

MANCHESTER NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE Journal.

EDITED BY LYDIA E. BECKER.

No. 3.—PUBLISHED MONTHLY.

MAY 2, 1870.

PRICE ONE PENNY.

BEFORE another number of this Journal reaches the hands of our friends a most important crisis in the movement will have taken place. The question of the removal of the Electoral Disabilities of Women will have been submitted to the verdict of a reformed House of Commons; and this assembly, elected on the ostensible basis of household suffrage, will have pronounced whether or no this basis is to be a reality or a delusive cry. Under household suffrage, were it universal throughout the land, only a comparatively small number of the population would have the franchise. Nevertheless, this suffrage, carried out in its integrity, would give a share in the representation to every class in the community. It would secure a vote to every home in the country, and if the family is considered the unit in the State, every such unit would have a voice in the government. Therefore household suffrage is an intelligible demand—founded on something like a principle—it has been the avowed aim of many advanced Liberals, and forms the basis of the Conservative Reform Act of 1867. It is this principle, so deliberately sanctioned by both the great parties in the State, and ratified by the verdict of the nation, that we now ask to have applied impartially. Whatever be the personal disqualifications which excludes a class of householders, that exclusion will operate injuriously to their interests. If no working man were allowed to vote under a household suffrage qualification, the interests of working men would suffer, and their views would not command attention from the legislature. But the moment you give them votes, you secure care to do them justice. Women householders form about one seventh of the whole number in the country. Women form above one half of the nation. Therefore one half of the nation is asking for one seventh of the representation. This is surely a very moderate claim. But it would be sufficient to secure incalculable benefits to the enfranchised half of the community. The immediate effect would be to elevate all questions affecting the interests of women in regard to employment, education, property, and personal security, out of the category of questions which OUGHT to be attended to into that of questions which MUST be attended to. There are few members of Parliament who would not admit that the laws as they affect women on these matters require amendment. Nevertheless, the laws do not get amended.

The cases of husbands who misuse their legal power over the

person and property of their wives, are so numerous as to cease to command attention. It is so very common for a certain class of men to beat and rob their wives that no public notice is taken of any particular instance of such a wrong. It is somewhat difficult to deal with personal violence towards women; but it would be very easy to secure wives against legal robbery. A little band of just men has for the last three sessions pressed this matter on the attention of the legislature, but they have not succeeded in obtaining from Parliament more than an acknowledgment that a great wrong exists, and a languid acquiescence in the principle of the proposed remedy. The suffering is borne by a class which is specifically excluded from representation, and its consideration is postponed to the pressing claims of those who have votes to give. It is the same with every other question in which the interests of men and women have been separately considered, and notably with regard to educational endowments. The men get attended to first, as a matter of course and of right. If there is anything left after their wants are fully satisfied, a little of the superfluity is, as a matter of favour, bestowed on the other sex. The friends of the education of women vainly endeavoured to insert in the Endowed Schools Bill a clause providing that an equal share of the funds should be devoted to girls. All they could obtain was a clause empowering the commissioners to make provision, "as far as convenient," for the education of girls.

We have in this city a striking instance of the manner in which the interests of women in the matter of education are set aside. Many years ago Mr. Owens left a large sum to build and endow a college for the instruction of "young persons of the male sex." The college has proved so useful that an attempt is now being made to extend it. A large sum of money has been subscribed, and a government grant been applied for. A Bill for the extension of Owens College is now before the House of Commons, and was read a second time on the 25th April last. This Bill originally contained a clause empowering the authorities of the college to make provision for the education of "young persons of either sex." But, in a committee in the House of Lords, the lawyer representing the founder's estate opposed this clause. The promoters of the scheme, avowedly for fear of endangering the Bill,

consented to sacrifice the clause securing the interests of women, and the Bill was read a third time, and passed the House of Lords without it. There are at the present time in Manchester, and the surrounding district, large classes of women pursuing studies under collegiate lecturers, who would gladly avail themselves of the benefits of Owens College, if it were open to them. The authorities and professors of the college are one and all desirous of admitting these students to partake of its advantages. Some of the money for the new institution has been subscribed on the express condition that women shall be educated there. So the students and the professors and the college and the funds are there; waiting to come together, when the legislature steps in and forbids the arrangement. Should the Bill become law in its present shape, and a grant of public money be afterwards voted in support of the college, Parliament will be compelling the women of Manchester to pay taxes for the maintenance of an institution from the benefits of which it has arbitrarily interfered to debar them. There is, however, nothing to prevent the re-introduction of the original clause in committee in the House of Commons; and if the women on the citizens roll of Manchester possessed the Parliamentary vote, it is just possible that our city members might be impelled to bestir themselves in the interests of the feminine portion of their constituency, by moving that the provision for the education of women be restored to the Bill. They may do so under present circumstances. But their interest in the endeavour would be of a more practical nature, and their hands greatly strengthened in commending it to the House, if the class directly concerned was represented by eight thousand votes for Manchester.

The government of this country, so far as women are concerned, is absolutely despotic. We ask for free government. We say that wherever free government has been substituted for despotic government, the change has been to the advantage of the people. We are confident that our case will be no exception to the general rule. Despotism has a tendency to cause the evils, the existence of which has been made the excuse for its maintenance. It fosters timidity, slavishness, the desire to tyrannise over others, unreasonableness, and incapacity. A people which manifests these tendencies is said to be unfit for freedom. But men are slowly finding out that they can never learn to be free while in a state of slavery, and that the only way to make a people fit for freedom is first to make them free.

The defects laid to the charge of women by those who make these alleged defects the excuse for withholding from them constitutional freedom are precisely those which despotic government tends to produce. Women, as a class, are perpetually accused of want of capacity for self-government, of liability to be unduly influenced by others, and of wilful and unreasonable perverseness. We do not believe that these accusations have

any other foundation than that of taking the peculiarities of a few unreasonable women as characteristics of the sex, instead of judging them as those of unreasonable men are judged, and ascribing them to individual character. But were they true, they are such defects as might be looked for in a subject class, and they may be expected to disappear with the establishment of political and social equality.

It may be said that we are not claiming political equality for men and women, since we only ask for women, who compose half the nation, one seventh of the representation. To this we reply that the equality we claim is not arithmetical, but political. Let the *qualification* be precisely the same for men and women; let the element of sex be eliminated from the conditions for the exercise of the suffrage, and men and women will stand before the law in a state of perfect equality. The mere number of each who will acquire the specified qualification is an accidental circumstance, and does not in any way detract from the principle of complete equality as to the constitutional rights of men and women.

The comparatively small number of women who would be actually enfranchised under conditions of perfect political equality as to sex, is an element of great advantage in the solution of the question. It renders what is theoretically a great change practically a very small measure. While securing at once the full benefit of political freedom to the class it is proposed to enfranchise, it reduces to a minimum the inconveniences which usually attend constitutional reforms. It has been the boast of our country that changes which in other nations need violent revolutions to obtain, and cause organic dislocation of the framework of society in their working, are, through the elasticity of our political institutions, accomplished safely and tranquilly by a natural process of development. Not a change has been introduced in the political status of Englishmen that had not its root in the traditions of the past. Not a step has been made forward that was not the logical sequence of some preceding step. It is on this principle that we now ask for representation of women in the imperial legislature. From the earliest times they have enjoyed equal electoral rights with men in parochial affairs. Successive Acts of Parliament, in providing for local governments, have scrupulously guarded the electoral privileges of both men and women ratepayers. The Municipal Corporations Act of 1835 was the first in which this principle was disregarded. Based on the phraseology of the Reform Act of 1832, it specifically disfranchised the women ratepayers in every district subject to its provisions. But in 1869 this disability was removed by the unanimous assent of both Houses of Parliament, and women, so far as the municipal franchise is concerned, have rights equal and similar to those of men. This was a very great step; yet it follows naturally from the previous status of women as regards local voting. The alternative

PUBLIC MEETINGS, ETC.

PUBLIC MEETING IN PLYMOUTH.

A meeting was held at the Mechanics' Institute, Plymouth, on Tuesday, March 29th, for the purpose of taking into consideration the question of extending the franchise to women.

Mr. F. Hicks occupied the chair, and amongst those present were: Walter Morrison, Esq., M.P., Messrs. W. F. Collier, R. E. Moore, W. R. D. Gilbert, I. Latimer, Bryant, Skelton, Horswell, Whipple, E. Goadby, Williamson, A. Groser, Alger, Reed, Rev. T. W. Freckleton, &c. Amongst the ladies present were:—Mrs. W. F. Collier, Mrs. S. Harris, Miss L. A. Calmady, and Miss Luxmoore.

