

WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE JOURNAL.

EDITED BY LYDIA E. BECKER.

VOL. VI.—No. 68. PUBLISHED MONTHLY.
REGISTERED FOR TRANSMISSION ABROAD.

OCTOBER 1, 1875.

PRICE ONE PENNY.
By Post THREE HALFPENCE.

PARLIAMENT out of session has begun its autumnal utterances, and although it seems no more disposed than Parliament in session to concern itself directly with the interests of the unrepresented half of the people, it is not possible to read the speeches without finding matter for suggestive reflection in connection with the political and social condition of women.

When members make speeches about the people generally, and when they endeavour to induce them to raise themselves in the political, educational, or social scale, they usually appear to intend that their remarks shall be taken as words from men to men and for men. They do not seem to suppose that women who read their speeches will take them to themselves. Yet a large and constantly increasing number of thoughtful women who read newspapers quietly take as addressed to them, equally with men, those exhortations to strive for more political freedom, more education, and more full and developed lives which are so often urged on public attention.

Mr. GLADSTONE, after laying the foundation stone of King's School, Chester, last month, said, in the course of a speech on middle-class education: "There is an old saying that where God sent mouths He sent food to fill them, and where He sends minds He sends work for those minds to do." Minds are sent to women as well as to men, and there is work in the State for their minds as well as for the minds of men. Women are asking for this work, and for the education which shall fit their minds to do it, and the conscience of the nation is beginning to be slowly awakened to the wrong that has been done in withholding this education from the minds that are craving for it.

Mr. FORSTER said that in dealing with pauperism and its causes he desired to consider how far they could rightly bring in the power of compulsion. On the one hand they were told, "Here are great evils—you can only remedy them by compelling people to do, or not to do, something." On the other hand it was urged, "England is a free country; you sit in the House of Commons on that ground alone, and from you, as the representatives of a free people, the word 'compulsion' should be heard as

little as possible. It was an exceedingly difficult problem and there was no general rule for it. Every case had to be decided on its merits, but the principle that ought to guide them was that, if they had made up their minds that there was any one thing which it was the business of Parliament to compel Englishmen to do, they must not be over squeamish, but apply the law of compulsion. A parent owed duties to his child. He must, in the first place, feed and clothe his child. That was a duty which he must be made to perform. Then a parent was not at liberty to work his child quite independently of that child's power to work: hence our factory laws. Then we were coming to the belief that it was a parent's duty to see that his child had mental food as well as bodily, and that the State should say to him, "If you won't do it without compulsion, it is our business to say that you must, and you shall do it." That was an interference with the freedom of Englishmen for which he thought English feeling was ready. As to what should be done with regard to adults, the ground was more debateable. Parliament, last session, became excited on the question as to whether a sailor, who was supposed to be a free man, should be able to enter into a contract with a shipowner to sail in exactly such ship as the shipowner pleased. He had come to the conclusion that the sailor should not be allowed so to do. That conclusion involved some attack on the so-called freedom of Englishmen; but it was inevitable; the practical evils were so great that Parliament was driven to it. Although he was a citizen of a free country, a sailor had not that amount of personal power in considering whether he should go into one ship or another which enabled him to decide not to go into one which was manifestly unsafe. Therefore Parliament said, "The law must come in to protect him." There was a somewhat similar interference with the freedom of bargaining in the Artisans' Dwellings Act. One would have said that a free Englishman ought to be allowed to build any kind of house, and let it to any person who was willing to take it, and that the person taking it ought to be allowed to live in it if he pleased unmolested. Yet he was quite prepared to say that he would have made the Act in question even stronger than

it was. No one would deny that was an interference with the freedom of one man to contract with another. But the line must be drawn somewhere in this argument. Parliament had no right to say to a man, however much they might advise him to do it, "You shall save," or, "If you save, you shall do it prudently." If they attempted that, they would probably do more harm than good; for men would rely on their endeavours, which would be fruitless, and the great hope of success in this matter—the sense and effort of the individual himself—would probably be much less than it was at this moment.

We have quoted these remarks in order to point out that it would have been neither just nor practicable to have imposed these restrictions on the so-called freedom of Englishmen, unless they had a voice in electing the Legislature which imposes them. Englishmen submit to them because the laws are made by their responsible representatives, and because the very persons who are the subjects of this restrictive and compulsory legislation are themselves voters. But when men make compulsory laws for women while they deny to women a voice in the election of the Legislature which composes them, they are exercising despotic government, though they may seek to blind themselves to the evils of despotism by the cover of "benevolent intentions."

The conclusion of Mr. FORSTER'S speech was an earnest appeal to every working man *and woman* to strive for

—The glorious privilege
Of being independent.

But in a free country there can be neither freedom nor independence for any class which is deprived of political rights.

"To him that hath shall be given" is a proposition the truth of which is constantly demonstrated when the relative rights and duties of men and women come before the Legislature or the Law Courts. One of the latest illustrations of this is to be seen in the judgments on two cases recently decided in the Lambeth Police Court. In the first case a woman was charged with violently assaulting her husband with a poker. The magistrate observed that husbands were often sent to prison for assaulting their wives, and he was bound to afford to husbands when assaulted *the same* protection as he did to wives. He committed the woman to prison with hard labour for *two* months. The next case was that of a man charged with a violent assault on his wife. He kicked her on the side when she was undressed, putting her to great pain. Her son came to her assistance and prevented further violence.

The same magistrate sentenced the man to *one* month's imprisonment with hard labour. There appeared to have been no provocation whatever in either case for the assault; but in the first case the husband, after receiving one blow, appeared to have been able to ward off the second, and to defend himself by his own unaided efforts; and in the second case the assistance of the victim's son was necessary to protect her from further violence. Yet the woman receives twice as heavy a penalty as the man.

We may suppose that some difference in the circumstances of each case, other than the sex of the party claiming the protection of the law, caused the difference in the sentences, although women who commit offences against men are usually much more severely condemned than men who commit similar offences against women; but we think that the assertion of the magistrate, that he was bound to give to husbands, when assaulted, *the same* protection as he did to wives, deserves some comment.

Without touching on the question as to which, all things considered, is the "weaker sex," we may safely assert that the rule is that which appeared in the cases at Lambeth, namely, that husbands are more able to protect themselves when assaulted than wives are, especially when wives are about to become mothers; therefore, if each party receives only "the same" measure of legal protection, the actual protection enjoyed by husbands and wives is not the same. We learn from Euclid that when equals are added to unequals the results are unequal; and if we apply this axiom to the foregoing instances, or to the typical case of the blacksmith who allowed his wife to beat him because he said it pleased her and did him no harm, we shall perceive that the same measure of legal protection to each party would not meet the exigencies of justice in such instances. It would be either superfluous for the husband or inadequate for the wife, and in either case injustice would be done to the weaker person. If the blacksmith had taken to beating his wife, although it might have pleased him, she would not have said that it did her no harm, and from such harm the law as it stands does not afford wives adequate protection.

This inequality or inefficiency of the law for the protection of women from violent assaults receives daily illustration in the columns of the newspaper press, and cries aloud in vain for redress in the deaf ears of our legislators.

THE silent revolution in the domestic, industrial, and social condition of women which is being brought about by the changed and changing conditions of modern life, receives

fresh demonstration with every statistical return bearing on the general condition of the people. We reprint two able articles from Edinburgh newspapers, which we commend to the attention of our readers. We learn that according to the census of 1871 there were in England 1,319,903 unmarried women between the ages of twenty and fifty. As the total number of women between these ages, married and unmarried, was 3,504,357; we have the startling fact that two out of every five women in the prime of life are unmarried. No doubt many of these women will at some period of their lives marry, but although a woman may maintain herself by marriage, she cannot maintain herself by waiting for marriage; it is, therefore, necessary that some means of earning a living should be open to women who are not, and who possibly may never be married.

