

# WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE JOURNAL.

EDITED BY LYDIA E. BECKER.

VOL. II.—No. 14. PUBLISHED MONTHLY.

MANCHESTER, APRIL 1, 1871.

PRICE ONE PENNY.

## Contents :

Leading Article by the Editor.  
Tamworth Election.

Manchester National Society for Women's Suffrage :—  
Treasurer's Report for March.  
School Boards :—Exeter, Merthyr Tydvil.

Public Meetings :—London, Rawtenstall, Cheltenham,  
Gloucester, Cirencester, Bermondsey, Bath, Bristol,  
Plymouth, Devonport, Scotland, Lochee, Eccles, &c.  
Memorial to the Right Hon. Henry Austin Bruce, M.P.,  
Secretary of State.

Sonnet.

Petitions to the House of Commons.  
Reports of the Select Committee on Public Petitions.  
Proposed Bazaar and Exhibition.

THE month which is now commencing is the last period that remains to us for helping the Bill before its fate is decided, and our friends throughout the country should use their utmost efforts to promote petitions and other demonstrations of opinion in its favour. By the time that another issue of this *Journal* reaches the hands of its readers the work outside Parliament will have been well-nigh completed, and little will remain to be done but to await the decision which the House of Commons will pronounce on the question of the second reading of the Bill on the third of May. That decision may be greatly influenced by the work of the next few weeks. If members of Parliament find among their constituents an appreciation of the justice of the measure, of the benefits that it would confer on society, and a desire that it should become law, the division list cannot fail to be influenced thereby. It is not in our power to command success, but we may at least deserve it; and whatever be the result of the critical vote, we shall have no cause either for regret or discouragement if all of us can say, on looking back to the struggle, that we have done what we could.

The help which is perhaps the most important of all just now, is such as everyone can give, namely, signing and inducing others to sign petitions. In almost every locality there are many friends who would be glad to sign petitions if they were asked, and others who are under a misapprehension as to the object of the Bill, but who would assent at once on being made acquainted with its real nature. We beg that our friends will help us by collecting such names, and add to the list of petitions by their contributions, which, however humble, cannot fail to do good. Every little helps; and every petition, however small, swells the sum total.

The petitions already sent in have been signed by 58,322 persons; at the same time last year they had been signed by 45,765. The increase is satisfactory, but we need a still greater increase, and to secure this, very earnest effort should be made. One solitary petition has been presented

against the Bill—from the Town Council of Dundee. This worshipful assembly does not condescend to express its reasons for its request; it merely observes that it entertains objections to the measure and craves that it may not pass into law. Women in Scotland do not possess the municipal franchise, else the Council of Dundee might have hesitated to present a petition against the extension of privileges to its constituents. In pleasing contrast to the action of Dundee stands that of Edinburgh and Dumfries, both of which have petitioned for the Bill.

This example is likely to be followed in some places in England. In another column will be found a copy of the petition adopted last year by the municipal corporation of Manchester, and which will be proposed again this year; and we beg that all of our friends who live in municipal boroughs will take steps to bring the matter before their respective town councils with a view to the adoption of similar petitions. In English boroughs where the councillors have to ask the suffrages of women electors, it is to be expected that such petitions would in most cases be carried, and they would greatly help the progress of the Bill.

The circumstances under which we approach the contest this session are somewhat different from those of last year. The concession of the municipal franchise without opposition in either House of Parliament, and with the direct sanction of the Government, led not unnaturally to the impression that the principle of women's suffrage might be regarded as established, and its application to the Parliamentary vote follow at once. A member of Parliament who had been a consistent opponent of women's suffrage, in addressing his constituents soon after the change, said that after giving to women the municipal vote he did not see on what principle the Parliamentary vote could be withheld. This same member afterwards voted against going into committee on Mr. Bright's Bill, and on being asked for an explanation he replied that when he made the speech he believed that the Government would

give the franchise as a matter of course. If this belief was entertained by opponents both of Government and of the measure, it is not surprising that friends of both should have held the same view. We therefore approached the House of Commons last session with a reasonable hope that it would proceed on the path on which it had entered, and this hope was justified by its acceptance of the principle in the vote on the second reading of the Bill. So far all went well, and events might have marched quietly to the consummation of the measure, but for the retrograde policy suddenly assumed by her Majesty's Government.

