiently serious in themselves. They are, however, further complicated by those arising out of the *res angusta domi*. A case was mentioned at a recent meeting of the guardians of St. George's, Hanover Square, which forcibly illustrates the character of these perplexities. A woman whose husband earns 20s. a week, and who is besides in receipt of outdoor relief, applied to the union doctor for a medical order. That official found her in such a condition that he sent a slip of paper to the relieving officer, containing these words, "MARY MARKEY tells me that she has had no food to-day. I find her suffering from the want of it. If anything occurs, I shall hold you responsible." Now if the relieving officer is responsible for MARY MARKEY'S pitiable state, what becomes of her husband's responsibility in regard to her maintenance?—a responsibility, be it remembered, which is continually brought forward as an excuse for legislative interference with female labour.

A. D.

We desire to call especial attention to the announcement on our first page of the establishment of scholarships for women, tenable at University College, Bristol. We believe that this is the first college of the kind which offers educational privileges without distinction of sex, and we earnestly hope that a sufficient number of students in the classes, and of candidates for the scholarship, will present themselves to justify the effort that has been made in behalf of women. We would commend the college and the scholarship fund to the good offices of benefactors and testators who desire to devote money to the promotion of education. The disproportion between the amount of public money expended in the teaching of women and men respectively is infinitely greater than that between FALSTAFF'S poor halfpenny worth of bread to his inordinate quantity of sack.

We observe that a memorial has been presented to the Royal Commissioners of the Exhibition of 1851 praying that the income from surplus funds in their hands, which amounts to £12,000 a year, should be devoted to education in the form of scholarships. Should this proposal be entertained, we submit that women have an equitable claim for consideration. We commend this suggestion to Dr. PERCIVAL and his coadjutors at Bristol College. The public owe them a large debt of gratitude for their eminent and indefatigable services in the cause of education, and we trust that this debt may find due acknowledgement by a generous support of their present effort to place the means of extended culture within the reach of wider sections of the community.

WOMEN AND THE CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION OF THE FOURTH OF JULY.

In a letter to the *Alliance News*, Mr. Raper gives the following account of the presentation of a declaration by the American National Women's Suffrage Association. After the reading of the veritable original Declaration of Independence, says Mr. Raper, there was another Declaration of Independence ready to be presented and read. This was from the women of America, claiming the rights recognised in the old Declaration, but never rendered to women. General Hawley had been applied to for a place and time for its presentation. As the Commission had no sitting in the interval, he took upon himself the responsibility of saying it was too late for inclusion on that occasion. This did not deter the ladies. Five of them, Miss Anthony, Mrs. Gage, Mrs. Spencer, Mrs. Blake, and Miss Couzens, took places on the platform, and the moment Mr. Lee had finished Reading the Declaration, they stepped forward to the President, and Miss Anthony handed him the document duly engrossed and signed, and enclosed in a case. All that Miss Anthony said was, "From the women citizens of the United States," and thus simply was presented the "Women's Declaration of Rights and Articles of Impeachment against the Government of the United States." The Hon. Mr. Ferry received the case with a courteous bow, and the ladies retired. As they glided towards the rear of the platform to the exit, the curiosity of beholders was excited, and they had to give copies of the Declaration right and left. On reaching the outside steps of Independence Hall, through which they passed on retiring, they found a large crowd, and Miss Anthony read the document with effect to them. . . . In a neighbouring church (Dr. Furness's) a large assembly of ladies had gathered, in response to public invitation, to hear the "Women's Declaration" read. Mrs. Stanton presided, supported by Mrs. Lucretia Mott. The President read the document. Some of the points in it evoked strong feeling. In one portion it says:—"Believing in temperance, we have been taxed to support the vice, crime, and pauperism of the liquor traffic. While we suffer its wrongs and abuses infinitely more than man, we have no power to protect our sons against this giant evil. During our Temperance Crusade, mothers were arrested, fined, imprisoned, for even praying and singing in the streets, while men blockade the side-walks with impunity, even on Sunday, with their military parades and political processions." After the reading of the declaration, the meeting was addressed by Miss Lockwood, Mrs. Spencer, Mrs. Mott, Miss Couzens, Mrs. Gage, Miss Anthony, Mrs. Blake, Mrs. Parker, Mrs. Edward Davis, and others. As a visitor from a city in which the suffrage is exercised by women in all questions short of Parliamentary representation, I was requested at the close to give some information as to its general working. This was done briefly, and the meeting, which lasted for upwards of four hours, was reluctantly closed."