Mr. GLADSTONE said in the House of Commons in 1871, that the old law of the human race—the law under which to the woman falls the domestic portion of duty, the care of the household, and to the man the procuring of subsistence, is one which the return of every census shows to be undergoing a serious modification. The number of self-depending women is increasing year by year, especially in the great towns of the country. He went on to say with reference to this condition of things, that women obtain much less than justice under social arrangements. He scarcely ever saw in the hands of a woman an employment that ought more naturally to be in the hands of a man, but he constantly saw in the hands of a man employment which might be more beneficially and economically in the hands of a woman.

Since these words were spoken, the Legislature has curtailed the employments open to women, and has restricted their freedom of action and contract in some of those still left free to them; and more of this starvation legislation is threatened at the instance of men who fear the competition of women in the labour market.

The reports of the factory inspectors show a constantly increasing proportion of women and young people under 18 years of age, and a constantly decreasing proportion of adult men engaged in the cotton trade. Therefore, in the great staple trade of Lancashire, the old notion of the man being the breadwinner is fast becoming a social fiction. Mr. REDGRAVE calls the increased and increasing employment of women in factories a "new evil." But spinning and weaving have been special employments for women ever since cloth was made. So long as these occupations were domestic, and brought in little or no pay,

women might toil at them for ever without interference from men. Up to the last century every thread woven by the people was spun by the fingers of women; even now the law calls every unmarried woman a "spinster." What is new is that women do their spinning and weaving in factories, and are paid for it, instead of doing it at home for little or no pay. "A fair day's wages for a fair day's work" has long been the rallying cry of working men, and is now taken up, with equal reason, by working women.

"THERE IS A TIME TO SPEAK."

AMONG the stale witticisms repeated at the expense of women in general, none are so sure to raise a laugh in any public assembly as those directed against their supposed love of talking. As idle women do not usually, like idle men, stop their mouths with a cigar, these sneers are possibly well grounded, and we willingly give all empty chatterboxes into the hands of their adversaries. The opposite fault, however, seems to beset the worthiest members of our sex—the thoughtful and the industrious—who do not, as a rule, express their opinions distinctly, frequently, and publicly enough. There can be no question that such women have an opinion, certainly upon all the social questions now mooted; but it is also evident that a very small minority only takes any pains to bring it to bear on the great body of public opinion produced by the expressed wishes and feelings of men. The reasons of this are not far to seek. Immemorial habit has made women imagine that their interests can be cared for, and such of their wants as legislation can supply, be expressed by men. In a primitive state of society, in which the physical weakness of women made them necessarily and inevitably slaves to those who could give them something that was called protection, and even in feudal times when matrimony or the cloister were the only alternatives open to women, such a theory had a show of reason. Nothing better, at all events, was to be had. Now, however, that a high state of civilisation annuls the advantage formerly enjoyed by physical strength, and that a large and increasing number of women work and live independently of men, it seems high time that they should recognise the fact that men can no longer represent their wishes or relieve them of the duty and privilege of bearing a personal part in the formation of public opinion.

As a matter of fact men do not and cannot, except in rare instances, represent the opinions of women, married or single, because their exposition of the same is always coloured by their own conceptions of what women ought

to want, and of what they would wish women to be. It is questionable whether any men ever approached questions affecting the political or industrial position of women with a mind wholly unbiassed by sentimental or selfish considerations. Even men who honestly intend to advocate the claims of women to some of the many boons which the progress of the whole race now renders essential to their happiness and welfare, do so very much in the manner that an indulgent brother backs up a spoilt child's request to the authorities for more jam. They desire that women should have that for which they earnestly plead, but they would be all the better pleased if their clients would be content without it. In short, the vast majority of men are hostile or indifferent on questions most nearly affecting the interests of all those women who are not entirely dependent upon them.

No better evidence of this can be afforded than the tone of some of the witnesses who lately appeared before the Commissioners appointed to inquire into the working of the Factory Acts in Scotland, and gave their view on the question of maintaining the present restrictions on the labour of women. At the last public sitting of the Commission in Glasgow, a deputation from Edinburgh of master printers was heard, who desired the extension of the modification in respect of overtime allowed in the bookbinding to the printing trade. One of their spokesmen being asked whether, if the restriction upon the employment of women were withdrawn, he thought they would be more generally employed? "No doubt they would," he replied, "if the restrictions were withdrawn altogether we would then employ women more largely than we do. Wherever we possibly can get lads over sixteen we do so, because we are enabled to work these lads overtime." "Have you had to dismiss any women?" he was asked. "No; but we have not increased them to the same extent as we might have done," said the master-printer, while another member of the deputation added: "We wish that women about eighteen were allowed to work as men do, but overtime might be restricted to a certain number of days per month." Can we doubt that the "women about eighteen" echo this wish. Meantime they are "represented" by the journeymen printers in the following manner. A deputation of operative printers having been introduced, the subject of overtime was again discussed, and it appeared that "the effect of the law was to confine the masters to get their work done by overtime by their male employés, so that, at present, women are debarred from employment open to men." "Is that an

exclusion which ought to be maintained?" inquired the chairman. "Yes," replied a printer, "because we think it is intended to use women in the composing rooms. The masters told us they would like that. *We say* that employment as compositors for women is unhealthy. I have a report by American commissioners which shows how-unhealthy it is." "The masters told us the women sit during their work?" suggested a commissioner. This, however, did not mend the matter in the eyes of the chivalrous printer. "Yes," he repeated, "it is a notorious fact that they cannot stand. The back gives way." In reply to another commissioner this witness said his objection to female labour applied to unhealthy occupations. He owned to being "aware that the shirt factories in which women were employed were more unhealthy than composing." If he pursues such investigations further he may indeed find "the back gives way" considerably more in some of the unremunerative employments to which he and his colleagues are anxious to restrict women than in this new field of labour. Mr. BRAND (one of the commissioners) said they had evidence from women themselves that they wanted to be allowed to work overtime for extra pay. "Did the deputation object to that?" he asked. The printer replied in the affirmative, "because it meant extra labour for the male apprentices. The men worked occasionally overtime." "And you would not," inquired Mr. BRAND, "like the same liberties granted to women, because you are afraid it would become too general?" Another printer said that they particularly objected to any extension of the limit of the employment of women and boys, especially in the caseroom, contending that fifty-one hours is long enough for a man, and consequently too long for females or young persons. The first spokesman "could not say what the wishes of the women were in this respect," and being pressed on the point replied that he "could not say, as he had not heard the question discussed amongst them, and the girls employed were mostly young, and not fit to think for themselves." He stated that there were no women compositors or women readers in Glasgow, and that there would have been none in Edinburgh but for the men endeavouring to fix the fifty-one hours' limit. On this a member of the Commission observed: "The strike was the means of inducing women to enter the trade, and now you want legislation to restrict them as much as possible." That is no doubt the secret of all this anxiety about "the back." As a matter of fact the real danger to which compositors are exposed is mischief in the chest, lung disease, and to this

women are neither more nor less likely to succumb than men.