Of this policy we have just reason to complain. We charge Mr. GLADSTONE'S administration with levity in dealing with a question affecting the electoral rights of one-sixth of the householders of a nation which professes to make household suffrage the basis of its electoral law, and with inconsistency in disappointing just expectations created by its previous conduct. No one could have predicted that a responsible government would first give its deliberate sanction to a proposal for enfranchising a large body of householders in regard to the municipal vote—would next remain neutral on a proposal for giving them the Parliamentary vote, and as soon as it found that the proposal was likely to be carried, would suddenly turn round and bitterly oppose the claim which it had hitherto actively and passively encouraged. We have spoken of a responsible government, but no government which was responsible to those whose interests were in question would have dealt with them in so capricious a fashion. We can only account for such conduct by supposing that as some men attribute to women illogical and inconsistent faculties, they think it right, in order to match these, to behave to women in an illogical and inconsistent manner.

We are, however, not altogether without hope that the Government may reconsider the matter. The just and liberal sentiments in regard to the political rights of women, avowed by the leader of the Opposition, in his place in the House of Commons, in 1866, are known to be shared by many of the most eminent members of the present Government. The wise and generous policy thus indicated was adopted without qualification in the Elementary Education Act, a measure which is based on perfect equality between the sexes, as regards the whole of its subject matter. We think that some show of reason is required even from men who are legislating for women, and it appears impossible to find any tenable grounds which would at once justify the concession of the municipal

and educational vote and the withholding of the remaining one.

We say that it is anything but complimentary to the educational parliaments which the Legislature has just instituted, that it should declare eligible to take part in their deliberations persons whom it does not deem fit to have a vote in the election of its own members, and we maintain that the recognition by the Legislature of the fitness of women for the responsible office of member of a School Board, renders anomalous and untenable the maintenance of the disability which excludes them from voting in the election of members of Parliament. We cannot, therefore, altogether abandon the hope that the Government may perceive the difficulty of the position it has assumed, and extricate itself from the maze of inconsistency in which it is involved by ceasing to oppose the passing of the Women's Disabilities Bill.

#### TAMWORTH ELECTION.

The nomination of a burgess to fill the vacancy caused by Sir Henry Bulwer's elevation to the peerage took place on March 28, at Tamworth. Mr. John Peel was the only candidate. Mr. Peel has been twice member for Tamworth. In 1867 he voted with Mr. Mill for the enfranchisement of women. In 1868 he was defeated. No other candidate being proposed, the Mayor declared Mr. Peel duly elected, amid deafening cheers.

Mr. PEEL in warm terms acknowledged the honour conferred upon him. In the course of his speech he expressed his determination to support the ballot and admission of women to the franchise, and resumed his seat amid loud cheers.

Three cheers were given for Mrs. Peel and family, and a cordial vote of thanks to the Mayor closed the proceedings.

#### TREASURER'S REPORT FOR MARCH, 1871.

##### SUBSCRIPTIONS RECEIVED DURING THE MONTH.

|                              |          |
|------------------------------|----------|
| Mr. Cooke .....              | £1 1 0   |
| Mrs. H. Gaddum .....         | 2 0 0    |
| Rev. G. Barnby .....         | 0 1 0    |
| Mrs. Barnby .....            | 0 1 0    |
| Miss Barnby .....            | 0 1 0    |
| Mrs. Pennington .....        | 20 0 0   |
| Mrs. Thacher .....           | 1 0 0    |
| Rev. T. G. Crippen .....     | 0 2 6    |
| Mr. Benjamin Whitworth ..... | 10 0 0   |
| Miss S. J. Clemesha .....    | 0 2 6    |
| Mrs. J. G. Dean .....        | 0 10 0   |
| Captain A. D. D. .....       | 0 6 0    |
| Mrs. Mary Hargreave .....    | 0 2 0    |
| Mr. James Hill .....         | 0 5 0    |
| Miss Ramsbottom .....        | 0 10 0   |
| Mrs. Winkworth .....         | 5 0 0    |
| Mr. F. Carey .....           | 0 5 0    |
| Mr. Hampson .....            | 0 2 6    |
| Mrs. Hampson .....           | 0 2 6    |
| Mrs. Ogden .....             | 2 0 0    |
| Miss Rigby .....             | 5 0 0    |
|                              | £48 12 0 |

Cheques and post-office orders payable to the Treasurer.

S. ALFRED STEINTHAL.

107, Upper Brook-street, Manchester.

