

WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE JOURNAL.

EDITED BY LYDIA E. BECKER.

VOL. XII.—No. 136. PUBLISHED MONTHLY.

MAY 2, 1881.

PRICE ONE PENNY.
BY POST THREE HALFPENCE.

Contents :

Leading Articles:—Work during the month; The Municipal Election at Hyde; Ladies Elected as Poor Law Guardians; Women Freeholders and the Election of Coroner; The late Earl of Beaconsfield; Ancient Rights of Women in France; Women's Suffrage in St. Petersburg; An unwilling Wife forced to return to her Husband; Suicide of Wife through Ill-treatment; A Husband cannot make a Gift to his Wife; Persecution of Women under the Factory Act.

The late Earl of Beaconsfield.
Public Meetings:—Exeter, Nottingham, Mansfield, Hyde.
Debating Societies:—West Hartlepool, Batley Carr, Southwark.
The Half Pay of Married Officers in the Army.
How, Indeed?
Review:—Woman's Claim.

An Energetic Elector of Wyoming.
Law Report:—Futcher v. Futcher.
Parliamentary Intelligence:—Married Women's Property (Scotland) Bill.
Obituary:—The Earl of Beaconsfield, Mrs. Downing.
The Royal University of Ireland.
Treasurers' Reports:—Manchester, Central Committee, Bristol and West of England, Glasgow.
Petitions.

When you ask for
Reckitt's
Paris
Blue
See that you get it,
as bad qualities are
often substituted.

ENGLISHWOMAN'S REVIEW.—Published on the 15th of each month. Price 6d., or 6s. per annum.

CONTENTS FOR APRIL, 1881.

1. Report from the Select Committee on the Married Women's Property (Scotland) Bill.
2. Gallery of Lady Artists.
3. Nothing for the Women.
4. The Ladies' Column.

RECORD OF EVENTS:—University Education of Women in St. Andrew's, Cambridge, King's College, London—Ellen Watson Memorial Fund, Dulwich—Crossthaite High School and preference of Boys—Poor Law Guardian Election, London, Bristol—Isle of Man Election—Suffrage Public Meetings: Ireland, England, Wales—Municipal Franchise, Hyde—Maintenance of Children Bill—Conjugal Rights—A Woman separated from her Husband—Waitresses—Women and Emigration—Miscellaneous.

Review.—The Traffic in English Girls.

The Law Courts.

Foreign Notes and News.

Published by Trübner and Co., Ludgate Hill, and at 22, Berners-street, London, W.

A HANDBOOK FOR WOMEN engaged in Social and Political Work, Edited by HELEN BLACKBURN. Contains an Account of the Public Franchises open to Women—Information as to Educational Resources—A Concise Statement of Statutes affecting Women, and other miscellaneous information. Price One Shilling; postage 1½d.—Orders may be sent to the Editor, 20, Park-street, Bristol; to the Publisher, Mr. J. W. ARROWSMITH, 11, Quay-street, Bristol; and to 28, Jackson's Row, Manchester.

WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE JOURNAL.—Communications for the Editor and Orders for the Journal to be addressed to Miss BECKER, 64, Berners-street, London, W.; or to the Office, 28, Jackson's Row, Albert Square, Manchester.

PETITION! PETITION! PETITION!—Friends of Women's Suffrage are earnestly exhorted to aid the cause by collecting signatures for petitions to be presented in support of Mr. Mason's Resolution, which will come on for discussion in Parliament on May 27th. Written petitions, ready for signature, will be supplied on application to Miss BECKER, 64, Berners-street, London, W., or 28, Jackson's Row, Albert Square, Manchester; Miss BLACKBURN, 20, Park-street, Bristol; or Miss KIRKLAND, 13, Raeburn Place, Edinburgh.

PRELIMINARY NOTICE.

LONDON.—A Public Meeting in support of Mr. Mason's Resolution for the extension of the Parliamentary Franchise to Women who possess the qualification which entitle men to vote, and who in all matters in local government have the right of voting, will be held on Tuesday, May 17th, in the Grosvenor Hall, Buckingham Palace Road, Ebury Square, S.W. The chair to be taken at eight o'clock. Doors open at 7-30. Numbered seats, price 1s., reserved until eight o'clock, to be had on application to the Secretary, 64, Berners-street, London, W. The attendance of friends is respectfully and earnestly invited. Admission free.

WOMEN'S UNION JOURNAL, published Monthly by the Women's Protective and Provident League, records the progress of the Women's Trade Union movement; and contains information, collected from reliable sources, about the wages, hours of work, and other conditions under which women are employed in various trades. The Journal also discusses all questions connected with the industrial position of women, such as the influence of Factory and Workshops' Legislation, Factory Inspection, the establishment of Co-operative Workshops, &c., &c. Its pages are open to correspondence.

Price One Penny; Subscriptions for year, including Postage, One Shilling and Sixpence.

Communications for the editor and orders for the Journal to be addressed to the Secretary, Women's Protective and Provident League, 36, Great Queen-street, London, W.C.

UGHT WOMEN TO LEARN THE ALPHABET? By T. W. HIGGINSON. Reprinted from "Atlantic Essays." Price 3d. A. Ireland & Co., Manchester.

**TOWLE'S
CHLORODYNE**

Pleasant and effective remedy for Coughs, Asthma, Bronchitis, Consumption, and Diarrhoea, 13½d. and 2/6, of Chemists; also in 6d. and 1s. boxes.

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

WOMAN'S CLAIM.—By EMILY PFEIFFER. Reprinted from the "Contemporary Review" for February, 1881. Price 6d. London: 64, Berners-street, W.

ELECTORAL REFORM.—By WILLIAM COUNT, General Secretary of "The National Union of Working Women," and late Member of the "Bristol Trades' Council." Price 2d. London: George Vickers, Angel Court, Strand. Bristol: John Hayward, 1, Corn-street. 1880.

WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE JOURNAL.—Volume XI. January to December, 1880. With coloured cover, price, post free, One Shilling and Tenpence.—London: Trübner and Co.

"LIBERTY, EQUALITY, FRATERNITY."
A Reply to Mr. Fitzjames Stephen's Strictures on Mr. J. S. Mill's "Subjection of Women," by LYDIA E. BECKER. Reprinted from the *Women's Suffrage Journal*. Price 2d. To be had at 28, Jackson's Row, Albert Square, Manchester.

**BELL'S
UNFERMENTED WINE
IS THE BEST**

The true fruit of the Vine will keep good any length of time after the bottle is opened.

TRY THE FRENCH IMPERIAL LIQUEURS.

Late 104, Breck Road, Liverpool.

Present Address:—56, Upper Milk-street, Exchange Station.

Extract of a letter, dated May 31, 1879, from DR. NORMAN KERR, relating to the British Medical Temperance Association Dinner, London.—"Bell and Co.'s Unfermented Wines were largely patronised and much thought of. The French Imperial Liqueurs were admitted to be remarkably good."

THE CALENDAR.—MAY, 1881.

MOON.		SUN.	MOON.	SUN.
6th First Quar., 10h 44m morn. 13th Full Moon, 10h 24m aft.		Rises. 4 24 Sets. 7 29	29th Last Quar., 3h 7m aft. 27th New Moon, 11h 36m aft.	Rises. 4 3 Sets. 7 50
MEETINGS, &c.				
1	S	2nd SUNDAY AFTER EASTER. Fourth Debate Women's Disabilities Bill, 1872.	Lecture, Mrs. Ronniger, Lewes, 1871. Meeting, Greenwich, 1871. Meeting, Blackburn, 1874. Lecture, Miss Downing, Ashford (Kent), 1879. Meeting, Penicnik; Meeting, Bernondsey, 1880. Meeting, Hampstead, 1880.	1
2	M		Conference, Westminster Palace Hotel, 1872. Meeting, Dorchester, 1874. Meeting, Reading, 1878. Meeting, Marlborough, 1878.	2
3	T	Resolution to admit Women to the Ladies' Gallery, H. of C. 1835. Third Debate Women's Disabilities Bill, 1871.	Meeting, Weymouth, 1874. Meeting, Kensington, 1877. Meeting, Cheltenham, 1880. Meeting, Clapham, 1880. Lecture, Miss Craigen, Kingsland, 1880.	3
4	W	Second Reading of Women's Disabilities Bill carried in the H. of C., 1870. Dame Dorothy Pakington returned two members to Parliament, 14 Q. Elizabeth. S. Monica, 337.	Meeting, Kirkcaldy, 1877. Meeting, Tower Hamlets, 1880. Meeting, Homerton, 1880. Meeting, New Cross, 1880. Meeting, Kensington, 1880. Drawing-room Meeting, Langham-street, 1880.	4
5	Th		Annual Meeting, Birmingham, 1879. Meeting, Islington, 1880. Meeting, London, 1880.	5
6	F		Meeting, Bow, 1874. Great Demonstration of Women, St. James' Hall, London, 1880.	6
7	S	Catherine I. crowned Empress of Russia, 1724.	Meeting, Cuzpar, 1877.	7
8	S	3rd SUNDAY AFTER EASTER. Anti-Corn Law Bazaar, Covent Garden, 1845. John Stuart Mill died 1873.	Meeting, Frome, 1877. Meeting, St. George's Hall, London, 1877. Meeting, Tower Hamlets, 1877.	8
9	M	Mdme. Guyon died 1717.	Annual Meeting, London, 1879. Meeting, Willis's Rooms, London, 1879.	9
10	T		Meeting, Hanover Square Rooms, 1872. Meeting, Greenwich, 1877.	10
11	W	Mary Astell (author of "A Serious Proposal to Ladies," etc.) died 1731.	Conversazione, Westminster Palace Hotel, 1876. Lecture, Miss Craigen, Wigton, 1874.	11
12	Th	Laura Bassi created Doctor of Philosophy, Bologna, 1732. Women's Disabilities Bill defeated on Committee in the H. of C., 1870.		12
13	F		Meeting, Cork, 1874. Annual Meeting, London, 1876. Meeting, St. George's Hall, 1876.	13
14	S		Meeting Edinburgh, 1879. Drawing-room Meeting, Westbury-on-Trym, 1879.	14
15	S	4th SUNDAY AFTER EASTER.	Meeting, Memorial Hall, London, 1877.	15
16	M	Maria Gaetana Agnesi (Prof. of Law) born Milan, 1718.		16
17	T	Heloise died 1164.	Lecture, Miss Craigen, Halton Sea Gate (Cumberland), 1874. Lecture, Miss Arabella Shore, Westminster, 1877. Drawing-room Meeting, Hyde Park Gardens, 1878.	17
18	W		Meeting, Limerick, 1874. Drawing-room Meeting, Eton, 1878.	18
19	Th	Mr. J. S. Mill's Motion on Women's Suffrage in H. of C., 1867.		19
20	F			20
21	S	Maria Edgeworth died 1849. Mrs. Fry born 1810. Julia Ward Howe born 1819.	Meeting, Bandon (Ireland), 1874. Meeting, Hereford, 1878.	21
22	S	5th SUNDAY AFT. EASTER. Rog. Sun.	Meeting, Clonmel (Ireland), 1874.	22
23	M	Margaret Fuller born 1810.	Meeting, St. George's Hall, London, 1878.	23
24	T	Queen Victoria born 1819.		24
25	W		Meeting, Waterford, 1874.	25
26	Th	ASCENSION DAY.	Lecture, Miss Craigen, Haltwhistle, 1874. Annual Meeting, Birmingham, 1880.	26
27	F	Matrimonial Causes Act, 1873 (Wives' Protection Act). Factory and Workshops Act, 1873.	Meeting, Stafford, 1874. Lecture, Miss Craigen, West Coanwood, 1874.	27
28	S	Miss C. Herschell and Mrs. Somerville elected Members of R. Astron. Soc., 1823.		28
29	S	SUNDAY AFTER ASCENSION DAY.	Meeting, Dudley, 1874. Meeting, St. Pancras, 1875. Meeting, Edinburgh, 1877.	29
30	M		Meeting, Stalybridge, 1874. Meeting, Wolverhampton, 1874. Annual Meeting, London, 1875. Meeting in St. George's Hall, 1875.	30
31	T		Meeting, Tamworth, 1874. Meeting, Wigan, 1874. Conference, Dublin, 1874.	31

WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE JOURNAL.

EDITED BY LYDIA E. BECKER.

VOL. XII.—No. 136. PUBLISHED MONTHLY.

MAY 2, 1881.

PRICE ONE PENNY.
By Post THREE HALFPENCE.

WE are glad to be able to say that Mr. MASON has succeeded in obtaining a night (May 27th) for the discussion of his Resolution in the House of Commons, and we therefore very earnestly ask our friends to continue to send petitions, and to use all available methods of influencing their parliamentary representatives to vote for the Resolution.

MEETINGS have been held during the past month at Exeter, addressed by Mrs. ASHWORTH HALLETT, Lady BOWRING, and Miss BLACKBURN. At Nottingham and Mansfield, addressed by Mrs. OLIVER SCATCERD and Mrs. COWEN. At Hyde a crowded and enthusiastic meeting of women electors and other women was held in the Temperance Hall, under the presidency of Miss HIBBERT, to hear addresses from Miss BECKER and Mrs. SCATCERD on the duties and responsibilities of the municipal vote. An overflow meeting in the lower room was held under the presidency of Mrs. THOMAS THORNELEY, and the addresses were repeated. Speeches were also delivered at these meetings by Mrs. MOSS, Mrs. THORLEY, Mrs. KERTAIN SMITH, and Miss SMITH; and resolutions respecting the duties of women in the election of the council for the newly-incorporated borough, and adopting petitions to the House of Commons for the parliamentary vote, were carried unanimously.

THE first municipal election for Hyde took place on April 14th, when eighteen councillors were elected. The borough is divided into three wards, six councillors for each ward. The election was conducted on strictly party lines, the Liberals and Conservatives each nominating a list of six candidates, and the appeal to the electors was made on avowedly imperial and political grounds. The total number of electors on the burgess roll is about 5,400, and of these 1,005 are women. This proportion, one woman to four men, seems to be above the average, but possibly a careful examination into the actual proportion through-

out the country might show that the number of women ratepayers is greater than is generally supposed.

The usual insinuations against the character of the women voters, *i.e.*, that they were apt to get drunk, and that they would sell their votes for a ride in a cab, or a glass of ale, were freely bandied about before the election. But a determined effort was made by a number of those who were deeply concerned to prove the falsity of these thoughtless and injurious imputations. A band of earnest workers organised themselves to look after the women and observe their actions. We are happy to say that the result proved the utter injustice of the charges against the women voters.

The polling took place on April 14th, when the women polled in large numbers. Our correspondent, who was engaged in seeing after the voting of the women electors, reports the following incident of her experience:—The first woman she called on, when asked whether she was going to use her vote, said, "We vote by ballot," apparently under the impression that the object in the query was to ascertain for whom she was going to vote. When it was explained that the object was merely to urge her to use her vote, she replied, "Yes, and I shall be there in good time." Next morning, at a quarter before the hour when the poll began, she was seen alone, waiting till the doors were opened in order to record her vote. Another woman voter said, "I am doing my house-work to-day so that I can go to vote with some of my neighbours to-morrow." One woman said, "My daughters want me to vote Blue, and my son, who is a teetotaler, and a steady lad, says Red is best. I have not told them, but I don't mind telling you, I mean to plump for the Reds." Thanking our correspondent for the visit, she said it was much better for women to come to women to explain these things, for she did not like to talk to the men. Another with her hands in her dough said, "I will not say, if you stay all day, whether I am going to vote or not," but next day she recorded her vote. Another woman, seventy years of age, indicated her sentiments by

pointing to a red flower in a pot, saying, "That's the right colour, and I mean to use my vote." She did not think it right to say for whom she intended to vote, out of respect to the secrecy of the ballot. On the day of election the first woman called upon—a widow—had the dead body of her only girl laid out in the room for interment that day, but so great was her sense of the importance of the vote that she went willingly, saying, "It won't hurt my poor dead child, and it is a duty." Several Irish women voters seemed pleased to be called upon, but it was quite evident they had already made up their minds how to vote.

In every instance the women thanked our friend for calling upon them. Nowhere was there the slightest evidence of drunkenness or of bribery among the women; they went out early to record their votes, and returned to go on with their household duties, as if nothing had happened to interrupt them.

THE recent elections of Poor Law Guardians have been signalled in many places by the return of lady candidates, especially in the Metropolis. In St. Pancras there were 40 candidates for 18 seats, of whom five were ladies. Of these four were elected—Miss ANDREWS, re-elected; Miss FLORA DAVENPORT HILL, Miss ELIZA S. LEDGETT, and the Dowager Marchioness of LOTHIAN. In Paddington, Mrs. CHARLES; in Islington, Miss HELENA DOWNING; and in Kensington, Miss MARY ANNE DONKIN, were elected. Miss JENNER was elected in Cardiff, Miss SPILLER in Bridgwater, and Mrs. M'ILQUHAM was nominated for Boddington in Tewkesbury Union, and elected by a majority of 71 votes.

The election of the last-named lady is of special significance, as it directly challenges the correctness of the prevailing belief that the nomination of a married woman as guardian is illegal. Mrs. M'ILQUHAM has, we understand, property in her own right to the amount of the rating qualification; and she was nominated for election by her own husband, also a ratepayer. The clerk of the union, although he distinctly refused to allow Mrs. M'ILQUHAM's right to vote in the election as owner of the property for which she was rated because she was a married woman, raised no objection to her nomination as a candidate. Since the election Mrs. M'ILQUHAM has taken her seat at the Tewkesbury Board of Guardians without comment or objection from anyone. It remains to be seen whether any objector will come forward to challenge the legality of the act, and what would be the result of the challenge if

it should be made, which now seems highly improbable.

A somewhat similar doubt arose with regard to the legality of married women sitting as members of School Boards. At first only *femes soles* were elected, and when Dr. ELIZABETH GARRETT married Mr. ANDERSON many persons seemed to imagine that she thereby vacated her seat on the London School Board. But Dr. GARRETT ANDERSON continued to sit, and nobody thought it worth while to contest her right. Thus the custom has become fairly established and now seems to have the force of law, whatever might have been the decision had the question been judicially raised in the beginning. Should Mrs. M'ILQUHAM continue to serve on the Tewkesbury Board of Guardians without let or hindrance, the precedent may possibly establish the practice of admitting the nomination of married women as guardians, and may lead to the election of many more in future years.

THE vacancy in the office of Coroner for Middlesex offers an opportunity for raising the interesting question whether women have a right to vote in the election. The Coroner is elected by the freeholders of the county. It is assumed that male freeholders only can exercise this vote, but the assumption seems to rest on no definite foundation. We are not aware that there is any law to forbid women freeholders from voting, or that their right has been abrogated or denied by any judicial decision. Under these circumstances we would suggest that women who are freeholders of Middlesex should tender their votes in the forthcoming election of Coroner; and that, if their votes are refused, they should take steps to test the legality of the refusal.

A GREAT actor has vanished from the world's political stage—BENJAMIN DISRAELI, Earl of BEACONSFIELD, is dead. All the world is familiar with his wondrous story, and acknowledges the indomitable force of will and brain and personal charm by which he won his way from comparative obscurity to the proudest position that is attainable by an English politician. For the greatest part of his life Mr. DISRAELI led a party which seemed to be in a hopeless minority, but DISRAELI was never hopeless. He bided his time, and his time came. The general election of 1874 placed Mr. DISRAELI at the head of a great majority of the House of Commons, and put the destinies of his country under his control. How they fared at his hands it is not for us in this place to judge. We leave to others to deal with his action in general politics. His

career has been reviewed by all the public journals, and our readers will have formed their own judgment upon it.

But the memory of the departed statesman claims from us a special tribute of gratitude and respect for the support which Mr. DISRAELI gave to the movement for the enfranchisement of women. In a sense, he may be styled the father of the movement, for it was a speech of his that gave the final impulse that started it. During the debates on the Reform Bill introduced in 1866 Mr. DISRAELI spoke as follows:

"I say that in a country governed by a woman—where you allow women to form part of the other estate of the realm—peeresses in their own right, for example—where you allow a woman not only to hold land, but to be a lady of the manor and hold legal courts—where a woman by law may be a churchwarden and overseer of the poor—I do not see, where she has so much to do with the State and Church, on what reasons, if you come to right, she has not a right to vote."

This appears, so far as we know, to have been the first expression in the House of Commons, during the discussion for the reform of the representation of the people, of the opinion that women have a right to vote. This utterance sounded on the ears of women as a note that the time was ripe for movement, and as a summons to take action. Petitions were immediately set on foot, and the result of this effort shewed so wide spread a desire for enfranchisement that Mr. MILL, in the succeeding year, endeavoured to obtain an express recognition of the right of women to vote, in committee on the Representation of the People's Bill, 1867. This effort was unsuccessful, and perhaps needless, for the Act, construed according to the ordinary mode of interpreting Acts of Parliament, namely, that they shall include women, unless the contrary is *expressly provided*, does seem to include women in the clause which confers the vote, equally with the clauses which regulate and impose the payment of the rates which form the qualification.