WHAT MAN SAYS TO WOMAN.

"No," said the Princess, shaking her head, and folding her arms with an air of decision, "you are not a woman. You may try, but you can never imagine what it is to have a man's force of genius in you, and yet to suffer the slavery of being a girl. To have a pattern cut out,—This is the [Jewish] woman; this is what you must be; this is what you are wanted for; a woman's heart must be of such a size and no larger, else it must be pressed small, like Chinese feet; her happiness is to be made as cakes are, by a fixed receipt,—that was what my father wanted. He wished I had been a son; he cared for me as a makeshift link."—*Daniel Deronda*.

LECTURES.

LONDON.

THE LIBERAL SOCIAL UNION.—On Thursday, July 27th, the last meeting for this session was held in the Suffolk-street Gallery. Miss Ramsay, authoress of "Mildred's Career," and other works, occupied the chair, and, with a few words of introduction, called upon Miss Becker, the secretary of the Women's Suffrage Society, to open the subject of discussion, which was "The Political Disabilities of Women, their Legal and Social Consequences." Miss Becker, in an effective address, urged her well-known views, and sat down amid much applause. A discussion followed, the speakers being Captain Scholey, Messrs. Eiloart, Reed, Grant, Lyons, A. Preston, and Miss Miller, who delivered the most effective speech of the evening. All the speakers accepted the general principle of the Women's Suffrage Bill, although differing in respect to the nature and extent of the legal and social disabilities of women. Miss Becker replied, congratulating the meeting on the fact that no one there was disposed to discourage the ladies in their work of political enfranchisement.—*Unitarian Herald*.

RHYL.

On the evening of August 1st, Miss Becker gave an address in the Town Hall, Rhyl, on "The Political Disabilities and Legal Disadvantages which Injurious affect Women as compared with Men." The chairman, Mr. John Rhys, M.A., gave a concise and interesting sketch of the social position of women in savage life, also in early stages of civilisation, and surprised as well as interested his audience by showing how the very ancient Brehon laws of Ireland gave an amount of protection and consideration to women, particularly to married women and their property, far in advance in equity and enlightenment of the law of England at the same period. The address by Miss Becker proved to be interesting to a very attentive audience. The way they have in Wales of dropping in after the beginning of a lecture or an address swelled on this occasion the number present, whose attendance was well rewarded by an ably-reasoned, calm, and thoughtful statement of the proposed legal and political reforms, long and ably pleaded for by Miss Becker and by others, and now supported by many distinguished public men of all parties. The speaker very fairly and neatly showed how Mr. John Bright "begged the question" in the debate on Mr. Forsyth's Bill on the disabilities of women, by asserting that the motives of the measure arose in a morbid restless feeling of hostility and suspicion, and that the proposed reforms would tend to arouse and continue social and domestic hostility between the sexes. In other parts of her address the speaker certainly proved that male legislators have been neither just nor generous custodians of women's interests in questions of property. If solid acquirements, in preference to a showy, shallow teaching of accomplishments, if how rightly to feel, think, reason, and read, formed the course of a liberal education for women, then would woman more easily attain all that is true and fit in legal social position. One marked merit in Miss Becker's address was its suggestiveness, the tendency it had to open the heads of folk and set them thinking.—*Abridged from the Rhyl Journal*.

LLANDUDNO.

An address on behalf of the Manchester National Society for Women's Suffrage was delivered at St. George's Hall, Llandudno, on August 2nd, by Miss Becker. There was a fair attendance, and marked attention was paid to the different addresses. The chair was occupied by Mr. H. D. Pochin, Haulfre, who, evidently from strong convictions, delivered a long and warm address in advocacy of the claim of women to the suffrage. Anticipating most

of the points to be dwelt upon by the lecturer, the chairman made passing remarks on the same, showing the unreasonableness if not the absurdity of the opposition to the proposal to give votes to women, and stating that even the agitation in favour of the same had conducted in rousing the country to look more after that education.—Miss Becker afterwards addressed the meeting in an exhaustive and telling speech. She laboured, and this very successfully, to minimise the seeming acquisition their opponents had obtained in the speech of Mr. Bright against the Bill, and showed that though their cause did not appear to everyone in the ascendancy, to those who carefully watched passing events it daily was found to take a firmer hold of the country, and that its ultimate triumph was not distant. Miss Becker, after an address extending over three-quarters of an hour, sat down amidst loud applause.—On the motion of Mr. Davenport, seconded by Mr. Worthington, a warm vote of thanks was accorded to the distinguished lady. Miss Becker afterwards moved a vote of thanks to the chairman, which the audience readily endorsed.—*From the Carnarvon and Denbigh Herald*.