#### PUBLIC MEETINGS, &c.

##### LONDON.

A public meeting was held on March 25, at St. James's Hall, to advocate the claims of women to the suffrage. Sir Robert Anstruther, M.P., occupied the chair, and amongst the gentlemen on the platform were Mr. Jacob Bright, M.P., Mr. Henry Fawcett, M.P., Professor Cliffe Leslie, Dr. Lyon Playfair, M.P., Mr. P. A. Taylor, M.P., Mr. M'Laren, M.P., the Hon. A. Herbert, and a considerable muster of ladies.

The CHAIRMAN having read letters of apology from Lord Houghton, Mr. Stansfeld, Mr. Eastwick, M.P., Mr. Thomas Hughes, M.P., and Lord Amberley, in opening the proceedings, expressed a doubt as to the wisdom of the committee in choosing him as chairman. He thought it would have been more appropriate to have chosen a lady, considering the admirable mode in which Mrs. P. A. Taylor had presided over a similar meeting at the Hanover Square Rooms last year. He doubted the wisdom, also, of making all the speakers men, after the admirable speeches of the ladies last year. Concurring heartily in the object of the meeting, he was, however, glad to do what he could to promote its success. The action and progress of the association was very well known. Four years ago their object had been introduced to the notice of the House of Commons by Mr. J. S. Mill—(cheers)—with extraordinary force, eloquence, and ability. Since then, under great difficulties, the question of female suffrage had made extraordinary strides. Four years since it was thought impracticable, but now more than half of what Mr. Mill had contemplated had been obtained. In 1869 Mr. Jacob Bright brought forward his motion for giving the municipal franchise to women, and in 1870 his Bill was brought forward and passed a second reading, thus affirming the principle of woman suffrage; while the passing of the Education Act, giving women the vote for and a seat on School Boards, was the best proof of the utility of the bugbears which had been raised to the incapacity and undesirability of women fulfilling such civic duties. The association did not ask for privileges, but demanded a right; for those who bore the burdens of citizenship were entitled to exercise its rights. He desired that the question whether women were fitted for the exercise of the parliamentary franchise should be fairly discussed in the House of Commons or elsewhere, and he would then challenge any man to show that the exercise of that right would not be of advantage not only to women, but to the whole community. (Cheers.) Having referred to the defeat of the Bill of Mr. Jacob Bright, he considered some of the arguments used against it, and showed that the inconveniences which had then been predicted would be removed by the impending adoption of the ballot. But other influences, he said, than those expressed had caused the rejection of the Bill. It was a party division, for it was feared that the woman franchise would have injuriously affected Liberal interests in many closely-contested boroughs. Such a motive was a most unworthy one, and little creditable to the Liberal party. But even if the woman franchise would injuriously affect the Liberal majority, that was no reason why a right should be withheld, nor did he think it would be possible long to withhold that right. Liberal measures ere now had been carried by turning out a Liberal Government, and he would impress upon the meeting a remarkable expression of Mr. Disraeli on the subject of female suffrage. He said, "In a country where ladies hold manorial courts, and where they act as churchwardens, he did not see why the suffrage should be withheld from them." (Cheers.) He hoped that would sink into the ears of the meeting, and that Mr. Jacob Bright, in pressing his measure, should remember that, though he might fail to get that support which he deserved from the Liberal Government, a time might come when the

support they refused might be accorded to him by the occupants of the front Opposition bench. (Cheers.) In any case he was sure he expressed the sense of the meeting in wishing the hon. gentleman success in his arduous task. (Hear, hear.)

The hon. Chairman concluded by calling upon Mr. JACOB BRIGHT, M.P., who moved the first resolution, which was as follows:—"That this meeting is of opinion that the exclusion of women from representation is injurious, not only to the welfare of women themselves, but to the interests of the whole community." He sympathised with the chairman in regretting that the ladies had not come forward to advocate their own cause. All the arguments used on behalf of extension of male suffrage applied with equal force to the claim of women to the suffrage. They had taught women to ask whether that which was of such benefit to men might not be of advantage also to women. Justice was good for both, and if legislative justice could only be obtained for men by giving them power at the polling booth, it was very simple logic on the part of women to conclude that legislative justice could only be obtained by the same process for themselves. The women who were asking for the suffrage were amongst the most gifted of their sex, and they were supported by some of the most gifted and intelligent of men. He regretted that Mr. John Stuart Mill was not still in the House, because he believed the measure would have received more consideration and support in that House if it had been in that gentleman's hands. Though defeated, his (Mr. Jacob Bright's) Bill had commanded more votes than the corn-law repealers could get, until Sir Robert Peel came to their assistance. He regretted the opposition the Government had shown; but he was sure that as that Government had given women the municipal and education franchise, they would readily be induced to concede the whole demand when public opinion had unequivocally expressed itself. (Cheers.)