The CHAIRMAN, after stating the object they had in calling the meeting, said the very fact that this matter was being discussed and considered by the legislature showed that it was ripening for a decision. It was a matter calling for most serious reflection, as it was desired that there should be admitted to the franchise a large number of occupiers and owners of property who are called upon to pay the ordinary taxation of the country, but who, up to the present time, have not been admitted to the privileges which the opposite sex enjoy. At large and important meetings the ladies had not only shown their ability to vote, but to speak on and discuss such an important subject. There was no doubt but that it was ripening rapidly for legislation. This meeting was to invite the attention of those present to the arguments which might be adduced in favour of the question.

Mr. W. F. COLLIER moved the first resolution, which was as follows: "That this meeting is of opinion that it is unwise and unjust that the suffrage for the election of members of Parliament should be limited to one sex, and that it is expedient to admit women to the franchise." (Applause.) He would ask his hearers to consider the question first in a moral point of view; and in making use of that word he did not wish to do so in the sense in which it was most popular, but he would apply it to the happiness of the whole of mankind, and when he said the whole of mankind he meant a very different thing than the mere pursuit of pleasure, because a man might pursue his pleasure at the sacrifice of his happiness, and of those about him, and therefore when he asked them to consider the question from a moral point of view he did not mean, on the one hand, Puritanical morality, nor did he mean, on the other hand, reference to the mere pleasures of life. If we observed what our legislation had been up to the present time he thought we must come to the conclusion that it had not been, in the sense in which he used the word, altogether a moral legislation. One of the most painful passages in our history that could possibly be brought against us in the future was the statement made by the commissioners appointed to examine into the treatment of women and children in our manufacturing districts. He did not know anything more disgraceful to our civilisation than the state in which those poor, wretched children were found, whose lives were sacrificed, as it seemed to him, to the greed of wealth in those manufacturing districts; and he would undertake to say that if women had a voice in the legislation of this country, that if women had the franchise given them years ago, inquiries would have been made into the condition of those children, and a harsh and theoretical political economy would not have been allowed to grind down our young children to dust on some abstract principle of wealth. (Applause.) No one could doubt that women, for many reasons, understood children far better than men; they were constantly with them, and therefore, had frequent opportunities of studying their characters. Then there came the great and mighty question of education, and he would ask whether they were going to educate the children of this country, and not allow women to have a voice in the matter.

The resolution was seconded by Mr. REED, of Ford Park, and supported by

Mr. DISRAELI ON WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE.—Mr. Disraeli, in a speech delivered in the House of Commons, on April 27, 1866, said:—"I have always been of opinion, that if there is to be universal suffrage women have as much right to vote as men. And more than that—a woman now ought to have a vote in a country in which she may hold manorial courts and sometimes act as churchwarden."

Mr. WALTER MORRISON, M.P., who said: I have come down from London at some personal inconvenience to attend this meeting, because when I found good men and true taking a leading part in this movement in London, and above all, knowing that the question has passed out of the region of mere theory, and that there is actually a measure before the House of Commons awaiting its second reading, in favour of extending the franchise to women, I thought it my duty to come down to show you that although in the past I have theoretically advocated such a measure, I have not receded

from the position I then took, now that it has become a practical question, and one for debate in the House of Commons. (Hear, hear.) It may be said that when we advocate the extension of the franchise in any form, the *onus probandi*—the proof of the necessity for the measure—should be with those who ask for the change, and indeed if you ask me for arguments in favour of giving the franchise to women I do not think that I can do better than refer you to any of the good speeches that were delivered during the reform agitation in favour of extending the suffrage to the working classes. Read through either of the speeches that were delivered by Mr. Bright, by Mr. Gladstone, or by Mr. Cobden, on the subject of Parliamentary Reform, substitute women for working men, and I think you will have a very fair argument in favour of the resolution that is now before the meeting. (Applause.) We used to argue that it was desirable, in the interests of the whole community, that the franchise should be extended as widely as possible, and I do not think that any danger is likely to arise to society by giving votes to women, especially to the limited number included in the bill that has been introduced by Mr. Jacob Bright. Whether they are fit for it is another, and perhaps a more complicated question, but one of the arguments that used to be advanced in favour of admitting the working classes to the franchise was that they were a most numerous body in the state. That is an argument which tells with overwhelming force in favour of a female franchise—(hear, hear)—and at the present time it is obvious that we exclude from the parliamentary franchise more than half the human race. It has also been argued that it was desirable to admit the working classes to the franchise, because that was the only way in which their rights and interests could be secured, and the answer made to that was that there was no occasion to give working men votes because they were already, if not directly, yet virtually represented in the House of Commons. It was urged on the other hand, that although the large majority of them were without the pale of the franchise, yet they exercised a considerable moral influence upon the electors and upon Parliament itself, and that no fair demand brought forward in their interests was likely to be refused. Furthermore it was argued that it would be better for them that they should not have votes, because they were not likely to know what their real interests were as well as the existing £10 electors. I have heard that argument over and over again, and this fallacy of virtual representation is revived, but in rather a different form, now that it comes to be proposed that the franchise shall be extended to women. It is all very well to say that the interests of the working classes have been watched and cared for in the House of Commons without their themselves having votes, but somehow or other, whenever a question came up in which the interests of the middle classes and the working classes were diametrically opposed to each other, the interests of the latter always went to the wall. (Hear, hear.) And so it is in the case of the rights of women. Mr. Collier has alluded to some of the imperfections in our law as regards women, and, therefore, I need not go over the ground again; but there is one question to which no reference has been made, and that is the different ways in which our law at the present time regards offences against the property and even against the person of the wife. I think it is a scandal to our laws generally that they should be so lax in punishing personal violence, whether committed against a man or against a woman. (Applause.) At the present time a woman has hardly any rights against personal violence from her husband. What rights she has, such is the nature of woman—and it is a noble nature—she can hardly ever be induced to put them in force against her husband. Every now and then some terrible case of wife beating crops up before the magistrates, and in almost every case you will find that at least the wife is an unwilling witness, and that shows, I think, that for one case that comes before the notice of the public there must be a hundred cases of suffering in which no complaints whatever are made. (Hear, hear.) I think that if women were legally put before the eyes of the world, and also in a position of political equality with their husbands, it would encourage them to speak out. This would be materially to their benefit, for it would be a safeguard against their husband's violence. It would also be a benefit to the husband, for it is good for all of us that we should have intercourse with our equals, and it is bad for us all that we should have an opportunity of tyrannising over others without the fear of punishment. (Hear, hear, and applause.) As to the question whether women are fit to be entrusted with the franchise, I can hardly suppose anyone would maintain that women, as a rule, and especially those who are proposed to be admitted to the franchise