LLANRWST.

On August 3rd, Miss Becker addressed a meeting in the Infant's Schoolroom, Llanrwst. The Rev. S. Roberts, of Conway, in the chair. The lecture was received with attention by the audience, and the meeting terminated with the customary votes of thanks.

NEW BRIGHTON.

A meeting was held on August 10th, in the hall of the Young Men's Christian Association, Victoria Road, New Brighton, Cheshire, when an address was delivered by Miss Becker, to a numerous and influential audience. Mr. W. S. Caine occupied the chair. After the lecture, votes of thanks were moved and supported by Mr. T. E. Stephens, Mr. Eskrigge, Mr. S. E. Capper, and others, and carried unanimously.

HARROGATE.

A numerous and highly-respectable assemblage of ladies and gentlemen met in the Chalybeate Spa Concert Room, on Thursday afternoon, August 17th, to hear an address from Miss Becker. Mr. R. Ellis presided, and in opening the proceedings said this was a question which he had not heard thoroughly discussed, and therefore looked forward with pleasure to Miss Becker's address, as he was sure they would all receive from it a large amount of valuable and solid information.—Miss Becker then delivered an address of about forty minutes' duration, and was listened to throughout with the utmost attention. She concluded by asking her hearers to give this subject thoughtful consideration, feeling sure that the issue would be their active aid in repealing a law which was so unjust and degrading to the women of this country.—(Applause.)—Mr. Whitmell, junr., proposed a vote of thanks to Miss Becker, which was carried by acclamation, and briefly acknowledged by that lady.—Mrs. Oliver Scatcherd proposed a vote of thanks to the chairman, which was carried unanimously; and that gentleman having acknowledged the compliment, the meeting terminated.—*Abridged from the Harrogate Advertiser*.

The prize for political economy at University College has been gained by Miss Ada Heather Bigg. This young lady is a most diligent student, and the unusual circumstance that a lady had been successful in taking the prize for so abstruse a subject was strongly commented upon by Mr. Goschen in delivering the awards. The eldest brother of Miss Bigg took the silver medal for practical physiology at the same college at the last examination. Miss Catherine Raisin was bracketed with Mr. C. Eardley Wilmot for the geology prize. All the fine arts prizes were taken by ladies.—*Victoria Magazine*.

WOMEN'S RIGHTS TO DOWER.

(From the North of England Review.)

It is somewhat singular that at a time when women have ascended the platform to agitate for public rights, as well as numbers of advanced reformers amongst men, that the one material point that women now suffer from, that they never did in the past two thousand years or more, is never mentioned as far as we know.

The point is one that touches the feelings more generally and more deeply than any other. The rights of property, particularly of dower. A case came very near to us where the wife brought the principal money at marriage, property was accumulated during coverture, real property was purchased, and at the husband's death his will did not contain the name of his wife, and she has no claim on the estate that she largely produced. Her relatives have to keep her, or she must become a worker or a pauper—though her husband died leaving a landed estate as well as considerable personal property.

Only a week or so ago a similar will was contested in the law courts and overturned; but not because the wife and children were excluded from all benefit, but because the testator was proved to be incompetent to make a will. That he had for some time contemplated such a will before his last illness was amply proved. Therefore it is quite clear that a wife is completely at the mercy of the husband. From a temporary quarrel, or from some influence over the mind of a husband not exactly of a right character, a husband can exclude his wife from any share of his property, and give it away to whom he pleases.

The ancient laws always favoured the wife, and gave her one-third or one-half of her deceased husband's property.

In the earliest laws we have of Æthelberht, King of Kent, 560-616, the provisions are thoroughly liberal for the widow.