It was believed by some, and there may be ground for the belief, that the framers of the Bill designedly worded it so that it might be construed to include all ratepayers; but, if so, the intention was nullified through the decision of the Court of Common Pleas, in November, 1868, a court of First Instance, from which, by a technicality in the Act, there is no appeal, as there is in ordinary cases, to a higher or supreme court, and whose decision was given at a time when the right of women to vote in local elections appeared to have fallen into oblivion.

Mr. DISRAELI, then Chancellor of the Exchequer, was

present during the debate on Mr. MILL's amendment, but did not vote. Possibly he may have believed that the Bill as drawn gave women the vote. In 1870 Mr. JACOB BRIGHT brought in his Bill to remove the electoral disabilities of women, the second reading of which was carried on May 4th by 125 votes to 91, but lost on going into committee. In 1871 Mr. JACOB BRIGHT again brought in his Bill, when the numbers were 155 for and 220 against. On this occasion Mr. DISRAELI voted for the Bill, and continued to support it on every subsequent division during the time he remained a member of the House of Commons.

In 1873 a memorial, signed by upwards of 11,000 women, was presented to Mr. DISRAELI through the late Mr. GORE LANGTON, M.P., to whom he addressed the following reply:—

"Dear GORE LANGTON,—I was much honoured by receiving from your hands the memorial signed by 11,000 women of England, among them some illustrious names, thanking me for my services in attempting to abolish the anomaly that the parliamentary franchise attached to a household or property qualification, when possessed by a woman, should not be exercised, though in all matters of local government, when similarly qualified, she exercises this right. As I believe this anomaly to be injurious to the best interests of the country, I trust to see it removed by the wisdom of Parliament.—Yours sincerely,

"B. DISRAELI."

Since the above was written Parliament has not been engaged in the discussion of any measure for the redress of grievances and the removal of anomalies connected with the representation of the people, but such a measure will probably be submitted to it at no very distant date. Parliament will then be asked to remove the anomaly indicated by extending the parliamentary franchise to women who in all matters of local government have the right to vote. Lord BEACONSFIELD no longer lives to see the removal of this anomaly by the wisdom and justice of Parliament, but we commend this expression of his opinion and wishes to the party which looked to him for guidance, and we suggest as an appropriate tribute to his memory that they should give effect to his wishes by aiding the accomplishment of this measure of reform—a measure which belongs to no party, but which is based on those principles of equity and reason which Conservatives and Liberals may alike uphold.

THE *Devoir* recounts the curious fact that 700 years ago,

in 1182, the law or custom of Beaumont was established, which spread from Beaumont in Argonne all over the east, the north, and in the Basque provinces. This law enacted that the widows, independent single women, and married women in the absence of their husbands, should take part in deliberations and voting. This law was in force in many hundred towns and communes till the time of the Revolution. In the documents which mention the part taken by women in the votes and deliberations they are treated on a footing of perfect equality with men, as witness this finale, "which all men and women (*tous et toutes*) did, ordered, and devised among themselves."

This ancient right is another illustration of our contention that the suffrage for women is no new or unprecedented demand, opposed to "the experience of ages," but the claim for a restoration under the changed conditions of modern political life of a right possessed by women in the early dawn of political freedom—preserved with more or less completeness throughout the middle ages—nearly lost during the development of modern democratic ideas—but destined to be restored and fully recognised as the logical consequence of the principles on which free government is demanded for men.

WOMEN'S suffrage has just been recognised in St. Petersburg in the establishment of a new form of local Parliament introduced by the new Police Prefect, General BARANOFF, on whose suggestion the EMPEROR has approved the formation of a Council of the inhabitants to advise with the Prefect respecting the measures to be adopted against the troublers of social order. The householders and lodgers in each of the 228 sections of the city were invited to elect one representative for each section, and these 228 elected persons selected from their number 25 members to form a Council. The choice actually made was generally approved. The measure is aimed in the direction of bringing society to co-operate with the Government in combating revolutionary activities. Women are allowed the franchise in the election of this Council.

It was said by Lord COLERIDGE on one occasion during a debate in Parliament on the marriage laws of England as regards property that the law as it stands was more worthy of a barbarian than of a civilised country. This assertion would appear to be true of other parts of the law of marriage, if we may judge from some remarks of

the PRESIDENT in the Divorce Court, in the case of *WILLIS v. WILLIS*, on March 24th.

The parties were married in 1870, the husband being twenty-one and the wife at least twice that age. In a few months the respondent, who was at that time a widow and had in her own right an income of £150 a year, left the petitioner's house, and has since declined to return to him. He instituted these proceedings in consequence. The respondent pleaded cruelty on his part, but offered no evidence in support of the charge.

On cross-examination it was suggested that the wife was near seventy years of age, and that the object of the suit was to obtain better terms than those she was prepared to give—namely, £50 a year, or £300 down for the privilege of living apart from him. The petitioner denied that he was actuated by mercenary motives, and said that he desired the society of his wife, who was dear to him.

In giving judgment, the PRESIDENT said: "It is not any part of the duty of a Judge to comment on the law, but I cannot forbear from saying that the law in this matter calls for consideration. *I am not aware of any other country in which a Judge can force an unwilling wife to return to her husband.* I never exercise this jurisdiction without the greatest pain, and, notwithstanding the statement of this gentleman, I have never known a case in which it was not a question of terms." It was ordered that the respondent return to cohabitation within three months.

AT Plymouth on March 3rd an inquest was held on the body of Mrs. HOOPER, the wife of a photographer, who had poisoned herself with cyanide of potassium, taken from her husband's studio. The jury returned a verdict of temporary insanity, caused by her husband's ill-treatment. No further action seems to have been taken.

We suppose that there is no law whereby a husband, who has driven his wife to madness and death by ill-usage, can be made responsible for such action. The clumsy ruffians who get rid of their wives by the hasty method of blows and kicks may learn, by the study of such cases as that of HOOPER, that if they will be patient and torment their wives till they kill themselves, they may accomplish their desire without the smallest personal risk or inconvenience to themselves.

HUSBANDS are allowed by English law to do almost anything they choose with their wives, but there is one thing that a husband cannot do, and that is, make a valid gift

to his wife. A curious case, illustrating this singular state of the law, was decided before Vice-Chancellor HALL on April 3rd in *re BRETON v. WOLVEN*. The question that arose in this case was whether certain plate and furniture which the testator, FREDERICK BRETON, had in his lifetime purchased for his wife belonged to her for her separate use. The testator had written and signed three memoranda or notes as to this plate and furniture, by the first of which he had certified that he had "given" a part of the furniture to his wife "for her own use and benefit;" by the second he stated that "he made a present to her" of the plate "for her sole use and benefit;" by the third he stated that he "presented her with" certain other articles of furniture, &c., as from that date. "All this," he added, "is to be yours and yours only from this date." By his will the testator had given all his property to his wife for life, and after her death to his nieces. The question thence arose whether or no the plate and furniture which the testator had presented to his wife during his life formed part of his property at his death.

A husband cannot in law make a gift to his wife; therefore, in order to sustain her claim to the plate and furniture, it was contended, on behalf of the widow, that the testator had constituted himself a trustee for her for her separate use. It was contended that, although in the case of a gift to a stranger, words of present gift cannot be held to create a trust, in the case of husband and wife the law was not so clear, because a husband cannot in law make a gift to his wife, and that there had been recent decisions which rather tend to show that when the gift was an immediate gift from a husband to a wife the court would uphold the gift as a trust.

The Vice-Chancellor said "he was unable to support this gift as a trust declared for the lady by her husband. He was very sorry to come to this conclusion, because it was a monstrous state of the law that such a gift as this could not be given effect to. The law was that deeds of immediate gift could not be supported as a declaration of trust, and there was no sound distinction between the case of husband and wife and any other case. It was said that the testator must be taken to have known the law, and that as the gift to his wife would have been otherwise ineffectual, he must have intended to constitute himself trustee, but it was manifest that the testator was in truth mistaken in supposing that he had made an effectual gift to his wife, and that he never intended to constitute himself a trustee." His lordship "could well understand that a husband might say to his wife, 'I give you this property

for your own, but if you ask me to be a trustee for you I must respectfully decline, I do not desire to involve myself in a trust of that or any kind.' He must, therefore, very unwillingly hold that the plate and furniture formed part of the husband's estate."

The effect of this judgment is that the wife is deprived of the ownership of property which her husband had believed he had given to her absolutely, and the nieces obtain under the will things which the testator never intended to pass under it. The moral of the judgment is that husbands who desire to make valid gifts to their wives must give the property to themselves or to some other person as a trustee for the wife in order to make the gift effectual, until the law shall be amended, which, while it endows the husband with all the wife's worldly goods, absolutely forbids him, in flat defiance of the marriage service, to endow her with any worldly goods whatever.

THE persecution of women and their employers under the Factory and Workshop Act goes on apace. Hardly a week passes without some record of women being harried out of honest work through its arbitrary operation and relentless enforcement. As an example, we may quote the case of Mrs. SANDERS, a dressmaker, of 106, Denmark Hill, who was summoned before the Lambeth Police Court, at the instance of Mr. REDGRAVE, for employing three women as dressmakers after two o'clock on Saturday, 19th March, contrary to the provisions of the Factory Act. The defendant said she was not aware of the law, and added that on the day named the young women were engaged in finishing a dress which was wanted particularly. Mr. ELLISON said that had nothing to do with it. The defendant had no right to keep women at work after two o'clock on Saturday. The defendant repeated that she was ignorant of the law. Mr. LAWSON said there was no desire to press for a heavy penalty, but it was necessary that some example should be made that the law might be understood. Mr. ELLISON ordered the defendant to pay a fine of 30s., being 10s. on each summons and 6s. costs.

Now here we have the law interfering with the liberty of women in three respects. The customer wants her dress finishing on Saturday, probably to wear on Sunday, and is willing to pay for the work; the dressmaker is willing to supply the work; and the workwomen are willing to execute, and desirous of being paid for it. All these women are by law debarred from a voice in making the law they must obey. Then the law, made solely by men, steps in to prevent the customer from obtaining her

requirement, and to forbid the workwomen from supplying it; and the execution of this law is entrusted solely to men, who seem to exercise neither sympathy nor discrimination in enforcing it. The law may be needed for the protection of children, but adult women should be free from legislative fetters in their hard struggles for bread.

