

# WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE JOURNAL.

EDITED BY LYDIA E. BECKER.

VOL. IV.—No. 36. PUBLISHED MONTHLY.

MANCHESTER, FEBRUARY 1, 1873.

PRICE 1d.—By Post 1½d.

## Contents :

### Leading Articles by the Editor.

Birmingham: The Liberal Party and Women's Suffrage.  
Public Meetings:—Scotland: Dundee, Laurencekirk, Arbroath, Montrose, Brechin. England: Bedford, Folkestone, Dover, Deal, Sandwich, Maidstone, Canterbury, Hackney, Paddington, Barnsley, Darlington, Bath, Yeovil, Lyme Regis, Wimborne, Poole. The Potteries: Longton, Hanley, Newcastle-under-Lyme.

### Colonel Roden, M.P., on Women's Suffrage.

Mr. Otway, M.P., on Women's Suffrage.  
The Hon. Auberon Herbert, M.P., on Industrial Disabilities for Women.  
Correspondence.  
The Property of Married Women: Court of Queen's Bench. A Curious Case.  
List of Committees.

### Memorials to Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Disraeli.

Taxation and Non-Representation.  
Manchester National Society for Women's Suffrage:  
Treasurer's Report for January.  
Subscriptions received by the Central Committee.  
Vigilance Association for the Defence of Personal Rights:  
Treasurer's Report.

WITHIN a week from the date when these pages shall be in the hands of our readers the Women's Disabilities Removal Bill will, in the usual course of events, have been read a first time in the House of Commons. Its introduction has been prefaced by demonstrations of public opinion in its favour far greater than any exhibited on previous occasions. The public meetings that have taken place during the past month have been larger, more numerous, and more influential than those of any corresponding period. We especially call attention to the great meeting at Dundee, under the presidency of Sir ROBERT ANSTRUTHER, M.P.; to that at Bedford, with the borough member, Mr. J. HOWARD, M.P., in the chair; to that at Bath, where Lady ANNA GORE LANGTON and other ladies pleaded the cause with eloquence and grace; to the meetings in the Potteries, to which the borough member, Mr. MELLY, lent the force of his presence and advocacy; and to the series of meetings in Kent, where the constituency of the Parliamentary author of "Moonshine" was enlightened as to the estimation in which the honourable gentleman holds the feminine portion of its inhabitants. Members of Parliament who speak in support of the maintenance of the electoral disabilities of women will do well to remember that the merits of their speeches will be canvassed, and their arguments laid before their constituents, and that it behoves them to produce something in the way of a justification of their course which will stand a searching process of examination. Besides these meetings, one was held this week in Edinburgh, too late to be reported in the present issue of this *Journal*; and with regard to all, we have to express regret that the limited space at our disposal does not permit us to give notices which are adequate to their interest and importance.

The petitions are being extensively signed. Already 10,000 women in Manchester have signed a petition for Mr. JACOB BRIGHT'S Bill, and a nearly equal number in Salford have done likewise. The petition in Macclesfield has been signed by one of the borough members, by 29

Town Councillors, by one clergyman of the Church of England, by every Dissenting minister in the town save one, and by a large number of inhabitants. The women of Macclesfield have signed a separate petition, and we commend their example to the women in other districts.

Our friends should begin to send in their petitions with the second week in February, and continue to do so up to the time of the second reading of the Bill. We desire to impress on all the extreme importance of invariably sending the petition for presentation to the member for the constituency where the petitioners reside. Petitions which are sent otherwise than through the local representative are comparatively wasted, and may even do positive harm. One of the main objects of a petition is to prove to the member who presents it that there exists a desire for the measure among those whose opinions and interests he represents; and it is obvious that this advantage is entirely thrown away when the petition is sent to a member who is a stranger to the constituency. When the petition contains the signatures of persons of prominence or influence in the place, the names will probably be recognised by the local member, and will have an influence on his mind which they could not have on any but their own member. Some persons are deterred from sending petitions to their local members by the belief that these are opposed to the Bill, and by the fear lest on that account they may refuse or neglect to present the petition. But this is a most groundless fear. Whatever their opinions may be, members of Parliament are, as a rule, most willing to be the medium through which any of their constituents may approach the House of Commons, and most courteous to those who entrust petitions to their charge. Should the local member be unfriendly to the principle, that is all the more reason for sending him petitions to present in favour of the Bill. We heard last session of more than one member of Parliament who informed those who had sent him petitions that after receiving such a manifestation of opinion from his constituency in favour of the

Bill, he did not feel justified in voting against it, and consequently abstained from opposing it. A petition which neutralises a hostile vote gives efficient aid to progress, and we trust that the experiment may be tried next session on a goodly number of our former opponents.

Besides the petitions, memorials to Mr. GLADSTONE and to Mr. DISRAELI, praying for their support as leaders of their respective parties, to the Women's Disabilities Removal Bill, are in course of signature by women of the United Kingdom. Further particulars respecting these will be found in another column.

Turning from the efforts of our own especial workers to the wider field of general political action, we find gratifying signs of progress. Last month we had to chronicle a most important demonstration of opinion in our favour within the ranks of the Conservative party. This month we have had a proof that Liberals, in their organised political capacity, are not disposed to leave the Conservatives in the enjoyment of a monopoly of the desire for political justice to women. The great centre of Liberalism in England is Birmingham, that being the only three-cornered constituency where the party is powerful enough to return all the members under the minority clause. The annual address of the members to their constituents forms the occasion for the promulgation of the political programme which Birmingham Liberals desire to press on the consideration of Her Majesty's Government. The resolution embodying this programme asserts the great importance of the objects enumerated, and trusts that Ministers will introduce measures thereon as early as practicable. Among the measures of pressing importance enumerated in the resolution occurs "the recognition of the rights of women (being householders) to the franchise." Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, in moving the resolution, said that there were many other matters on which they desired legislation, and if these were not included in the resolution it was not because they did not attach importance to them, but because they felt that the resolution would lose somewhat of its effect if it were too multifarious in its composition. The selection of the right of women householders to the franchise among the subjects to be specially pressed on the Government by the formal vote of the Liberal party of Birmingham is a proof of the growing political importance of our claim, which cannot fail to have an influence on the mind of leaders, who avowedly seek inspiration and guidance from the sentiments of the people.

#### THE SOUTH WALES STRIKE.

The electoral disabilities of women with regard to Parliamentary government have an injurious influence in matters not directly connected with legislation. The habitual disregard of the opinions of women, as persons who have no right to be consulted even when their very lives are at stake, has received an appalling illustration in the deplorable calamity that has suddenly overtaken the feminine population of the mining districts of South Wales. Placed by law in a state of absolute dependence on their husbands for the means of subsistence, without a shadow of a legal claim for daily food on those who have undertaken the moral responsibility of providing for them, they suddenly find themselves—without warning, without being allowed to have a voice in determining the matter, without the opportunity of exercising the much vaunted "influence" recommended as a panacea for all the legal hardships inflicted upon women—reduced to a condition of starvation, and condemned to the yet more cruel pangs of witnessing their children pining and perishing for want of that bread which a quasi-political organisation, in which wives have no votes, has forbidden their husbands to earn. The telegrams from what we may describe as the "seat of war" state that there is an appalling amount of misery among the poorest families, many of them having been reduced to such straits that potato parings have been boiled to make soup. The gas stokers in London have incurred a severe penalty for improperly leaving undone the work they had undertaken to perform, although the employers found no difficulty in supplying their places. But the wives whose means of subsistence have been suddenly cut off, cannot find any substitute for the labour of their husbands. It is not just that men should be at liberty arbitrarily to repudiate their obligations to support their wives by wilfully abstaining from going to work at the bidding of the executive of a trades' union. If women had a voice in making the laws, some legal process akin to that by which a man may be compelled to contribute to the support of an illegitimate child, would be devised whereby the legitimate wife and children could obtain an order for maintenance. Such a change in the law would be a protection to the men themselves from any undue pressure from the trades' unions, and it would render a general strike impossible without the consent of the wives as well as of the husbands.

It may be said that the wives do not know what is good for them, and that they ought to be forced to bear present

starvation for the sake of a prospective increase of wages. But it is a notorious fact that the great bulk of the money obtained by an increase of wages is frequently spent in the public-houses, and not in the homes of working men, and that an increase of wages too often means an increase of drunkenness and degradation. The men who are on strike do not feel the pangs of starvation in their own persons. They can escape from the sight of their starving families, and pass their season of enforced idleness with tolerable comfort at the public-house. It is on the helpless wives and the feeble children that the full force of the calamity falls; and the law holds the husband irresponsible for deliberately causing this calamity by refusing to perform his share of domestic obligations, while at the same time it leaves him free to spend the whole of the income which, should the strike be successful, he will ultimately obtain at the cost of the cruel suffering of his wife and family, upon purely personal indulgences. Wives must starve that beer-houses may thrive. We are satisfied that a law giving to wives and children a direct claim on the husband and father for a weekly sum for maintenance, proportionate to the amount of wages he has ability to earn, would curtail the liquor traffic more effectually than any number of licensing regulations that the ingenuity of Home Secretaries could frame, while it would be free from the danger to liberty inseparable from all attempts at regulation or suppression.

There has been a suggestion that the question of the continuance of the strike should be submitted to vote by ballot among the men. The result of that test might be doubtful. But we venture to affirm that if the question whether work should be resumed, and the matters in dispute be settled by arbitration, or the strike carried on "to the bitter end" were allowed to be determined by women's suffrage in South Wales, the furnaces would soon resume their wonted blaze, and the fire be re-kindled on the domestic hearth. There are many social and political problems which seem to have arrived at a dead lock, and men appear to be able to apply no other solution than brute force, either through wars, or strikes, or the strong arm of the law. But the true key to the difficulty may after all be found in giving to woman her rightful place as the responsible adviser and helpmeet for man in guiding the interests common to humanity.

THE property disabilities of married women will engage the attention of the House of Commons early in the session. Before the recess, notice was given by Mr. J. HINDE

PALMER that he would bring in a Bill on the subject. That Bill will, in all probability, be introduced immediately after the opening of Parliament, and the second reading fixed for an early date. In the next issue of the *Journal* we hope to give the text of the Bill, and to report as to its progress and prospects.