CAP. LXXVIII.—*Gif hio cwic bearn gebyreth, healfne sceat agegif ceorl ar swyltelh.* If she bear a live child, let her have half the property.

CAP. LXXIX.—*Gif mid bearnum bugan wille, healfne sceat age.* If she wish to go away with her children, let her have half the property.

CAP. LXXXI. *Gif hio bearn ne gebyreth, feoderingmagas fioh agan, and morgen-gyfe.* If she bear no child, let her paternal kindred have the "fioh" and the "morgen-gyfe."

The "fioh," the property received with the bride. *Fioh* or *fioh*, one of the oldest words in all European languages; originally cattle when they were the only wealth. "Morgen-gyfe" was the dowry the husband named as his gift to his wife, before witnesses, the morning after the wedding night. It would be generally one half what he died worth.

Other Anglo-Saxon Kings were as liberal. Edlund CIV. gave all the property to the widow, except she married again. The historian of that period gives a striking testimony. "It is well known that the female sex was much more highly valued, and more respectfully treated by the barbarous Gothic notions than by the more polished states of the East. Among the Anglo-Saxons they occupied the same important and independent rank in society which they now enjoy (?); they were allowed to possess, inherit, and to transmit landed property; they shared in all the social festivities; they were present at the *Witena-gemot* and the *Scir-gemot*; they were permitted to sue and be sued in the courts of justice; their person, their safety, their liberty, and their property were protected by express laws. * * * *Morgen-gift.*" This was the present which the Anglo-Saxon wives received from their husbands on the day after the nuptials; a compliment to the ladies for honouring a suitor with their preference,

and for submitting to the duties of wedlock."—*Turner's History A. Saxons, vol. 2.*

Under the law of *Gavel-Kind*, which was instituted here many centuries before Jutes, Angles, or Saxons arrived, or even before Julius Cæsar ever saw the shores of England, the same liberality was displayed, we (Du Lombard and Tottel) have an inquiry into the law of *Gavel-Kind*, and its acknowledged authority in 1294. The costumal of Kent commences, *Ces sent les usages de Gauyle Kend, e de Gauyle Kendeys en Kent, &c.* These be the usages of *Gavel-Kind*, and of *Gavel-Kind* men in Kent, which were before the Conquest and at the Conquest, and ever since till now, allowed in Eire, before John of Berwicke and his companions, the justices in Eire, in Kent the 21 years of King Edward the son of King Henry.

VIII.—*Et si il eit femme, meintenant seit dowe per le heir, sil seit dage, de la meytie, de touz les terres e tenementz que son baroun tint de Gauyle-Kend en fee, a auer e a tener solonc la fourme de suthdyte. Et de tiels terres le roy ne auera an ne wast, mes tant soulmët les chateux, sicome il est auatdit.*

And if he have a wife, forthwith be she endowed by the heir (if he be of age) of the one-half of all the lands and tenements which her husband held of Gavel-Kind nature in fee: to have and to hold according to the form hereafter declared. And of such lands the King shall not have the year, nor waste, but only the goods as is before said.

By our common law, from all known time, a wife, except she be an alien, a Jewess, or an apostate, was entitled to one-third of all the lands and tenements of which the husband was solely, seized either in deed or in law, to enjoy as her life estate.

Magna Charta provided that the widow should not be taxed to the lord for her dower.

The Statutes of Merton stated, and made statutory what the common law had all along allowed, that a widow could have her remedy if the dower was not given and given fairly. The sheriff could appoint her dower, or she could enforce it by Bill in equity.

But all the statutory rights and common rights to dower are now gone. By the 3 and 4 William IV., cap. 105, all absolute rights to dower are destroyed. The wife is absolutely at the mercy and goodness of the husband. If he chooses to endow a paramour, and leave the wife penniless, the law of England will support the paramour in her claim, but leaves the wife without a remedy, even though the land or other property may have been originally hers, the sole gift of her relations, or of her earnings. W. G. WARD, F.R.H.S.

THE PROPERTY OF MARRIED WOMEN.

The seventh annual meeting of the Married Women's Property Association was held on July 28th, under the presidency of Mr. Jacob Bright, M.P., at the Library of the Social Science Association, Adam-street, Adelphi, London.