by Mr. Jacob Bright's bill, are less educated or intelligent than were the £10 householders of 1832, who were granted the suffrage because it was believed that they were in every way fitted to possess it, or even the masses of the people who were given the suffrage three years ago. (Hear, hear.) It used to be argued, too, that by increasing the basis of our constitution, we should arrive, either directly or indirectly, at greater purity of election. I fear that the reports of the commissioners have not shown that that argument was of much value, although it was supposed that by increasing the constituencies it would be less easy, because more expensive, to obtain a seat in the House of Commons by direct bribery. Of course, that argument will apply to the extension of the franchise to women, but whatsoever objections may be urged on other grounds, or may be found to arise in practice, my firm opinion is, that if women are admitted to the franchise, as a rule, they would be less accessible to direct money bribes than men. They might, perhaps, show less judgment than men, but at all events they would show as much probity and integrity in the exercise of their political rights. They may come to hasty conclusions, but those conclusions would be honest, and I believe that women voters would generally raise the character of our constituencies, in that they would pay more attention to the personal character of the candidates and think less of mere sordid personal advantages and of party gains. To me, as a politician, the great danger in the democratic times on which we have entered, is the danger lest the Government, at its fountain head, should become corrupt, and I would ask every constituency to do its best to secure high class representatives so far as their personal characters are concerned. (Applause.) Such, is my honest belief, would be the result of the infusion of female voters into our constituencies. Then again, there is the old English argument that taxation and representation should go together. Women pay taxes, and therefore they should have a voice as to the way in which those taxes shall be applied. Among those who were lately admitted to the franchise I suppose there are very few indeed—perhaps a hundred or two over the whole country—who paid direct taxation, but the women who pay direct taxes may be numbered by thousands, and if the women of England do not swell the coffers of the Chancellor of the Exchequer so much as the men, by their contributions to that part of the Customs and Inland Revenue which deals with tobacco and spirits—(laughter)—it is generally supposed that they at least come up to the men in the consumption of sugar and tea. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) Finally, it used to be argued that it was desirable to give working men votes, because by entrusting them with a consciousness of their possessing direct political power, their whole moral tone was elevated, and they took a greater interest in the management and conduct of affairs that were carried on around them; in fact, that it enlarged their ideas, and made them better in every respect; better workmen, better husbands, better fathers, better sons. Surely the same argument can be applied in the case of women. It is only within the last few years that there has been any serious movement in favour of admitting women to the franchise, and as a movement of this sort requires to obtain a certain amount of headway before it is seriously discussed, especially by those who have hitherto opposed reform, we are as yet uncertain as to what will be the arguments that will be advanced against the measure that has now been introduced into the House of Commons. Hitherto it has been the custom to treat the proposal rather as a good joke, but if all the arguments that I have put before you, as having been advanced in the case of the working classes, have any basis in them—and it appears to me that this has been admitted by both political parties in the country—there can be no justification for preventing women from having votes, unless it can be shown that there is something essentially different in the nature of women from men, which makes it undesirable to apply the same law to them, or that some practical inconvenience would result from so doing which will outweigh the advantages that we assert will arise from it. It has been said that women should be put under the subjection of men because their natures are different and inferior. This is a very old controversy. I believe the first man who treated of this subject was Plato, in his great work called "The Republic," and he pronounced in favour of giving women a trial. (Laughter.) It is quite clear that we men, however much we may talk about the natural inferiority of women, are a little bit jealous, and afraid of their catching us up in the careers of life. You may recollect that there was a strike threatened among the printers of Washington, because

it was proposed to employ women in the Government printing offices; and at one time an objection was absolutely raised to women being entrusted with the sending of telegraphic messages, on the ground that they would not be able to transmit them correctly. We all know how completely that has been answered. Then again you will recollect perhaps the jealousy which has prevailed, and which, I fear, prevails at the present time among the medical profession, against the admission of women into the doctor's ranks. (Laughter.) Now, it seems a self-evident proposition that in the case of attendance upon women, women would make the best doctors, but when they endeavoured to obtain the degree of M.D. they were refused, and at last Miss Garrett, sister to Mrs. Fawcett, who delivered that admirable lecture on "The Female Franchise," at Brighton, the other day—(applause)—only managed to get in by a back door which all the medical profession had forgotten to lock—some obscure college in London which had the power of granting degrees. If women are really so inferior that they were incapable of exercising the franchise, in all probability they will not do very much harm, and we may treat them as ciphers, and boldly venture to admit a few of them, and see whether they would understand the newspapers, and the addresses of members of parliament or not.

The Rev. T. W. FRECKELTON then moved that a petition, praying that the electoral disabilities of women be removed, be addressed to the House of Commons, and that Mr. Morrison be requested to present it. In doing so, he said the subject which they were discussing that evening was part of a much larger question, and if they did not maintain that, while they were dealing with the part which they had now in hand, they had not other aims and desires. The larger question, he might say, touched, in the first place, in many points, more than one-half of the people of these realms, and it came close, in many points, to the homes and the businesses and the daily concerns of almost every English family and every Englishman. (Applause.) There was one aspect in this large point to which he would refer. The laws of their country—and they were the most civilised and Christianised under the sun—stood ready at any moment to put a real live woman into the hands of any man who demanded it, who could get a woman to join with him, if only for a few hours—no matter how bad he be, no matter for what brutal or dishonourable purposes he wished her, or how he intended to victimise her—the law would put the whole live woman totally and almost absolutely in his possession to barter as he pleased. (Cries of "No.") However bad a man might be, if he liked to take a woman to the altar, no clergyman would refuse to join them. (Cries of "No.") A man would treat a woman brutally, and barter her ever so much, before the law could touch her. (Cries of "Question.") How often before their own magistrates did there come such accounts? and the man implicated would get off with less for abusing a woman than he would for abusing a horse. (Applause.) Let them ask themselves the question—"Would the laws have been framed to do—could they possibly be as they were, if only one woman out of 5,000 in England had a share of making the laws?" They could not. What they wanted to do was to get in the thin edge of the wedge so as ultimately to redress all this. The gentlemen on the platform that night were all in earnest, and they did not intend leaving off until the question had been thoroughly discussed and settled either one way or the other. (Hear.) The poor down-trodden, ill-treated woman who came to the workhouse, and received her dole to keep her from starvation probably, was often met at the next corner by her husband, who took that dole from her, and immediately went and spent it in the public-house. If they did not know these things, he did. He also knew that amongst the working class the administrative capacity of woman was very wonderful, and a great many of those present would agree with him that, supposing they not only extended to them the franchise, but sent a few women up to the Board of Guardians, they would have just as peaceful and creditable meetings as they have now. (Loud applause.) Did they not think that charity would be quite as well dispensed. (Hear, hear, and a voice: "A good deal better.") As Mr. J. Mill said, they did not understand women, and, therefore, they were incapable of properly legislating for them. (Applause.) But if some women did not care to avail themselves of the franchise when it was extended to them, they could let it alone; there would be no harm done; but they had no right to withhold the privilege and right from ten people, if 10,000 or 10,000,000 people did not care about it. It was not fair to sacrifice justice to the majority of the people they were seeking to uphold and benefit. They did not

want only to bring about this reform and this better state of things, but they wanted women to feel that they wished to recognise their rights and give them what fairly belonged to them. Let women be put in a position that their influences might be legitimate influences upon men's understanding and reason, and he did not see how that could be done without giving them their rights, and extending to them the franchise. Social, political, and every other interest, as well as domestic happiness, depended, in his opinion, upon women being placed upon an equal footing with man. (Applause.)

Mr. HORSWELL, in seconding the resolution, said he wished to call the attention of the meeting to the feeling on this subject in the rural districts. In the country women felt themselves degraded and damaged, and considered that they had a just right to complain against the manner in which they were treated. He had seen how they had been treated by landlords through their having nothing to do with political matters. It was a most serious matter; but, perhaps those in the town were scarcely acquainted with the misery of being ejected from a farm. He would inform them that in the leases which were drawn up for the letting of a farm, there was often a clause that, in the event of the man dying, his wife had no right to remain any longer on the estate. He knew there was one gentleman in the county who had ejected no less than seven widows from his estate. He only hoped that if the matter of tenant right became agitated in England as well as in Ireland, the tenant would have some compensation. (Hear, hear.) He knew from experience that these cases of ejection were constantly occurring, and what was it for? His belief was that the widow was turned out of her home because she could not help her landlord at the elections, because she could not vote for him, and therefore he would not let her remain on the estate, but get a male tenant whom he could use as a vote. (Hear, hear.) This was one reason in his opinion, why they should give woman her proper place and her proper right. He should wish that party politics be thrown aside, and that all should try to elevate the depressed part of the human race. (Applause.)

The resolution was then put to the meeting, and unanimously carried.

The CHAIRMAN stated that anyone who wished to sign the petition that evening could do so, and copies would be sent to different parts of the town for signature.

Mr. COLLIER then moved a vote of thanks to the Chairman and to Mr. Morrison. The latter gentleman, he said, had been put to a great deal of inconvenience in being present that evening, in consequence of the pressure of business in Parliament.

The vote of thanks having been carried, amidst much applause, Mr. MORRISON, in returning thanks, said he hoped their Liberal whip would not find out that he was absent from the House of Commons that evening.

The meeting then terminated.—*The Western Daily Mercury* March 30, 1870.

DUBLIN.

LECTURE BY MRS. FAWCETT.

The announcement that Mrs. Fawcett, the wife of Prof. Fawcett, M.P. for Brighton, would deliver a lecture on "The Electoral Disabilities of Women," for the removal of which she is earnestly and ably labouring, drew to the Molesworth Hall, on Monday evening, April 18, a large and influential audience of ladies and gentlemen who feel an interest in the subject to be discussed. Before eight o'clock the body of the Hall and the reserved seats were crowded, and the platform was also completely occupied. Amongst those present were:—Sir Robert Kane (who presided), Professor Fawcett, M.P.; Sir William Wilde and Lady Wilde, Sir John Gray, M.P., and Lady Gray, the Provost of Trinity College and Mrs. Lloyd, Sir Joseph Napier, the Misses Robertson, Mr. James Haughton, J.P., and Miss Haughton, Dr. Stokes, jun.; Dr. Shaw, F.T.C.D.; Sir James Power, Rev. Dr. Dickson, F.T.C.D.; Rev. Dr. Tisdall, Rev. Mr. Carroll, Rector of St. Bride's; Mr. and Mrs. Carter, Mr. R. Reeves, barrister-at-law; Mr. J. F. Waller, LL.D.; Rev. Mr. Mahaffy, F.T.C.D.; Mr. James Slattery, Professor of Political Economy, Dublin University; Mr. J. D. O'Hanlon, Dr. Stewart, Mr. Henry Coulter, Dr. Ingram, F.T.C.D., &c.