#### BIRMINGHAM.

#### THE LIBERAL PARTY AND WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE.

On December 20th Mr. G. DIXON, M.P., and Mr. P. H. MUNZ, M.P., gave their annual address to their constituents, in the Town Hall, Birmingham. In prefacing his address Mr. Dixon said he had been asked to say something again upon the question of women's suffrage, but really the ladies themselves spoke so well on that subject that he thought it quite unnecessary to repeat what he had said before. He should, however, have pleasure in voting for them. After the members had spoken Mr. Chamberlain moved the following resolution:—"This meeting, in looking forward to the session of 1873, feels the great importance of the following objects, and trusts the Ministers will introduce measures thereon to Parliament as early as practicable:—the assimilation of the county and borough franchise; the equalisation of representation by a redistribution of seats; the abolition of the Minority Clause of the last Reform Act; the recognition of the rights of women (being householders) to the franchise; the amendment of the Education Act of 1870, by the abolition of the cumulative vote and the 25th clause, the universal establishment of School Boards, and compulsory attendance; such changes in the laws relating to land as shall secure its cheap and easy transfer, and relieve it from the injurious restrictions of primogeniture and entail. This meeting further urges Her Majesty's Government to exercise the most rigid economy in every department of the state—to insist upon retrenchment whenever possible—so that the people may be relieved from the present heavy burden of taxation." He said that resolution would constitute the best part of his speech, as he did not intend to go in detail into a defence of the various objects which were comprised within its terms. The questions which had been asked and the evident feeling of that meeting showed that there were many other matters upon which they desired legislation, and he wished it to be understood that, if they were not included in the resolution, it was not because they did not attach importance to them, or because they did not hope that their members would seek every opportunity of urging them upon the attention of Parliament, but it was because they felt that the resolution would lose somewhat of its effect if it were too multifarious in its composition.—In the course of his speech, Mr. Chamberlain said they had to complete the work of 1867. They had also to claim the suffrage for women who were householders.—Mr. Radford seconded the resolution. He said they would see that the good work which they began in establishing household suffrage was altogether incomplete until the changes enumerated in the resolution became the law of the land.—The resolution was put and carried unanimously, after which votes of confidence in the borough members were also carried.—*From the Birmingham Post.*

ERRATUM.—In the report of Alderman Hawkes' speech at Birmingham, page 4 of last number of the *Journal*, for "her" read "his."

## PUBLIC MEETINGS.

## DUNDEE.

## GREAT MEETING IN KINNAIRD HALL.

On January 11th, a public meeting of those favourable to conferring the electoral franchise on those women who are owners or occupiers of land or houses in their own right was held in the Kinnaird Hall. Sir Robert Anstruther, Bart., M.P., presided, and there were also on the platform Miss Wigham, Miss Burton, Edinburgh; Miss Beedy, Miss Home, Miss Clarkson, Mrs. Gilfillan, Mrs. E. Parker, Mrs. Donald, Mrs. Steele, Professor Masson, Edinburgh; the Rev. Mr. Knight, the Rev. George Gilfillan, Mr. Peter Matthew, Mr. E. Howat, Mr. D. Jobson, Rev. Mr. Wilson, Dunkeld; Mr. E. Parker, Mr. J. L. Cunningham, Mr. W. Howat, Rev. Mr. Reed, Mr. H. White, Mr. R. Ewing, and Mr. John Sutherland.

The CHAIRMAN esteemed very highly the honour which had been conferred upon him by the association which had been formed for the advancement of the cause of women's suffrage in Scotland asking him to preside over that meeting, and he could not help hoping that they would receive a very cordial welcome at their hands—(applause)—for he knew that the opinion which Dundee formed on such questions must have great weight throughout Scotland and England. They desired first to influence all the great centres of Liberal thought, for they might be pretty certain that all other opinion would follow in their wake. He had never in his life known a cause so inherently just, or which to all unprejudiced and thinking men, carried so clearly on the face of it a demand for redress. They asked no favour at the hands of the Legislature. All they asked was that a disqualification at present imposed on certain citizens of this country should be removed. He must say that he had never heard, either in Parliament or out of it, one single argument which appeared to him to be of the slightest possible weight in maintaining the disqualification as it at present existed. He proposed to detain them a few minutes, in order to consider the question as it referred to one or two or three Acts of Parliament which had been passed, and to one or two or three Acts of Parliament which they expected, or at least which they hoped, might shortly be passed. Now, that was bringing the question to a practical bearing; they, as Scotchmen, were practical people, and when he was in a position—as he believed he was—to show that the conferring of the franchise on women would have had a material effect on legislation in a beneficial direction which had already passed, and would have—or ought to have—a very beneficial effect on legislation yet to come, he should like to lay the burden of proof on those who denied their position, and to call on them to say why opinion which was thoughtful, which was intelligent, which had been on the average certainly as high as that of man, was to be lost to the nation. He would refer first to the series of Acts known by the name of the Contagious Diseases Acts, and he made free to say that if the opinion of the women of this country, both of the upper classes and of the working classes, had been taken on those Acts before they were submitted to the Legislature they never would have passed. That was a case which he put before them as a very strong case, in which it would have been well for all parties in this kingdom if they could have known the opinion of women on the Acts before they were propounded, and he knew no means by which constitutionally the opinion of women was to be got on any of those public and social questions except by the same means that were taken to obtain the opinion of men on any social question, which was at the hustings and at the polling-booth. The hon. baronet proceeded to argue that women owners and

occupiers ought to have the same facilities for making known their views and enforcing them as men owners and occupiers, and that both ought to be in the same position with regard to giving and receiving compensation for unexhausted improvements. The only argument which he had heard against the removal of the disqualification was that women were very often fools, and that they might be influenced by their clergy and their lovers. All people were influenced by somebody, and if they were influenced only by their clergy and their lovers, possibly they might not be so badly off. The argument that women were very often fools proved a great deal too much, because there were fools among men as among women; and if they disfranchised all women because there were some of them fools, it followed logically that they ought to disfranchise all men because there were some of them fools. (Laughter and applause.) All who took a dispassionate view of the subject would admit that so far as right and reason and logic were concerned there was not a single word to be urged against that most reasonable of all propositions, that those who were qualified according to the existing regulations and rules of Parliament to vote for a member of Parliament ought to be allowed to exercise their right as citizens and free persons, whether they were men or women. (Loud applause.)

Professor MASSON proposed the usual resolution. In the course of his speech he said women had at that moment the municipal franchise in England. Why then on earth should they be admitted to these minor exercises of the franchise and be debarred the major? They had heard a case alluded to, and it was with some difficulty that he quoted it as an instance, without saying one word on one side or the other. They had an instance of women concerning themselves and acting as politicians, and had they not there shown political power? What had happened in that case but that the feminine arm had been outstretched and clutched the neck of the Legislature, and compelled it to arrest itself, rightly or wrongly, in the path on which it was going? If people were uncredited politicians on one side or the other, why should these women, who might have done right or might have done wrong, not be able to do it in a way for which they would have been responsible for what they did. (Applause.) Another argument that had been used was that women were non-combatants. He believed that was an argument which originated in America. Well, it was a very peculiar one, because it amounted to this, that no one was entitled to the political franchise who personally was not capable of bearing arms offensively and defensively in the country's service. It was a very peculiar argument, and broke down the moment they tried it; for then, in fact, the recruiting-sergeant would be the person to decide whether a man even had a right to exercise the suffrage. Some people, on account of being undersized, were rejected from the army, and they ought not to have the suffrage. Some people were weakly or crippled, and why should they have the suffrage? Then some people were past the age of military service. For example, Mr. Disraeli and Mr. Gladstone and a great many more ought to be disfranchised from political power if this argument was worth anything; but the fact was it was just one of the arguments fished up and put into circulation, but broke down and was of no avail the moment they looked into it. There were unjust laws—in the first place as relating to women's property, to their earnings, and to the custody of their children. (Applause.) Some improvements had taken place recently in these laws, but there were still a great many injustices in them. For example, a woman in England married, and brought £500 to her husband. That sum, in the circumstances, became legally and absolutely his. The husband dies soon. His creditors seize legally that £500, and amongst those

creditors are the father and brothers of the deceased husband, and the wife is left penniless. That was one out of an immense mass of examples that had been collected of the injustices to women by the present laws as to property and earnings. But, take another glaring injustice—that of the exclusion of women from the higher and more money-making industries, not by natural incapacity, but by sheer inveterate custom, often backed by law. A prevailing theory was that every woman was supported by some man or men; and they would be astonished to find how deep that notion lay in the minds of a great many people from ignorance or inexperience. This was one of the most glaring hallucinations possible. He had taken the trouble once to examine the census of 1861—the census of 1871 was not yet completely published. But examining that of 1861 he found this to be the state of matters:—The female population was 11,900,000. The females of all ages working for their bread in various fashions—not domestically, not merely as wives and sisters, and attending to household affairs, but working for their bread in the sense in which the word was commonly spoken of—were 3,800,000. That was to say, actually one-third of the entire female population were working in different ways for their own bread—many not for their own bread only, but, in many cases, for the bread of men depending upon them; in many cases, too, for the bread of unworthy men depending upon them—(applause)—for the bread of men who were downcasts to them and curses to them, and the placing of whom in their coffins under the earth would be the greatest release possible for those hard working women. (Applause.) Well, what kind of industries were allowed to these women? There was no objection whatever to their working so long as the industry was hard and squalid and low paid. But the moment some women had educated their minds—being led by natural capacity and by circumstances—and wanted to make a way into certain of the professions, then what happened? Why the theory came up that every woman ought to be supported by some man or men, and these women were hurled back to shift for themselves—what they demanded being denied them. Look again at what took place in female education. He believed that female education was stunted at the present moment, stunted precisely because women had no political power. Look at the educational endowments over the country of which young men had the advantage. Something additional had been done for women in that respect; but how little. He was ashamed to think of the fact that he was a Professor in a University, that part of his income was supplied to him by taxation of women, and yet that if a woman appeared on the steps of that University and demanded some share of the higher education that was given in that institution, he was forced to say to her no! (Applause.) That was a state of things which ought not longer to exist. Now, the remedy was this—put political power in the hands of women, or even of that portion of women who were now concerned, and they took a short cut to abolish all these injustices. (Applause.) By doing this the axe would be laid at the root of them all, and till this was granted all kinds of injustice would remain. Scotland had taken a decided and leading part in this matter. By two to one the Scottish representatives had declared themselves in favour of female suffrage. (Applause.) Fifteen Scottish towns and burghs had sent in petitions by their Town Councils in favour of women suffrage. What Scotland thought upon any great question would very soon be the opinion of the United Kingdom—(applause)—and what they desired that night was that the great community of Dundee should join with them so much of the rest of Scotland and try to accelerate the time when injustice to women in all its varieties would disappear from the British statute book. (Applause.)

The resolution was seconded by Miss BEEDY, and carried unanimously.

The Rev. W. KNIGHT moved a resolution adopting petitions and memorials in favour of the Bill.

Miss WIGHAM seconded the resolution. She was sure that the meeting would be convinced that this mode of action was quite necessary in order to carry on the work which they had in view. They were of course deeply indebted to Mr. Jacob Bright for having during three successive years brought forward his motion, and it was gratifying to know that he was again to do so this session. The ability which Mr. Bright had displayed in supporting the rights of women had earned for him the commendation of the Prime Minister. It was a great satisfaction indeed to think that in Scotland there was such a large proportion of the members of Parliament in favour of women's suffrage; and while they regretted the death of Colonel Sykes, of Aberdeen, who was a firm friend of the Association, they hoped that the recent elections and the elections yet to come might bring forward new supporters. They had one, it was pleasing to know, in the member for Forfarshire. (Applause.) Last year 829 petitions were presented to Parliament, signed by 350,093 names. It might interest the meeting to know that there were only three petitions presented against the motion, and she was sorry to say that one of the distinguished three was from Dundee; but she hoped, now that they had got a reformed Town Council, they would forward a petition on the other side. They demanded the concession of the political franchise, because it was a right which they were entitled to possess. The time was gone by when they could disassociate politics with religion. Women held patriotic views as well as men. They wanted to do something to help forward the well-being of their beloved country. They knew something about education, and they knew something about expenditure, and if they had some voice in the Legislature, perhaps they might turn their experience to save the pockets of the ratepayers. If they obtained their demand, she had no doubt that they would exercise the franchise in a just and conscientious manner, and for the general good of the body politic of the nation. (Applause.)