The CHAIRMAN said the object of this association was to alter the law which confiscates the property of a woman when she marries—in other words, to give to women the same proprietary rights after marriage as before. In narrating the Parliamentary history of this question, he showed that the Act of 1870, owing to the alterations made in the measure when it passed through the House of Lords, had by no means attained the object of the committee. It gave some protection to the earnings of women, but it was so complicated that it had led to much confusion, and few persons even among the class for whose protection it was intended understood how to obtain protection under it. Mr. Hinde Palmer had in 1873 succeeded in getting a Bill advanced several stages, but he was

PETITIONS.

FIFTEENTH REPORT (continued) 10—25 April, 1876.

WOMEN'S DISABILITIES REMOVAL BILL—*In Favour.*

NO.	DATE.	PLACE.	PRESENTED BY	NO. OF SIGNATURES.
6461	Apl. 10	BANNOCKBURN	Sir William Edmonstone ..	28
6462	10	CAMBUSBARRON	" ..	40
6463	10	HACKNEY	Mr. Fawcett.....	814
6464	10	SAINT JOHN'S WOOD	Mr. Forsyth ..	263
6465	10	BAYSWATER	" ..	353
6466	10	FINSBURY	" ..	615
6467	10	SAINT JOHN'S WOOD	" ..	230
6468	10	MARYLEBONE	" ..	482
6469	10	EMILY PFEIFFER and others	" ..	827
6470	10	KENSINGTON	" ..	36
6471	10	HOUSLOW	Ld. G. Hamilton ..	14
6472	10	HAMPSTEAD	" ..	360
6473	10	" ..	" ..	560
6474	10	HOUSLOW	" ..	19
6475	10	" ..	" ..	43
6476	10	HACKNEY	Mr. John Holms ..	690
6477	10	DUNDEE	Mr. Ed. Jenkins ..	2
6478	10	JANE SMITH.....	" ..	1
6479	10	PERTH.....	Mr. Kinnaird	624
6480	10	PUTNEY	Sir T. Lawrence ..	2,530
6481	10	BRISTOL	Mr. Morley	700
6482	10	BIDEFORD	Sir S. Northcote ..	47
6483	10	LARNE.....	Mr. O'Neil	227
6484	10	EXMOUTH	Sir Law. Palk	57
6485	10	SOUTHAMPTON, Corporation of	Sir F. Perkins... Seal.	
6486	10	CROSS HILL	Mr. Rylands	57
6487	10	MAYBOLE	" ..	62
6488	10	CARDIFF	Colonel Stuart... ..	145
6489	10	DOWNTON	Lord H. Thynne ..	54
6490	10	AMESBURY	" ..	22
6491	10	KINGSLAND	Mr. Torrens.....	289
6492	10	LICHFIELD	Sir E. Wilmot... ..	11
6493	10	UPPER NORWOOD	" ..	36
6494	11	ISLEWORTH	Lord G. Hamilton ..	505
6495	11	WESTMINSTER	Mr. Wm. Smith ..	1,076
6496	11	" ..	" ..	323
6497	11	" ..	" ..	161
6498	11	RATHMINES	Colonel Taylor... ..	55
6499	11	KING-TOWN.....	" ..	108
6500	11	WARMINSTER	Lord H. Thynne ..	
6501	24	GARLLESTON, Public Meeting, D. Williamson, chairman ..	Mr. Agnew	1
6502	24	NEWTON STEWART, Public Meeting, W. Lockhart, chairman... ..	" ..	1
6503	24	PLYMOUTH	Mr. Bates	3
6504	24	CIRENCESTER	Mr. Bathurst	90
6505	24	KING'S LYNN	Mr. Bourke	25
6506	24	WEDNESBURY	Mr. Brogden	318
6507	24	KIRCALDY	Sir G. Campbell ..	90
6508	24	NORWICH	Mr. Colman	784
6509	24	NEWPORT.....	Mr. Cordes	65
6510	24	BELFAST	Mr. James Corry ..	12
6511	24	" ..	" ..	619
6512	24	" ..	" ..	154
6513	24	" ..	" ..	34
6514	24	" ..	" ..	372
6515	24	KENSINGTON	Sir Chas. Dilke ..	690
6516	24	HACKNEY	Mr. Fawcett.....	1
6517	24	" ..	" ..	139
6518	24	" ..	" ..	510
6519	24	RATOATH.....	Mr. Forsyth.....	105
6520	24	MARYLEBONE.....	" ..	1,191
6521	24	HAMBLEDON	" ..	27
6522	24	H. E. TURNER and others	" ..	38
6523	24	LADYBANK	" ..	190
6524	24	DUBLIN	" ..	37
6525	24	OLD FORD	" ..	70
6526	24	KENSINGTON	Mr. W. Gordon ..	1
6527	24	HARROW	Lord G. Hamilton ..	19
6528	24	PETERBOROUGH	Mr. Hankey.....	2,153
6529	24	EASTON	Mr. K. Hodgson ..	295
6530	24	TOTTERDOWN	" ..	628