Be that as it may, the point we wish to bring before thinking women is this: here are men who from interested motives, desire to keep women out of their trade, bringing forward every sort of plausible argument in favour of such restrictions upon the labour of women as would make them well-nigh useless to the masters, and thus secure their dismissal, and complacently observing that they have "never heard the women discuss the question." Now this should not be. The women employed, even those so young as not to be "fit to think for themselves," must know what is at stake in these discussions. Three alternatives lie before women without means—honest labour, starvation, or a life of shame—surely they have something to say on points involving their enjoyment of the former, or their endurance of either of the latter. The silence of the women interested in the present inquiry inflicts a serious injury, since while such remarks as those we have been quoting go forth to the world, and are taken for gospel by many, the opposing testimony of women themselves does not reach the public ear. It is, indeed, too much to expect that the habit of centuries can be easily cast off, and that the poor working women will take the initiative and state their views publicly and collectively. But they may and should be assisted and encouraged to do so.

Meantime we cannot but state our conviction that women of all classes should make an earnest effort as a matter of duty to express their own views at first-hand, and that whether they claim the suffrage, or the alteration of oppressive laws, or the removal of restrictions on their labour, professional, skilled, or unskilled, they should learn to speak for themselves, and to further their own interests in the same manner, and by the same means, as those employed by men.

A. D.

MEN'S thoughts about women are sometimes expressed with a cynical frankness which contrasts somewhat strangely with their professions of chivalrous respect. The Paris *Temps* quotes an aphorism by M. PROUDHON, which probably conveys a prevalent opinion. "We men (*nous autres hommes*) believe that a woman knows enough when she mends our shirts, and cooks our beefsteaks." Mr. P. G. HAMERTON applies a similar theory to "The Intellectual Life." He says, "It is not by adding to Our knowledge, but by understanding Us, that women when really companionable, become Our helpers." We have embellished Mr. HAMERTON'S text with capital letters, as seems to befit the dignity of "*nous autres hommes*."

CAREERS FOR UNMARRIED WOMEN.

[From the Edinburgh *Daily Review*.]

Of marriageable but unmarried women, between the ages of twenty and forty, there were in England 1,319,903 by the last census of 1871. As there were 3,504,351 women between these ages, married and unmarried, we have the startling fact that two out of every five women, who ought to be married, and who would be married if society were all that it ought to be, according to the law of the proportion of the sexes at birth, are not only unmarried, but have no prospect of the family life for which they are both intended and fitted. All that this vast and increasing army of one and a third millions of marriageable women involves, to themselves, as the victims of a diseased civilisation; to society, as deprived of their services and the benefits of their competition for the general good; to morality, as out of joint or over-balanced; to every great social question that has hitherto proved insoluble, from the poor law, contagious disease and drunkenness to the army, education, legislation, and a living Christianity, our readers may decide for themselves. It is difficult to say which is the greater, the individual wrong to each woman, or the evil done to society and the race. Christianity deals, or would deal if it were allowed by men, with this great woman question in one way, and all other religions in another. The old paganisms failed utterly to control a danger and a wrong which they increased, till society perished under its influence, as, unconsciously, the historians and satirists of the last Empire describe. The existing paganisms and false cults have groped after another solution, in the early marriage system of Hindooism on the one side, and the consecrated polygamy, the unbridled sensuality of Mahomedanism on the other. To one acquainted with the streets of the great cities, and the statistics of the rural communities of Christendom, it may be doubted whether, at present at least, the Hindoo experiment is not as successful as the marred and inconsistent Christian practice.

However that may be, there will be no reform in this portion of Christendom until men and married women, delivered from the fear of the fate which hangs over more than a million of their sisters, and which is daily dragging hundreds down to want and misery, and all that these involve, begin either to help to solve the question of the best career for unmarried women, or to cease to oppose and misrepresent those who are making the attempt. As a moral question alone, as the best secondary means of preventing the growth or altogether removing some of the worst sores of our modern life, we ask for this slight instalment of justice to the 1,319,903 marriageable women of England as to the 1,483,494 of Prussia and the other millions in the older States of Christendom—that no artificial or legislative bar shall be placed in the way of their earning an honest livelihood, of their being educated and otherwise permitted, if not fitted, to develop to the full extent of their mental and moral nature, without favour or fear. Both men and married women fail to realise the magnitude of the duty laid upon them in this matter, not only because they are ignorant of the facts and of the principles at issue, but because they are the slaves to their own fears on the subject. We do not allude to the purely selfish, whether they be distinguished physicians or trades unionists, like the ribbon-makers of Coventry, who fear the competition of the sisters and daughters whom they often leave to penury and sometimes to vice. We refer to the many who seek to know and do the right, but cannot deliver themselves from old prejudice, nor get rid of the dream that, if the bar to a career be withdrawn, the whole 1½ millions of marriageable women will be found rushing in to choke up every avenue and revolutionise society. To such we commend meditation on all that the increasing armies of mar-

riageable women involves in this and every country of Europe, whether in causes or results, and the study of two casual papers on details of the subject in the magazines of this month.

We shall begin with *Fraser*, in which a Government official—a man—reports the success of the employment of educated girls, of gentlewomen, in the lower forms of labour, as clerks. We leave out of account, as exceptional, such projects as Mrs. Crawshaw lately expounded to the British Association at Bristol, for employing gentlewomen as domestic servants. The evidence and the report of Mr. Lyon Playfair's commission shows that Government has for the past ten years encouraged the employment of women, separate in all cases save one from men, as clerks in four departments of the Post Office. In the central station of the Telegraph Department, at St. Martin's-le-Grand, 700 women are employed as signallers only by day. In the Postal Accountant-General's Office, Mr. Chetwynd told the Civil Service Inquiry Commission that the female clerks examine about 60,000 messages a month to see that the regulations have been duly observed by the postmasters. They prepare the very varied accounts against the 85 newspaper proprietors who, like ourselves, contribute no less than £15,726 a year to the department, and those of the news agencies which pay £32,000. They check the bills of the railway companies, to whom the department pays £20,000 a year for work done. To clerky duties is added the highest responsibility for operations of a most intricate character. Mr. Chetwynd declared that these ladies do their work so well—quite as well as men—that “they leave nothing to be desired.” We might add to this, except an increase in their pay, which ranges from only £30 to £180 a year—the latter in a very few cases. These ladies are doing the work of male clerks, “who in many instances received more than double the salaries of even the recommended new scale,” while each “gets through as much work as a male clerk, and equally well.” So in the Returned Letter Department there are forty female clerks, who, though on salaries of from only £36. 8s. to £62. 8s. a year, deal with letters involving a sum which aggregated £596,000 last year. So in the Savings Bank Department. Private companies, like the Prudential Life Assurance Company, Ludgate Hill, which employs from sixty to seventy ladies, report similar success on salaries so low as from £32 to £62 a year. They keep their staff very select; one of the clerks is a judge's and several are clergymen's daughters. And we are told all this by a male official who has yet so much prejudice left in him as to oppose free competition to any greater extent than the substitution of boy clerks by educated women.