Mr. JOHN SUTHERLAND moved the last resolution in these terms:—“That this meeting recommends the formation of a committee to promote the cause of women's suffrage in Dundee, and earnestly requests all those favourable to the cause to meet the following ladies—namely, Mrs. Gilfillan, Mrs. E. Parker, Miss Wigham, Miss Beedy, and Miss Burton—at Lamb's Hotel, on Monday, 13th, at 11 o'clock.

The Rev. GEORGE GILFILLAN seconded the resolution.

The resolutions were carried unanimously.

Miss BURTON moved a vote of thanks to the chairman, which was seconded by Mr. WHITE, and heartily accorded.

The CHAIRMAN, in acknowledging the compliment, said he had to apologise for the absence of Sir John Ogilvy, who regretted his inability to be present, as they all knew the hon. baronet was a warm supporter of the movement, and had promised to vote for it when it came before Parliament.—*Abridged from the Dundee Advertiser.*

## LAURENCEKIRK.

A lecture was delivered in the St. Lawrence Hall here, on December 19th, by Miss Beedy, M.A., of St. Louis, U.S. Mr. Alexander, Bent, of Haulkerton, occupied the chair. Resolutions favourable to the cause were moved by Mr. Keppie, parochial teacher, and Mr. P. Dickson, banker, and seconded by Mr. Largie, Mains of Haulkerton, and Mr. P. Carnegie, Newton. The proceedings terminated by the Rev. Mr. Smith, of the Congregational Church, moving a vote of thanks to the Chairman. The movement is very generally supported in this district.—*Montrose, Arbroath, and Brechin Review.*

## ARBROATH.

A public meeting in favour of conferring the franchise on female householders was held in the New Public Hall on December 24th. The following ladies and gentlemen were on the platform:—Miss Beedy; Mrs. E. Parker, Dundee; Miss Burton, Edinburgh; and Mrs. D. Millar, Arbroath; Provost Muir, Rev. C. C. Macdonald, Rev. Mr. Drake, Mr. David Millar, Mr. Strachan, and Mr. Crighton. Provost Muir occupied the chair.—Miss Beedy addressed the meeting.—The Rev. C. C. Macdonald said that whatever their opinions with regard to the question before them might be they could not but feel indebted to Miss Beedy for her ingenious and sparkling and, he thought, convincing address. He then proposed the usual resolution.—Mr. Crighton seconded the resolution, which was approved of unanimously.—Mr. Millar moved a resolution to petition Parliament in support of Mr Jacob Bright's Women's Disabilities Bill, said petition to be signed by the Chairman and forwarded for presentation.—Rev. Mr. Drake seconded. The meeting approved of this resolution also, and on the motion of the Provost a vote of thanks was accorded to Miss Beedy for her able address. A vote of thanks to the Provost concluded the proceedings.—*Dundee Advertiser.*

## MONTROSE.

A public meeting was held on December 26, in the Guild Hall, to hear a lecture on Women's Suffrage, considered in its educational and industrial aspect.—Baillie Lyall, in the unavoidable absence of Provost Mitchell, occupied the chair, and introduced the lady lecturer, Miss Beedy, who was warmly received.—The following resolution was proposed by Rev. Mr. Robertson—"That the exclusion of women, otherwise legally qualified, from voting in parliamentary, municipal, and parochial elections, is injurious to those excluded, contrary to the principle of just representation, and to that of representative governments."—The Chairman seconded the resolution, which was unanimously agreed to.—Rev. Mr. Campbell moved the next resolution as follows—"That the petition, now read, to both Houses of Parliament, be adopted and signed by the chairman on behalf of this meeting, and that a memorial to W. E. Baxter, member for the Montrose district of Burghs, requesting him to support Mr. Jacob Bright's Bill to remove the Electoral Disabilities of Women, be signed by the chairman and forwarded by him."—Mr. David Anderson seconded the resolution, which was also agreed to.—Discussion was invited, but no one seemed anxious to be further informed on the subject; and the meeting closed with a vote of thanks to the chairman.—*Montrose, Arbroath, and Brechin Review.*

## BRECHIN.

On December 27 a well-attended meeting to hear Miss Beedy lecture upon the extension of electoral privileges to women was convened in the City Hall—Ex-Baillie Smith in the chair. Miss Beedy was accompanied to the platform by Miss H. Burton, of Edinburgh, the Chairman, Rev. Mr. Crabb, Mr. James Guthrie, and Mr. D. Burns.—The Chairman, after a few remarks, introduced Miss Beedy, who gave an excellent lecture, during the delivery of which she was frequently applauded.—At the close the Chairman invited discussion, but there was no response.—Resolutions adopting petitions to Parliament, and a memorial to Mr. Baxter, M.P., asking him to support Mr. Jacob Bright's Bill were moved and supported by Councillor Hutcheon, Mr. Willcocks, and Mr. Hodgeton, and carried unanimously.—Votes of thanks to the lecturer and chairman concluded the proceedings.—Abridged from the *Brechin Advertiser.*

Meetings have also been held at Turriff, Aberdeenshire, and Stonehaven, Forfarshire, particulars of which have not reached us.

## BEDFORD.

## IMPORTANT MEETING AT THE BEDFORD ROOMS.

A public meeting in support of Mr. Jacob Bright's Bill for the extension of the parliamentary franchise to women ratepayers was held in the Bedford Rooms, on January 22nd; James Howard, Esq., M.P., presiding. Notwithstanding the inclemency of the weather the attendance was large, the audience including a very large number of ladies. Mrs. Henry Fawcett and Mrs. Henry Kingsley, of the National Society for Women's Suffrage, were in attendance; and there were also present on the platform the Mayor (Frederick Thomas Young, Esq.), Mr. James Coombs (ex-mayor), Mr. Alderman Carter, Mr. George Hurst, J.P., Mr. C. E. B. Gillions, Rev. J. Brown, Mr. W. Steward, Mr. E. E. Morris, M.A., Middle Class School, Mrs. Young (mayoress), and Miss H. H. Coombs.

The CHAIRMAN, who was warmly received, said: The Bill introduced by Mr. Jacob Bright for conferring electoral rights upon women has two great merits, simplicity and brevity. If it should become law (and I believe it will, and very soon) it will perhaps be the shortest Act ever passed by the British or any other Parliament. It contains but seven lines, and in addition to its brevity it is so simple that it seems impossible that there should be anything in it even for the lawyers to squabble over. The Bill did not seek, as it is often very erroneously supposed, to confer the franchise upon women indiscriminately. It simply provided for extending to ratepaying householding women the same privileges which are now enjoyed by householding and ratepaying men. Upon the face of it, the claim seemed so just and reasonable that one is amazed at the number of objections which have been raised against the proposal. The author of the last Reform Bill, Mr. Disraeli, stated in his place in the House of Commons that the main principle—the main object—of that Bill was to confer upon every householder who was rated for the relief of the poor the right of voting in the Parliamentary elections. That is a very broad and intelligible ground. But can we say that the main principle and object of that important Bill has been carried out so long as one-seventh of the householders of this country are debarred from that right, simply and merely upon the ground that they are of the wrong sex? (Hear.) The objects of all legislation refer to the life, the liberties, the property, and the welfare of the people. I would ask, are not women as deeply interested as men in every one of these objects? I would go further, and ask, are there not a great many questions coming up for the consideration of Parliament in which women are far more deeply interested than men? Need I remind you of the Marriage Laws. A very eminent English lawyer has characterised the British marriage laws as the most barbarous to be found upon the statute books of any civilised country. (Hear.) I have no doubt that the ladies who are to follow me will remind this meeting of other subjects in which ladies are as deeply interested as men, and therefore I will only refer to one other subject, and that is the great question of education. (Hear.) Is not this essentially a woman's question? Have the girls of this country had a fair share—(hear)—in the great educational endowments of England? (No.) How have the girls of Bedford fared? (Hear.) As most of you know, until a very few years ago, our vast educational endowments were monopolised exclusively and entirely by the male sex. I say unhesitatingly that the claims of girls to share in the educational endowments of the country have been scandalously ignored, and when the Endowed Schools Bill was before Parliament I raised my voice in support of the amendment proposed by Mr. Winterbotham claiming for the girls a larger and fairer share of the advantages of these educational endowments. Perhaps it may not be uninteresting

to the meeting—and I am not perhaps divulging any secrets—if I inform you that the scheme being prepared by the Endowed Schools Commissioners, whatever may be its demerits, has this one merit—it recognises the claims of the girls of Bedford to a larger share in our great educational endowments, and in addition to the enlargement and extension of our present elementary girls' school, we are to have two other girls' schools, a high school and a modern school. (Hear.) In conclusion I would observe that the time is fast approaching when the attention of the Legislature would be turned more and more from party politics to social questions; and it is because I believe that women can render essential service in the solution of such questions, and because I think that the conferring of electoral power on women will compel public men to pay more attention and respect to their opinions, that I stand upon this platform to-night. (Cheers.) I have great pleasure in calling upon Mrs. Fawcett to move the first resolution. (Applause.)

Mrs. FAWCETT, who was also very warmly received, moved the usual resolution affirming the principle, and among other observations said—to give you an idea of the difficulties we have to encounter, and the general state of public opinion upon questions relating to the rights and wrongs of women, I will tell you what once happened to me some years ago in reference to the Married Women's Property Bill. I was staying with my father in an agricultural county, on the eve of a general election, and he invited twenty or thirty of the more active Liberals of the county to meet and confer with him as to the tactics of the coming campaign. I thought this would be a very fair opportunity of bringing this Bill before their notice, and I accordingly prepared a petition to which I hoped to obtain a large number of signatures, including the signatures of these gentlemen. Alas, I was very inexperienced then, and I did not know that Liberalism, like beauty, is only skin deep. (Hear, and laughter.) Well, after it was prepared, I presented my petition and a copy of the Bill, the various provisions of which I pointed out to the gentlemen, laying particular stress on the clause which exempted husbands from debts incurred by their wives. This provision seemed to elicit unanimous approval—(laughter)—and I was in great hopes of getting a great number of influential signatures to my petition in consequence. One gentleman, however, said to me, "Am I to understand that if this Bill passes into law, if my wife has a couple of thousands of pounds left her, and if I want the money, I am to ask her for it?" (Laughter.) I was rather taken aback, and the only answer I could make was "Yes, I suppose so." (Renewed laughter.) That gentleman strutted to the end of the room, and they all raised a kind of chorus, saying "We won't sign it;" and not a single signature did I get to that unfortunate petition. That was the voice of advanced Liberalism in the county of Suffolk eight years ago. We have made considerable progress since then, for some of those who were most forward in opposing it, are now endeavouring to their utmost to secure the abolition of any enactments that are oppressive to the women. Is it right and just when a member visits the town or borough which he represents for the purpose of consulting his constituents on a proposed change in the law, or when the Government appeals to the country on a question perhaps differently affecting the interests of men and women, that the voice of men alone should be recorded, and that no woman has a chance of furthering the solution of the question by her vote? It would be a question very much like if, in a question of capital and labour, all the arbitrators were all capitalists. You may be sure that the questions in dispute would be settled in favour of the capitalists. It would be contrary to human nature if they did otherwise, and it could

not be expected. It is on this ground that I advocate the extension of the suffrage to women, because I believe that the interests of no class are safe except in their own keeping.