Dr. LYON PLAYFAIR, M.P., felt himself unfit to answer the sentimental and traditional objections which alone were urged against woman suffrage. The parliamentary debates were difficult to deal with, for they were without argument. Even Mr. Gladstone had only talked of it as "a tearing-up of the landmarks of society." Mr. Beresford Hope had defined the functions of women to be, not to govern, but to guide, to influence, to moderate, to regulate, and to suffer. (Laughter.) The whole history of human progress showed that every link which had been knocked off the servile chain of women had added to the purity and beauty of woman's character. They now desired to break off the last few links of that chain, and give her perfect equality in all political and social relations of life. It could not be denied that women had very rough practical duties to perform, which they performed with great aptitude; and he therefore would cite that fact in disproof of the only argument which Mr. Bouverie had used to defeat Mr. Bright's Bill—namely, that women were like a fine porcelain, which should not be touched lest it should be injured. In conclusion the hon. gentleman, in dealing with the *raison d'être* argument—that woman's sphere was to be wives and mothers—said there were many women to whom that destiny did not apply, and the Bill only asked for the suffrage for those who were ratepayers and subject to the burdens of citizenship, though it was possible that if their opponents did not yield what was now asked, they might ask a great deal more before long. (Hear, hear.)

Professor C. LESLIE supported the resolution, and excited some amusement by citing a physiological argument which had been advanced against the social and political equality of women—namely, that they have fewer particles in the composition of their blood.

The resolution was then put to the meeting and was carried with two or three dissentients.

Mr. FAWCETT, M.P., moved the second resolution, which was as follows:—"That women, being held equally with men responsible to law, should therefore have equal voice in electing those who make the laws." The principle of that resolution was so incontestable that he should not argue about it. It was more profitable to consider the obstacles which impeded the progress of the movement, and those were prejudice and party. In so far as they rested on prejudice it was difficult to meet them, for they rested on an unsubstantial basis: but much of what had been urged in the past could not be stated in the future. Dealing with the argument that it was not proper for women to take part in politics, he admitted the force of the objection, if politics were defined to be mere rivalry and struggling for office; but, if taken in its high and true sense, he contended that politics were a fit study for women, and were only beyond the sphere of those who were base and vicious. It had been urged that women did not care for the power of voting; but that was no sound argument for depriving those who did value the franchise of their right. Having denounced as miserable, cowardly, and oligarchic, the motive said to have influenced the Liberal party in opposing the Bill of Mr. Jacob Bright—namely, that it would weaken the majority of the party in the House of Commons—the hon. gentleman proceeded to consider the prospects of the measure in the future, and he said its supporters might console themselves with the reflection that the Prime Minister could be convinced by argument, and did not mind changing his opinion; and that right hon. gentleman's argument on this subject had been so illogical that the time was not far distant when he would be brought to recognise their absurdity. Quoting the Premier's famous dictum, "Are not working men our own flesh and blood?" the hon. gentleman asked whether women were not our own flesh and blood, and whether, according to his own argument, Mr. Gladstone could any longer refuse them the franchise. In conclusion, he appealed to the lately enfranchised working classes to extend the boon they now enjoyed to women, not to agitate any more for manhood suffrage, but one and all to help forward the advent of that era when no one in this country, unless incapacitated by mental defects, by pauperism or by crime, should be deprived by those political rights without which justice was not guaranteed, and freedom was not secured. (Cheers.)

Mr. GEORGE HOWELL seconded the resolution.

The resolution was carried unanimously.

Mr. P. A. TAYLOR moved the next resolution:—"That the recent Acts conferring the municipal franchise on women and the right of electing members to sit on School Boards, ought to be supplemented by the acceptance of the Bill introduced by Mr. Jacob Bright; and it is therefore resolved that petitions signed by the chairman on behalf of the meeting, in favour of this Bill, be forwarded to both Houses of Parliament."

Mr. AUBERON HERBERT seconded the motion. He said it had been remarked that the condition of the life of woman was to suffer. He believed that, if he were to attempt to make a speech at that late period of the evening, he should be adding to their assumed natural suffering. (Laughter.) If everything depended upon the reserve fund—if he might use the expression—of thought and feeling in the country, we were bound to do everything in our power to stimulate it. Men were very careful in reading their newspapers, and studying political and social questions, but those matters scarcely ever entered their homes. The reason was that we had unfortunately drawn a dividing line between man and wife. We had not invited women to share our responsibilities. (Applause.)