The *Fortnightly* introduces us to the higher and more vexed question of the opening of the professions, and especially that of medicine to women. C. Jenner, a lady, gives us the latest information regarding the success of the experiment of the women at the Swiss Universities. Like India, Russia is sorely in need of lady doctors, and ten years ago the first Russian woman applied for admission to the Zurich University in its medical faculty. She was followed by others, and then, as in Edinburgh, the question of graduation arose. The battle was fought out in the Senatus twice, and was not decided in favour of the women until they had proved their assiduity and success in comparison with the male students. Miss S— was the first to obtain a degree, and many followed, till the Russian Government, fearing that the Zurich ladies were plotting against its despotism, and for no moral reason whatever, broke up the studies of its young subjects there by a decree. They scattered chiefly to Berne, the so-called political object having been secured, and that, unlike Edinburgh, showed the same sense of justice to itself as a “University,” to science and

healing which are of no sex, and to the women, as Zurich had done. One professor, however, like some of his Edinburgh brethren, held that women are forbidden by nature to study medicine, because their brains are $4\frac{1}{2}$ ounces less than those of men! The women, solely by their own success in study and the goodness of their cause, have, in these ten years, so triumphed, that they are now admitted to practice in every one of the Swiss Cantons. Even the male students of Berne, who could not, like those of Edinburgh, plead the attitude of their own professors, and who had petitioned against the admission of women on equal terms, are now reconciled to their presence. These are the results for the last winter session, 1874-75, in the two Swiss Universities:—In Zurich 33 entered. Of these, 19 are studying medicine, and 14 philosophy, which latter term includes philology, literature, mathematics, and the natural sciences. According to nationalities, 13 are Russians, 5 Germans, 4 Austrians, 3 Servians, 1 English, and 1 French, besides 4 from the United States, and 2 from Switzerland. In Berne, 32 entered. Of these, 28 are in the medical, 3 in the philosophical, and 1 in the legal faculty. According to nationalities, there are 24 Russians, 1 Pole, 1 Austrian, 1 native of Bogota (whose father is a Swiss), and 1 Swiss studying medicine. 3 Russians studying “philosophy,” and 1 law. Four Russians have already taken medical degrees at Berne, with considerable credit. Prejudice has disappeared before truth, fear before fact, and already the ignorant peasant women of Russia, among whom, at a certain period of their lives, the mortality is scandalous, are beginning to enjoy the benefit of skilled advice. So is it in India, which draws upon more enlightened America for female medical missionaries to save its millions of women from the same cruel fate, and give them, at the same time, a higher hope.

How long is this country to hold back, to perpetuate a wrong, to refuse to stop the greatest moral evils of society at their root? Mr. Cowper-Temple's Bill, and a significant hint from Government, have brought the Medical Association partially to reason, and we may hope to see the result next Session. How long is the London University, how long is Edinburgh, to identify themselves with the Philistines and the self-seeking who bar the way?

THE FACTORY ACTS COMMISSION.

(From the *Scotsman*.)

The Factory Acts Commission, which has been and still is taking evidence in various manufacturing towns throughout the kingdom, was appointed in order to put aside for a time requests that were being made, by persons who professed to represent working men, that the Factory and Workshops Acts should be further extended. Last year, and in the spring of this year, representations were made to Mr. Cross by trades unionists that much of the good which was to be expected from factory legislation would be lost, because the Acts did not extend to all cases of employment of women and children. Mr. Cross must have had a pretty good idea of what was the real meaning of these representations, and he fell upon the plan common to most members of the Government of issuing a Commission of Inquiry. Hence the presence of Sir James Fergusson, Lord F. Cavendish, Mr. Brand, and other commissioners in Glasgow and other places. They have to inquire whether it is desirable to extend the Factory Acts with or without modifications. The evidence which has already been taken has brought out at least two facts—one that trade unionists are anxious to have the Acts extended, because thereby they may get by law what they cannot get by their organisations; and second, that some of those employers who are already under the Factory Acts desire

to see them extended, in order that other people may not have less inconvenience than they suffer.

When the demand for further factory legislation arose, those who were most prominent in its advocacy were the people who had been contending, by strikes and otherwise, for shorter hours of work for men. They knew that if they could get a law limiting the hours of work for women they would virtually secure shorter hours for men. The Act of 1874 gave them part of what they wanted; but it did not include all trades in which women are employed, and there arose a demand for its extension. The evidence which has been given before the commissioners has been, so far as the so-called representatives of working men are concerned, to the effect that in some trades women have to work long hours, greatly to the detriment of their health; therefore these philanthropic men wished the law to go further than it has gone in the restriction of the labour of women. In one or two cases the hollowness of the pretence was fully exposed by the commissioners, and the witnesses who had been contending for the health of women had to admit that it was the competition of women which they wished to prevent. That beyond doubt is the chief if not the only cause of the desire that has been shown for further extension of factory legislation. By its means a monopoly of work may be secured to men. There are some occupations which are in all respects suited for women, and which would afford them good wages. In many of these occupations, however, it is necessary occasionally to work overtime; and the Factory Acts prevent this. No employer will resort to overtime if he can help it; such work is paid at a higher rate, it is, as a rule, carried on by means of artificial light, and it is altogether more expensive, and therefore less profitable than ordinary day-work. But he cannot always avoid overtime, and when it has to be done, it is desirable that all the working staff he can command should be available. Where women work under the Factory Acts, they are not available for overtime except on such conditions as make them of little use. The result is, that as their services cannot be had whenever they are wanted, they are dispensed with when they might be used. This fact is well known to the unionists, and they see that the operation of the Factory Acts is to shut out women from occupations where they could be employed with advantage to themselves and to the public. Open avowal has more than once been made by unionists that this is what they desire. On Friday last, for instance, a Mr. Martin was giving evidence as to the desirability of extending the Factory Acts with greater rigidity to printing offices. The chairman put this question to him—“The effect of the law as it at present stands is to confine the masters to get their work done by overtime by their male employes?” “Yes,” replied Mr. Martin. “So that at present women are debarred from employment open to men,” said the chairman; adding, “Is that an exclusion that should be maintained?” To which this answer was given—“Yes; because we think it is intended to use women in the composing rooms.” There is the plain avowal of motive—let the Factory Acts be extended in order that men may be saved from the competition of women. Nothing is said about the wishes of the women: they are to be disregarded altogether. Mr. Brand, one of the commissioners, said they “had evidence from women themselves that they wanted to be allowed to work overtime for extra pay.” Did Mr. Martin object to that? Mr. Martin promptly replied that they did. So that the liberty of action which is admittedly right for men is to be refused to women. The gross selfishness of all this is only equalled by the hypocrisy that endeavours to cover it with a profession of desire to preserve the health of women.

There have been several instances of witnesses who are employers advocating the extension of the Factory Acts to occu-

pations now exempt, because that exemption gives an advantage in procuring labour. What does that mean? It must mean that in the exempted occupations women can, by working longer hours, earn more money, and prefer to do so. If they wished for shorter hours of work they could get it by employment in establishments under the Factory Acts; but they do not. Is not this fair evidence that legislation of this kind is against the wishes of women; and that being the case, is there any reason why they should be subjected to it? Besides, where is the legislation to stop? Several witnesses have told the commissioners that further legislation is necessary in order to limit the hours of women employed in shops. For the most part, these witnesses are members of early closing associations, and it is plain that what they want is to get their own hours of work reduced by a law limiting the hours of women. But how is such a law to be applied? If it only touch shops in which say twenty women are employed, will it not give an undue advantage to the shop which employs fifteen? If it is to be applied to every woman employed in a shop, what will be the effect? A widow and her daughter earn a respectable living by keeping a shop. The law says they shall close their shop at a time when people want to make purchases. A few doors from them a man and his son carry on an exactly similar business, and the law leaves them at liberty to keep their shop open as long as they please. Is not that handicapping the women? Is it not, in fact, saying that they shall not have a fair chance of making an honest living? Some of the witnesses before the commission stated that women in their employment took work from other people to be done at home at night. That is to say, the women would have worked longer hours at the workshop if the law had allowed them; but as it did not, they took work at home. If the excuse for the law—that it is to preserve the health of women—is worth anything, what is to be said of this? The chances are that in most cases the work of the women in their workshops would be much healthier than that in their houses; yet they are driven from the workshop. Is the law to forbid them to work at home? and if not, why not? They are legislated for in the factory on the theory that they are not able to look after themselves. Do they become better able to look after themselves when they get home? The truth is, there is no stopping place in such legislation. Its tendency is and must be to increase, until in the end the law may undertake to regulate every action of women. There is no excuse for all this. Women are quite as able to take care of themselves as men. They must eat and drink and be clothed; and if they are to get what they require they must earn it. Yet legislation which puts barriers in their way at every step is proposed and carried. The excuse that it protects their health is not worth much. They are more likely to suffer from being refused opportunities of working, than by having free scope to earn the means of living comfortably. The proceedings before the commissioners seem likely to make this sufficiently clear. Nothing is gained by legislative restrictions on the work of women, and a good deal is lost. The people who advocate further restrictions, even where they are honest, only look at one side of the question; but most of them are actuated by intense selfishness, and are careless of the mischief that would ensue if their evil advice were largely acted upon.