The resolution was seconded by Mr. HURST, and supported by Mr. Alderman CARTER.

The CHAIRMAN then put the resolution to the meeting, the only dissentients being two persons sitting in the body of the room.

Mrs. HENRY KINGSLEY, in an eloquent speech, moved the second resolution:—"That the petitions now read, to both Houses of Parliament, be adopted and signed by the chairman on behalf of this meeting; and that a memorial to Samuel Whitbread, Esq., member for the borough, requesting him to support Mr. Jacob Bright's Bill to remove the Electoral Disabilities of Women be signed by the chairman and forwarded by him."

Dr. COOMBS had great pleasure in seconding the resolution.

Mrs. STEWARD supported the proposition, which was put to the meeting and carried unanimously.

The MAYOR of BEDFORD moved a vote of thanks to Mrs. Fawcett and Mrs. Kingsley, which was seconded by Mr. MORRIS and carried with acclamation.

Mrs. FAWCETT acknowledged the compliment, and proposed a vote of thanks to the chairman, which was seconded by Mrs. KINGSLEY.—The MAYOR put the resolution to the meeting, and it was carried unanimously.

The CHAIRMAN, in returning thanks, reiterated his expression of deep interest in the movement.

A number of ladies and gentlemen then signed the petition, and the meeting dispersed.

Next day a meeting was held at the Swan Hotel, when a committee was formed. Mrs. Kingsley attended, and made a statement as to what would be required, the duties of the committee, &c. The list is not yet complete.

Our notice is abridged from the *Bedfordshire Mercury*, which contained an admirable and apparently *verbatim* report of the meeting, occupying many columns.

## FOLKSTONE.

A meeting in aid of women's suffrage was held at the Town Hall, Folkstone, on January 14th. Addresses were delivered by Miss Biggs, Miss Young, and the Revs. A. J. Palmer and W. Sampson. The Rev. Mr. Chester, of Cardiff, occupied the chair.—The Rev. W. Sampson proposed, and Miss Biggs seconded, that a petition in favour of women's suffrage should be sent to Parliament.—This was met by an amendment, moved by Mr. John Henry Trevenen, and seconded by Mr. Hewitt, viz., "that this meeting is of opinion that it is not desirable to confer the franchise on women; that this Bill shows a distrust in woman's natural protector, man; therefore this meeting opposes, on moral and religious grounds, a petition being sent to Parliament in favour of the Bill." On being put to the meeting the amendment was lost, and the resolution was declared carried.—A vote of thanks to the chairman concluded the proceedings.

## DOVER.

On January 15th a public meeting was held at the Wellington Hall, Dover, in support of the Bill of Mr. Jacob Bright for giving votes in the election of Members of Parliament to women householders. There was a good attendance, and among the audience a large number of ladies. The chair was occupied by Mr. Alderman Rees, and upon the platform were three lady representatives of the National Association, namely, Miss C. A. Biggs, Miss Annie Young, of Chatham, and Miss Lilia Ashworth. After some remarks by the Chairman, Mr. Agate moved the first resolution, which was seconded by Miss Caroline Biggs.—Miss Annie Young, of Chatham, moved the

second resolution, viz, "That petitions to both Houses of Parliament, and memorials to Major Dickson and Sir George Jessel, as well as to Mr. E. L. Pemberton and the Hon. G. Milles, the county members, requesting them to support Mr. Jacob Bright's Bill in the next session of Parliament be signed by the chairman on behalf of the meeting." Women had hard work to do. 1,080,700 were employed in work away from home. She passed in review various laws affecting women disadvantageously; the Divorce Law, the Married Women's Property Bill, the Medical Act of 1858 which prevents a woman practising with a foreign diploma, thus making her a quack; the custody of children by married women, the 40th clause of the Mutiny Act, &c. The possession of the franchise would compel attention, for women would then have some hold upon the gentlemen who represented the borough in which they lived. The speaker then called attention to the fact that Major Dickson had on the last two occasions voted for Mr. Jacob Bright's Bill, and that Sir George Jessel, though he had voted once against the measure, had the last two years remained neutral. This, with his remarks about married women's property, intimated that he would be open to conviction if his constituents used the right efforts. She then concluded with an appeal to women to come forward and aid in the work, using that influence which at present was styled indirect.—Miss Lillias Ashworth seconded the resolution. The resolutions were carried unanimously. The proceedings were closed with a vote of thanks to the chairman for presiding, and to the ladies who had represented the associations. On the invitation of Miss Biggs, several ladies who had listened to the speeches, came forward and formed themselves into a local committee.—*Dover Chronicle*.

The *Dover News* and the *Dover Express* contained extended reports of the meeting, and articles advocating the claim.

## DEAL.

A public meeting was held at the large room in Park street, on January 16th, Alderman Brown, J.P., in the chair. Very interesting and persuasive addresses were delivered by Miss Ashworth, of Bath; Miss Biggs, of London; and Miss Young, of Chatham. There were present also on the platform Mr. Councillor Cottew, the Rev. W. Garwood, and the Rev. Henry Chester, who took part in the proceedings.

Mr. GEORGE COTTEW proposed a resolution affirming the principle, which was seconded by Miss CAROLINE BIGGS, supported by Miss ANNIE YOUNG, and carried unanimously.

The second resolution was proposed by the Rev. W. Garwood, "That the petitions now read, to both Houses of Parliament, be adopted and signed by the chairman on behalf of this meeting; and that a memorial to Knatchbull-Hugessen, Esq., and H. A. Brassey, Esq., members for the united boroughs of Deal, Walmer, and Sandwich, requesting them to support Mr. Jacob Bright's Bill to Remove the Electoral Disabilities of Women, be signed by the chairman and forwarded by him."

Miss LILLIAS ASHWORTH, in seconding the resolution, showed that the demand came from women themselves, that the organization for obtaining the Women's Disabilities Bill was organized and carried on principally by women, and that hundreds of meetings were being held all over the country, all of which were addressed by women. And in referring to the municipal vote, she stated that the returns which had been received by the Suffrage Society proved that in many of our towns women voted quite as freely as men. She then referred at some length to the inequality of the laws of England in regard to women, and said that they were asking for direct political power in order that their interests equally with those of men might receive the consideration and attention of the Legislature. She said that on looking through the division

lists she found that both the members for Deal had voted against the Bill. Mr. Brassey had only voted once, but Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen had voted every year against it, and last session he made a curious speech against it. She had before her a copy of that speech and also an article which the hon. member wrote in the last November number of *Macmillan's Magazine*, entitled "The Redistribution of Political Power." She said that she thought that when men made speeches about women in the House of Commons that it was only fair women should answer them in the country, and she was the more inclined to do so because she found that this right hon. member had the strange presumption to constitute himself the special champion of women, and so keen was his imagination that from his speech he evidently considers himself providentially sent into the House of Commons to guard woman's privileges upon earth—privileges which he grieved to say would be seriously imperilled by the proposed Bill. She then quoted several passages from the article in *Macmillan*, which went to prove that the vote was a right worth preserving and a blessing to those who enjoy it. Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen said, when speaking of household suffrage in the counties, that the "sauce for the town goose will be found to be equally suitable for the country gander," and she would like to ask the hon. gentleman to give a clearly defined reason why "What was sauce for the town and county gander would not also be sauce for the town and county goose." But they would find when she quoted from his speech against woman's suffrage that their "Liberal" member only included one half the human race in his Liberal schemes. She then proceeded to read the objections which Mr. Hugessen had made against the enfranchisement of women, and to censure them. While in one sentence he said the franchise would be a "grievous injury" to women, in another sentence he said he objected to placing unmarried women in a better position than married women as regards the vote. Though he maintained that women did not want the vote, he proceeded to show that, if women obtained it, they would value it so highly that they would think twice before, in his own words, "they relinquished it by committing themselves to a matrimonial bond." He was in favour of what was called the "pedestal or pinnacle argument," and was astonished that anyone should sneer at it. He would have women kept on pedestals and regarded with reverence and love, and shielded from all hard and stern duties. Miss Ashworth said that as there were more than 2,000,000 of women engaged in the hard and stern duty of working for their daily bread, she was afraid that this philanthropic legislator would find it a difficult matter to provide the requisite number of pedestals. She thought that the mind of the right hon. member had become so imbued with the delightful fairy stories with which he charms the minds of children, that he had come to regard women in the light of fairy Princesses whose ethereal natures did not require any legal safeguard. She concluded by appealing to the electors of Deal to help in the removal of the electoral disabilities of women.

The lady speakers were warmly received, and loudly cheered by a large and sympathising audience. The resolutions were unanimously passed, and the petitions to Parliament were adopted and signed at the close of the meeting. A ladies' committee was also formed, of which we believe the Rev. J. T. Bartram will act as assistant and corresponding secretary.—*Abridged from the Deal and Kentish Telegram*.

## SANDWICH.

A very crowded meeting was held in the Town Hall, Sandwich, on January 17th, addressed by Miss Ashworth, Miss Biggs and others, of which we have received no detailed report.

## MAIDSTONE.

A meeting was held in the Corn Exchange, Maidstone, on January 20th; the Rev. R. E. B. Maclellan in the chair. The usual resolutions were moved and supported by the Rev. D. G. Watt, Miss Beedy, Miss Caroline Biggs, and others, and carried by a majority.

## CANTERBURY.

On January 21st, a meeting was held in St. George's Hall, Canterbury, in support of Mr. Jacob Bright's Bill. Mr. Councillor Joyce presided, and there was about an average attendance. The chairman having briefly opened the proceedings, the Rev. Mr. Murray moved the usual resolution, which was seconded by Miss Beedy, and carried.—The second resolution was moved by Mr. Alderman W. J. Cooper, namely,— "That petitions to both Houses of Parliament and memorials to Mr. H. A. Butler Johnstone and Captain Brinckman requesting them to support Mr. Jacob Bright's Bill in the next Parliament, be signed on behalf of the meeting."—Miss Caroline Biggs, of London, seconded the resolution in place of Miss Young, who had been prevented by illness from attending the meeting. She said that she deeply regretted to-night the loss they had experienced in the death of the late Dean Alford, who had been one of the earliest supporters of the women's suffrage, and would, if still alive, have been present at the meeting. A member of Parliament had recently characterised Mr. Jacob Bright's Bill to Remove the Electoral Disabilities of Women, as a Bill to subvert the laws of creation, but she thought that as the laws of creation had remained immutable till now, they were not likely to be overthrown by a measure which would only give to every woman household and ratepayer who already voted in municipal elections once a year, a vote in parliamentary elections once in every five or six years. Women needed the suffrage to get rid of many oppressive laws. She would instance only a few. The Married Women's Property Law, which enabled a husband to possess himself of the entire property of his wife, thus reversing the promise he made at marriage, "With all my worldly goods I thee endow," which ought rather to run, "Of all thy worldly goods I take possession." But a woman had no power to compel a husband to maintain her, although the Poor Law Guardians might recover damages against him. The Bill which had been brought into Parliament to amend the law of married women's property did ensure now to a wife the right over her own earnings, but a husband had the power to forbid his wife to earn money. A married woman could neither sue or be sued for debt, and a husband was not now responsible for his wife's debts. The claims of women were sometimes opposed by Bible arguments, and the sayings of St. Paul were quoted to keep women in subjection. But St. Paul had also been quoted in defence of negro slavery and in support of despotic governments. Where would England be now if the Liberals of the seventeenth century had followed too closely the precept to submit themselves to their rulers. The Bible was a living guide for all time, but was not to be interpreted by rules fitted only for Jewish or Greek society. But women were in one respect at least better off in Judea than now. For the virtuous woman in Proverbs, amongst other things, "considereth a field and buyeth it;" and it would be impossible for any married woman to do that under our English property laws.—The resolution was carried, and the proceedings terminated.—*Abridged from the Kent Herald*.