Another case of equally harsh operation was heard the same day at Greenwich. WALTER COBB appeared to answer five summonses for employing women after two o'clock on Saturday, March 19th. The defendant said he allowed five of his fifty hands to go on three-quarters of an hour late to finish a large mourning order. He complained that the Act was very iniquitous and hard-hearted, and said he would have finished the order if it cost him £5, rather than disappoint his customer. Mr. REDGRAVE said this was exactly the principle he had to contest. A fine of 10s. in each case was imposed, making a total of £3. 15s.

Now, if Mr. REDGRAVE had brought to light a regular course of systematic overwork of women for long hours into the night, some excuse might have been discernible for the existence of the law; but when unfortunate tradespeople are pounced upon for a little extra time to meet a sudden and occasional exigency, it does suggest the thought that the law wants amending, and that the time of highly-paid inspectors might be better employed than in harassing unfortunate workwomen, whose only offence is that of carrying on their own business at hours convenient to themselves and those who employ them.

THE *Echo*, in a notice of the Return of Prosecutions for Offences against the Factories and Workshops Act of 1878, calls attention to some fines inflicted for offences against the Act which appear very singular compared one with another. Thus the Colne bench of magistrates inflicted a fine of £10 upon a firm, on the 6th of October, for "neglecting to fence a hoist," in consequence of which a boy was killed. In another case of a similar kind a woman was killed, and a fine of five pounds was thought heavy enough. But the offence of causing the death of a woman or even of a boy appears to be considered light in comparison to that of allowing women to work a few minutes later than half-past five in the afternoon. At Ashton-under-Lyne the Harper Twist Company were fined £12, and £6. 1s. 6d. costs, for employing women after 5-30, from which it would seem that inspectors and magistrates pursue with far less vigour the object of protecting the lives of women from contact with dangerous machinery than that of preventing them from earning increased wages by working as long as they please.

THE LATE EARL OF BEACONSFIELD.

The following resolution was passed at a meeting of the Executive Committee of the Manchester National Society for Women's Suffrage, held April 26th:—

"That this committee, in expressing their deep sense of the loss which Parliament and the country have sustained by the lamented death of the Earl of Beaconsfield, desire to record their gratitude for the services the deceased statesman rendered to the cause of the enfranchisement of women by stating in the House of Commons, during the debates which preceded the passing of the last Reform Bill, his opinion that women having property ought to have a vote, and by his steady and uniform support of the Bill to remove the electoral disabilities of women so long as he remained a member of the House of Commons."

PUBLIC MEETINGS.

EXETER.

A public meeting in support of Mr. Hugh Mason's resolution to extend the parliamentary franchise to women who possess the qualifications which entitle men to vote was held in the Royal Public Rooms, Exeter, on April 6th. Mr. H. W. BOYD MACKAY presided. Among those present were Lady Bowring, Mr. and Mrs. Ashworth Hallett (Bath), Miss Helen Blackburn (secretary to the Bristol and West of England Society for Women's Suffrage), Mrs. H. W. Boyd Mackay, Mrs. and the Misses May, Miss Colby, the Misses Buckingham, Norton, Petherick, Brown, and Messrs. E. J. Domville, F. Townsend, Petherick, jun., Littleton, P. Varwell, W. Brown, S. R. Force, Marker, J. Pinn, Bailey, Henderson, Passmore, Wilson, Woolcombe, Cann, Wills, Jerman, Glanville, Sawdye, J. J. Darke, Shepherd, A. Greenhill, London, Burdon, Hake, A. Clark, Godbeer, F. Clapp, Hitt, Daw, Strong, Featherstone, Osborne, Ellis, Norton, Leigh, &c.

The CHAIRMAN said that letters regretting their inability to attend the meeting and sympathising with its object had been received from Mr. H. Wilcocks, the Rev. Conway Carter, and Mr. Wilkinson. The members for the city had been communicated with, and Mr. Domville had that evening received the following telegraphic message from Mr. H. S. Northcote from the House of Commons, viz.:—"Please tell meeting your letter of fourth only reached me to-day. Can hardly explain views in telegram; would prefer to wait and hear Mason's debate." (Applause.) Mr. George Franklin had also written in favour of the views of the promoters of the meeting, and had promised a liberal donation. Lady Portsmouth had written sympathising with their object, and the Rev. Preb. Barnes, in regretting his inability to be present, wrote expressing his opinion that two points could not be claimed with advantage, namely—(a) that women should not be elected as representatives of any constituency; and (b) that the franchise should be as extensive as that now conferred, especially in counties, on men. But when those points were excepted, and, indeed, he believed that they were not pressed, the limited franchise for women became a movement which he earnestly supported. He (Mr. Barnes) strongly advocated the appointment of women as well as men to the office of Poor Law Guardians. (Hear, hear.) Continuing, the Chairman gave an exhaustive address in favour of the movement, dwelling specially on the legal aspect of the question. The giving of the parliamentary franchise to women was not an end, but only the means to an end, but if the end could be equally attained without the use of those means, it would be a very open question whether all was not gained that any reasonable person might desire. The action of the law before this movement was set on foot was retrograde, but since then it had been progressive, and much amelioration had taken place.

Lady BOWRING, who was received with applause, said she did not propose to say much, and would leave it to those who came afterwards to explain more fully the whole subject. She entirely sympathised with the movement; and, although she observed that very little progress had been made in this city, she rejoiced to know that in other great towns the movement was making considerable progress, and they were still living in the hope that at some future day parliamentary representation would be accorded

to those who were so justly entitled to the same, the female householders and ratepayers who stood in the same position as man. Various arguments, political, sentimental, absurd, or vexatious, were urged against the accordance of the suffrage to women, but the justice of the claim of the female ratepayers to be represented could not be denied. (Applause.) She moved: "That, in the opinion of this meeting, the parliamentary franchise should be extended to women who possess the qualifications to enable men to vote, and who in all matters of local government already have the right of voting." (Applause.)

Mr. F. TOWNSEND seconded the resolution, and observed that he could not understand why, if women were qualified to vote in municipal matters, and contributed their share towards Imperial taxation, they should not be equally qualified to vote for members of Parliament. The only objection that he knew of was a sentimental one, which sooner or later must be broken down. (Hear, hear.)

Mrs. ASHWORTH HALLETT said it was just ten years since she was present at the first public meeting in Exeter called to discuss the question they were met to consider that night. She recollected that much interest was taken in that meeting, because at that time people were not as much accustomed as they now are to hear women speak in public and plead the cause of their own enfranchisement. On that occasion Mrs. Fawcett gave an address on the subject, and one of their most widely known and eminent citizens, the late Sir John Bowring, presided. (Applause.) If anyone had told them then that ten years or more would elapse before this question became settled, they would not have believed it possible. But it had had to wait, as all demands for enfranchisement had ever had to wait, upon the necessity or opportunity which sometimes arose when least expected, and induced a Government to pass great measures of reform. It was understood that the present Government would ask Parliament to widen the franchise in the direction of the rural labourer, and when that time came she believed that the claim of educated and industrious women must also be met. Mr. Bright once said, "I believe that the solid and ancient basis of the franchise is that all persons who are rated to some tax—the relief of the poor being the more general one—should be admitted to the franchise." Now women were persons; they were rated to this tax; but they were not admitted to the franchise. A lady told her that in the metropolitan constituency where she lived the rating paper contained a printed notification that whoever paid that tax should be able to vote for a member of Parliament, but in the case of women she found that the promise thus held out was a delusion and a snare. (Laughter and applause.) This demand for political representation no doubt appeared to all present a natural and reasonable one. It had been submitted for discussion to hundreds of meetings of citizens throughout the country, and resolutions in favour of the cause had always been adopted. There were other great public questions upon which a wide divergence of opinion existed, but no opposition had manifested itself against women's enfranchisement, and this because it was merely the extension of a principle long since laid down and accepted as part of the constitution. A few days ago the head of every household was asked to fill up the papers of the new census, and this new census when completed would supply some valuable information to those who were preparing for electoral reform. It would tell us the exact number of women who were heads of homes throughout the country, and it would tell the occupations by which many of these women maintain them. It would probably show, as the last census did, that there are every year an increasing number of women earning their own living in this country and maintaining homes for themselves and their families, and these facts and figures would be calculated to strengthen the hands of those who said that an industrious and honest woman had as much right as her neighbour to be represented in the councils of the nation. It would tell us also the kind of occupation which enabled a woman to maintain a home, and one of these would be farming. We had heard a good deal lately about the wrongs of tenant farmers in Ireland; but there were wrongs suffered by English women farmers which were more grievous. Women farmers were not unfrequently evicted, not because they refused to pay their rent, but because they had no votes. Tenants who could vote are preferable to tenants who could not. This was a direct wrong and injury, which we asked to have removed. (Applause.) There was yet another fact which we might perhaps also learn from