THE LABOUR OF MARRIED WOMEN IN FACTORIES.

The following letter has appeared in the *Manchester Guardian*: Sir,—In the interesting report of the factory inspectors published in your issue of to-day one important statement is made, viz., that of “the increased and increasing employment of women

in factories." This, for what reason I am unable to imagine, is called "a new evil."

Further on it is added: "Evidence has been given again and again of the unhappy consequences to child life and infant development of the working of the mothers in factories."

If our inspector means by this that other things being equal, a baby is more likely to be strong and healthy if its mother is not overworked before its birth, everybody will agree with him; also the elaborate evidence produced by masculine energy to prove that a baby really is all the better for being nursed and taken care of by its own mother will appear to women rather amusing. There are certain facts which should never be forgotten when it is proposed to interfere with the right to labour of married women by arbitrary legislation. One is that a married woman has no claim upon her husband for her own maintenance or for the maintenance of her children. Another is, that she has recently been made equally liable with her husband to be prosecuted if her children are not maintained. I think your readers will see that this is a serious case, and that it might be advisable before forbidding a fellow-creature to earn money for herself and family that some means of supporting her and them should first be devised. Besides these facts, of which most people are unaware, and in defence of the rights of those poor mothers who are compelled to work in factories (I say compelled to work, for I doubt if the most inveterate "protectors" of women pretend that married women work in factories out of pure joy in such labour), I would like to state that it has never yet been proved that factory labour of mothers is more injurious to unborn children than standing over a washtub all day, or "charing," or indulgence in drinking habits, or even than the lives led by many fashionable women in London and elsewhere. Why, therefore, it should be proposed to legislate only for factory mothers is a mystery; or why, indeed, should we confine our benevolent efforts to legislation for women alone? Are no fathers responsible for puny, ill-fed children?

It has not even been proved that the towns in which women are employed in factories have always a higher rate of infant mortality than those in which there is no factory labour.

What are poor women to do whose husbands cannot, or will not, or do not support them? If the law imposes upon them the same responsibilities as are borne by men, is it not fair that at least their hands should be left free to fulfil those responsibilities? Equal legal duties ought to imply equal legal facilities for the performance of those duties.—Yours, &c.

A MEMBER OF THE "VIGILANCE ASSOCIATION
FOR THE DEFENCE OF PERSONAL RIGHTS."
Manchester, September 20, 1875.

CORRESPONDENCE.

A SUGGESTION.

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

Madam,—There is near my residence a public reading-room, extensively used by persons of both sexes. I have for some time made it a practice to lay my copy of the *Women's Suffrage Journal*, after reading it myself, upon the table of the institution, the permission of the authorities having been readily granted. Judging from its appearance towards the end of the month, I should say it is read a great deal, and probably by many persons who would otherwise never see it. Some of your readers may perhaps have opportunities of serving the cause similarly.—Yours, &c.,
September 17.

A FRIEND.

LADIES' CLASSES AT THE ANDERSONIAN UNIVERSITY.

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

Madam,—I have chanced to come upon the will (printed) of John Anderson, who was a Professor of Natural Philosophy in the University of Glasgow last century, and founded the Andersonian University in that city. It is now a flourishing institution, but I am not aware that the founder's intentions in regard to ladies' classes were ever acted on. I have known the institution for the last fifty years, but I never heard anything of ladies' classes there. I send you the enclosed extracts, first, to show you a Scotchman's views and intentions last century; and, further, I thought it possible that you might be inclined to call upon the visitors to call on the trustees to show cause why the founder's intentions in regard to ladies are seemingly disregarded.—Yours faithfully,

A FRIEND TO EDUCATION.

[EXTRACT.]

Article 9th.—I appoint the said trustees to observe the following rules and regulations in the management of this institution:—

First Rule.—The Professor of Natural Philosophy in this university shall give lectures in the city of Glasgow, to be called "THE MATHEMATICAL COURSE," every year, from the first day of November to the first day of May, according to the plan which I have long carried on in Glasgow College with great success; the Mondays, Wednesdays, Fridays, and Saturdays being appropriated to the Mathematical part of Physics, without any experiments; and the Tuesdays and Thursdays being appropriated to the experimental part of Physics, without any Mathematics. The hours of lecturing and examination to be regulated by the trustees, as well as the honorarium or fee.

Second Rule.—Besides the above-mentioned course of Physical Lectures, another course shall likewise be given by the same professor, at least once every year, to be called "THE LADIES' COURSE OF PHYSICAL LECTURES," in which no mathematical reasoning shall be used; and it shall be similar to the course on the Tuesdays and Thursdays above-mentioned, but with this difference, that the audience shall consist of both ladies and gentlemen. The time of the year, the days of the week, the hours of the days, the honorarium, and everything relating to it, shall be appointed by the trustees, under the direction of the ordinary managers. The intention of this course of lectures is that the ladies of Glasgow may have an opportunity for a small sum, and in the early part of life, of being at several of these courses of lectures, by which their education for domestic affairs will not be interrupted. No pedantic language will be acquired, as is often the case in more advanced age; and such a stock of general knowledge will be laid in, as will make them the most accomplished ladies in Europe. Nor is this expecting too much, as it is well known that by a course of experiments which I have given annually for many years, according to the plan in my Institutes of Physics, upon the Tuesdays and Thursdays, the *manufacturers and artificers in Glasgow* have become distinguished in a high degree for their general knowledge as well as for their abilities and progress in their several arts.

Third Rule.—Of the eighty-one trustees, twenty, if they choose it, shall have a gratis ticket for every lecture by rotation.

Fourth Rule.—The name of each lady and gentleman, with the signature of the Professors and of two of the ordinary Managers, shall be written upon their tickets, which shall not be transferable.

THE BRITISH ASSOCIATION.

On Monday, August 30th, the Economic Section was occupied almost entirely by the reading and discussion of papers by ladies. Mrs. Wm. Grey opened the proceedings with a paper on the "National Standard of Education;" Miss Carpenter followed with a discussion on "Day Industrial or Feeding Schools," and Miss Stamper gave some information respecting a free library instituted through the exertions of the President of the Section, Mr. James Heywood, F.R.S.; Miss Priestman contributed the following paper, which was read, at her request, by Mrs. E. M. King:—

THE INDUSTRIAL POSITION OF WOMEN AS AFFECTED BY THEIR EXCLUSION FROM THE SUFFRAGE.

The industrial resources of a people are best developed when everyone employs his faculties fully.