The resolution was agreed to with acclamation.

After thanking the chairman the meeting separated.

#### RAWTENSTALL.

A meeting in favour of the Bill for removing the electoral disabilities of women was held in the Co-operative Hall, Rawtenstall, on March 20.

The chair was occupied by Mr. J. B. WHITEHEAD, J.P.

Miss BECKER moved: "That, in the opinion of this meeting, the exclusion of women, otherwise legally qualified, from voting in the election of members of Parliament is injurious to those excluded, contrary to the principle of just representation, and to that of the laws now in force regulating the election of municipal, parochial, and of all other representative governments." In the course of her address, Miss Becker enumerated a number of hardships, which arose from injustice in the existing political and legal condition of women. She deprecated, as a violation of the law of nature, the provision whereby a woman possessed no right to the custody of her children, and a state of things that would not be continued in any country in which women were represented in making the laws. It did mostly happen that the inconveniences caused by the one-sidedness of the law with regard to women had been felt chiefly by them, but a case had lately happened in which the tables had been unexpectedly turned on society by the legal fiction of the non-existence of a wife—the case of Mrs. Torpey, who was properly acquitted, on the ground that she acted under the direction of her husband. That verdict was right in accordance with the principle of the law; it was very wrong according to justice; and this injustice they were endeavouring to remove. Referring to the education of children, she said every one would see that women were as much interested in education as men; yet great injustice was done women in that respect. There was not an endowed school or university the doors of which were not barred to women. When they were enfranchised, and were recognised as part of the nation—then they would bring in their University Tests Bill and Endowed Schools Bill, and not rest content to be excluded from any institution which offered education to the people. To her mind the dispute as to whether the universities should be open to the Dissenters or not was a very small matter so long as half the nation was excluded from their benefits. With regard to elementary education, great injustice was done to girls and women. On the Manchester School Board she had had a struggle in which she was hopelessly beaten—being only one woman among 14 men—with regard to obtaining an equal proportion of money to be spent on the education of girls to that spent on the education of boys. In vain she had said that it took as much to teach a girl as a boy. She had been told—she did not quite see it—that the laws of political economy decreed that a girl must only have three-quarters as much money spent on her as a boy. It was said that a schoolmistress was paid less than a schoolmaster. Why should that be so if she did the same work? She supposed that at any of the surrounding mills a woman weaver got as much for her piece as a man weaver. In the course of further remarks, she said women ought certainly to look sharply after what went on in Parliament. At the present moment a bill was before the House of Commons, introduced for a very praiseworthy object, by the junior member for Salford (Mr. Charley). He had brought in a bill called the Infant Life Protection Bill, his object being to preserve the lives of those unhappy infants who perished in baby farms and such institutions. She heartily concurred with Mr. Charley in his object, but she thought he had not taken the right means to accomplish it. In her judgment the proper means of preserving the lives of these poor infants was to make their fathers responsible for their lives; but the Bill did not touch that—it fastened the

responsibility on the nurses; and in case any poor woman wished to take a neighbour's child to nurse, she might become liable to six months' imprisonment for so doing. Strong efforts should be made to oppose the Bill, or there was great probability that it would pass. She thought when men began prying into nurseries and looking so closely after babies, it was really time for women to ask what they were about. In conclusion she referred to the conduct of Parliament with regard to the Bill to enfranchise women; she commented in strong terms on the course taken by Government, and expressed a hope that if the present Government persisted in being illiberal towards women, that the other side of the House might set them an example, and she thought it was not improbable that might be the case. Mr. Gladstone was afraid of men—he was not afraid of women, because they had no votes. (Laughter and applause.) She believed he, like most other men, would like to be thought a just man; then let him act justly by those who had nothing but justice to enforce their claims. The Liberal party would make a great mistake if, after allowing the Conservative Government the credit of enfranchising the working classes, it allowed them the credit of enfranchising the women. (Applause.)

Dr. PANKHURST seconded the motion. He argued that, on the grounds of justice in the abstract, the value of rich personal experience, and of increasing the sweep and power of our united national life, the cause of the Bill was complete.

The motion was unanimously passed.