the census, viz., the number of households in which the head of the family was unable to fill up the census paper for himself or herself. It was stated in the House of Commons by Mr. Dodson the other day that among the humbler classes the enumerator had himself to fill up fifty per cent of the schedules. Now, it would be interesting to know how many women who were heads of homes were unable to perform this simple act of scholarship. She believed in proportion to the men they would be comparatively few. Employments for women were fewer, and wages even for an equal amount of work were usually less. A woman had to be a clever and capable woman to be a householder. By extending the suffrage to women it could probably be thus shown that they would not be increasing to any sensible extent the class of illiterate voters, already too numerous in every constituency, but that the addition of women voters would add new strength to the thoughtful and intelligent among the electorate. In a speech once made by Mr. Gladstone he expressed his belief that the man who would be able to effect a well-adjusted alteration in the law as to political power, and as to the just arrangement of other laws bearing upon the condition of women, would be a real benefactor to his country. We now looked forward to the time when, by the framing of an honest household suffrage Bill, Mr. Gladstone would himself become a real benefactor to his countrywomen. Women would never forget that Lord Beaconsfield—(loud applause)—who, as Mr. Disraeli, was the first member within the walls of Parliament to speak in favour of granting women votes; and now, when he was lying on a bed of sickness, there were many of them who recalled his words, and who thought with sorrowful feelings that he might not live to see the anomaly which he characterised as "injurious to the best interests of the country" removed by the wisdom of Parliament. But in his mind's eye he had seen it already accomplished, and none knew better than he did that a claim founded on justice must in the end prevail. Sir Stafford Northcote—(applause)—had repeatedly voted in support of this question. The last time it was discussed in the House of Commons, he, as the then leader of that House, said that he could not vote for it at that time, but he added that "women had shown by the way they had used their local votes that they were not unworthy or incapable of exercising such functions, and at a fitting time and under fitting circumstances he should be prepared to assent to a proposal that the same rank should be given to them as to others." Looking at the division lists she found that a majority of the members for Devon had voted for this question. Sir Lawrence Palk (now Lord Haldon), Sir John Kennaway, Sir Massey Lopes, and the two late members for this city, Messrs. Mill and Johnson, voted for the question. The present members had not yet had the opportunity of recording their votes, but this opportunity would probably be afforded to them in the House next month. They trusted that Exeter would continue to give an undivided vote on their side. (Hear, hear.) It was understood that Mr. Johnson was entirely in favour, and Mr. Northcote was certainly not opposed. (Applause.) In answer to those who asked what interest women had in general politics, the best reply would be an examination of the various measures introduced during any given session of Parliament. Some of these measures had a special reference to men, and some a special reference to women. The great bulk, however, would be found to affect both sexes equally. We had this session had an Irish Coercion Act passed. This Bill bore on the interests of Irish men by way either of protection or of punishment, but it bore equally on the interests of Irish women. More recently there had been a great discussion on the sale of advowsons, and on this important question the member for Huddersfield spoke eloquently on the iniquity of buying and selling the care of the spiritual interests of church congregations. But church congregations consisted both of men and of women; nay, it was said they consisted more of women than of men, and, if so, women had as great an interest as men in this sale of their spiritual interests and in anything legislation might have to say on the subject. The spiritual interests, however, of the men were directly represented in Parliament, whilst those of women were not. We had also had many millions of money voted away in supply during the last few weeks, and here, too, men contributed and voted, while women did not vote but contribute. The budget in every one of its parts exemplified, too, the same system—taxation and representation for the one side, taxation without representation for the other. To-morrow there was to be brought into Parliament perhaps one of the most remarkable Bills of this generation—namely, the Land Bill for Ireland. This Bill would in some way redistribute the powers of

landlord and tenant in relation to the land, and in so doing would directly change the positions of thousands, nay millions of landowners and tenants. Many women were tenants, many women also were landowners. If the tenants were insecure, women tenants were insecure as well as men. If landowners' rights were to be expropriated, the rights of women landowners would be expropriated. It was not for them there to inquire whether the three F's, of which they had heard so much, were, as some authorities assert, fraud, force, and folly, or whether, as others said, they were fixity, fairness, and freedom; but what she would point out was that not one of these F's could be lost by landowner or gained by tenant without the interests of women being changed. Women tenants and landowners gained or lost like male tenants and landowners; but whilst the men were directly represented in the making of these land laws to which they were responsible, the women were responsible to them without representation. But throughout the story was the same, throughout the disability was the same, and throughout it reacted injuriously on women's position. Whether we had regard to coercion laws or remedial laws, to ecclesiastical laws, to civil laws, or to criminal laws, the interests both of women and of men were regulated by them, and the means of both were equally taxed to maintain them in operation. Whatever might be the difference of sphere, to use the common expression, between man and woman, the political sphere was common to both, and a woman could no more escape the sphere of politics than she could escape the physical atmosphere itself. (Applause.)

The resolution was carried.

Mr. Councillor DOMVILLE moved a petition to the House of Commons based on the previous resolution, and memorials to Sir S. Northcote, Mr. E. Johnson, and Mr. H. S. Northcote, praying them to support the removal of the electoral disabilities of women. Justice demanded that women should have the franchise, and the objections to their having the vote were but sentimental.

Mr. W. J. PETHERICK seconded the resolution.

Miss HELEN BLACKBURN, in supporting the motion, remarked that they simply asked that the parliamentary franchise should be given to women when they fulfilled the conditions which gave the franchise to men. It was said that there were not many women who desired the franchise, but she was sure that in Exeter, as in other cities, there might be found large numbers of thoughtful, industrious, and intelligent women who desired the power the franchise would give them. Without the franchise women had no voice in the affairs of the nation, no share in the sovereign power of the people. It was said that for women to take part in public affairs was against the teachings of nature. Now naturalists tell of creatures who begin their lives swimming about freely in the sea, with numerous limbs, but who when they reach maturity stick their heads against a rock and never move thence—their limbs all dwindle and disappear, they become mere sacks with two mouths. That was the teaching society imitated when it first allowed girls to learn the history of their own and other countries and filled them with a sense of duty to others, and then just when their lives were full of enthusiasm and energy bade them go and fix their heads against their nursery walls, and never move beyond. But these were not the teachings of nature that we should imitate; they were rather warnings than examples. She maintained that it was not to the interest of the country that women should be taught to look only to the nursery at home and entirely neglect the nursery of the State. The speaker dwelt upon the suitability of women for the work of Poor Law Guardians, and pointed out that the election of women as guardians was quite legal. By discouraging women from taking any part in the affairs of the State a great deal of power was being wasted; we were wasting the powers of our women, and overtaxing the brains of our men. She appealed to both men and women to support the movement, pointing out that the power of the former would not be less because the power of women was greater. Neither justice nor expediency, but simply social custom, interfered with the progress of this movement, but soon they would overcome the opposition that now stood in the way. (Applause.)

The petition was adopted, and a vote of thanks to the deputation and the chairman terminated the proceedings.

NOTTINGHAM.

On March 31st Mrs. Oliver Scatcherd delivered a lecture in the Baptist Chapel Schoolroom, Woodborough Road, Nottingham, under

the auspices of the National Society for Women's Suffrage, Notts Branch, on "Women's Suffrage—what it will do for us." Mr. Sheriff Cropper presided. After Mrs. Scatcherd had given her address, which was received with applause, the Sheriff read a memorial, praying Parliament to pass a measure for the removal of the electoral disabilities of women, and moved a resolution expressing the opinion of the meeting that women should exercise the franchise in the election of members of Parliament. He pointed out that the movement was not a party one, and that Conservatives and Liberals were uniting to provide women a measure of just legislation. When the 60,000 widows of this country should have a voice in the election of members of Parliament—many of them widows who had lost husbands and sons in bloody and useless wars—they would possibly put a few crucial questions to candidates, who, having been submitted to a woman's catechism, would not be so ready to support war-making Governments as in the past. (Applause.) Mrs. Cowen seconded the resolution. Mr. H. Stanger proposed a vote of thanks to the lecturer, which was seconded and carried enthusiastically.

MANSFIELD.

On the afternoon of Friday, April 1st, at three o'clock, a meeting, arranged by Miss Wright for women only, was held in the large room of the Coffee Tavern, when Mrs. Scatcherd gave an address on "What the suffrage will do for women." The attendance was good and representative. Mrs. Cowen, hon. sec. Notts Branch Women's Suffrage Society, presided, and said she thought the parliamentary vote of more importance than the local vote, for whereas in local government both sexes are treated alike as ratepayers—not as men and women—the Imperial Parliament deals with them very differently, making one set of laws for men and another for women. She hoped those present would support the Nottingham Association in its efforts to obtain the franchise. Mrs. Scatcherd's address was listened to with deep attention. A petition to Parliament and memorials to the county members in favour of Mr. Mason's resolution were carried without a dissentient. As usual at such gatherings, where women are not afraid to speak, several instances were given in which women were suffering great hardship owing to the inequality of the law. Votes of thanks to Mrs. Cowen, Mrs. Scatcherd, and to Miss Wright brought to a close this earnest meeting, which all present acknowledged to have been most instructive and useful.

On the evening of April 1st, Mrs. Oliver Scatcherd, of Leeds, who has, by her eloquence and force of argument, won over to the side of the claimants of women's suffrage many an audience in the North of England, delivered a lecture bearing the title, "Women's Suffrage—what will it do for us?" in the Town Hall, Mansfield, before a very large assemblage of the inhabitants. The Rev. C. H. Wellbeloved occupied the chair, and Mrs. Wellbeloved, Mrs. Cowen (of Nottingham), and Mr. G. Pickard were also present upon the platform. The meeting having been opened by a few remarks from the chairman, Mrs. Scatcherd delivered her address, at the close of which, after a brief speech by the chairman, Mr. Pickard proposed that the following petition should be signed by the chairman on behalf of the meeting and forwarded to Parliament:—

"To the Honourable Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, in Parliament now assembled: The humble petition of the inhabitants of Mansfield, in public meeting assembled, on the 1st day of April, 1881, sheweth that the franchise adjudged by law to the occupation and ownership of property liable to Imperial and local taxation shall be exercised by women in the election of members of Parliament; therefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Honourable House will pass a measure for the removal of the electoral disabilities of women."

Mr. R. Barringer seconded the proposition, and it was carried unanimously. Votes of thanks having been accorded to Mrs. Scatcherd (proposed by Mr. Willis Ward, seconded by Mr. Wallis, and supported by the Rev. J. Jones), and to the chairman, the proceedings terminated.

HYDE.

MEETING OF WOMEN ELECTORS AND NON-ELECTORS.

On Wednesday, March 30th, there was an overflowing meeting

held in the upper room of the Hyde Temperance Hall, got up under the auspices of the local branch of the Women's Suffrage Association; indeed so great was the press, people standing down the centre approach when the forms were all occupied, that at the outset Miss HIBBERT, of Godley, announced from the chair her gladness at so great an interest being shown by the attendance at that meeting, and as numbers of people were coming who could not be heard there, an overflow meeting would be held in the room below, where Mrs. Scatcherd would go first and address them, and afterwards Miss Becker. There were some 800 women assembled in the upper room, and perhaps half that number below, so that the women, says the *North Cheshire Herald*, from whose ample report we abridge our notice, may chuckle over the men in having succeeded in drawing together about the largest gathering that can, or will, be held in connection with the first election of councillors for the borough of Hyde. Amongst those on the platform, or in the body of the upper room, were noticed Miss Becker, of Manchester; Mrs. Scatcherd, of Leeds; Miss Smith, secretary; Mrs. Orlando, Oldham; Mrs. Dowson, Mrs. Aspland, Mrs. and the Misses (2) Sidebottom, Mrs. Thomas Thorneley, Mrs. John K. Smith, Mrs. Thorley, Mrs. Moss, and numerous others. The meeting was varied with a considerable buzz of conversation two or three times, in the intervals, but when once the business was fairly commenced, it was continued without flagging to the finish, and seemed to have been much enjoyed. Once or twice, when there was an inclination shown by speakers to side with partisans, a hum of conversation rose.