subjected to six "counts" in the course of the session, and the Bill perished.

Mrs. VENTURI read the report of the Association, which ascribed a certain apathy with which they had to contend in dealing with this question to a mistaken belief that the Act of 1870, instead of being, as it really was, an ineffective compromise, had once for all affirmed the principle this committee intended to establish, namely, to confer on women the same rights and liberties as to property and contract as appertained by law to men. The committee rejoiced to believe that this evil was being gradually removed, and that the prospects of an early and just settlement of the question were still brightening. Lord Coleridge had promised next session to introduce a Married Women's Property Bill, and she hoped this measure would receive a wide support.

Mrs. JACOB BRIGHT, as treasurer of the committee, read the accounts. She said that the subscriptions for the year showed an increase of more than £150 over those of any previous year, and there was a proportionate increase in the number of subscribers.

Mr. P. A. TAYLOR, M.P., moved that the report and statement of accounts be adopted.

Mr. ARTHUR ARNOLD seconded the resolution which was passed.

Mr. HINDE PALMER moved, "That this meeting hereby expresses its hearty thanks to Lord Coleridge for his promise to introduce the Married Women's Property Bill into the House of Lords early next session, and pledges itself to renewed activity to secure the passing of a just and comprehensive measure which shall establish for all women the same rights and liberties as to property and contract as appertain by law to men.

Mr. MOZLEY seconded the motion in a speech directed to the analysis of the Act of 1870, exposition of its faults, and a consideration of the remedies which a new measure ought to contain.

The resolution was passed; and on the motion of the Hon. Mrs. M. DRUMMOND, seconded by Miss DOWNING, the executive committee was appointed.

Mrs. VENTURI moved a vote of thanks to Mr. Jacob Bright for presiding. Mrs. ARNOLD seconded the motion, which was passed, and the proceedings then closed.

ELECTION INTELLIGENCE.

LEEDS.

The election of a member for Leeds, in place of Mr. Alderman Carter, took place on August 15th. The candidates were Mr. Alderman Barran, Liberal, and Mr. Jackson, Conservative; and Mr. Barran was returned by a considerable majority. Both candidates were favourable to women's suffrage. At one of Mr. Barran's meetings, Mr. Garforth asked whether the candidate was in favour of extending the Parliamentary franchise to females.—Alderman Barran replied that "he was rather inclined that way, but he would not like to be pledged upon it. If representation went with taxation, he would not say that women had not a right to vote; but there were, on the other hand, some considerations which made him doubtful. When he was presiding officer in one of the Leeds wards, at a municipal election, he found that of 430 women who voted, 400 were brought up by the Tories." At a meeting at Bramley, in answer to a question, Mr. Jackson said, "As to women's suffrage, he thought he might safely say he would vote for it, as his friend Alderman Barran had once found that out of about 430 women voters at the Leeds municipal election 400 were Conservatives."

Table with columns: No., Date, Place, Presented by, No. of Signatures. Lists petitions from various locations like Clifton, Bala, Paisley, Stoke Newington, etc., with names of presenters and signature counts.

Table with columns: No., Date, Place, Presented by, No. of Signatures. Continues the list of petitions from locations like Salisbury, Tower Hamlets, Chelmsford, Stalybridge, Cambridge, etc., including a summary of 873 petitions and 312,114 signatures.