## HACKNEY.

On January 21st, a meeting was held in the Town Hall, Hackney. Mr. P. A. Taylor presided, and the audience, by a large majority, carried the several resolutions submitted and spoken to by Mr. P. A. Taylor, M.P., Mrs. Ernestine Rose, the Rev. J. A. Picton, and others.

## PADDINGTON.

On January 22nd, a lecture was given by Mrs. Westlake, on "Women's Claim to the Suffrage," in Providence Hall, Church-st., Paddington. Rev. J. L. Davies presided.—After answering the arguments commonly brought against the claim of women, the lecturer deprecated all artificial rules of exclusion founded on preconceived notions of what was suitable for women, the truth of which could only be ascertained by experience, and urged that ability, whether political or otherwise, was not so common that the world could afford to lose any part of it because of the sex in which it might happen to be found.—Mr. Westlake, in proposing a resolution in favour of women's suffrage, showed that there was no mystery about the questions which came before Parliament which should put them beyond women's reach, and said that much ability was wasted on the exclusion of women from all share of government.—Miss Blackburn instanced the case of the refusal of the central authority to allow the election of a woman to the post of overseer of Stromness, notwithstanding the strong feeling of the inhabitants in her favour, and her peculiar fitness for the post, as an instance of the way in which women were injured by the inferior position in which they were placed.—Mr. Warr mentioned several cases which had lately occurred, in which women were denied the guardianship of their children, as a proof that their demand for the suffrage was based on a real need for the redress of their grievances.—Miss Lord also supported the resolution, which was carried unanimously.—Miss Davies, in proposing the usual vote of thanks, pointed out how often girls were merely forgotten in the case of endowments from the fact that women were so little before the public.—Mrs. W. Burbury read some amusing extracts from a sermon by Mr. Burgon, the late opponent of the Dean of Westminster's appointment as select preacher at Oxford, in which he complained of the horror, inconvenience, and discomfort he felt it was to men that women should be signing letters with their names in the newspapers and speaking on platforms, and expatiated on the advantage it was to women that they should enter religious sisterhoods, and descend in them into a nameless grave.—*Abridged from the Times*.

## BARNESLEY.

A public meeting was held on January 15, in the Mechanics' Hall, when Mrs. Ronniger gave an address on the Parliamentary Franchise for Women. There was a numerous and respectable attendance. Captain Bufham was called to the chair, and in a few words introduced the lecturer. After the delivery of the address, which was received with loud cheers, on the motion of Mr. Butcher, seconded by a gentleman in the body of the hall, a petition in favour of women's suffrage was unanimously adopted, and ordered to be forwarded for presentation to Parliament by the Yorkshire members. Cordial votes of thanks brought a very successful meeting to a close.—Our notice is abridged from the *Barnsley Chronicle*, which gave a good report of the lecture.

## DARLINGTON.

On January 16 a public meeting was held in the Mechanics' Hall, Darlington. There was a respectable audience. The chair was occupied by Mr. J. H. Bell, who introduced the lecturer, Mrs. Ronniger. The lecture was received with loud applause. A petition in favour of Mr. Jacob Bright's Bill was moved by a gentleman in the audience, seconded by Mr. Fisher, and unanimously adopted. The chairman proposed a vote of thanks to the lecturer, which was seconded by Mr. Clapham, and carried. Mrs. Ronniger briefly responded, and moved a vote of thanks to the chairman, which was seconded by Miss Sturge, of Birmingham, and carried by acclamation, after which the meeting separated.—*Abridged from the Northern Echo*.

## BATH.

## LARGE MEETING AT THE GUILDHALL.

On January 23rd, a large and influential meeting was held in the banqueting-room of the Guildhall, Bath, in connection with the movement to remove the electoral disabilities of women. There were present Miss Rhoda Garrett, Lady Anna Gore Langton (wife of the member for West Somerset), Miss Ashworth, Miss Liliash Ashworth, Miss Spender, Miss Agnes Garrett, Mr. J. Hulbert, the ex-Mayor (in the chair), Aldermen Hunt and Gore, Major Baker, Major Brickmann, Captain Lysaght, Rev. W. E. Littlewood, Messrs. F. D. Caillard, T. W. Gibbs, Roberts, Prendergast, Kemp, Robertson, R. Cook, J. L. Stothert, White, S. Butler, Theobald, Loder, Heywood, W. Hunt, Chibbon, Miss Bernard, Captain Hampden, Mrs. Littlewood, Miss Le Geyt, Mrs. Lascelles, Mrs. and Miss Stothert, Miss Collins, Mrs. Butler, Mrs. Gibbs, Miss Gore Langton, Miss Hamilton, Miss Rooke, Mrs. Wastell, Mrs. Theobald, Mrs. and Miss Cotterell, Miss Shum, Miss Fenwick, Miss Peach, and others.

The CHAIRMAN, upon rising, was received with loud applause. He said it afforded him very great pleasure to preside upon that occasion, because he most cordially supported the movement. The Legislature had not only given women a right to vote at school board elections, but they were given the right to vote for their own sex. The city of Bath had set a noble example in this respect. Not satisfied with one, it had two women on the school board. He did not think any would say the city had acted unwisely.

Alderman HUNT moved the first resolution as follows:—"That the exclusion of women, otherwise legally qualified, from voting in the election of members of Parliament, is injurious to those excluded, contrary to the principle of just representation, and to that of the laws now in force regulating the election of municipal, parochial, and other representative governments." Mr. Hunt supported the resolution with an able speech, but he was greatly interrupted towards the close, the audience being impatient to hear the ladies. They were soon gratified.

Lady ANNA GORE LANGTON rose amid cheering and applause. She said she cordially seconded the resolution. It had long been her sincere conviction that an injustice was committed in not giving the franchise to women so qualified that they would be able to vote had they been men. (Applause.) It had always been a principle of the British constitution for taxation and representation to go together, but so far as women were concerned that principle was not carried out. Was this fair, she would ask? (Cries of "No.") She believed there were three millions of women in this country earning their own livelihood, supporting their families, paying their rates and taxes, and contributing, by their industry, to the riches and well-being of their country; but none of these women could vote because of their sex. Sometimes when they asked for votes men told them that the franchise would take them away from their proper duties and employments, but she would ask them whether they found having a vote took them away from their proper employments. (Laughter and applause.) She would like to know whether sowing, ploughing, reaping, manufactures, and other occupations which men engaged in, were neglected because men once in five or six years exercised the privilege of voting. Men told women that their education did not fit them for public affairs, but had not machinery been put in motion to enable illiterates among men to vote? (Applause.) If, the speaker continued, she thought a woman would suffer either socially or morally by the franchise she would not have been there that night. Depend upon it the more trust was reposed in people the more they were awakened to a sense of responsibility—(applause)—and the more earnest and useful

their lives would be. She felt that poor, toiling women, with no one to help them, but struggling on in spite of physical weakness, should be raised by the franchise, and thus receive greater benefits of legislation. The speaker concluded by expressing her conviction that in course of time the Government, which had recognised the qualifications of women to vote in municipal elections and for school boards, would also extend to them the political franchise—only ask a thing in the name of justice, and it was seldom, if ever, asked in vain of Englishmen. (Loud applause.)

Miss RHODA GARRETT supported the resolution, and was received with cheers.

Miss SPENDER also supported the resolution. She observed that a great deal had been said about women, and what women ought to be, &c., but the time had now come for women to speak themselves, and they must either do it through the medium of the press or platform. A great many books had been written about women's sphere, women's influence, &c., how was it no books had been written about men's sphere and men's influence? (Laughter.) The reason she thought was this—men had been allowed to do everything they could do, to fill every sphere they could fill, while women had been allowed to do only what men liked them to do, or what men did not want to do themselves. (Laughter.) The song said "Men must work and women must weep;" but the fact was the women did quite half the work of the world besides all the weeping. (Loud laughter.) The common idea was that every woman was intended to be supported by some man, that is, she must either be, or destined to be, a wife and a mother; but as the last census proved that there are nearly a million more women in this country than men, how they could all become wives and mothers she did not exactly see. (Laughter.) It was said that politics were out of woman's sphere. What was this mysterious thing—woman's sphere? Miss Spender proceeded to show that woman's sphere was rather extensive since they were found as princesses and as charwomen, serving upon school boards and working in the fields, &c. A woman had been appointed the manager of a bank at Limerick, and another had lately been appointed a Poor-law inspector. (A waggish voice: "Serve her right"—loud laughter.) She was, however, not allowed to take part in the services of the Church, although many of the hymns sung in churches were written by women; she was not allowed to occupy the pulpit, although many wrote the sermons that were preached there. (Laughter.) Dr. Dalrymple had said that because some women had not done well at the Oxford Examination, women ought not to have the franchise. It was necessary therefore for women to pass a university examination in order to establish their right to vote, while men who could neither read nor write were allowed the privilege provided they possessed a tenement. It had been said that there was no warrant in the Bible for women to vote. In reply to this contention, she would ask whether there was anything about the abolition of purchase or vote by ballot in the Bible. (Laughter.) It would be very strange to her were there anything in the Bible about Parliamentary affairs at all. It had been the achievement of Christianity to raise women from the degraded condition in which the heathen natives had kept her. If the teaching of Christ were fully acted upon, women would become socially and politically the equals of men. (Applause.) Christ had never uttered a word which tended to place woman in an inferior position. The only woman he had reproved was Martha, and it was for devoting herself too much to domestic affairs. (Laughter and applause.) She trusted that God would see that they had spoken right, and would crown their endeavours with success. (Cheers.)

The resolution was carried by a large majority.

## LYME REGIS, DORSET.

Miss Craigen addressed a meeting in the British School Room, Lyme Regis—Mr. Henry Osborn in the chair—when a petition was adopted in favour of the Women's Disabilities Removal Bill.

## WIMBORNE, DORSET.

A meeting was held in the Town Hall, Wimborne, on January 7, which was well attended and drew much attention to the subject. Mr. Daniel Bollam presided, and Miss Craigen delivered an address. The petition from the meeting was voted unanimously, and a general petition from inhabitants of the town received fifty signatures in two days.

## POOLE.

A very crowded meeting was held on January 10th, in the Temperance Hall, Poole, Mr. George Curtis in the chair. Miss Craigen addressed the meeting. A petition in favour of Mr. Jacob Bright's Bill was carried unanimously, and a general petition to the same effect from inhabitants of the town was numerous and influentially signed and forwarded for presentation.