An experiment in the opposite direction was tried on a large scale in the United States, and has just signally failed. The attempt was made there to overwork the many, whilst the few remained idle, but without success; with all the advantages of modern times, the institution of slavery could not hold its own. The tendency in England is towards the ideal condition. More men of the upper ranks are engaged in trade and commerce now than fifty years ago, and in the lower ranks fewer hours than formerly are reckoned to a working-day. More men work a little, and fewer men have to work too much in order to earn their bread.

This tendency, whilst strongly marked amongst men, is much less noticeable amongst women. The number of women who are employed in no industrial occupation but housekeeping scarcely alters, and the duties of housekeeping are lighter than when weaving, spinning, baking, brewing, &c., were done at home, so that the leisure or idleness of some women increases, whilst those women who are engaged in trades appear to be increasingly hard-worked, and are beset year by year with new drags and difficulties. In some callings higher education is needed than used to be the case; girls have not had a large share of educational benefits; the census returns show a much greater percentage of women than of men who cannot read or write, and now the educational standard is lower for girls than for boys, thus girls cannot compete with boys. In skilled trades a knowledge of the work is requisite. Most trades unions forbid their members to take a girl as an apprentice; thus proficiency is impossible. In some cases the laws of the country hamper and harass women while they leave men free, so that little by little, women sink down so low that here, in this city of Bristol, there are women keeping themselves alive without complaint, but without hope, on making shirts for 2½d. each.

The tendency to a more even division of labour amongst men has always grown out of certain political changes. The Reform Bill of 1832 admitted a large number of the middle classes to the franchise. In consequence of entrusting votes to these men, the principle of free trade was established, the navigation laws were repealed, the taxes on knowledge were taken off, and so powerful an impetus given to the industrial activity of the country that its wealth reached a point unknown before. The more intelligent of the lower orders were quick to see the benefits which political power had obtained for the classes above them, and united to win like advantages for themselves by the same means. Rich men were annoyed by burdens, which were heavy grievances to the poor, and joined with them; and the clear-sighted of the electors, who knew that in the poverty and ignorance of any portion of a people lies danger to the whole, led and cheered them on. John Bright used

these strong words at a great meeting of trades unions and trade societies in St. James's Hall, 1866:—"My opinion is, that your duty—your obvious duty—a duty from which you cannot escape—is to go on as you have begun, to perfect in every part of the country your organisation in favour of your enfranchisement. It is to bring every society with which you are connected, to give itself for a time—it will only be a short time—to the working out of your political redemption." The men who heard him, believed his words; the second Reform Bill was passed one year later, and the rise in their wages, the comfort of their homes as compared with the condition of the unenfranchised agricultural labourers, justifies their trust.

If all classes of men are raised by sharing in the making of the laws they have to obey, why should not women be gainers also? Is the application of a general rule to fail only in their case? Those extremes of idleness and toil which mar the healthful activity of industry, prevail amongst women; they are living in no approach to the ideal condition which might render them indifferent to beneficial change.

It is said that they do not stand in need of the suffrage, because in all ranks, men and women are so closely connected together, that the interests of every class of women are watched over by some men, as if identical with their own. The weakness of this assertion is shown by the fact that men make laws for women which men in the same position of life reject for themselves. Either the conditions of male electors and female non-electors are not the same, or else the interests of the one are not faithfully represented by the other. Equally, in either case, the need of the franchise is absolute, if women as well as men are to have a fair chance of making their powers as useful as possible to themselves and to the nation.

The Factory Act of 1874 was originally urged upon the attention of Mr. Mundella, by working men. They declared it would be a boon to women—it would lessen their fatigue, which was too much for them. Some women remonstrated, for less work and less food struck them as no privilege at all. A deputation of factory hands in Leeds had an interview with two of the candidates for the representation of that borough, and urged their views with cogent reasoning. They met quite as much courtesy as non-electors usually do. But the folly of electors is heard more readily in Parliament than the common sense of the unrepresented. Mr. Mundella's Bill was taken up by the Government, and, somewhat modified, became law. Parliament lent itself to one of the worst mistakes of the first trades unions; for to limit the wages of working men to one standard, and to make a hard and fast line for the length of time women shall work, though different in detail, are one in principle. The law took effect in January last, and immediately women's wages were reduced in some of the factories to which the Act applied. The women are losers by the 1s. or 6d. taken off their wages, and the country is a loser by the lessened productiveness of the 392,986 hands employed in the manufacture of textile goods. The women have no chance of being able to force the masters to pay the old wages, for the shorter hours have not been yielded to a combination of the employed, at a time when trade was brisk, and the master receiving larger profits and able to pay his hands more without crippling his trade, but the hours have been shortened by an arbitrary law, irrespective of cause; and to expect the masters to give as much money for less work under such conditions would be to expect him to make a present to his people of the extra sum for which they had not laboured. The distinction between a benefit which grows out of natural causes, and one which is gained in defiance of all natural growth cannot be too strongly insisted on. Working women are beginning to understand this distinction; some unions have been formed amongst them, and

the National Union of Working Women sent a delegate to the Trades Congress, held in January last, for the express purpose of opposing further restrictive legislation. Part of the programme of the congress was an instruction to their Parliamentary Committee to endeavour to obtain an extension of the Factory Acts to other trades in which women are employed. The congress heartily objected to all such legislation for men. The women's delegate expressed the views of the body who appointed him clearly and well. No one supported him. The speakers on the other side said they were acting entirely for the interests of women. Two of them said, not only ought women to be forbidden to work without restriction, but in some trades they ought to be forbidden to work at all, for the work was not fit for them, and they were content with lower wages than men, and pulled men's wages down. A new element was here brought into the discussion, which had no bearing at all upon the plea of kindness to women, but no one seemed to notice this, and the resolution was carried with but one dissentient—the women's delegate. It seems as though men thought women worked on and on in a sort of intoxicating love of work which carries away their senses. Would it be in human nature to work for a mere pittance, twelve, fourteen, sixteen hours a day, nay, through the whole night, if bread could be earned less laboriously? Would it be in human nature to follow arduous and repulsive callings, if lighter and pleasanter trades were to be entered into? The love of rest and comfort and plenty is common to women as well as men; but to forbid women to work, who have no money to live on, is simply to give them leisure to die. It is clear that the interests of working women are not represented by the class of men to whom they belong; but men have votes, women have none, and the electors are carrying their points.

Their policy is as short-sighted as it is selfish, for if women have to live at all, they must eat, and if they are shut out from industrial pursuits, it follows that they must live on the earnings of others—either on money furnished directly by individuals, or indirectly by the state. The fact that a country must lose in wealth, if those of its inhabitants who could be productive labourers are made idle by force, is glaringly evident. If the trades' unionists are too much engrossed with other facts to look at this one, it would be well for those men, whose eyes are not so absorbed, to take notice of it. If women worked for their own bread, they would spend the money they made and stimulate other trades, which would put out demands for more labour. Productive industry is in itself so expansive that no one can determine the bounds which it shall not pass. In a country like England, where the employers of labour are ever supplementing the toil of the workman by new inventions, new machinery, there must be room for more labourers, if the laws, or the usages of society, did not hold them back. The difficulty women find in getting anything to do, and the low wages they receive, are not because there is no more work in the country to be done, but because they are held in by artificial barriers, within which they crowd, and jostle, and tread one another down, in a terrible struggle to live. If these arbitrary hindrances were but taken away, the industrial efforts of women would find ample and enriching scope. To do this, to enable them to win a fair and open field for their industry, they must have their due share in the making, or rather the un-making of those laws which now hedge them in on every side. Those whom Government can afford to forget, must not expect to be fairly dealt with by the law.