The Rev. A. BUCKLEY moved the adoption of a petition praying for the removal of the electoral disabilities of women, to be forwarded to Mr. Holt, M.P., for presentation to the House of Commons, and that both the members for North-east Lancashire, Messrs. Holt and Starkie, be requested to support its prayer; also that a similar petition to the House of Lords be forwarded to the Earl of Derby for presentation.

Mr. ROBT. BAXTER (schoolmaster) seconded the motion, which was carried unanimously, and the proceedings terminated with a vote of thanks to the chairman.—*Manchester Examiner and Times.*

#### CHELTHENHAM.

On February 28 Miss BECKER lectured on the need of the franchise as a protection for women, to a large and fashionable audience. Dr. Wright occupied the chair. Petitions to both Houses of Parliament in favour of Mr. Bright's Bill were adopted, and a committee was afterwards formed for the purpose of promoting the measure.

The following ladies and gentlemen, with power to add to their number, constitute the committee:—

|   |                            |
|---|----------------------------|
| Miss MARY JANE BRIGGS.  | Miss L. F. MARCH-PHILLIPS. |
| Rev. DAVID GRIFFITH.  | Mrs. ROBBERS, Treasurer.   |
| Secretary: Mrs. GRIFFITHS, Clan Teivi House, Montpellier Grove. |                            |

#### GLOUCESTER.

On March 1st Miss BECKER lectured to a large audience in the Corn Exchange, Gloucester. Mr. T. Cash in the chair. A vote of thanks to the lecturer was cordially adopted by the meeting, and a vote of thanks to the chairman concluded the proceedings.

#### CIRENCESTER.

Miss BECKER lectured at Cirencester on March 2. The Rev. Henry Austin in the chair. The lecturer was well received. Petitions were adopted, and a committee in connection with the society established at Cirencester.

The following form the committee:—

|   |                 |
|---|-----------------|
| Mrs. AUSTIN.                                    | Mr. ISAAC PITT. |
| Mr. BEGHAM.                                     | Miss TEUBRIDGE. |
| Mr. PARKINSON.                                  |                 |
| Secretary: Rev. HENRY AUSTIN, Pembroke Terrace. |                 |

#### BERMONDSEY.

On February 22, Mrs. FAWCETT delivered a lecture on Women's Suffrage to a crowded audience, at the Schoolroom, Upper Grange Road. Mr. GEORGE ODGER occupied the chair. A vote of thanks to the lecturer was adopted by acclamation.

#### BATH.

On Friday, March 3rd, Mrs. FAWCETT, wife of Professor Fawcett, M.P., addressed a very large audience at the Guild-hall, Bath, on the text "Why women require the suffrage." The Mayor presided, and at his right sat Mrs. Fawcett, Miss Ashworth (of the School Board) occupying a seat at his left. There were also present Miss Lydia Becker (of Manchester), Mrs. Rose, Mrs. Cotterell, Mrs. Pringle, Col. Watson, Messrs. Jerom Murch, R. T. Gore, B. Bartrum, I. Pitman, R. E. Peach, and others.

The MAYOR, in introducing the lecturer, said that, as women had a right to vote at municipal elections, and for members of Boards of Guardians and School Boards, he could not see why they should be denied the power to vote at Parliamentary elections, because the qualifications that were required for the one ought to qualify for the other. Again, two ladies in Bath had very lately been elected to fill a most important office, as members of the School Board, and it appeared a strange anomaly when those ladies to fill that office must be possessed of high mental qualifications, as well as good business habits, that they should be denied the right which was possessed by the poorest and least educated of our fellow-citizens, provided they were only householders.

Mrs. FAWCETT delivered an eloquent address, which was heard with great attention and frequently interrupted by applause. At its close

Miss ASHWORTH moved that a petition in favour of the Women's Disabilities Bill be adopted and signed by the Mayor on behalf of the meeting, and forwarded to Mr. Dalrymple for presentation to the House of Commons, with a letter asking him to support its prayer, and that a similar petition to the House of Lords be forwarded to the Marquis of Lansdowne.

Mr. ISAAC PITMAN seconded the resolution, which having been supported by one of the audience, by Miss Lydia Becker and Mrs. Rose, was put to the meeting and carried.

Mr. R. G. PEACH proposed a vote of thanks to Mrs. FAWCETT for her lecture. The vote having been seconded by Mr. R. T. GORE, was carried by acclamation.

The proceedings closed with a vote of thanks to the Mayor, proposed by Mr. JEROM MURCH, and his WORSHIP, in acknowledging it, expressed his cordial concurrence with the principle advocated by Mrs. Fawcett.