NO.	DATE.	PLACE.	PRESENTED BY	NO. OF SIGNATURES.	NO.	DATE.	PLACE.	PRESENTED BY	NO. OF SIGNATURES.
7416	Apl 26	WHITHORN, Public Meeting, A F Mac-Geochy, chairman ..	Mr. Stewart.....	1	8521	Apl. 26	SALFORD	Mr. Forsyth....	86
7417	26	SUTTON.....	Colonel Taylor...	32	8522	26	FLETCHING	Mr. Gregory ...	22
7418	26	BARNSTABLE	Mr. Waddy	227		May			
7419	26	CAMBRIDGE	Mr. Walpole ...	43	8523	3	EVESHAM.....	Colonel Bourne .	208
7420	26	PENGE	Mr. Watney ...	41	8524	3	CALSTOCK	Mr. Tremayne...	56
7421	26	LEEDS	Mr. Wheelhouse	479	8525	3	BELFAST	Mr. Whitworth .	72
7422	26	"	"	2,737	8526	3	NEWTOWN	"	29
7423	26	BELFAST	Mr. B. Whitworth	48	8527	4	UTLEY.....	Ld. F. Cavendish	161
7424	26	WREXHAM	Mr. Williams ...	162	8528	4	REDLAND.....	Mr. Hodgson ...	171
7425	27	OLDBURY	Mr. Allsopp.....	11	8529	5	CUPAR, Public Meeting.....	Mr. Ellice.....	Seal 1
7426	27	R. NOSWORTHY and others	Mr. Bates	25	8530	5	ANSTRUTHER	"	91
7427	27	FORFAR	Mr. Baxter	Seal 1	8331	5	WARWICK	Mr. Peel	36
7428	27	"	"	103	9364	8	EDGWARE	Mr. Coope	60
7429	27	MANCHESTER	Sir Thos. Bazley	41	9365	8	JEDBURGH	Sir H. F. Davie .	1
7430	27	"	"	402	9366	8	BECKENHAM	Mr. Forsyth.....	5
7431	27	NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE.....	Mr. J. Cowen ...	2228	9367	8	FLIMBY, Public Meeting, F. Moon. chairman	Lord Muncaster	1
7432	27	"	"	1945	9368	9	LONDON	Sir T. Chambers	49
7433	27	SAINT PANCRAS, Public Meeting; Mark E. Marsden, chairman	Mr. Forsyth.....	1	9339	9	CHARLES BOLT and others	Mr. Tremayne...	56
7434	27	HOLLOWAY, Public Meeting; M. E. Richardson, president	"	1	10277	10	DUBLIN	Sir A. Guinness .	26
7435	27	CASHEL	"	17	10278	10	NANTWICH	Colonel Leigh ...	40
7436	27	HOLLOWAY, Public Meeting, Thos Hare, chairman	"	1	10279	10	PITLOCHRY	Sir W. Maxwell	101
7437	27	J. STEVENSON and others	"	34	10280	10	CORRY	Mr. Turnor	59
7438	27	ELLEN MURRAY and others	"	5	10281	11	SOUTH MOLTON	Sir T. Ackland	21
7439	27	A. W. TUER and others	"	8	10282	11	BOW.....	"	34
7440	27	ALNWICK.....	"	47	10283	11	LANGTREE	"	24
7441	27	SWINDON	Sir D. Gooch ...	204	11779	15	GREENWICH.....	Mr W.E. Gladstone	555
7442	27	W. J. TATHAM and others	Mr. Gourley ...	1097	11780	15	DEPTFORD and NEW CROSS	"	1,113
7443	27	E. WRIGHT and others	"	912	11781	15	PLUMSTEAD.....	"	685
7444	27	LLANLLYFNI	Mr. Hughes.....	49	11782	15	WOOLWICH and neighbourhood	"	92
7445	27	NOTTINGHAM	Mr. Isaac.....	30	11783	15	CHARLTON	"	385
7446	27	SALE	Mr. Legh.....	54	11784	15	GREENWICH.....	"	302
7447	27	BERKENHEAD	Mr. Melvor.....	41	11785	15	DARTFORD	"	185
7448	27	MEYSEY CLIVE	Mr. Pateshall ...	1	11786	15	WOOLWICH	"	410
7449	27	GLOUCESTER	Mr. Wait	33	11787	15	DEPTFORD	"	442
7450	27	"	"	587	11788	15	NEW CROSS	"	239
7451	27	GREAT YARMOUTH.....	"	117	11789	15	STROMNESS, Town Council, J. Spence, chairman	Mr. Laing	1
7452	28	SHAFFESBURY	Mr. Benett-Stanford	3	12196	17	VICARSTOWN	Sir J. Esmonde	94
7453	28	CAROLINE W. WILLIAMS and others	Mr. Coope	84					
7454	28	KILMESSAN	Mr. Ennis	63					
7455	28	STANNINGLEY, Reform Club, Saml. Laycock, chairman, and another	Mr. Forsyth.....	2					
7456	28	PANT-Y-COED	Mr. R. Gurney...	36					
7457	28	HONLEY	Mr. Leatham ...	111					
7458	28	SUNNINGHILL	Colonel Lindsay.	41					
7459	28	MAIDSTONE	Sir J. Lubbock...	48					
7460	28	SALISBURY	Dr. Lush	491					
7461	28	DEVONPORT	Mr. Puleston ...	42					
7462	28	MOUSEHOLE.....	Sir J. St. Aubyn.	23					
7463	28	NEWLYN	"	30					
7464	28	HARRY R. NEWTON and others.....	Mr. Stansfeld ...	8					