The CHAIRWOMAN said: Our meeting this evening is held in connection with an event of great importance in the history of Hyde. Incorporation for a town may be likened to the coming of age of a man or woman. The public affairs have been transacted creditably enough by the Local Board for some years, and when strangers have asked "Where is Hyde? and what sort of a place is it?" they have been told that it was a well drained, well paved, and, on the whole, well built town near Manchester, somewhat smoky as to its atmosphere, certainly not remarkable for beauty, and dependent chiefly on its cotton mills. Beyond that there was little to be said; the town did not exert any decided influence on its neighbours, sent no member to Parliament, had no mayor or municipal council to act as its representatives; in short, had no status in the country at all, except as a little bit of East Cheshire. This state of things was felt to be wholly unsuited to a town with 32,000 inhabitants, and, therefore, by degrees, this important change of incorporation has been brought about. Thus a new era is opening before us, with new duties and new responsibilities. To the 1,000 women electors, who are for the first time exercising the municipal franchise, the change is of the highest importance; they now take the position as citizens to which they are reasonably entitled. With their new privileges, however, let them remember that maybe new temptations may assail them. Already the town, in which, as a rule, Liberals and Conservatives have lived and worked together as a happy family, the harmony being not greatly interrupted even at election times, is splitting into two parties, and it would be too much to hope that perfect amity will be maintained. "The weakest point about this Hyde election is the women," said a gentleman the other day to one of my family; "they will anyone of them sell her vote for a glass of gin?" Now we never expect sweeping assertions to be wholly true, and I most earnestly hope that this assertion may be proved to be wholly untrue. I acknowledge that I have a fear of something worse than that some of the women may sell their votes for glasses of gin, and that is, that there may possibly be candidates dishonourable and mean enough to offer them. Now I have several times heard it brought forward as an argument against granting the parliamentary suffrage to women, that in municipal elections they are in so many cases influenced by bribes; especially is this said to be the case in a neighbouring town. I do not hear that the men are any better than the women in that town, and I hold that the tempter is far more blameworthy than the tempted. I hope, for the honour of our town, that no attempt will be made by any candidate to influence the electors by unfair means, but if such be the case, I earnestly hope that all women voters will decidedly, and at once, refuse their support, and all further consideration, to any candidate, or agent, who insults them by offering a bribe, be he Liberal or Conservative. Let them remember that of this privilege, as of all others, an account must one day be rendered. But I must not forget that the duty of a chairman is not to be eloquent himself, but only to be the director

of the eloquence of others. I have, therefore, the pleasure of calling on Miss Becker to move the first resolution, and give us some advice on the duties that lie before us.

Miss BECKER, in moving the following resolution, spoke at some length on the duties of women in respect to the municipal vote:—"That, in the opinion of this meeting, it is the duty of every woman on the burgess roll of the newly-incorporated borough of Hyde to use her municipal vote with a view to the good government of the town, and also with special reference to the promotion of such measures of justice to women as can be effected by the action of the Town Council."

Mrs. Moss, addressing those present as "worthy president and dear ladies," said she could second that with all her heart, and she hoped the women would carry it into practice. They knew the question was often asked why women should take an interest in the work of the town. There was nothing more common, had not been in late elections, than for people to say it did not matter who got in, it mattered nothing to them; that was very false, and it only wanted just looking at, to see that it was very important, whether they had wise men to govern them or not. The principle was all the same in the home, town, or parliament; for the nation to be wisely and economically governed was an immense advantage; for the town to be wisely governed was an advantage to the inhabitants; so, for the home to be wisely and economically governed was good for the children. These three apply with force; the one principle ran through all, only there was this to be said, in the government of the home they felt it directly, in the government of the town it came indirectly, and there was the evil; but it was quite true that if money were spent extravagantly the rates would go up, and they who paid their weekly rents would have to pay more. They must always remember that money came out of the hard worker. Humanity was divided into two classes—they who produced, who did something; she and they who went the round of their little duties, week by week, produced work, by making others comfortable, and allowing them to work; and those who got nothing, and the "get-nothings" were generally the "spend-alls." (Laughter and applause.) By-the-by they had heard it said that women could not get up an enthusiastic meeting, but she thought they were getting pretty warm, and they would warm one another. (Laughter.) Why should women meddle with politics? The answer was plain, because politics meddled with them; and there was another reason, if the women did not wake up, and begin to think, they would never get those laws redressed which were oppressive to them. Now there were laws very oppressive to women; they had been treated as nobody. For instance she knew an individual, and she was as respectable, honest, and hard-working, and striving a woman as they could come across, who got married, and for anything she knew she was marrying well. But the husband married her for her money. Some twelve months afterwards he got hold of all her money; she had a little boy, and he turned out bad indeed to her, and before she could get any maintenance she had to go into the Union Workhouse, and the guardians had to get it for her; although there never was a girl better brought up, or more honestly, yet she had to submit to that humiliation before she could get maintenance for herself and her little boy. There were many laws that hung heavily on women when they were brought into distress. It was sometimes said that women were best at home—(laughter)—and she was not going to deny that; there was no place like home, and if she saw a woman pretending to work for the suffrage movement and neglecting her home, she would not have her respect. She thought women's place was home, but those people who said women were best at home meant more than that; they meant that home should be their place, and nowhere else. Now with that she quite disagreed, because there were women who look well after their homes, and yet their hearts wanted a larger sphere; they wanted something outside; they could do their little round to the best of their ability, but they wanted something outside. Now what Dr. Young said of men was true of women, and it was this—"They must aim at something great, the glitter or the gold." Women had expectations and yearnings, all of them; she meant to say women who were never outside their homes had the desire to do great and good things for their sex. She said that anything a man could do she might be allowed to do. (Hear, hear.) She was right glad to see so many there; it told her the women had an interest, and she thought it was the beginning of the good times for Hyde. (Applause.)

She had lived in Hyde for about ten years; she came from near Ashton, and they looked after politics there, but ever since she came it had seemed as if they were always asleep, nearly sleeping the sleep of death. She hoped they would make a good beginning, and if she could use an angel's tongue she would advise them to have nothing to do with those who would bribe their votes. She was in Ashton on the day of the last election, and what she saw made her heart ache, and she felt as if immersed in a dark cloud, because she had always expected better things of women, and felt they were capable of them. She saw cabs posted with blue, and thronged with women in liquor. (Murmurs.) Well, she did not see any red; she was only speaking of what she did see. (Laughter and applause.) But those women were really a disgrace to their sex, and she felt sorry, and in that coming election she was very anxious to see that they did not get amongst the drink. Let them keep away from it. She did not believe a woman, unless she was a little inclined for drink, would be bribed for her vote. When they went to vote let them go quietly and orderly, record their vote, and go home, and maybe they would get some of those strong-minded men on their side to assist them in obtaining the parliamentary vote. They were not contending for equality with the men; they wanted to keep their fine natural distinctions; they were finer than those of the males, but they wanted to show the men they were not all weak-minded, that they knew what they were doing. The speaker then stated the terms of joining the Women's Suffrage Association, and said the object of that Association was to elevate women, and they would receive the journal every month, in which they would see the disabilities women laboured under. Let it be understood she did not blame the men for this servile slavish position of the women; some people said it had been selfish of men to frame laws for the women, but she thought it over-indulgence; they had treated the women as babies. (Laughter.) Let them be up and doing, come with them (the promoters), and help them to gain equality, justice, and reform. (Loud applause.)

The resolution was then put and carried.

Mrs. OLIVER SCATCERD said the resolution she had to propose was: "That this meeting urges every woman elector, before giving or promising her vote, to ascertain from each candidate for the municipal election whether he will, if returned, vote in the council in support of a petition in favour of the Bill to give women ratepayers the suffrage for parliamentary elections, and that a petition be passed and signed by the chairwoman of this meeting, on behalf of the meeting, in support of Mr. Hugh Mason's resolution, which will extend the parliamentary franchise to women householders." Mrs. Scatcerd supported the resolution in an eloquent and instructive address.

Mrs. THORLEY thought it very fortunate for her that she had to follow Mrs. Scatcerd; she had laid so much before them that she had left very little for her. There was one question she would like to put before their candidates when they came before them, and that was whether they would be willing to have public baths and wash-houses: all the towns about them had but Hyde. She was happy to tell Mrs. Scatcerd they were not so over-crowded in their residences, and they had many open places, and many clean places, yet those baths and wash-houses would be a very great improvement to their town. She would like to say one word to the women there, and that was, whoever they voted for, let them not vote for a publican. (Murmurs.) There were men, she was told, who had a great objection to women voting, because they got drunk. She hoped that would not be said of the election in Hyde. Let them go with honour. She had very great pleasure in seconding the resolution.

The motion was put and passed with a full chorus of "Ayes," and no "Noes."

Mrs. Scatcerd then took the chair, and Mrs. ROWCROFT moved a vote of thanks to Miss Hibbert for presiding, which was seconded by Mrs. FRED SIDWAY.

Mrs. SCATCERD said it was a great thing to get a local lady to come and take the chair. (Applause.) They heard a great deal of what women could not do, but they never knew what they could do until they tried, and she was quite sure, from the experience, that they got on as well as men did.

The motion was then put and acknowledged, and a petition for the chairwoman to sign, in furtherance of the renewal of women's electoral disabilities, having been read, the meeting came to a close.

DEBATING SOCIETIES.

WEST HARTLEPOOL.

On the 3rd March the question of women's suffrage was discussed at the West Hartlepool Young Men's Christian Association House of Commons. The subject was introduced by Mr. F. W. Lawson, who moved the following resolution: "That in the opinion of this House the deprivation of certain ratepayers of the right of voting in the election of members of Parliament, on the sole ground that they are women, is directly opposed to the fundamental principle of representative government, is therefore unjust to those ratepayers, and deprives women of that free expression of opinion which is the only real safeguard of freedom in the State." After an animated and lengthy discussion the resolution was put to the "House," and was lost by a majority of two votes in a large division. The local correspondent who communicates the above believes that as the small majority grows in years they will grow in wisdom, and when our young champion brings it again before the "House" he will have a very large majority.

BATLEY CARR.