## THE POTTERIES.

## LONGTON.

A meeting was held in support of Mr. Jacob Bright's Bill to remove the Electoral Disabilities of Women, in the Town Hall, Longton, on January 20th, and was numerous attended. The chair was taken by Mr. J. Y. Carryer, in the absence of the Mayor, who it was stated was unable to attend.—Mr. W. Mayer proposed the usual resolution, which was seconded by Mr. G. E. Farmer, and supported by Mr. T. Hulme and the Rev. B. Glover, and passed unanimously.—The Rev. J. Whittles moved that petitions to both Houses of Parliament in favour of Mr. Jacob Bright's Bill be signed by the chairman on behalf of the meeting, and that the county and borough members be requested to support the same. He (Mr. Whittles) was sure that the movement was destined to triumph. It was not a party question. Conservatives had supported the Bill; and Mr. Gladstone had ceased his opposition, and probably would aid the movement before long. (Hear, hear.) The great Liberal party, to be consistent, must unite to carrying the movement to a successful issue. (Applause.)—Mr. T. Hawley seconded the resolution, which was supported by Miss Becker, of Manchester, and carried unanimously.—The meeting closed with votes of thanks to the deputation and the chairman.

## HANLEY.

The Hanley meeting, held in the Town Hall on January 21st, was called by the mayor in compliance with a requisition signed by a number of ratepayers. There was a large attendance, and the mayor (E. E. Bedley, Esq.) presided.—The Rev. D. Horne proposed, and Mr. A. Bevington seconded the first resolution, which was supported by Miss Becker and carried unanimously.—Mr. Gilman expressed his hearty concurrence in the movement for removing the electoral disability of women. He moved the adoption of petitions to both Houses of Parliament in favour of Mr. Jacob Bright's Bill, and also memorials to Colonel Roden and Mr. Melly, the borough members, praying the former to give his support and the latter to continue his support to the Bill.—Mr. Steventon seconded the motion, which was supported by the Rev. B. Glover and Mr. T. Hulme, and unanimously adopted.—Mr. G. Melly, M.P., who had just arrived at the meeting, then rose amidst applause, and, after a few introductory observations, made an effective speech, in the course of which he observed they were not going to deny to persons, intelligent and competent to vote, the right to exercise the franchise, their birthright, that

## YEovil, SOMERSET.

A public meeting was held in the Town Hall, Yeovil, on December 18, when Miss Craigen delivered an address, after which a petition in favour of Mr. Jacob Bright's Bill was voted unanimously, and signed on behalf of the meeting by the chairman, Mr. Samuel Ralls.

which they were logically and consistently bound to give them, simply because they could not rely upon their votes being recorded for any particular party. (Hear, hear.) Not so had he learnt the lesson given him by a Liberal education. (Hear, hear.) Nor was he quite sure that they were quite correct who judged that the votes of the ladies would be all given on the one side only. They were entering upon a new phase of political thought. The questions now before the constituencies were social questions, such as that of education and the expenditure in drink, which latter touched to the quick many women in England. The women, he believed, would, on the drink question, vote on the same side as himself. (Hear, hear.) He did not see why they should draw a line between the parliamentary and the municipal suffrage. (Applause.) He considered that ladies who were competent to take part in choosing municipal representatives, who were qualified to vote at school board contests, and even, as had been the case in more than one instance, to sit on school boards—ladies who had been thus privileged by the Legislature to take part in these frequently-recurring elections were competent to take part in the less frequent parliamentary elections. (Hear, hear.) It would be a gain if, by giving the ladies the franchise, they found that, as in the case of the slaves of America and the ratepayers in large towns, they changed the tone of legislation; for a great American statesman once said the slaves would never be free until they had the franchise, and the Duke of St. Albans at an agricultural meeting the other day said that the reason why the House of Commons had lately attended with such peculiar interest to questions touching borough populations was because by the Reform Bill the ratepayers were represented. He believed that when they were directly represented in the House of Commons greater attention would be given to those questions which more particularly touched the rights of women. (Hear, hear.) Already Parliament had protected the earnings of married women; but after English-women had votes how long would they be excluded from the Universities? How long would they be refused that which was the inherent right of every English man or woman? On the grounds that it was just, that it was logical, that it was expedient, that it would educate women electors themselves, that it would in some degree refine the House of Commons itself, he would accept the memorial and would vote again—he hoped he should not have to do many times—for the Bill of Mr. Jacob Bright for removing the electoral disabilities of women. (Applause.)—The usual votes of thanks were accorded, and the meeting closed.

#### NEWCASTLE-UNDER-LYME.

The meeting held in the Town Hall, Newcastle, on January 22nd, was not very largely attended, although before it concluded the room was nearly filled.—The Mayor (S. Hyslop, Esq.) presided, and in opening the proceedings, read a letter from Mr. W. S. Allen, M.P., which had been addressed to Miss Becker. Mr. Allen stated that he was unable to be present, owing to a prior engagement. He thoroughly sympathised with the praiseworthy efforts which Miss Becker was making to remove the electoral disabilities under which women laboured at the present time. He had always, when able to attend the House of Commons, voted for giving women the franchise, and should still continue to do so. (Applause.)—The Rev. B. Glover moved, and Mr. T. Hulme seconded, the first resolution, which was supported by the Rev. W. M. Beeby.—The resolution having been carried unanimously, Mr. Arthur Leech moved the adoption of petitions to Parliament in favour of Mr. Jacob Bright's Bill; also, to the borough members, asking that Sir Edmund Buckley would support the Bill, and that Mr. Allen would continue to deserve thanks for supporting the

measure.—Miss Becker seconded the resolution. She said before going to Newcastle she and her friends received warnings that it would not do to go there. Newcastle was represented as being a sort of dead-alive place, and it was said that nobody there would support the movement in favour of woman suffrage. But women were not easily frightened by such rumours, and she determined to see if she could not find some friends of women in the town. (Hear, hear.) She felt sure she could, and the unanimity with which the last resolution was passed showed that she was justified in her expectations. Newcastle people had done something for women. They had sent to Parliament a member (Mr. Allen) who had all along voted for the extension of the franchise to women. When the question was first brought forward, in 1867, by Mr. John Stuart Mill, Mr. Allen voted for it. (Hear, hear.) Since then he had supported Mr. Jacob Bright. She trusted that they would take care that Sir Edmund Buckley should walk into the right lobby when next the question came before the House of Commons. (Hear, hear.) Before the last Reform Bill was passed they were told working men did not want the franchise; but those who said so were ignorant of the wants of the majority of the working men. Before slavery in America was abolished, some pampered house slaves were contented with their lot; but that did not prevent the success of the anti-slavery movement. There were some women who had not sufficient intelligence to understand and value a vote, but women of eminence, headed by Florence Nightingale and Harriet Martineau, signed a petition in favour of women suffrage. (Applause.) Women not care for their rights! Some wives who said they did not care about women's political rights were those who took care that their husbands had no rights at all. (Laughter and applause.) Miss Becker resumed her seat amidst loud applause.—Mr. John Massey in a brief speech supported the resolution, which having been unanimously adopted, the meeting was closed with the usual votes of thanks.

The notices of the meetings at Longton, Hanley, and Newcastle, are abridged from the *Staffordshire Advertiser*, which as well as the *Staffordshire Sentinel*, contained good reports of them.

#### COLONEL RODEN, M.P., ON WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE.

On the day after the women's suffrage meeting at Hanley Messrs. Melly and Roden appeared before their constituents in the Town Hall, Hanley, to deliver their customary annual addresses. Mr. Melly had expressed his sentiments as to the removal of the electoral disabilities of women on the previous evening. After the addresses a number of questions were asked of both members. We extract the following from the *Staffordshire Sentinel*:—"Mr. Wood, after expressing himself generally satisfied with the terms in which the two members had expressed themselves that evening, handed to Mr. Roden a memorial adopted at a meeting held in Hanley on the previous evening in favour of the women's suffrage movement (with the sentiments of which Mr. Melly had, at the meeting, expressed concurrence), and asked the hon. member if he were prepared to support the same. (Laughter.)—Mr. Roden said in reply that if he had been at the meeting on the previous evening he might possibly have been charmed by the fair speakers into compliance with the terms of the memorial. At present he regarded the question as a very important one, and all he could say was that possibly the time might come when he should be converted to a supporter of the movement. At any rate the ladies should have a fair chance of converting him. (Laughter.)—The Mayor: Then upon my word they will. (More laughter.)—Mr. Roden continuing, said that at present, as their representative, he felt that he had not gone sufficiently far into the

#### THE PROPERTY OF MARRIED WOMEN.

COURT OF QUEEN'S BENCH, JANUARY 11.

(Sittings in Banco, before the Lord Chief Justice, and Justices Mellor, Lush, and Archibald.)

DIGGES V. GADDERER.

The plaintiff, Mrs. Digges, was a married woman, living apart from her husband, and the present proceeding was upon an interpleader issue to try whether certain goods seized by the Sheriff of Middlesex belonged to Mrs. Digges or to her husband, against whom the execution was. At the trial before the late Mr. Justice Willes, the plaintiff stated that in 1865 she married Mr. Deleware Digges, who called himself a teacher of billiards. He left her in June, 1868, and she had not lived with him since. After the desertion she returned to the Haymarket Theatre, where she had been previously employed. She also taught the piano, and sometimes worked with a sewing machine. The furniture which had been seized was her own, and her husband did not in any way contribute to the purchase of it. Most of the things had been given to her, or purchased with money given to her by gentlemen who frequented the theatre and admired her dancing. At the trial the verdict was for the plaintiff, but the question now was, whether a rule should be made absolute to enter a verdict for the defendant.

Mr. PEARCE appeared to show cause against the rule; and Mr. HUDDLESTON, Q.C., and Mr. OPPENHEIM to support it.

Mr. PEARCE mentioned to the Court that since the trial the plaintiff had obtained a protection order, and he argued that this would have relation back so as to bar any claim made through the husband, even before it was granted. He further contended that the goods belonged to the wife under the Married Women's Property Act, notwithstanding that the things were gifts, and had not been bought out of her "earnings."

Mr. Justice BREIT: And even supposing that there had been any improper motives for the "gifts," such motives would probably not have existed but for the husband's desertion. Could he, under such circumstances, acquire property in such "gifts"?

Mr. PEARCE submitted not, and argued that in equity the plaintiff had a right to the furniture. The Married Women's Property Act gave protection to any wages and earnings of any married woman acquired in any employment, occupation, or trade in which she was engaged, and any money or property acquired through any literary, artistic, or scientific skill.

Mr. Justice BREIT: But the question was whether "gifts" were protected.

Mr. PEARCE submitted that they were; but added that he relied more upon the order of protection, and upon the equitable right of the plaintiff.

Mr. HUDDLESTON contended that the protection order could not now be brought forward to interfere with a verdict previously found in a superior Court. It still remained with their lordships to say whether the things acquired by the plaintiff in the way which had been mentioned were her lawful "property" within the statute. She said that one gentleman had given her £60, but such a sum could not be given on mere admiration of her talents.

Mr. Justice KEATING: Can we take judicial notice of that?

The LORD CHIEF JUSTICE: Or can we take your own evidence upon the point? (Laughter.)

Mr. HUDDLESTON repeated his argument that the Legislature never intended to protect property obtained in the way this had been.

The LORD CHIEF JUSTICE believed that it was for the interest

subject, but he thought the adoption of female suffrage would open a very wide door. He did not mean to say that he was not as fond of the ladies as any one present—(laughter)—but he thought he should have to wait a short time until he had heard some of those really beautiful creatures whom he believed were speaking on the previous night before he was induced to change his mind. (Hear, hear, and applause.)