#### BRISTOL.

On March 8, a meeting was held at Bristol, Professor F. W. NEWMAN in the chair, when an address was delivered by Mrs. FAWCETT, on Women's Suffrage, and petitions in its favour were adopted and signed by the chairman.

#### PLYMOUTH.

Mrs. FAWCETT addressed a crowded meeting at the Mechanics' Institution, Plymouth, on March 14th, Mr. W. F. COLLIER presiding. In the course of her address, Mrs. FAWCETT observed: Why soon it would be objected that women should not go to church or for a walk because so doing would withdraw them from their domestic duties. The polling booth inconveniences were much exaggerated. She had been to several, and passed through the crowd outside, during the excitement of a contested election. On none of these occasions had she experienced anything so really painful as the crowd on the staircase of one of the great houses in London, where some lady of

fashion is holding an evening reception. After giving both a fair trial she decidedly preferred the crowd round the polling booth. (Applause.) When Mrs. Fawcett resumed her seat the applause lasted several minutes.

Mr. BISHOP moved that a petition be presented to the House of Commons by the borough members, and to the House of Lords by Earl Morley, in favour of the removal of the electoral disabilities of women.—This was seconded by the Rev. T. FRECKELTON.

Miss ASHWORTH supported the resolution, observing that if the exclusive legislation of men had been all they could wish, women might not have moved in the matter, but, unfortunately, working men and women had found that non-representation meant neglect and oppression. As the subjection of women was based only on law and not on fact, the law ought to be amended. (Applause.)

Mr. FITZROY moved a vote of thanks to Mrs. Fawcett, and this was heartily seconded by Mr. J. N. BENNETT, and carried by acclamation.

The meeting closed with a vote of thanks to the chairman.

Mrs. FAWCETT subsequently addressed meetings at TAUNTON; at TAVISTOCK, on March 11; at PLYMOUTH, on March 14; and also at EXETER. From each of these meetings except Taunton, where the question was not put, petitions in favour of Mr. Bright's Bill were sent to both Houses of Parliament.

#### DEVONPORT.

A very interesting meeting was held at the Council Chamber of the Guildhall, Devonport, on February 27th, when Mrs. RONNIGER delivered a very powerful lecture on Women's Suffrage. Dr. Rolston, the ex-Mayor, presided.

After the lecture the Rev. W. BINNS moved that a petition should be presented to Parliament, remarking that the petition did not go quite far enough for him, but that he was willing to take it as far as it went. They wanted to give women, politically, a legal, constitutional, and established power, and that it should be given them openly and honestly as it was given to men. As to the talk indulged in about the sphere of women, let women determine their own spheres; men had no more right to determine the spheres of women than women had to determine the spheres of men. He did not believe domestic life would suffer by the suffrage being granted to women; on the contrary, he believed it would become richer and grander in every way by the fact. They did not want women to be mere playthings and the pets of local clergymen—(laughter); they wanted them to be their equals—to be able to enlighten them when ignorant and to strengthen them when weak, and they would be able to do this without losing the endearing, gentle, and affectionate qualities which they now possessed. (Loud applause.)

Mr. S. MACKENZIE seconded the resolution, remarking that the petition did not go far enough for him either, and that he would never remain satisfied until they had universal suffrage for men and women also. (Hear and laughter.)

The resolution was carried unanimously.

Mr. I. C. RADFORD proposed a vote of thanks to the lecturer.

Mr. R. ORAM, R.N., seconded the resolution.

Mr. J. W. W. RYDER supported it, and remarked that now that the vote had been given to women in municipal elections, it could not be logically or consistently withheld from them in Parliamentary elections. (Hear and applause.)

The resolution having been passed with acclamation, the meeting terminated.

During the month of March Mrs. RONNIGER has lectured with great success at BRIDPORT, WAREHAM, POOLE, DORCHESTER, WEYMOUTH, SALISBURY, and WINCHESTER.

#### SCOTLAND.

During the month of February, in addition to the lectures already recorded, Miss TAYLOR has addressed meetings at MOFFATT, ANNAN, LOCKERBIE, CAMPBELTOWN, RENFREW, PAISLEY, and KILMARNOCK. On March 3 she lectured at BRIDGE OF ALLAN; on March 13, at KIRKCUDBRIGHT; on March 14, at KELSO; on March 16, at BERWICK; on March 17, at GALASHIELS; on March 20, at JEDBURGH; on March 21, at MELROSE. At each of these meetings petitions in favour of the Women's Disabilities Bill were adopted and signed by the chairman on behalf of the meeting.