On March 10th, at the rooms of the Batley Carr Liberal Club Debating Society, a paper was read by Mr. Fred Sheard, of Batley, on "The claims of women to the parliamentary franchise." The chair was taken by Mr. Samuel Firth (the president), and there was a very good attendance, which included a number of ladies. Mr. Sheard's able paper concluded with the affirmation that his Liberalism taught him to give to his fellow beings the rights he possessed and could use for himself. Discussion being invited, the argument of the essayist was followed by Mr. James Denton, and opposed by Mr. Walker, who was the only opponent, Mr. John Allen, Mrs. Ellis, Mr. David Vero, and Mr. James Farnhill. Mr. Sheard replied; and votes of thanks to the essayist and the chairman brought the proceedings to a close. A petition in favour of women's suffrage was laid on the table and received many signatures.

SOUTHWARK.

On April 12th a debate took place at the offices of the Southwark Liberal Association, High-street, Borough. Mr. Sinclair presided. The discussion was opened by Mr. W. F. Reynolds, who said they proposed to treat the political, legal, and industrial rights of women. He advocated these in an able and exhaustive paper, and claimed that justice, though tardy, should be done. The Chairman having invited discussion, Mr. U. Gardner moved an amendment that the franchise formed no portion of what was due to the ladies. The original resolution was supported by Mr. Hunter and Mr. Moss. Mr. Moore, Mr. Parish, Mr. Hennessy, and Mr. Wright spoke in favour of the amendment. After a reply from Mr. Reynolds, the amendment was lost, and the original motion was carried.

THE HALF PAY OF MARRIED OFFICERS IN THE ARMY.

The following letter appeared in the *Daily Chronicle* (London), and points out a great hardship to women under existing laws and customs.

"The public generally cannot be aware of the fact that the authorities at the War Office allow an officer in the army, married or single, to sell his half-pay for a round sum of money, and thereby, in the event of the wife surviving, leaving her penniless and destitute. Under the late Government, the authorities of the War Office allowed my brother-in-law, a major in the Army of distinguished military services in the Indian Mutiny and elsewhere, to sell his half-pay, although his wife had previously represented and earnestly protested against such injustice and inhumanity, and stating at the same time that in the event of her surviving him she would, in consequence, be left totally destitute. I beg to state that the major died last year, and his widow is now starving.

"I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

"AUGUSTUS J. HARVEY, F.R.G.S.

"Great Yarmouth, April 2nd, 1881."

In view of a recent decision of the Cambridge University authorities, the *Scotsman* understands that Professor Masson has given notice of a motion asking the Senatus of the Edinburgh University to reconsider their position in regard to the University education of women.

HOW, INDEED?

The following letter appeared in the *Standard*:—

"To the Editor of the *Standard*."

"Sir,—Will you be so kind as to find a corner in your valuable paper for the following:—

"On the 20th December, 1880, the 1st Battalion Scots Guards left London for Dublin, and left the women and children of the Battalion behind in quarters at Wellington House. On the 24th of February the women and children were removed to the Tower of London, except 16 families (privates), who had to find quarters where they could. Now, sir, I ask if it is justice to the British soldier who is on the married roll of a regiment to make him keep two homes. We have been separated nearly four months, and the only recompense is 3d. per day for each woman, and 1½d. for each child. There are plenty of quarters where the Battalion is stationed for married people, then why are our families kept from us? A private soldier, with 8s. 2d. a week, and one or two children to keep—how are they to live?—I am, Sir, your obedient servant,
"Dublin, April 14."

"SCOTS GUARD."

REVIEW.

WOMAN'S CLAIM. By EMILY PFEIFFER. *Contemporary Review*, February, 1881.

One of the symptoms of the growing strength of the feeling among women of the need for enfranchisement is the appearance from time to time of articles in support of the claim from ladies eminent in the departments of public life, and who are not specially identified with the movement. A few months ago an article appeared in *Fraser's Magazine* by Mrs. Oliphant, which touched on the benefits accruing to women through the efforts of the pioneers of the movement; and now we have an article in the *Contemporary Review* from Mrs. Emily Pfeiffer, whose plea for the granting of the suffrage to women proves that a keen sense of their political rights and duties is compatible with if not enhanced by the possession of the poetic spirit. The article is doing good work by appealing to the reason, self-interest, to the heart, and one may say, the wisdom of men; and as it has been reprinted it will, we trust, have a wide circulation. Mrs. Pfeiffer says: "It may be conceded as a fact, that the desire on the part of the daughters of England to be no longer excluded from participation in one of the rights which her sons hold dear, is a genuine and increasing one. . . . Women are still sometimes roundly told that they have no grievances, and asked what it is they can want which lies within the competence of the suffrage to give them. Like Shylock, 'I will not answer that.' There is little to be gained by going over that ground of old wrongs which has often led to bitter question. I will not even more than point in passing at the burning injustice which can wrest from the woman's grasp the child who, bone of her bone and flesh of her flesh, is the fruit of her labour and sorrow. It is, or ought to be, sufficient that women are awakening to a consciousness that their interests are unrepresented, and suffer in consequence; that they feel themselves aggrieved by their position—illogically maintained in the face of altered conditions—of a separate caste; and that they demand to join their judgment to the opinions of men on questions of social policy, and to add their experience to those same opinions on matters with which it is their special function to deal. To this end they seek to give weight to their views in the authorised fashion; they claim to count as an element in the constituencies with which members of the Lower House have to reckon. . . . Women are dissatisfied not only with what has been done, and with what has been left undone for them, they are also dissatisfied that they, toilers and sufferers, should be left to the self-dependence of labour and sorrow without a voice in the government to which they are accountable. Their right to labour on other fields than the barren patch into which they were until lately crowded, has been tardily conceded; they now demand to have a word to say in the making and administering of the laws by which the fruits of labour are protected. It is not well that there should be this widening breach, this growing sense of hardship. . . . In making the experiment of their fitness for untried work, they have had to face odium and abundant ridicule from those whose approval they hold dear. Their efforts to train themselves for higher and more re-

munerative labour have encountered the opposition of a jealously-guarded monopoly; and the claim for citizenship now formulated—though enforced independence has rendered it a right—may be met, seeing that it lacks the element of material force which still enters largely into human affairs, on many sides with indifference, and on some with scorn. It would not be thus if there existed a threat behind it. Meetings of men of any class, upon the scale of the women's meetings which have lately assembled, would be held sufficiently representative of their mind and will to enforce respect for their demands. But the stream of tendency which sets in the way of women's advance is irresistible, and the vital rational principles incorporated in her claim could in the end win alone in the struggle with material resistance—

The soul of things is strong;
A seedling's heaving heart has moved a stone.

AN ENERGETIC ELECTOR OF WYOMING.

One of the leading ladies of Laramie City, Wyoming, spent last summer upon a ranche seventy miles distant from her home. October passed, November came, yet the plans which had been made, and upon which she counted for a comfortable journey to Laramie with good company to shorten the weary distance over the bleak plateau, like other "best laid plans of mice and men," went "agley."

Monday, November 8, dawned. "To-morrow will be election and I am seventy miles away from my precinct!" said the little madam to herself, though still hoping that the desired opportunity for return would appear that morning; but that proved to be a hope deferred and unavailing, and by noon she knew that her only alternative was to lose her vote or ride alone into Laramie. She seized the latter horn of the dilemma, and at 2 p.m. was in the saddle and homeward bound. Having ridden far into the night she picketed her horse, wrapped herself in a blanket, and, with prairie beneath and sky above, she slept the sleep of the tired and unafraid.

Early morning found her again on the desolate trail, and with good cheer she hastened over the lessening miles. All went happily, and at 3 p.m., November 9th, the journey was ended, and this energetic citizen dropped her little white ballot into the box, thus noiselessly but effectually giving to town and territory her piece of political mind.

This may be considered only a floating straw, but it shows which way the tide is setting. The decade of citizenship which the women of Wyoming have had has not been fruitless; year by year the value of the elective franchise appreciates as its results become more and more apparent, not alone in the higher standard that is demanded of officials, but as an educator as well. Real responsibility of any sort, nobly borne, develops strength and increases capacity; only through such discipline does humanity out-grow its childhood and attain its full stature, and only in freedom of mind, body and estate, can humanity reap the reward of such discipline. A.

Denver, Colorado, March, 1881.—*Women's Journal*.

LAW REPORT.

HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE.—CHANCERY DIVISION, APRIL 26.

(Before Mr. Justice FRY.)

FUTCHER V. FUTCHER.

This was an action by a lady against the representatives of her third husband (two of his sons by a former marriage) to enforce an alleged parol agreement by him that she should have power over the whole of her property. The plaintiff was married to her first husband, Mr. Newman, in 1829. He died in 1832. She was married to her second husband, Mr. Lodge, in the year 1834. He died in 1864, leaving her a considerable fortune. She had one daughter by her first marriage, now Mrs. Wallis, who has several children. Her only child by her second husband died in childhood. She married her third husband in the year 1877. She was then seventy-two years of age and he was fifty-four. He died in April of last year. He had settled some portion of his wife's property on her daughter and grandchildren in his lifetime, but had left the larger part by will for the benefit of his own children. This

was stated to amount to over £40,000. The present application was a motion to restrain the defendants from dealing with that part of the deceased's property which had belonged to the plaintiff and for the appointment of a receiver. It was supported by affidavits by herself, her daughter, and one of her grandsons, aged twenty-four. She affirmed that she was illiterate, and that many times before marriage her late husband had stated that she should have as full control over her property as if a settlement had been made, and as if she had not been married to him, and that she should receive her own dividends and incomes, and should have the absolute disposal of the whole of her property, and should be able to give it or leave it by will to her daughter, Ellen Wallis, and her children, or otherwise among her own family.

Mr. North, Q.C., and Mr. George Harris Lee appeared in support of the motion; Mr. Glasse, Q.C., and Mr. Giffard in opposition, but were not called on by

His LORDSHIP, who considered the evidence rather showed that there had been no intention of making anything like a settlement; that the deceased had received his wife's property into possession, and there had been no assertion of her right during the marriage, and there had been nearly three years; but, on the contrary, when her daughter and grandchild applied to him, he had insisted that the property was absolutely his, and they had to look for his bounty. Considering, therefore, the improbability of the plaintiff's getting the relief she asked at the hearing, he could not grant the injunction or interfere in the present stage of the action with the defendants' control over the property.—Times.

PARLIAMENTARY INTELLIGENCE.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, Monday, April 25.

MARRIED WOMEN'S PROPERTY (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Mr. ANDERSON moved that this Bill as amended be considered. The SPEAKER: Are there any amendments to insert in it? Mr. ANDERSON: No.