It is not working women only, but all women, who suffer. Women are not paid so much as men, and they are not rewarded so well as men. For the same work they receive smaller wages; for the same success in art and study, they

receive smaller honours; they may not be elected members of the Royal Academy, nor receive degrees; and the solid prizes of scholarships are almost unknown for women. Incentives to industry which are powerful for men are wanting for them. In the upper ranks, where the nation might expect much profit from the learning and research of a well trained leisure class of women, there are to be numbered thousands of aimless and indolent lives. The mischief does not stop with these, for the idle and ignorant encourage idleness and ignorance in every one with whom they come in contact; the loss from waste labour and waste land is as nothing compared with the loss from waste thought prevailing up and down the kingdom in women's minds. The evils that result from this waste amongst privileged women, and from the pressure of indescribable want amongst poor women, can be met neither by friendly counsels nor by almsgiving. Words which were spoken some ten years ago by a great leader of the people to unenfranchised men are true now of unenfranchised women: "Benevolence can touch scarcely the fringe of this vast disorder. There is another virtue we could add, and that virtue is justice. It is not benevolence but justice that can deal with giant evils. It was not benevolence that gave the people bread twenty years ago, but it was justice embodied in the abolition of a cruel and a guilty law. But justice is impossible from a class; it is most certain and easy from a nation; and, I believe, we can only reach the depths of ignorance and misery and crime, by an appeal to the justice, the intelligence, and the virtues of the entire people."

A. M. P.

The hour when the paper came on was so late that discussion could not take place. Miss Becker thanked the Section for having admitted a paper on the subject, and after a few words from Mrs. Salis Schwabe and from two gentlemen, one of whom supported and the other questioned the opinions expressed in the paper, the proceedings terminated.

Other papers contributed by ladies were one from Mrs. Crawshaw, likewise in the Economic Section, on "Lady Helps;" and one by Miss Buckland in the Anthropological Section, on "Rhabdomancy and Belomancy," which, being interpreted, means divination by the divining-rod and by arrows. Mrs. Bladen Neill read a paper on "Silk Culture in Victoria," and afterwards, by the kind permission of Miss Carpenter, she gave an address on the subject in the oak drawing-room at Redland Lodge. Sir Antonio Brady occupied the chair, and warmly commended Mrs. Neill's object and exertions to the consideration of the public. He said she had by her perseverance and energy obtained possession of the finest race of silkworms in the world, and in pursuit of this object she had travelled up and down the Red Sea thirteen times. A numerous and influential party were assembled to hear the address, including Mr. David Chadwick, M.P., Mr. Hyde Clarke, and others. Votes of thanks concluded the proceedings.

On Thursday, September 2nd, there was an excursion of members of the Association to Bath. After lunch, provided by the city, in the Grand Pump Room, the members were entertained by the Misses Ashworth at a garden party at their residence, Claverton Lodge. There was a large and brilliant gathering in the beautiful grounds, and speeches offering the thanks of the party to their fair hostesses were suitably responded to by Miss Lilius Ashworth.

During the meeting at Bristol, a new section, not generally known to the world, was instituted, and spoken of by its friends as "Section T." It met regularly every afternoon at the rooms of the Bristol and West of England Branch of the National Society for Women's Suffrage, and took its name from the circumstance that the ladies connected with the Society provided tea every afternoon for all comers during

the sittings of the Association. The new section speedily became popular, and those who partook of the graceful hospitality of the ladies must wish that it might become a permanent institution.

SILK CULTURE BY LADIES IN AUSTRALIA.

Mrs. Bladen Neill is now in this country with the object of obtaining support and sympathy in her efforts to establish the cultivation of silk as a remunerative industry for women in the colonies, and in such parts of England as are favourable to the growth of the mulberry tree (*Morus alba*). She gives the following particulars respecting the company formed in Melbourne:—

"The Victorian Ladies' Sericultural Company Limited was established in Melbourne in 1873, to promote the cultivation of silk in the Australian Colonies, with the view of thus providing a suitable and profitable means of employment for educated women of small means, and for young girls, who, though willing to work, are too often unable to find any appropriate means of livelihood. In the establishment of an industry of this kind in Australia, a prospect is offered to many women and girls in the United Kingdom, who may hereafter be induced to emigrate with a reasonable and confident prospect of suitable employment to look forward to. As the movement aims to increase and cheapen the supply of raw material required in the silk trade, it is hoped that manufacturers and merchants will render assistance. One of the objects in view is to assist the establishment of the silk-growing industry in Australia, by sending out to the ladies and girls now at work there some of the latest and most approved apparatus used in Italian and French *magnaneries* and reeling establishments. Since 1873, the company, formed in Victoria, has met with considerable support in that colony, and is now established on a promising footing. A large grant of land has been obtained from government, and sericultural operations have been carried on by a number of ladies and girls for three seasons. Samples of the silk and cocoons thus produced have been brought to England by Mrs. Neill, who represents the company. The Ladies' Sericultural Company hope to effect, in Melbourne, sales of silk goods made in England from raw material produced in Australia. A quantity of Australian "grain" (silkworm eggs) has been imported into Italy, and has been successfully cultivated on a mulberry plantation near Verona. The produce commands a very satisfactory price on the continent—1fr. 50c. per kilo. having lately been offered for Australian cocoons *above* the price realised this season for the best Italian cocoons. The floss and common rubbish are now being made by the Contadini, near Verona, into common strong silk for dresses and coats. The produce of finer quality is being reeled by the Maison Keller, of Milan, and will be manufactured into first-class silks."

Mrs. Neill further says that she has found, since her arrival in this country, that the particular kind of mulberry tree required for silkworms grows not uncommonly in the West of England; and she strongly urges on ladies who possess or who can obtain leaves from such trees to endeavour to turn them to profitable account by rearing silkworms from the cocoons or for "grain." The difficulty which has been hitherto insuperable in the way of silk culture in England is the fact that with eggs produced in the Northern Hemisphere the silkworms are hatched in the early spring, before the leaves come out on the mulberry tree. This difficulty is obviated by procuring the grain from Australia. Here the seasons are reversed, and Mrs. Neill can undertake to supply grain for the European market, which will hatch in June or July. This discovery promises to be of the

greatest economic value, and may prove a source of vast wealth both to the colonies and to the silk-growing countries of Europe.

Ladies and gentlemen who desire to assist in the equipment and better establishment of the industry above referred to, are requested to communicate with Mrs. Bladen Neill, 27, Prince's Gardens, South Kensington, London, S.W.

THE ISLE OF MAN.