The reply of Colonel Roden is a remarkable manifestation of the frivolous temper with which members of Parliament permit themselves to deal with the gravest questions affecting women. When the 616 women householders of Hanley obtain their due share of political influence under a Household Suffrage Bill, their representative will find it to his interest to assume a more respectful attitude towards them.

#### MR. OTWAY, M.P., ON WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE.

At a meeting of his constituents, at Chatham, last month, Mr. Otway, in replying to a string of questions from Mr. Buckhurst, promised that if a measure were brought in this year for the enfranchisement of women householders he would vote for it. Mr. Otway has never voted against the Bill, but he has not hitherto recorded a vote in its favour.

#### THE HON. AUBERON HERBERT, M.P., ON INDUSTRIAL DISABILITIES FOR WOMEN.

At the Trades' Congress at Leeds, on January 15th, the Nine Hours' Bill for women and children in factories was discussed. In the course of the discussion, the Hon. Auberon Herbert, M.P., said that he heartily went with them as regarded the children. As regarded the whole childhood of this country, they could not take too great a care of it. But he had to stop there. As soon as they came to enter upon the case of women, they got to a very large question. His belief was that they injured the women, who were very largely employed in the trade of this country, by giving them any special protection, as much as they would injure them if they pursued the same course in regard to them. It was his deep, settled conviction that no part of the industry of this country could be in a satisfactory condition until it had learned to protect itself. (Hear, hear.)

#### CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the Women's Suffrage Journal.

Dear Madam,—Allow me to call your attention to the following extract from the *Scotsman*, of January 15:—"In the East Lethan Colliery, Saline, men being, like others, on strike, by order of the Union, some of their wives, who appeared to have more sense than their husbands, asked the proprietor, Mr. W. Fraser, junr., to be allowed to go down a pit to make some money for the support of their families, stating that they neither cared for the Union nor their husbands if they could make something for the children; it being illegal to allow women to work in the mines of course he refused." Now, I by no means contend that mining is a sort of work desirable for women, but I do maintain that it is the grossest of oppression for a Government, in which women are wholly unrepresented, to pass a decree debarring women from engaging in any branch of industry which may lie between them and starvation. We have heard of a sensitive member of Parliament who was greatly shocked to see women smoking at pit-heads, yet such tender-hearted gentlemen can survey, unmoved, the spectacle of mothers, willing and able to work, condemned by the decrees of a masculine Government, to sit in empty houses destitute of food and fire, and to exercise women's patience in watching their children perish through want.—Yours &c.,

Balgonie, 16th Jan., 1873.

ISABELLA STUART.

of both parties that some arrangement should be come to, and he suggested that the produce of the sale of the furniture, about £40, which was in Court, should be equally divided between the plaintiff and the defendant.

The matter stood over to enable this suggestion to be considered.

**A CURIOUS CASE.—WOMEN'S RIGHTS AND WRONGS.**—Elizabeth Sykes, of Earlsheaton, factory operative, appeared on Thursday, at the County Court, Dewsbury, as plaintiff in an action against Henry Rylah, of the same place, formerly a boarding-house keeper at Blackpool. The claim was for wages due as a servant at Blackpool and for furniture sold, and plaintiff gave evidence in support.—Mr. Chadwick, who was for the defendant, cross-examined Sykes, and ascertained that she was a married woman, but that her husband had emigrated ten years ago, and was in America.—The Judge said that if she had not heard from him for that time, the presumption of law was that he was dead.—Plaintiff, in reply to Mr. Chadwick, said she heard from him about three years since, and the learned gentleman thereupon asked his honour how she could recover. She had not the consent of her husband to bring this action, and he could not be made responsible for costs.—The Judge said he was inclined to hold that she could, but at the conclusion of a long legal argument, in which the registrar stated his view, his honour gave way, but asked why such an objection should be taken?—The Registrar said the defendant might waive it.—Mr. Chadwick said he would do so, and take it that plaintiff was a *femme sole*, and he was proceeding to deal with the facts when his honour interposed, and said it was no use going on, the plaintiff had no legal right to sue, and he must order a nonsuit.—Plaintiff, who appeared somewhat at a loss to understand what had been going on, left the box, but returning soon afterwards, asked upon what terms she could re-enter the case.—The Judge told her she would have to obtain a letter from her husband, authorising her to sue the defendant.—*Dewsbury Reporter*, January 11th, 1873.

### COMMITTEES.

#### RUTHERGLEN, RENFREWSHIRE.

Mr. and Mrs. Aitkin	Miss Baker
Miss Aitkin	Rev. W. F. Stevenson
Mr. Adams	Baillie and Mrs. Scoular
Mrs. Baker	Mr. Warnock
	The Provost, <i>Convener</i> .

#### GIRVAN, AYRSHIRE.

Rev. D. Chapman	Mr. John Lusk
Mr. Andrew Crawford	Mr. John Lawson
Mr. W. McCreath	Mr. Bryce Wright
	Mr. W. R. Marshall, Ailsa Cottage, <i>Convener</i> .

#### STRACHUR, ARGYLLSHIRE.

Mrs. Anderson	Rev. J. Lauder
Rev. H. Macdonald	Mrs. Macdonald
	Mrs. Hamilton, The Cottage, St. Catherines, <i>Hon. Sec.</i>

#### HELENSBURGH.

Miss Anderson	Mr. and Mrs. McMicking
Mrs. Drew	Miss Wrie
Mr. W. Drysdale	Miss Wilson
	Miss Drew, Shawfield, <i>Treasurer</i> .
	Councillor Cramb, } <i>Hon. Secretaries</i> .
	R. D. Orr, Esq., }

#### CARDIFF.

John Cory, Esq.	Rev. A. Tilly
Richard Cory, Esq.	Mrs. Tilly
Rev. J. Waite	Mrs. Chester
Mrs. Waite	Miss Chester
	Miss Jenner, Nenvoe Cottage, <i>Hon. Sec.</i>
	Rev. H. Chester, Canton, <i>Assistant Sec.</i>

#### HASTINGS AND ST. LEONARDS.

Miss Aviolet	Mrs. E. J. Hawkes
Miss Bird	Mrs. Edward Perkins
Mrs. Bonus	Mr. Wm. Ransom
Rev. J. A. Briggs	Rev. H. Robinson
Mr. T. H. Cole, M.A.	Mrs. Samworth
Mr. B. Cullwick	Miss Samworth
F. Cumming, M.D.	Archibald Shaw, M.D.
Mrs. Duff	Mrs. Archibald Shaw
Miss Dunk	Rev. Halley Stewart
Mr. A. W. Elliott	Mrs. Halley Stewart
Mr. W. W. Fawcett	Mr. J. Stewart
Mrs. W. W. Fawcett	Mrs. J. Stewart
Captain Fawcett, R.N.	Mrs. Charles Thornely
Miss Gould	Rev. W. Wooding, B.A.
Mr. E. J. Hawkes	
Mr. John Stewart, West Hill, Hastings, <i>Chairman</i> .	
Mrs. Archibald Shaw, 33, Marina, St. Leonards, <i>Treasurer</i> .	
Mrs. W. W. Fawcett, Hollington Park, Hastings, } <i>Hon. Secs.</i>	
Mr. E. J. Hawkes, 74, High Street, Hastings, }	

#### BRIGHTON.

Dr. Buchanan	Miss Erskine Holland
Mrs. Bowyer	Miss Gibbs
W. Bowyer, Esq.	Miss Brown
Miss Hill	Miss E. L. Brown, <i>Hon. Sec.</i>
Miss Hopkins	Sir J. Cordy Burrows
Mrs. Haycraft	F. Shirley Woolmer, Esq.
Miss Bligh	W. Wood, Esq.
Miss Garnett	Miss Slatter
E. Carpenter, Esq.	Miss J. Boucherett, Delegate
Mrs. Carpenter	J. Robertson, Esq.
Miss Carpenter	Mrs. Robertson
F. Merrifield, Esq.	J. E. Mayall, Esq.
Mrs. Merrifield, Treasurer	Miss Barnard
Mrs. A. A. Rutton	Dr. Ackworth
Rev. G. Lamotte	Miss Burgess
Mrs. Edelman	Professor Fawcett, M.P.
Rev. J. M. Fincher	Mrs. Fawcett
	Miss E. L. Brown, 92, Montpellier Road, <i>Hon. Sec.</i>
	Mrs. Merrifield, <i>Treasurer</i> .

#### BEDFORD.

Miss Helen Coombs, Mill Street, *Hon. Sec.*

#### CROYDON.

Mr. Edward Berry	Mrs. Moore
Mrs. C. Balfour	Mr. Gavin Ness
Mrs. Crafton	Mr. Prout Newcombe
Miss Fearn	Mr. W. Moss Robinson
Mr. Wm. Malleson	Rev. T. W. Sharpe
Mrs. Wm. Malleson	Rev. Rudolph Suffield
Mr. Henry Moore	
	Mrs. Prout Newcombe, Park Hill Road, <i>Treasurer</i> .
	Miss Ramsay, 21, The Waldrons, <i>Hon. Sec.</i>

#### DEAL AND SANDWICH.

Mrs. Bartram	Miss Brown
Mrs. E. Brown	Mrs. E. Apps
Mrs. Josiah Bayley	Miss Stubberfield
Mrs. J. Apps	Mrs. Talford
Mrs. John Bayley	Rev. Dr. Hillier
Mrs. W. Fells	Mr. Nash
	Rev. J. Bartram, 2, Claremont Villas, Deal, <i>Hon. Sec.</i>

### MEMORIALS TO MR. GLADSTONE AND MR. DISRAELI.

The following Memorials are in course of signature by women in various parts of the country. Friends are earnestly exhorted to aid in the work of collecting signatures. It is not necessary that a large number of names should come from any one district, but in order to make it truly national it is necessary that a large number of places in all parts of the United Kingdom should be represented.

To the Right Hon. WILLIAM EWART GLADSTONE, M.P., First Lord of Her Majesty's Treasury.

The Memorial of the undersigned Women, from various districts of the United Kingdom—

Respectfully sheweth—

That the basis of representation in this country being a household or property qualification, as well for imperial as for local government, it is anomalous and unjust that the franchise annexed to such qualification should when the same is possessed by a woman become lapsed or suspended as regards imperial government, while no such disability exists in relation to local government.

That the imperial vote is of much more importance to women than the local vote, not only because the burdens of imperial taxation are heavier than those imposed by local authority, but also because in local government both sexes are treated absolutely alike, being dealt with as ratepayers, and not as men and women; while the imperial parliament deals with them in a different manner. It makes one set of laws for men, and another for women, and thus in various important particulars women obtain much less than justice under legal and social arrangements.

That your Memorialists have noticed the result of the extension of the franchise in legislation with regard to other portions of the people, and have observed that the middle classes and the working classes have been consulted more assiduously and that their interests have been better cared for than was the case before they became possessed of electoral power, and your Memorialists believe that the same results would follow in regard to women after the removal of the disability which now precludes them from voting in the election of Members of Parliament.