The CHAIRMAN said: Ladies and gentlemen,—It is scarcely necessary for me to go through the form of introducing to you the distinguished lady who has done us the honour this evening of coming forward to address this meeting upon the very important subject of "Electoral Disabilities of Women." Mrs. Fawcett has deservedly

earned for herself a most distinguished position as the earnest and eloquent advocate of the social and political rights of the sex to which she belongs, and of which she is a distinguished ornament. (Hear, hear.) All, therefore, that she says upon the subject will, I am sure, be worthy of and receive your most careful consideration. I will not trespass further upon your attention, or delay the pleasure you have soon to receive. Mrs. Fawcett will now deliver her lecture.

Mrs. FAWCETT then came forward, and was received with warm applause. The lecture was the same as that delivered at Brighton. The following is an extract:—The next objection which I have set down is that the indulgence and courtesy which women are now treated by men would cease if women exercised all the rights and privileges of citizenship. As I hear this objection, an old Bible story forcibly recurs to my mind—of Esau and how he sold his birthright for a mess of pottage. Let it be granted that women would no longer be treated with exceptional courtesy and indulgence if they exercised the rights and privileges of citizenship. What do this exceptional courtesy and this indulgence really mean? I am not going to say that they are valueless, but let us analyse them and see of what sort of things they consist. Women are usually assisted in and out of carriages; they also take precedence of men in entering and leaving a room; the door also is frequently opened for them, they are helped first at dinner, and they are always permitted to walk on the inside side of the pavement. Besides these there are more substantial privileges, such as being allowed to monopolise the seats in a room or in a railway carriage, in those cases where, owing to overcrowding, some of those present are compelled to stand. I hope I do not unduly underrate these little amenities of social life. They are very harmless, and perhaps even pleasant in their way; but I think it must be confessed that their practical value is small indeed, especially if the price paid for them consists of all the rights and privileges of citizenship. If the courtesy of men to women is bought at this price, it must not be forgotten that the sale is compulsory, and can in no case be regarded as a free contract. But now let us consider whether women would really lose all the politeness now shown to them if their right to the franchise were recognised. At elections it is not usually the case that those who have votes are treated with the least consideration; but, apart from this, how would the courtesy of every-day life be effected by an extension of the suffrage to women? I incline to the belief that some of the mere forms of politeness, which have no practical value, such as always giving precedence to a woman in entering and leaving a room, would slowly and gradually fall into disuse if the electoral disabilities of women were removed; but I am quite convinced that true politeness, which is inseparably associated with real kindness of heart, would not suffer any decrease from the extension of the suffrage to women. As far as my experience goes, those who are invested with political power of any kind are always treated with more deference and respect than those who are destitute of that valuable commodity. (Hear, hear.) The highest political power in this kingdom is vested in a woman, and what man is inclined on that account to be less courteous to her, or less considerate of her feelings? Have the women who have taken part in late municipal elections in England been treated more rudely since they acquired that instalment of electoral power? In answer to this objection to women's suffrage—that women would lose in the politeness with which they are now treated more than they would gain in political power,—I reply, in the first place, that women are compelled to pay a great deal too dearly for this politeness, if they are forced to sacrifice for it all the rights and privileges of citizenship; and secondly, that there is no reason to suppose that the acquisition of electoral power would cause women to be treated with less real courtesy and respect, though some of the mere forms of politeness might disappear if the equality of rights of men and women were recognised.

The lecture was most effectively delivered, and the audience testified their appreciation of several of the arguments adduced by Mrs. Fawcett to support her views by cordial applause.

Miss ANNE ROBERTSON, who was loudly cheered, moved the following resolution:—"That the thanks of this meeting be given to Mrs. Fawcett for her kindness in delivering a lecture in Dublin on the Electoral Disabilities of Women." She said—I feel sure that there is no one present here this evening who has not derived a great amount of pleasure and instruction from the able and comprehensive lecture which Mrs. Fawcett has so kindly given us an opportunity of listening to. It requires no words of mine to point out

its merits. The lecture speaks for itself to the understanding and common sense of all who have heard it. (Hear, hear.) Every one here must acknowledge its ability, and the admirable manner in which it has been delivered; and I think we must all join in thanking Mrs. Fawcett most cordially. (Applause.) I feel much gratification in having this opportunity of speaking a few words to a Dublin assembly. I have already spoken to many thousands of the inhabitants of Dublin, individually and separately, in their own houses, upon the question of the enfranchisement of women. I have never done so to them collectively as upon the present occasion, and I am glad to be able to testify to the great intelligence of the people of Dublin, and to the strong feeling which I know to prevail generally among them in favour of granting the suffrage to women who are householders and ratepayers. (Hear, hear.) When the movement in favour of the enfranchisement of women commenced in Dublin more than two years ago, it laboured under great disadvantages. The state of the country and other circumstances made some of the best friends of the cause here consider that it would be quite useless to attempt to bring before the notice of the people any new question with any hope of success; but England was preparing petitions to Parliament in favour of the franchise of women. Scotland was doing the same; and deeply interested as I was in this movement I felt anxious that Ireland should not remain altogether in the back ground, and I determined to try myself what could be done in Dublin about getting up a petition. I canvassed for signatures among great numbers of the people, and in this way found out what an intelligent interest they took in the question when it was explained to them—men and women signed the petition with equal alacrity, and in 1868 we sent to Parliament two petitions from Dublin in favour of the enfranchisement of women signed by nearly three thousand persons of all classes, of different creeds and different political opinions. In 1869 there were ten petitions sent from Dublin and other parts of Ireland, and in the present year, 1870, we have already sent in 16 petitions in favour of the enfranchisement of women, and are preparing more. (Hear, hear.) So far from standing in the back ground on this question, Dublin, next to London and Manchester, sent more signatures to petitions to Parliament last session than any other place in the United Kingdom. Mr. Jacob Bright mentioned this fact, so gratifying to Dublin, at the last meeting of the London Society for Women's Suffrage. Great progress is being made in the movement all over the country. The London Society for Women's Suffrage is extending its influence from one end of England to the other. Manchester has a powerful organisation, and Edinburgh has an active committee working zealously in the cause. I may here observe that the active work of the movement is all carried on by the ladies. We have numerous supporters among some of the most eminent men in the kingdom, but the rapid progress made in this movement during the last two years is altogether owing to the persevering and energetic efforts of women themselves. (Applause.) In Dublin the work has fallen rather heavily and expensively on one or two persons; and it would be well if any ladies or gentlemen who are interested in the cause would come forward to assist it in this country, for we cannot expect Ireland to keep pace with English or Scotch societies, whose members are always increasing, if help is not forthcoming here. (Hear, hear.) I shall not detain the meeting by any more observations, but will merely repeat that I think our heartiest thanks are due to Mrs. Fawcett for her admirable lecture. (Applause.)

Dr. JOHN F. WALLER seconded the vote of thanks, and said he felt he was very properly there as seconder, and not as mover of the resolution of thanks to the accomplished and learned lady who had addressed them so admirably that evening. (Hear, hear.) It was right that he should be called on as seconder, because men were nowhere there that evening, although they were there in great numbers—(laughter)—and it was proper that, as Irishmen, they should be there to receive with every cordiality a young lady who came to speak of her rights and of the rights of her sex. (Hear, hear.) He had listened with great pleasure to the able, learned, and logical discourse they had heard from Mrs. Fawcett; but if she would pardon him for saying it, he could have wished she had put the whole question upon a larger and sounder basis, including not merely the franchise, but woman's rights generally—their rights to education commensurate with their intellectual capacities, and to exercise all those rights that a cultivated capacity gave them a right to. (Hear, hear.) It was perhaps not to be wondered at that this subject had made such slow progress up to the present, but he feared

that it was because men took counsel from their ancient prejudices rather than by their own judgment. They looked at every question rather as a man's than a woman's question, and this was a man's question, because he believed that the helpmate of man should be rendered able to help him to the fullest extent of her faculties, intellectual and moral, with which God had gifted her. (Hear, hear.) He feared that in relation to this question there was a feeling that God had subordinated women to man, and undoubtedly He had, but he believed that women, who were the best educated, who most earnestly advocated their own rights, intellectually and morally, would be the very women who would most cheerfully accede to the proposition that they were subordinate to man. Physically God had subordinated woman to man, but this subordination did not imply that she should surrender her judgment. They should endeavour as far as possible to elevate woman to the position she was entitled to hold, and he believed in his heart that men would be thankful that they had done so. In reference to the observations made by the accomplished lady with regard to the courtesies extended to her sex by men, he did not believe that the slightest loss of respect would result to women if they were in possession of all the rights to which they were entitled. (Hear, hear.) Dr. Waller concluded by seconding the resolution, which was then put and carried unanimously.