The House of Keys has ordered to be printed a Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Law relating to House of Keys' Elections." It proposes to lower the franchise, to reduce the qualification for membership of the House, to enfranchise women, and to substitute for open voting vote by ballot. In the first section it is provided that the qualification of voters in shreadings shall be as follows:—"Every person of full age and not subject to any legal incapacity who shall be owner of real estate of not less than five pounds annual value, and every person of full age and not subject to any legal incapacity who shall occupy as tenant for a term of not less than one year any real estate for which he shall be *bonâ fide* liable to a net annual rent of six pounds, shall, if duly registered according to the provisions of this Act or 'The House of Keys' Election Act, 1866,' be entitled to vote in the election of a member or members to serve in the House of Keys for the shreading in which such real estate is situated, provided that no person being only a sub-tenant or assignee of any lease shall have a right to vote in such election, unless he shall be in the actual occupation of the premises." The qualification of voters in towns is set out in the second section in these words:—"Every person of full age and not subject to any legal incapacity who shall be owner of or who shall occupy as tenant for a term not less than one year a dwelling-house within any of the towns of the isle, and every person who shall be owner of or occupy as tenant for a term of not less than one year any corporeal real estate of not less than four pounds annual value in any such towns shall, if duly registered as aforesaid, be entitled to vote in the election of members to serve in the House of Keys for the town in which such house or other real estate is situated." These two sections propose to make a considerable reduction of the franchise, for at present the voter for a shreading member must be the owner or occupier of real estate of not less than twelve pounds annual value; and the qualification for a town voter is the ownership or occupancy of a house or other corporeal real estate of not less than eight pounds annual value. The qualification of a member of the House of Keys at present is one hundred pounds per annum from real estate, or fifty pounds from real estate and one hundred pounds from personal estate; but the Bill proposes instead this qualification:—"Any person shall be capable of being elected a member of the House of Keys who shall be possessed of personal estate of the value of one thousand pounds, or of an income arising from real estate in this island or elsewhere or from personal estate, or partly from such real estate and partly from personal estate, amounting to not less than one hundred pounds a year." Although the words used in this clause with respect to members are "any person," it does not appear that there is any intention of opening the House to women, for a subsequent clause regards the members as males, the words "his candidature" being used in reference to procedure at elections. The proposed mode of voting and nominating is nearly the same as that now in use in England, and what difference there is is merely in unimportant details. It is provided that the Bill shall continue in force till the 31st of December, 1880, "and no longer, unless otherwise determined by Act of Tynwald."—*Times*.

MANCHESTER NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE.

The Executive Committee beg to intimate to their friends that their financial year closes with the present month, and they respectfully request that all subscriptions not yet paid may be forwarded to the Treasurer. They also earnestly appeal to those interested in the cause to aid them with donations to the funds necessary for the work of next session. Mr. Forsyth has intimated his intention to re-introduce the Women's Disabilities Bill, and it will be necessary that large funds should be forthcoming in order to give him adequate support.

SUBSCRIPTIONS AND DONATIONS RECEIVED DURING SEPTEMBER, 1875.

	£	s.	d.
Dr. Borchardt	6	0	0
Mr. Philip Williams	1	1	0
Professor W. S. Aldis	1	1	0
Mrs. Stephenson Hunter (Lecture Fund)	1	1	0
Mrs. Gordon Barlow	1	1	0
Mr. Alderman Bennett	1	1	0
Mr. Tozer	1	0	0
Mr. Bedlington	1	0	0
Mrs. Charles Bowman	1	0	0
Miss Dora Thomson	1	0	0
Mr. Peter Spence	1	0	0
Mr. Hart	1	0	0
Rev. Dr. Mc.Kerrow	0	10	6
Miss Stuart	0	10	0
Mrs. Gay	0	10	0
Mrs. Walton	0	10	0
Miss Walton	0	10	0
Mr. Frank E. Marshall	0	10	0
Mrs. Fuller	0	5	0
Mrs. Plimsaul	0	5	0
Mrs. Sinclair	0	5	0
Rev. J. Freeston	0	5	0
Mrs. Freeston	0	5	0
Miss Mary Lowndes	0	2	6
Miss Jessie Hanning	0	2	6
Miss E. Jones (Weare Gifford)	0	2	0
Mrs. Elizabeth R. Scott	0	1	0
Mrs. Lawton	0	1	0
Collected by Mrs. Moses	0	4	6
„ „ Mrs. Poole	1	6	4
£23 11 4			

S. ALFRED STEINTHAL.

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

YORKSHIRE SOCIETY FOR WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE.

Central Office: 1, Victoria Chambers, South Parade, Leeds.

SUBSCRIPTIONS AND DONATIONS RECEIVED IN AUGUST AND SEPTEMBER, 1875.

	£	s.	d.
Mrs. Currer Briggs	1	0	0
Mrs. Henry Briggs	1	0	0
Mrs. Edw. Walker (donation)	1	0	0
£3 0 0			

CELIA WALKER, Treasurer.

Springfield Mount, Leeds.

[ADVERTISEMENT]—INFANT MORTALITY.—We are not in the habit of writing in commendation of Patent Medicines generally, but as a safe remedy for difficult teething, convulsions, flatulency, and affections of the bowels is frequently required, we earnestly call the attention of Mothers to Atkinson and Barker's Royal Infants' Preservative. Unlike those pernicious stupefactive which tend to weaken and prevent the growth of children, this Preservative gradually improves the health and strengthens the constitution, and from its simplicity, in no case can it do harm, indeed it may be given with safety immediately after birth. For nearly a century this real Preservative of Infants' Life has been recognised throughout the world as the best Medicine for all disorders of Infants, and is sold by Chemists everywhere, in 1s. 1½d. Bottles of the same quality as supplied to Queen Victoria for the Royal Children.

CENTRAL COMMITTEE.

The offices of the Central Committee of the National Society for Women's Suffrage have been removed from 294, Regent Street, to 64, Berners Street, Oxford Street, London, W.

Communications should be addressed to Miss Blackburn, Secretary.

RENEWAL OF THE MARRIED WOMEN'S PROPERTY AGITATION.

MARRIED WOMEN'S PROPERTY COMMITTEE.

Secretary: Mrs. Wolstenholme Elmy, Congleton, Cheshire.
Treasurer: Mrs. Jacob Bright, Alderley Edge, Manchester.

September 24th, 1875.

Madam,—Will you allow me, through the columns of the *Suffrage Journal*, to inform its readers that the Right Hon. Russell Gurney, M.P., will, if in England at the beginning of next session, introduce a Bill to amend the law relating to the property of married women. Should Mr. Gurney be absent it will be introduced by G. T. Shaw Lefevre, Esq., M.P. The object of the Bill will be, as heretofore, to secure to a married woman her own property and to make her liable for her own contracts, as if she were a single woman. As our case has not yet been presented for the consideration of the present House of Commons, we are anxious that those who have generously taken up our cause should feel that they have our strenuous support. As Treasurer of the above Committee I wish, therefore, to make an earnest appeal to all who love justice not to allow our work to flag for want of the necessary funds to carry on a vigorous campaign during the autumn and winter months. I subjoin a list of the contributions I have already received on behalf of the Committee.

I am, Madam, &c.,

URSULA M. BRIGHT.

P.S.—I should be obliged if contributors will make P.O.O. payable to me at Alderley Edge.

	£	s.	d.
Jacob Bright, Esq.	50	0	0
The Misses Ashworth (towards the Debt)	25	0	0
Samuel Morley, Esq., M.P.	25	0	0
Samuel Watts, Esq.	25	0	0
Hugh Mason, Esq.	10	10	0
Mrs. J. P. Thomasson	10	0	0
Sir Thomas Bazley, Bart., M.P.	5	0	0
Two Cousins	5	0	0
Mrs. Hodgson	5	0	0
J. Boyd Kinnear, Esq.	5	0	0
Mrs. Nichol	5	0	0
P. A. Taylor, Esq., M.P.	5	0	0
Mrs. Hensleigh Wedgwood	5	0	0
X. Y. Z.	4	0	0
Mrs. Gell	2	2	0
Sir Charles W. Dilke, Bart., M.P.	2	0	0
Mrs. H. Taylor	1	1	0
Henry Nichol, Esq.	1	1	0
Mrs. Whitehead	1	0	0

Newnham Hall, Cambridge, which is being built at a cost of some thousands of pounds by gentlemen interested in promoting the higher education of women, will be opened next month. There are several exhibitions and scholarships open to competition.

DESERTION OF WIVES.—The School Board of London, by means of the knowledge gained in the administration of the compulsory by-laws, have ascertained that 422 men deserted their wives in London during the year ending the 30th of June last.