Sir G. CAMPBELL: I really hope that this very important Bill will not be proceeded with at this hour of the night (12 35). I do not think that the members of this House, or the public in Scotland, have the least idea of what the nature of this measure is. It is a Bill of enormous importance, and it totally changes the character of husband and wife in relation to the possession of property. It provides that in future marriage should be a mere partnership and not one and the same interest. I believe that the measure was referred to a Select Committee, but the committee was largely composed of members who were what is known as "women's rights men." I also find on the back of the Bill that the names of the hon. members who have introduced it are all "women's rights men." It is a very important measure, but nevertheless it is to apply to Scotland only. In that respect I think the hon. members who have brought it in have been a little unjust to Scotland. So far as the Bill has been discussed in Scotland, very serious objection has, I believe, been taken to it by various persons of importance, weight, and authority, and I see no reason, if the principle of the measure is a good and just one, why it should not be applied to the whole of the United Kingdom, seeing that the property of the whole of the country is in precisely the same position. The Bill now comes before us, at this hour, as a matter of surprise, and seeing that the questions involved in it are of so much importance, I must be allowed to express a strong hope that it will not be allowed to be proceeded with at this hour of the night.

Mr. ANDERSON: The hon. member for Kirkcaldy (Sir G. Campbell) has, I think, drawn a very erroneous picture of the meaning and object of the Bill. Its provisions have already been considered by a committee not of members in favour of women's rights, but of members whom I, as the promoter of the Bill, looked upon as rather a hostile committee. The evidence taken by the committee was that of the principal lawyers of Scotland, and the Bill has been moulded in accordance with the statements which they made. The consequence is that the measure is not now entirely what I should wish it to be. It has been a good deal changed in its character according to the opinions of the learned Lord Advocate, of the Solicitor-General for Scotland, of the Dean of the Faculty of Advocates of Edinburgh, and also according to the opinion of other lawyers of Scotland who came to give evidence upon it. I have

deferred my opinion to theirs, although I did not entirely agree with the views which they put forward; and the Bill is not now at all of the character described by the hon. member for Kirkcaldy, but is an extremely reasonable, moderate, and mild measure. Then, again, in place of taking the House by surprise, the Bill has been before the House for a whole session, and it has been, as I have already said, before a Select Committee upstairs. It has passed through that committee, and various amendments have been inserted in it. Certainly the hon. member for Kirkcaldy never placed any amendment on the paper at all, and never expressed any opinion upon the Bill. The amendments which have been considered have been proposed by lawyers, and they have all been adopted. As the Bill now stands it is a measure which by a consensus of opinion has been accepted by the lawyers of Scotland, and I am sorry that the hon. member for Kirkcaldy should not accept it also.

The House then divided on the question that the Bill as amended be now considered:—

Table with 2 columns: Ayes, Noes. Ayes: 69, Noes: 19.

The Bill was then ordered to be read a third time on Tuesday.

Obituary.

THE EARL OF BEACONSFIELD.—Benjamin Disraeli, Earl of Beaconsfield, Viscount Hughenden, K.G., &c., &c., &c., died on April 19th, at the age of 76 years. He was born December 21st, 1804. He was the eldest son of Isaac Disraeli, of Bradenham Manor, Bucks, author of the "Curiosities of Literature." Mr. Disraeli wrote "Vivian Grey," "Coningsby," "Sybil," and many other novels and romances, in which he expressed many of his political and social theories, and which, therefore, have an interest besides their great literary merit. He was first returned to Parliament for Maidstone, in 1837, which borough he represented till June, 1841, when he was elected for Shrewsbury, and sat till 1847. He was then elected for Bucks, which county he represented at the time he was made a peer. In 1839 he married Mary Ann, daughter of Captain Viney Evans, R.N., and widow of Mr. Wyndham Lewis, M.P. She was created Viscountess Beaconsfield in 1868, and died in 1872. Mr. Disraeli was Chancellor of the Exchequer from March till December, 1852, and from March, 1858, till June, 1859, and from July, 1866, till February, 1868. First Lord of the Treasury from that date till December following. In 1874 he was again Prime Minister, which office he continued to hold till April, 1880. He was created Earl of Beaconsfield in 1876. He was interred at Hughenden, on April 26th, 1881. A public funeral was offered by Mr. Gladstone on the part of the Government, and it was known that the Queen was desirous that this honour should be paid to his remains, but this desire was overruled by the express direction in his will, "that I may be buried in the same vault in the churchyard of Hughenden in which the remains of my late dear wife Mary Ann Disraeli, created in her own right Viscountess Beaconsfield, were placed, and that my funeral may be conducted with the same simplicity as hers was." The funeral took place, therefore, in accordance with these directions, so far as the arrangements of his executors could determine; but if not a public, it was in one sense a national funeral. Representatives of sovereigns and statesmen followed Lord Beaconsfield to the tomb. Floral offerings from Queen Victoria and from persons of all ranks and ages brightened the gloom of death; and the whole nation, forgetting political differences, gathered in spirit round the grave of one whose place in England's political and social life was unique in history, and whose loss causes a blank in the group of central figures in the councils of the State, which friends and opponents alike deplore.

Mrs. DOWNING.—On April 20th, 1881, at 48, Arundel Square, Barnsbury, London, Mary Frances, widow of the late Washington Downing, Esq., and eldest daughter of the late Daniel McCarthy, Esq., Kilgadmire, Co. Kerry, Ireland, in the 71st year of her age. Mrs. Downing was the beloved mother of Miss Helena P. Downing, whose name is well known to our readers.

THE ROYAL UNIVERSITY OF IRELAND.

The following is the scheme for the organisation of the University, as proposed by the Committee appointed for that purpose by the Senate:—

DEGREES.

The University shall confer the following degrees:—

ARTS.—Bachelor of Arts, B.A.; Master of Arts, M.A. SCIENCE.—Doctor of Science, D.Sc.

ENGINEERING.—Bachelor of Engineering, B.E.; Master of Engineering, M.E.

MUSIC.—Bachelor of Music, B.Mus.; Doctor of Music, D.Mus.

MEDICINE.—Bachelor of Medicine, M.B.; Doctor of Medicine, M.D.

SURGERY.—Master of Surgery, M.Ch.; in Obstetrics, a special diploma.

LAW.—Bachelor of Laws, LL.B.; Doctor of Laws, LL.D.

All degrees in this University are open to persons of either sex. The examinations for women shall be held apart from those of men, but upon the same days.

MANCHESTER NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE.

SUBSCRIPTIONS, APRIL, 1881.

Table of subscriptions for Manchester National Society for Women's Suffrage, April 1881. Lists names and amounts for various individuals and groups across different districts like Hyde, Hull, and Grimsby.

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

CENTRAL COMMITTEE.

MARCH 20 TO APRIL 20, 1881.

Table of Central Committee subscriptions from March 20 to April 20, 1881. Lists names and amounts for individuals like Mr. Thomasson, Mrs. Neville Walford, etc.

LAURA M'LAREN, TREASURER, 64, Berners-street, W.

BRISTOL AND WEST OF ENGLAND.

SUBSCRIPTIONS AND DONATIONS, APRIL, 1881.

Table of Bristol and West of England subscriptions and donations for April 1881. Lists names and amounts for individuals like Miss Wansley, Mr. George Franklin, etc.

ALAN GREENWELL, TREASURER, 3, Buckingham Vale, Clifton.

GLASGOW.

FEBRUARY 20, 1881, TO APRIL 20, 1881.

Table of Glasgow subscriptions and donations from February 20, 1881, to April 20, 1881. Lists names and amounts for individuals like Mrs. John Smith, Mrs. Francis Smith, etc.

ANNA M. N. YOUNG, TREASURER and Hon. Sec.

PETITIONS.

WOMEN'S DISABILITIES—For Removal.

EIGHTH REPORT 23 March—4 April, 1881.

Table of petitions for removal of women's disabilities, 8th report. Lists locations like Mar., HULL, and BOLTON, along with petition numbers and signatures.

Total No. of Petitions 141—Signatures 4,863

The Petitions marked thus (*) are similar to that from Swansea [APP. 2]. The Petitions marked thus (+) are similar to that from Stockport [APP. 3.] The Petitions marked thus (©) are from public meetings, and are signed officially.

A LADY AS SURVEYOR OF ROADS.—Miss Mary Ann Turner was a few years ago Overseer of the Highways in the township of Matley, Cheshire, paying wages and superintending the workmen herself. At the end of the year she had not spent more money than former overseers, and had put the portion of road under her care into thoroughly good condition.

A Bengal lady, Maharanee Surnomoza, has recently subscribed 8,050 rupees for the endowment of scholarships for the encouragement of Sanskrit learning.



CASH'S CAMBRIC FRILLING

None are Genuine with-
out the Name and Trade
Mark of J. & J. CASH
Coventry.

To be had
of Drapers
everywhere.

Is the most Durable and Satisfactory Trimming for
Ladies', Children's, and Infants' Wardrobes.

DO NOT UNTIMELY DIE.

Sore Throats Cured with One Dose.

FENNINGS' FEVER CURER.

BOWEL COMPLAINTS cured with One
Dose.

TYPHUS or LOW FEVER cured with
Two Doses.

DIPHTHERIA cured with Three Doses.

SCARLET FEVER cured with Four
Doses.

DYSENTERY cured with Five Doses.

Sold in Bottles, 1s. 1½d. each, with full directions, by
all Chemists.

Read Fennings' "Everybody's Doctor." Sent post
free for 13 stamps.

SORE THROATS CURED.

EASY TEETHING.

DO NOT LET YOUR CHILD DIE.

FENNINGS' Children's Powders Prevent
Convulsions.

ARE COOLING AND SOOTHING.

FENNINGS' Children's Powders.

For Children Cutting their Teeth, to prevent
Convulsions.

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

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

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

COUGHS. COLDS. BRONCHITIS.

FENNINGS' LUNG HEALERS.

The Best Remedy to Cure all

Coughs, Colds, Asthmas, &c.

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

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

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

SAFE TEETHING.

BRONCHITIS CURED.

THE UNIVERSAL HOUSEHOLD REMEDIES!!!

HOLLOWAY'S PILLS & OINTMENT

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

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

ESTABLISHED 1835.



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

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

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

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

Printed by A. IRELAND & Co., Pall Mall, Manchester, for the Proprietors. and Published by Messrs. Trübner and Co., 57 and 59, Ludgate Hill, London, and
Mr. JOHN HEYWOOD, Manchester.—May 2, 1881.—Entered at Stationers' Hall.