The Rev. JOHN P. MAHAFFY, F.T.C.D., moved the adoption of a petition to Parliament in favour of giving the elective franchise to women.

Dr. SHAW, F.T.C.D., seconded the motion, and said he would not trespass on the audience, because he was sure they were anxious to hear Professor Fawcett.

Professor FAWCETT, M.P., who was received with applause, said that when he had the honour of entering that room he did not know that he should be called on to make a speech; but as the hour was late he would not occupy their time with any lengthened remarks. The resolution just proposed asked them to adopt a petition to Parliament in favour of the proposition to give the elective franchise to women. It was difficult to speak to that resolution, because there were only two courses open to him; the one was to go over arguments already mentioned in favour of the proposition, and the other course was to answer the objections which might be urged against the adoption of such a course. This was a question upon which they should all very soon make up their minds. Three years ago it was treated in the House of Commons as a joke, and regarded as a subject for merriment. He remembered hearing members of the House of Commons saying that when the question should come on for debate there would be such fun that they would give up a dinner party, and that was a great sacrifice—(laughter)—or the most attractive evening's amusement in order to be present at it. The question was brought forward by a great scientific thinker and political philosopher, and after he concluded his speech every one felt that whatever might be the fate of the proposition on that occasion, that a question of the greatest importance and one intimately connected with the fundamental principles of political economy had been started, and that it would be useless to try to get rid of that question by sneering or merriment. The question had made great progress in many towns in England. The enthusiasm on the subject was so great that the supporters of the movement were increasing by tens of thousands. In Dublin the enthusiasm had not assumed such formidable proportions, but the petitions were multiplying, and unless some strong arguments were raised against the extension of the franchise to women they might depend upon it that within two or three years the right of women to record their votes would be conceded to them. (Hear, hear.) He believed that for a time it was just possible that there might be a reaction against the movement, and that some members of the House of Commons, who had been in its favour, might not now be prepared to vote for it, if they thought the question should be carried. An impression had gone abroad that women were generally Conservatives, and that if they were to have the right to vote previous to the next general election a loss would result to the Liberal party of some twenty or thirty seats. It would be utterly unworthy of men calling themselves Liberals to be deterred for one moment from voting for that which they believed to be right and just on the ground that it might be prejudicial to the interests of their party. To do so would be to do one of the basest and most unjust things in the name of party, and he hoped that the question would be decided on broader and juster issues. He was strongly in favour of giving the franchise to women. If they looked to the arguments and speeches that carried the Reform Bills of '32 and '67

they would find that they were just as pertinent in support of the proposition now made in favour of giving the franchise to women. Whether the giving the franchise to women resulted in a loss of some five or ten seats to the Liberal party, he had that confidence in the political opinions which he advocated that he would say, as in politics so in everything else, what they desired was the triumph of reason and justice, and that this would best be attained by Parliament granting privileges to any class fairly entitled to them. (Applause.)

The resolution was then put and carried unanimously.

Mrs. FAWCETT, who was loudly cheered, said: I have to thank you for the kindness with which you have heard my remarks on the subject under discussion; I have especially to thank Miss Robertson and Dr. Waller for their kindness in respectively moving and seconding the vote of thanks to me. I feel I cannot sit down without repudiating the assertion of Dr. Waller, which he thinks, I admit, that women are naturally and eternally subordinate to men—(applause and laughter)—on account of their inferior physical power. Women are inferior in physical power to men, but it does not follow they are to be subordinate to men. If subordination was to result from inferiority of physical power the greatest intellects of the country would be subordinate to the athletes—to the prize fighters—to the other possessors of mere brute force. But some of our greatest philosophers and writers were men deficient in physical power—Scott was a cripple till manhood; Pope was a cripple all his life. There are many other instances I could name of the same kind, but it is not necessary. I content myself by repeating that it does not at all follow that inferiority of physical power should result in subordination. (Hear, hear.)

On the motion of Sir JOHN GRAY, M.P., Sir Joseph Napier was called to the second chair.

Sir JOHN GRAY then moved a vote of thanks to Sir R. Kane for his dignified and successful conduct of the proceedings of the meeting.

Dr. WALLER seconded the motion, which was passed with acclamation.

Sir ROBERT KANE briefly acknowledged the compliment, and the proceedings were then brought to a close.—*The Freeman's Journal*, April 19, 1870.

GREENWICH.

On Friday evening last a highly-intelligent and respectable gathering took place at the Lecture Hall, Greenwich, to hear an address from Mrs. Fawcett on the question of the electoral disabilities of women.

At eight o'clock the doors of the ante-room opened, and the chairman of the meeting, Mr. John Stuart Mill, who had arrived unnoticed a few minutes before, stepped forward on to the platform conducting the lady lecturer. He was loudly and heartily cheered, as was also the lady. They were followed by Mr. Fawcett, M.P., conducted by a lady, and he was hailed, perhaps, with more enthusiasm. There were also present on the platform, Mr. J. B. Langley, Dr. W. C. Bennett, Mr. J. P. Hutchinson, Mr. McCubry, Mr. Horton, and Mr. G. T. S. Floyd (who had taken an active part in promoting the meeting, and to whose indefatigable exertions we believe the town is indebted for the treat it received.) There were also several ladies, who occupied seats near the fair lecturer.

Mrs. FAWCETT, having been introduced to the meeting by Mr. Mill, rose amid loud cheers, and without any preliminary remarks, at once took up the subject of her address. She maintained that all, whether men or women, who were endowed with intellectual faculties, should have full liberty of action, and that the rights of women should stand or fall by those of men. If it was proved that women were intellectually inferior to men, it was no argument in favour of depriving women of the franchise, any more than that electoral power should depend on the gradation of intellect in men. She argued, a woman should be something more than merely a housekeeper or nurse, whilst the argument that politics would withdraw women from domestic duties was equally applicable to women attending meetings, reading newspapers, going for a walk, or going to church. Many women were unmarried or without families, and politics could not therefore take them from domestic duties. She doubted whether the male electors of the borough of Greenwich devoted an hour a week to their political opinions; and women were not therefore likely to let politics interfere with the comfort and duties of home. Her experience was, that women who devoted a fair atten-

tion to the public questions of the day had the best-managed homes. She denied the assertion that women did not want the suffrage, and urged that the feeling that women ought to exercise the rights of citizenship was growing daily more earnest and general; the highest political power of the State was invested in a woman, and women generally were entitled to a share of political power. She certainly denied the assertion that political power was repugnant to the feelings of women. The electoral freedom of women was in accordance with the Divine will. She had too much faith in the male population of the country to apprehend that women would be annoyed or insulted when going to the poll to record their votes. She believed the adoption of the ballot, and the abolition of nominations, would have the effect of insuring order at elections. The argument that the enfranchisement of women was monstrous, and to be treated only as a joke, had received its death-blow. The law recognised no difference of sex, and the enfranchisement of the country was incomplete as long as the suffrage was not extended to women. Mrs. Fawcett closed an elaborate argument, of which the above is but a brief outline, by referring to the names of the eminent men who are in favour of the electoral freedom of women, among which were those of Mill, Kingsley, Darwin, Huxley, and Herbert Spencer, and concluded by quoting from the works of Mill and Spencer to prove that man's rights and woman's rights must stand or fall together; that the God-ordained law of freedom applied to women as well as to men; and that the same reasoning which had established the right of the one to freedom, might be used with equal efficiency with regard to that of the other. (She was enthusiastically cheered.)