Your Memorialists hold that the legal inequalities from which women suffer are greater and more grievous than those which were borne by other classes of the community before these obtained political power. Women have to complain of want of the means of education; want of liberty to engage in honourable and lucrative professions; want of opportunities of earning the means of subsistence; want of security for the possession of their property—their tenure being forfeited by marriage; want of right to the guardianship of their children—the rights of mothers being, according to the ruling of the judges, *nil*, even after the death of the father; want of sufficient protection to their persons from violence and ill-treatment. These and other grievances and hardships, directly arising out of the existing state of the law, afford instances of the misgovernment which has been exercised towards women; and your Memorialists represent that the only security for good government, either for women or men, is that the governed shall be consulted in electing the Government and making the laws.

That the returns which have been made respecting the exercise of the municipal franchise prove that the number of men and women who vote in municipal elections bears a just proportion to the number of each on the register. Therefore there is every reason to believe that the same rule would hold good in Parliamentary elections, and that the existing disability imposes an injurious restriction on large numbers of duly qualified women, who, but for this legal bar, would as freely and peaceably exercise their electoral rights in Parliamentary as they now do in municipal elections.

That the personal intervention of women in public elections is a practice sanctioned by ancient law, by immemorial usage, and by recent legislation in regard to municipal and school board elections, and that the alteration lately made in the manner of conducting such elections takes away any excuse for the withholding of electoral rights from women which could be founded on the neglect of the Legislature to ensure such conditions of peace and order as would enable them to record their votes with security.

That the sanction given by the Administration of which you are the head to the principle that women ought to share in the government of the country, by supporting the extension of the municipal franchise, and by granting both the franchise in the election of and the right of sitting at School Boards to women, leads them to hope that the same Administration will support the proposal to remove the last remaining electoral disability of women—the only electoral disability imposed by British law on any class of citizens not under legal incapacity to exercise other civil rights.

Wherefore your Memorialists pray that you, on behalf of Her Majesty's Government, will give your support to the Bill now before the House of Commons, entitled, "A Bill to Remove the Electoral Disabilities of Women."

To the Right Hon. BENJAMIN DISRAELI, M.P.

The Memorial of the undersigned Women of various districts in the United Kingdom—

Respectfully sheweth—

That the basis of representation in this country being a household or property qualification as well for imperial as for local government, it is anomalous and unjust that the franchise annexed to such qualification should, when the same is possessed by a woman, become lapsed or suspended as regards imperial government, while no such disability exists in relation to local government.

That the aforesaid disability, by depriving a considerable portion of the property, the industry, and the intelligence of the country of all direct representation, is injurious both to the persons excluded and to the nation.

That the Representation of the People Act, 1867, has been described by yourself and others of high authority, as an Act by which the Legislature gave, and intended to give the franchise to every household rated to the relief of the poor. But this description cannot now be termed accurate, inasmuch as by the ruling of the judges in the Court of Common Pleas in 1868, about one-seventh of the householders in every borough were adjudged to be out of the pale of representation, although they paid rates equally with the rest, and were subjected to the personal obligations imposed by the rate-paying clauses, for which the vote conferred by other clauses of the Act was confessedly offered as an equivalent.

That in virtue of this decision large numbers of householders and ratepayers in every district were excluded from the franchise. In Bath there were 1,408, being one-quarter of the ratepayers of the city; in Birmingham, about 6,000; in Bradford, 3,436; in Manchester, upwards of 9,000; in Nottingham, 2,031; in Salford, 3,328; in York, 1,191, and a proportionate number in other places.

That your Memorialists gratefully recognise the services you have rendered to the cause of just and constitutional representation by speaking in the House of Commons, in 1866, in favour of giving votes to women having the property qualification, and by voting in favour of the Women's Disabilities Removal Bill. This support has greatly encouraged their efforts, and strengthened their hands in pressing their claim on public attention and on the consideration of the House of Commons.

Your Memorialists pray that you will further aid the cause of just representation by giving to the Bill to remove the electoral disabilities of women the weight of your advocacy when next it shall be brought before the House of Commons, and your support as leader of the Conservative party in influencing votes in its favour. They respectfully suggest that by taking such a course you would assist in completing, in a truly constitutional manner, that great and beneficent measure of reform based on household suffrage, with which your name must ever be associated in the annals of the country.

The Memorials to be signed by women only, with full Christian and Surname. Both Memorials may be signed by the same person. Women may sign them who have already signed the petition to the House of Commons, and those who sign them may afterwards sign the Parliamentary petition. Forms for signature will be forwarded by post on application to the office of the Manchester National Society for Women's Suffrage, by letter, addressed to Miss Becker, 28, Jackson's Row, Albert Square, Manchester. The sheets when signed should be returned to Miss Becker, at the above address, as soon as possible.

### TAXATION AND NON-REPRESENTATION.

To the Editor of the *Women's Suffrage Journal*.

Dear Madam,—Will you oblige me by finding a corner in your columns for the accompanying protest, which I have to-day handed to my tax-collector?—Yours truly,  
R. A. H.  
27th January, 1873.

"To the Collector of Taxes, Hendon, Middlesex.

"I again decline this year, as I did last, to pay the Queen's taxes; with the object of making the strongest protest in my power against the unjust exclusion of women householders from Parliamentary representation."



MANCHESTER NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR  
WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE.

SUBSCRIPTIONS RECEIVED DURING JANUARY.

	£	s.	d.
Mrs. W. Haslam .....	5	0	0
Mrs. P. A. Hanrott .....	2	2	0
Professor Newman .....	2	0	0
Mr. J. Hinde Palmer, M.P. ....	1	1	0
Mr. H. Nicol .....	1	1	0
"Omega" .....	1	1	0
Miss Briggs .....	1	1	0
Mr. Thomas Hulme .....	1	1	0
Miss Dora Thomson .....	1	0	0
Mrs. Mills .....	0	10	6
Rev. J. Black .....	0	10	0
Mrs. Bingham .....	0	10	0
Misses Oxley .....	0	5	0
Mrs. Mylne .....	0	5	0
Mrs. Meeke .....	0	5	0
Mr. T. Gasquoine .....	0	5	0
Miss Amy Gurney .....	0	2	6
Mrs. Halliday .....	0	2	6
Miss B. Blackburn .....	0	2	6
	£18	5	0

S. ALFRED STEINTHAL,

107, Upper Brook-street, Manchester.

CENTRAL COMMITTEE.

Subscriptions and Donations received from December 20th, 1872, to January 20th, 1873, by the Central Committee of the National Society for Women's Suffrage, 9, Berners Street, London, W.

	Donations.			Subscriptions.		
	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Miss Caroline Williams .....	5	0	0	5	0	0
Mr. Wm. Tally .....				1	1	0
Mr. W. C. Cazalet .....	10	0	0	5	0	0
Miss Hall .....				2	2	0
Mrs. Flint .....				0	2	0
Mr. and Mrs. Curtis .....				0	2	0
Mrs. Muller .....				0	1	0
Mrs. Holbrook .....				0	2	6
Miss Nicholson .....	0	10	0			
Miss Hope .....	1	0	0			
Mrs. Olivier .....	1	0	0			
Mrs. Mylne .....				1	1	0
Mr. Geo. Palmer .....	5	0	0			
Mr. Wm. Pare .....				0	5	0
Miss M. W. Dunlop .....				0	10	0
Miss Amy Gurney .....				0	2	6
Miss H. Blackburn .....				0	5	0
Miss S. Lewen .....				0	2	0
Professor Newman .....	3	0	0	2	0	0
Mr. W. B. Haynes .....				0	1	0
"A Friend," per Mrs. Jacob Bright .....	100	0	0			
Mr. and Mrs. William Hargreaves .....	20	0	0			
Miss Champ .....	0	10	0			
Mrs. Nichol .....	5	0	0			
Mr. H. Nichol .....				1	1	0
Miss Bonns .....				0	5	0
Mrs. Dunville .....				1	1	0
Miss E. L. M. Praed .....				2	0	0
Miss C. E. Babb .....				1	1	0
Mrs. Haslam .....				0	5	0
Mr. Mark E. Marsden .....	5	0	0			
Mr. Percy W. Bunting .....				1	1	0
Mrs. Robberds .....				1	0	0
Mrs. Griffiths .....				0	10	0
Miss Briggs .....				0	10	0
Mrs. Hamilton Fletcher .....				2	0	0
Mrs. W. Pearson .....				1	0	0
Mr. F. C. Banks .....				0	5	0
Miss H. Rigbye .....				1	1	0
	£156	0	0	£30	17	0
	30	17	0			
	£186	17	0			

Miss CAROLINE ASHURST BIGGS, } Honorary  
Miss AGNES GARRETT, } Secretaries.

PETITION! PETITION! PETITION!  
Friends of Women's Suffrage are earnestly exhorted to aid the cause by collecting signatures for the petitions. Written petitions ready for signature, and printed forms for the collection of additional signatures will be supplied on application to Miss BECKER, 28, Jackson's Row, Albert Square, Manchester.

VIGILANCE ASSOCIATION FOR THE DEFENCE OF  
PERSONAL RIGHTS.

TREASURER'S REPORT.

	£	s.	d.
"Three Friends" .....	10	0	0
Mr. Joseph Edmondson .....	5	0	0
Miss Lucy Wilson .....	2	0	0
Mrs. Ord .....	1	1	0
Mr. H. Nicol .....	1	1	0
Miss Mary Carpenter .....	1	1	0
Mrs. Finch .....	0	10	0
Mrs. Claypole .....	0	5	0
Mrs. Haslam .....	0	5	0
Mr. H. B. Wishart .....	0	2	6
"A Stranger" .....	0	2	6

£21 8 0

LYDIA E. BECKER, Treasurer.

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

A LADY POOR-LAW INSPECTOR.—The Local Government Board is reported to have appointed Mrs. Nassau Senior as one of its inspectors, at a salary of £400 a year, for the purpose of looking after the domiciles and the treatment of children who are boarded out.—*Lancet*.

The *Orient* of Vienna announces that the Princess Dora d'Istria, one of the most "spirituelle" women of the century, has been appointed honorary president of the Association of Greek Ladies for the Education of Women.

BLACKROCK.

On January 16th, a large and fashionable meeting was held at Blackrock, when Mrs. Arthur Arnold read a paper on the claims of women to the franchise. The chair was taken by General Sir Arthur Phayre, K.C.B. Miss Robertson gave an address, in the course of which she stated that the city and county of Dublin had sent several largely-signed petitions, including one remarkable petition signed by five hundred persons in one street in the city. Petitions in favour of women's suffrage were signed on behalf of the meeting by the chairman, who warmly sympathised with the cause.—*Abridged from the Saunders' News Letter*.

FIFTH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE MANCHESTER  
NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE,  
presented at the Annual General Meeting, on November 6th,  
1872. In coloured cover, price 6d.

WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE JOURNAL. Edited by LYDIA E.  
BECKER.—Volume II., January to December, 1872.—In  
coloured cover, price, post free, 1s. 10d.

London: Trübner and Co., Paternoster Row.  
Manchester: A. Ireland and Co.

Communications for the Editor and orders for the Journal may be addressed to 28, Jackson's Row, Albert Square, Manchester. Price post free for one year, One Shilling and Sixpence.

Printed by A. IRELAND & Co., Pall Mall, Manchester, for the MANCHESTER NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE, and Published by Messrs. Trübner and Co., Paternoster Row, London.—February 1, 1873.