Total number of Petitions 1,099—Signatures 369,620

MANCHESTER NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE. SUBSCRIPTIONS AND DONATIONS, AUGUST, 1876.

	£	s.	d.
Mr. Wm. Birch, jun.	3	3	0
Mrs. Mills (Upper Tooting) ...	2	2	0
Mrs. Mc.Culloch (Lecture Fund)	1	1	0
Mrs. Mc.Kinnel " "	1	1	0
Mrs. Pochin " "	1	1	0
Mr. Henry R. Dalton " "	1	1	0
Mrs. Hetherington " "	1	1	0
Mr. Wm. Lawson " "	1	1	0
Mr. A. Haworth " "	1	1	0
Mr. R. Ellis (Harrogate) " "	1	1	0
Mrs. Hunt " (Lecture Fund)	1	1	0
Mr. Thos. Powell (Southport) ..	1	0	0
Mr. A. M. Box (1875 and 1876) ..	1	0	0
Mr. James Burnett.....	0	10	0
Mr. A. Martin (Southport) ..	0	10	0
Mr. and Mrs. Reuben Sutcliffe ..	0	10	0
Mrs. Algernon Kingsford ..	0	10	0
Miss Alice Wilson ..	0	5	0
Mrs. Leach ..	0	5	0
Miss Ann Lomas ..	0	2	6
Mrs. Griffith ..	0	2	6
Miss Brooke (Kidderminster) ..	0	1	6
COLNE.			
Mrs. Shaw ..	1	0	0
Mrs. Henderson ..	0	5	0
Mr. Wildman ..	0	5	0
Mrs. Threlfall ..	0	5	0
Mrs. J. H. Threlfall ..	0	5	0
X. Y. Z., Colne ..	0	5	0
A. C., Colne ..	0	5	0
Miss Bracewell.....	0	3	0
Mr. W. H. Carr ..	0	2	6
Mr. John Horsfield.....	0	2	6
Mrs. Barker ..	0	2	6

S. ALFRED STEINTHAL, Treasurer.

£22 11 0

SEVENTEENTH TO TWENTY-SECOND REPORT.

1—23 May, 1876.

NO.	DATE.	PLACE.	PRESENTED BY	NO. OF SIGNATURES.
	May		Brought forward, Petitions 1,047—Signatures 358,401	
8057	1	KIRCALDY	Sir Geo. Campbell Seal. 1	
8058	1	SUNDERLAND	Mr. Gourley	Seal. 1
8059	1	ASHTON-UNDER-LYNE.....	Mr. Mellor	862
8060	1	ANNA GOKE LANGTON	Sir S. Northcote	1
8061	1	LINCOLN	Mr. Seely.....	1,512
8062	1	MANSFIELD	Mr. Saml. Smith	8
8063	1	MEATH AND WEST KENT.....	Mr. John Talbot	71
8064	1	KINGS TOWN	Colonel Taylor...	48
8065	1	RYDE	"	737
8066	2	BOLTON	Mr. Hick	1,784
8067	2	WELLINGBOROUGH	Mr. Ward Hunt	58
8068	2	STROUD	Mr. Stanton	59
8069	2	PAR	Mr. Tremayne...	18
8070	2	"	"	26
8071	2	POLRUAN.....	"	51
8072	2	SAINT TEATH	"	56