The CHAIRMAN—Mr. Baxter Langley, who is well known to all of you—(cheers)—will move a resolution in favour of the objects of the meeting, and the adoption of a petition, to be signed on behalf of the meeting by the chairman, for the removal of the legal disabilities of women possessing the qualification now required from men. (Cheers.)

Mr. LANGLEY proposed as a resolution "That in the opinion of that meeting the exclusion of women otherwise legally qualified from voting in the election of members of Parliament was contrary to the principles of just representation, and to that of the laws now in force regulating municipal, parochial, and other systems of representative Government; and it was therefore resolved that a petition to the House of Commons in favour of the Bill to remove the electoral disabilities of women be signed by the chairman on behalf of the meeting, and that the borough members be requested to support the prayer of such petition." (Cheers.)

Mr. W. GARDINER seconded the motion. He observed that when he was asked to take a part in the proceedings, he readily consented to do so, for he had long held that the exclusion of women from the suffrage was a great injustice, on two grounds. In the first place he had one standard by which to judge of right and wrong, one test of vice and virtue, and that was "the greatest happiness for the greatest number." (Cheers.) It was not his own, but he had worked it out, and had been unable to find any better. (Hear.) It told him that woman had as much right to the franchise as man; for if every man insisted on a share in making the laws which he was bound to obey, did they expect woman would be content to obey laws not of her making? (Hear.) They all knew that their best feelings—their whole understandings—were moulded at a mother's knee; they learnt reading at their mother's knee, and why not politics? When women became more interested in politics the cry that they were frivolous would cease. If women took greater interest in public questions, they would mould the ideas of future public men, and when they had young men brought up by their mothers in the study of national questions, we should have higher politics than we had ever yet had. (Cheers.)

The CHAIRMAN: Does any lady or gentleman wish to offer any observations on the motion?

There was no reply to this question, and the motion being put was carried with but three dissentients, amid loud cheers.

Mr. J. P. HUTCHINSON proposed a vote of thanks to Mrs. Fawcett for her excellent address.

Mrs. M'CURRY, wife of Mr. W. M'Curry, of Woolwich, seconded the motion of Mr. Hutchinson, which was then carried by acclamation.

Mr. A. MATTHEWS proposed a vote of thanks to the chairman, on which there were loud calls for the hon. member, Mr. Fawcett.

Mr. FAWCETT, on rising to second the vote of thanks, was enthusiastically received, the applause with which he was greeted

continuing for some time. He said all their thanks were due to Mr. J. S. Mill for the great assistance he had given to the question of the enfranchisement of women. He was the first who had written about it, or, at any rate, the first to bring it in an effective way before the public mind, by introducing it before the House of Commons. But for Mr. Mill they might have waited for years before an advocate possessing the position, ability, and courage of Mr. Mill had come forward to show that it was a question worthy of the attention of statesmen. He believed it would in future be made an important subject between constituencies and candidates throughout the country. It would tend to forfeit the confidence in their future Parliamentary representatives if they were not sufficiently liberal to concede to women the same rights of citizenship as enjoyed by men.

The CHAIRMAN: I am very grateful to this large and most intelligent meeting for the manner in which it has received the proposal of a vote of thanks to me. I feel that it is my duty to stand up for this cause wherever I am—(cheers)—and in whatever capacity I may have the opportunity of doing so. (Cheers.) Mr. Fawcett has done me more than sufficient honour when he spoke of me as the first advocate of this proposal. Several of the most eminent philosophers, and many of the noblest of women for ages have done so. But I was the first to bring it forward in Parliament. It was the first duty I was called upon to perform when I was sent there to represent the great constituency of Westminster, which was aware, when it sent me, that I held to this as one of the great principles of the justice of which in my heart I was convinced. (Continued cheering.)

The proceedings here closed.—*Greenwich and Deptford Chronicle*, April, 16, 1870.

SCOTLAND.

GLASGOW BRANCH OF THE NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE.

President:—Mrs. JOHN SMITH.

Miss ANDERSON.	Mrs. GLASFORD.
Miss CATHERINE ANDERSON.	Miss MACRAE.
Miss ELIZABETH ANDERSON.	Mrs. DAVID RUSSELL.
Mrs. BELL.	Mrs. FRANCES SMITH.
Mrs. CHARLES BELL.	Miss KATE SMITH.
Miss COCHRANE.	Mrs. STEWART.

Secretary:—Mrs. NELSON, 42, Dalhousie Street.

Treasurer:—Mrs. HARVEY.

We have much pleasure in recording the formation of a branch of the society in Glasgow. It was organised on the 4th of March, 1870, and the Secretary reports that since then the Committee have, by personal exertion and influence, obtained 3,000 names to petitions. These have been gathered mainly from the working classes who, if their convictions are not always formed, are at least free from narrow prejudices. Their greatest disadvantage is limited time; still there is much spirit and force in the bulk of the Committee, and though there is much work to be done before the petition is closed, they may, we think, be relied upon to make good progress. As the first fruits of their labour, we point to a petition from Glasgow with 1,734 signatures, which was presented to the House of Commons on the 8th of April last.

LECTURES.

Miss TAYLOR has given lectures during the past month at Aberdeen, Peterhead, Inverness, Cupar Angus, Blairgowrie, Alyth, and Dundee. They were most successful meetings, and from each one there went up petitions to Parliament, as well as a copy of petitions and resolutions to the Prime Minister, the Lord Advocate, and the members for the county and burgh, where it was a burgh.

NEW ZEALAND.

WOMAN'S PLACE IN CREATION.

An able lecture on the above subject was delivered, October 15th, 1869, at the Provincial Hall, Nelson, by Joseph Giles, Esq., M.R.C.S., resident magistrate on the Nelson South West Gold Fields, and has since been published. He commenced by observing: "There is at the present moment a tide in the affairs of women, and no one knows precisely whether it will lead. The existence of the phenomenon is unquestionable. The tide is rising upon the coasts of the leading civilised countries of the earth, and there is little doubt but it will reach our own shores. It cannot, therefore, be premature to bestow some attention upon the subject." In the

course of his observations, he said: "In the barbarous epoch, the disparity of physical strength in men and women controlled all the relations between the sexes,—and the somewhat eccentric logic of society concluded that as woman was the weaker, she must have been intended to do all the hard work. Therefore, the Indian hunter, having slain his deer, sent the squaws to carry it home; and the Maori of the present day walks at his ease, smoking his pipe,—or, at the utmost, holding one end of a string to the other end of which a pig is attached,—whilst the women stagger, bent almost double, under heavy loads of potatoes and kumaras. This aspect of society need not detain us longer, unless we pause for a moment to inquire whether some slight vestige of this state of things does not yet linger in modern life. That modern society consciously and deliberately condemns women to excessive toil and drudgery is of course not to be maintained, but, unintentionally and by the pressure of circumstances, there is reason for thinking that such a state of things exists to a greater extent than is desirable. I fear that in a great number of colonial homes, from circumstances which are perhaps unavoidable, and from causes which it is very difficult to remedy, women are constantly subjected to an amount of domestic drudgery which is too great for their strength." Further on the lecturer observed, "that just as barbarism has left us some vestige of its principal characteristic, the allotting to women of an excessive domestic drudgery,—so has chivalry bequeathed to us an element of an opposite kind, the belief that woman's place is on an aerial elevation where she is to be removed from all the roughnesses of daily life. These two characteristics, apparently inconsistent, do yet go hand in hand in modern life,—and, in my opinion, together constitute the most effectual barrier against any reform in the social position of the female sex. For, the two grand arguments that are constantly urged against any such reform are these: that the true sphere of woman is within the humble circle of domestic duties; and that woman is not fitted for the troublesome and onerous matters that engage the attention of men, and ought to be preserved from the feverish excitement alike of political discussions and of the daily struggle for existence." The lecturer, in his comprehensive and eloquent address, asserted that there is no intellectual pursuit, however high or however deep, which is not within the faculties of woman as well as of man, and which is not in itself desirable for her as well as for him. And, he observed, that as Nelson had always held a distinguished position among the provinces of New Zealand in the promotion of elementary education, and in the liberal principles of its school system, so he trusted that "when the founding of universities came to be considered in that country, the citizens of Nelson would exert themselves to obtain, in any such scheme, a full provision for the higher education of women."

THE UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH AND WOMEN STUDENTS.

The ladies who are at present studying at the University of Edinburgh are suffering under the pressure of a very legitimate grievance. They are by no means silent under it, however, and we trust that the wrong which has been done them will speedily be righted, and will not go to swell the already lengthened list of injustices perpetrated on women for no other reason than that they are not men.

The grievance and its circumstances are the following. The examinations in Chemistry having been duly held, the Professor, Dr. Crum Brown, announced the results to the students last week. The number of students in the class is 236, including the six ladies to whom we have referred. Out of all this number Professor Crum Brown announced that only thirteen had attained first-class honours, and of these thirteen two are ladies—Miss Mary Edith Pechey taking the third place on the list, while the tenth place is taken by Miss Sophia Jex Blake. These positions, as will be seen at once, are of the most creditable kind to the ladies who have attained them. Moreover, we learn that Miss Pechey is the highest of all the students of the year, for that the two students whose marks are better than her own (hers being 85, while theirs are respectively 86 and 87), have attended a previous course of chemistry.

It appears that a number of years ago Dr. Hope, then Professor of Chemistry in Edinburgh University, gave some lectures to ladies on his subject; and so successful were these lectures, and so well pleased was Dr. Hope with their popularity, that he applied the proceeds—a thousand pounds—to founding four Hope Scholarships

in Chemistry, to be held by the four students who passed the best examination; two of these scholarships entitling the holder to attend at the laboratory for the winter and summer sessions, and two for six months only.

Naturally Miss Pechey expected that she, being the third in the list of excellence, would obtain one of these Hope Scholarships. It may therefore be imagined what her annoyance and indignation and those of her friends were, when Professor Crum Brown announced that the scholarships would be given, not to the four students who actually stand highest on the list, but to the first, second, fourth, and fifth.

Dr. Crum Brown's refusal to award the scholarship is said to be "founded on the assumption that the women now studying in the University do not form part of the University class, on account of their meeting at a different hour." But if they do not form part of the class, why were they admitted to the examination; and if they have passed the examination, what reason is there for excluding them from the honour attained? Miss Pechey and Miss Jex Blake were mentioned as two students who were among those who had gained first-class honours. Moreover, at the same time that Miss Pechey was excluded from receiving a scholarship (on the ground, as it appears, that she was not a student), it was announced that, as a student, she would receive one of the five bronze medals which are awarded to the five highest students of the session, and to which members of the University Class are alone entitled.

The University Calendar states that, after a written examination on the subject of chemistry, those four students who have the largest number of marks are entitled to the Hope Scholarships; and under these circumstances the feeling decidedly is that Miss Pechey ought to have her scholarship.

The decision of the whole matter now depends on the Senatus, to whose members it has been referred. It will be indeed a curious and lamentable thing if the Edinburgh University, which has been in some things so liberal to women, should prove unjust in this instance.—*The Queen*, April 9, 1870.

MISS PECHEY AND THE HOPE SCHOLARSHIP.

Miss Pechey writes to the *Times* to correct the misconception on which Mr. Salt's "most kind and chivalrous letter" to that journal was based. She says:—

"The scholarship of which I have been deprived in Edinburgh is of very small value, and merely gives free admittance for six months to the laboratory, the ordinary fee for such privilege being but ten guineas. The pecuniary loss to me is therefore extremely slight, and I should be very sorry that any steps should be taken with the idea that a fund is needed to supply the place of what has been taken from me. I suppose, however, that Mr. Salt did not allude to the worth of the scholarship, but that he, with many others, thought that the adverse decision of the Senatus would affect the legal position of women studying in the University. It probably would appear impossible to most people that the Senatus could at one and the same meeting have recorded the two votes which appear to have been passed on Saturday last, for to most minds one verdict must contradict and nullify the other, and hence, I suppose, Mr. Salt's mistake.

"The real grievance is that, after women had been admitted to the University with the distinct statement (as given in the minutes of the University Court of November 10, 1869) that they should 'be subject to all the regulations now or at any future time in force in the University as to the matriculation of students, their attendance on classes, examinations, or otherwise,' this clause should be interpreted entirely without previous warning to apply only to possible penalties that might be incurred, and not to actual honours that have been won. The reason alleged by the professor, who has always been personally most kind to us, for transferring the scholarship won by me to a gentleman who stood below me in the examination lists is that our instruction was carried on (by special order of the University Court) at a separate hour. As, however, we had no choice in this matter, and as we received exactly the same tickets of admission, heard exactly the same lectures, and passed exactly the same examination, under identical conditions and at the same hour, I confess it is rather hard to me to see any justice in my being deprived of the prize to which the University Calendar states that 'the four students who have received the highest marks are entitled.' The matter was referred to the Senatus at its meeting

on the 9th, along with one respecting another detail evidently identical in principle—viz., whether we were entitled to receive from the University the same certificates of attendance and merit as those granted to other students. It will probably appear to the general public sufficiently curious that the Senatus decided that we are entitled to exactly the usual certificates, thus declaring us ordinary matriculated students, and at the same time confirmed Dr. Brown's refusal to me of the scholarship, though without revoking his grant of the medal, which was surely an equally public University honour."

WOMEN'S DISABILITIES BILL.

THE second reading of this Bill stands first on the orders of the day for Wednesday next, May the 4th. No one has, as yet, given any indication of an intention to oppose it. Our Parliamentary position is very encouraging. We have good supporters in the House of Lords, and on both sides of the House of Commons, Tory or Liberal—not a single part of the House of Commons in which we have not influential supporters. Outside Parliament the indications of approval of our principle are very satisfactory. Important public meetings have been held at Plymouth, Greenwich, and Dublin, at which petitions for the Bill have been adopted, and many newspapers in various parts of the country have published articles advocating the cause. Petitions in favour of the Bill are daily pouring into the House of Commons. From the 23rd of March to the 8th of April—an interval of sixteen days—petitions with upwards of 32,000 signatures were sent in. Up to the latter date the total number of signatures to petitions for Women's Suffrage, since the opening of the Session, was 78,651. All friends who have petitions ready should send them in before the 4th of May. Should the Bill pass the second reading they should redouble their energies to secure a further array against the third reading, which probably would not be long delayed.

REPORTS OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS ON PUBLIC PETITIONS—SESSION 1870.

Representation of the People.

FOR EXTENSION OF ELECTIVE FRANCHISE TO WOMEN.

Table with 2 columns: Date and Signatures. Includes entries for Dumfries, Shetland, Trowbridge, Leeds, Aberdeen, Devon, and Lancaster.

Total number of petitions 139—Signatures 3,022

WOMEN'S DISABILITIES BILL—In favour.

Table with 2 columns: Date and Signatures. Lists numerous petitions from various locations like Salford, Newton Stewart, Lambeth, etc., with their respective signature counts.

The petitions marked thus * have the addresses of some or all of the petitioners affixed. The petitions marked thus † are signed officially.

Table with 2 columns: Date and Signatures. Lists petitions from Saint Michael's Ward, Renfrew, Chatham, Dublin, Glasgow, and Windsor.

Total number of Petitions 173—Signatures 75,629

THE SUMMARY OF PETITIONS FOR WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE PRESENTED TO THE HOUSE OF COMMONS SINCE FEBRUARY 10, 1870, IS—

Table with 3 columns: No. of Petitions signed officially, Total No. of Petitions, and No. of Signatures. Includes entries for Extension of the Elective Franchise and Women's Disabilities Bill.

THE PROPERTY OF MARRIED WOMEN.

THIS Bill stands for second reading on Wednesday, May 18. Those who have not already petitioned for it are earnestly exhorted to send in as many as possible before that date. The following petitions have been presented since our last issue up to the Easter recess. We call particular attention to the great number presented on March 23rd, the day originally fixed for the second reading of the Bill.

Table with 2 columns: Date and Signatures. Lists numerous petitions from various locations like Headingley, Leeds, Wincoburn, Glastonbury, Manchester, Cambridge, etc.

Table with 2 columns: Date and Signatures. Lists numerous petitions from various locations like Tiverton, Tunbridge, Royston, Harrow, Sheldon Amos, Bridgwater, Southwark, Westminster, Dinaw-y-Mowddy, Barnsbury, Bourton-on-the-Hill, Carnarthen, Moreton-in-the-Marsh, Louisa E. Buckwald, Belfast, Burslem, Bristol, Bantry, Howth, Dublin, Donabate, Tipperary, Blackrock, Queen's County, Pendlebury, Chester, Cheltenham, Kendal Union, Bath, Finsbury, Macclesfield, Middlesex, Brighton, Oxford Ward, Framlingham, etc.

The petitions marked thus * have the addresses of some or all of the petitioners affixed. The petitions marked † are signed officially.

March 24.	Inhabitants of Monk Coniston (<i>Marquis of Hartington</i>)	65
" 24.	Inhabitants of Trowbridge (<i>Sir George Jenkinson</i>)	70
" 24.	Inhabitants of Trowbridge (<i>Sir George Jenkinson</i>)	60
" 24.	¶ Inhabitants of Lambeth (<i>Sir James Lawrence</i>)	4,264
" 24.	¶ Inhabitants of West End, Edinburgh (<i>Mr. M'Laren</i>)	131
" 24.	¶ Inhabitants of Edinburgh (<i>Mr. M'Laren</i>)	26
" 24.	¶ Inhabitants of Morningside (<i>Mr. M'Laren</i>)	133
" 24.	¶ Inhabitants of Edinburgh (<i>Mr. M'Laren</i>)	149
" 24.	Inhabitants of Sheffield (<i>Mr. Mundella</i>)	49
" 24.	¶ Inhabitants of Nottingham (<i>Mr. Seeley</i>)	679
" 24.	¶ Inhabitants of Nottingham (<i>Mr. Seeley</i>)	379
" 24.	¶ Inhabitants of Leicester (<i>Mr. Taylor</i>)	37
" 24.	¶ Inhabitants of Leicester (<i>Mr. Taylor</i>)	37
" 25.	Inhabitants of Leek (<i>Sir Edward Buller</i>)	25
" 25.	¶ Inhabitants of Brighton (<i>Mr. Fawcett</i>)	152
" 25.	¶ Inhabitants of York (<i>Mr. James Lowther</i>)	78
" 25.	¶ Inhabitants of York (<i>Mr. James Lowther</i>)	77
" 25.	Members of the Burnley Reform Club	80
" 22.	Inhabitants of Box, Wiltshire (<i>Sir George Jenkinson</i>)	42
" 28.	Members of the Law Amendment Society; E. Pears, general secretary (<i>Mr. Gurney</i>)	1
" 28.	¶ Inhabitants of Salisbury (<i>Dr. Lush</i>)	79
" 29.	Inhabitants of Paignton (<i>Mr. Solicitor General</i>)	25
" 29.	Inhabitants of Aldborough	39
" 29.	Inhabitants of Roscommon, and others	17
" 31.	British Subjects resident in Lisbon (<i>Sir Charles Dilke</i>)	3
April 4.	Inhabitants of Capel Ockley and other places (<i>Mr. Briscoe</i>)	136
" 8.	Inhabitants of Swansea (<i>Mr. Dillwyn</i>)	171
" 8.	Inhabitants of Swansea (<i>Mr. Dillwyn</i>)	105
Total number of Petitions, 175; Signatures		36,405

MARRIED WOMEN'S PROPERTY (No. 2) BILL—Against.

March 11.	Inhabitants of Monk Coniston (<i>Mr. Frederick Stanley</i>)	58
" 14.	Inhabitants of Hawkeshead	57
" 15.	Mary Beever and others (<i>Mr. Frederick Stanley</i>)	209
" 17.	Inhabitants of Hertfordshire (<i>Mr. Gurney</i>)	9
" 18.	Members of the Executive of the Holbeck Reform Association (<i>Mr. Baines</i>)	3
" 21.	Inhabitants of Corston (<i>Mr. Richard Bright</i>)	35
" 21.	Inhabitants of Pontesbury, county of Salop (<i>Mr. Gurney</i>)	21
" 21.	Inhabitants of Boston Spa, Yorkshire (<i>Mr. Gurney</i>)	59
" 21.	Inhabitants of Street (<i>Mr. Neville Grenville</i>)	296
" 21.	Inhabitants of Tavistock (<i>Mr. Arthur Russell</i>)	168
" 22.	Inhabitants of Bradford-on-Avon (<i>Lord Charles Bruce</i>)	55
" 22.	Inhabitants of Box (<i>Lord Charles Bruce</i>)	42
" 22.	¶ Inhabitants of Rathmines (<i>Mr. Pim</i>)	65
" 22.	Inhabitants of Leskinferre (<i>Mr. Pim</i>)	7
" 28.	¶ Inhabitants of Scarborough and others (<i>Mr. Dent</i>)	101
" 28.	Inhabitants of Salisbury (<i>Dr. Lush</i>)	70
" 29.	N. Garrett and others	35
Total number of Petitions, 17; Signatures		1,290

MARRIED WOMEN'S PROPERTY (No. 2) BILL—Against; and MARRIED WOMEN'S PROPERTY BILL—In Favour.

March 22.	Inhabitants of Salford (<i>Mr. Charley</i>)	1,001
" 22.	Women of Rawtenstall, county of Lancaster (<i>Mr. Holt</i>)	121
" 23.	Members of the Executive Committee for Amending the Laws with respect to the Property of Married Women (<i>Mr. Jacob Bright</i>)	9
" 23.	Men of Rawtenstall, county of Lancaster (<i>Mr. Starkie</i>)	69
Total number of Petitions, 4; Signatures		1,200

The petitions marked thus ¶ have the addresses of some or all of the petitioners annexed. The petitions marked * are signed officially.

SUMMARY OF PETITIONS PRESENTED IN FAVOUR OF ABROGATING THE PRINCIPLE OF THE COMMON LAW IN RESPECT TO THE PROPERTY OF MARRIED WOMEN:—

	No. of Petitions.	No. of Signatures.
Married Women's Property Bill (Mr. Russell Gurney's)—		
In favour	175	36,405
Married Women's Property (No. 2) Bill—Against	17	1,290
Married Women's Property (No. 2) Bill—Against; and Married Women's Property Bill—In favour	4	1,200
Total	196	38,895

MR. DISRAELI ON WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE.—The following extract is taken from one of Mr. Disraeli's "Speeches on Parliamentary Reform" delivered in April, 1866:—He said: "I observe that in a debate that recently took place, not only in another place but another country, on the suffrage, some ridicule was occasioned by a gentleman advocating the rights of the other sex to the suffrage; but as far as mere abstract reason is concerned, I should like to see anybody in this House who is a follower of the hon. gentleman get up and oppose that claim. I say that in a country governed by a woman—where you allow women to form part of the other estate of the realm—peeresses in their own right, for example—where you allow a woman not only to hold land, but to be a lady of the manor and hold legal courts—where a woman by law may be a churchwarden and overseer of the poor—I do not see, where she has so much to do with the State and Church, on what reasons, if you come to right, she has not a right to vote."

TREASURER'S REPORT.

107, Upper Brook-street, Manchester, April 23rd, 1870.

My dear Miss Becker,—I annex a list of subscriptions received by me during this month. I may just add that our expenses this year are not light, and if we could month by month balance expenditure and receipts, I should look upon our finances as more healthy. This month, unless some unexpected donations come in, we shall be attacking our balance in hand, and doing what, of course, I object to as a treasurer. May I be allowed to add that if our friends were to make post-office orders and cheques payable to me, it would save a little time and trouble.—I am sincerely yours,

S. ALFRED STEINTHAL,

Treasurer, Manchester National Society for Women's Suffrage.

SUBSCRIPTIONS IN THE MONTH OF APRIL.

Miss Rigbye, Monk Coniston	2 0 0
Dr. Samelson, Manchester	0 5 0
Mrs. Mears, Bowdon	0 1 0
Mr. Heatherley, London	0 1 0
Mrs. Mc.Culloch, Dumfries	0 10 0
Mrs. Mc.Kimmel, Dumfries	0 10 0
Rev. T. G. Crippen, Tronbridge	0 1 0
Mrs. Abel Heywood, Manchester	3 0 0
Mrs. Pochin, London	2 2 0
Mrs. Thacher, London	0 2 6
Mrs. Muir, Altrincham	1 0 0
Mr. Jonas Mitchell, Leeds	0 5 0
Mrs. Embleton, Leeds	0 1 0
Mr. Peter Spence, Manchester	1 0 0
Mrs. Gooneh, Waterford	0 5 0
Miss E. Becker, Manchester	0 5 0
Mr. H. M. Steintahl, Manchester	5 0 0
Mr. P. F. Lascaridi, London	0 5 0
Mr. J. G. Blumer, Darlington	0 5 0
Miss Dora Thomson, Altrincham	1 0 0
<hr/>	
	17 18 6

The Journal for next month will contain a full report of the debate on the Women's Disabilities Bill.

Communications for the Editor of the Journal must be addressed to 28, Jackson's Row, Albert Square, Manchester.

Printed by A. IRELAND & Co., Pall Mall, Manchester, for the MANCHESTER NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE.—May 2, 1870.