#### LOCHEE.

On Thursday, March 18, a meeting to promote the enfranchisement of women who are taxpayers was held in the Weavers' Hall, Lochee. The Rev. David Cook occupied the chair.

The CHAIRMAN in a few explanatory remarks introduced the business of the meeting, and explained the object of the Electoral Disabilities Removal Bill. The following resolution was proposed by Councillor Mackay, and seconded by the Rev. A. B. Connel:—"That as the owning or occupying of lands and houses is the foundation of representation in this country, therefore it is unjust to make sex a disqualification, and so exclude a large number of women well fitted to vote for members of Parliament."

The second resolution was proposed by Mr. David Neish and seconded by Mr. Thomas Aitken, and ran as follows:—"That this meeting desires to thank Mr. Jacob Bright and Sir Charles Dilke for their efforts to procure for women personally paying taxes and owning property the same right to vote for members of Parliament that is possessed by the male sex."

Mr. W. McKay moved and Mr. David Esplin seconded the third resolution, which was to the effect "That this meeting resolve to petition Parliament in favour of Mr. Jacob Bright's Bill to remove the electoral disabilities of women, and authorise the Chairman to sign the petition in name of the meeting."

All the resolutions were carried unanimously.

On the motion of Councillor Mackay a very hearty vote of thanks was given to the Rev. Mr. Cook for presiding.

#### ECCLES.

On March 28 a meeting was held in the Co-operative Stores, Eccles, for the purpose of considering the Bill introduced by Mr. Jacob Bright, M.P., to remove the electoral disabilities of women. The chair was occupied by Mr. J. M. Bailieff.

The meeting was addressed by Dr. Pankhurst, Miss Becker, Rev. S. A. Steinthal, and others; and petitions in favour of the Bill were carried with one dissentient.

Miss CRAIGEN has addressed meetings on Jan. 24, at DEWBURY; on Feb. 2, at RAVENSTHORPE; at WEDNESFIELD; at WOLVERHAMPTON; on March 3, at BILSTON; on March 9, at PONTYPOOL; on March 17, at PEMBROKE DOCK; on March 20, at PEMBROKE; on March 21, at NEYLAND, Pembrokeshire; on March 22, at SAUNDERFORD, Pembrokeshire; and on March 27, at NEWPORT, Monmouthshire. At all these meetings except Pembroke, where the question was not put, petitions in favour of the Women's Disabilities Bill were adopted.

[We greatly regret that the pressure on our space does not permit us to give more extended notice of these meetings. Any of them would have furnished matter for a valuable report, but their number compels us to content ourselves with little more than a bare record of names and dates.]

#### SCHOOL BOARDS.

##### ST. THOMAS, EXETER.

Miss TEMPLE, sister to the Bishop of Exeter, has been elected on the School Board for this district. The board consists of five members, and Miss Temple had a majority of one vote over the gentleman who was highest on the list of unsuccessful candidates.

##### MERTHYR TYDVIL.

Mrs. CRAWSHAY, of Cyfarthia Castle, has been elected a member of the School Board of Merthyr. She was second on the poll.

MARRIED WOMEN AND SCHOOL BOARDS.—Much discussion arose in the newspapers when the approaching marriage of Miss Garrett, M.D., was announced, as to the right of married women to be members of School Boards. It was confidently asserted that marriage must necessarily disqualify a woman for the office. But the question may now be regarded as practically settled, for not only has Mrs. Garrett Anderson taken her seat at the London School Board and spoken, and voted without opposition, but two married ladies, Mrs. Huth, at Huddersfield, and Mrs. Crawshay, at Merthyr, have been elected, and no objection has been raised to the legality of their nomination. It is strange that any doubt should have arisen, seeing that the Act distinctly states that any person may be elected, and the list of the causes of disqualification which preclude a person from sitting does not include marriage.

Several ladies have been elected members of a provisional committee for the formation of a Hospital for Diseases of Women, which is just established in Birmingham. Many ladies of that town, who have been desirous of seeing their position established on these public questions, regard this as a move in the right direction.

At Birmingham last month a public tea party was held in Duddeston-cum-Nechell Ward, in honour of the municipal representatives and in commemoration of the first occasion on which women voters had exercised their newly acquired rights. The meeting was thronged, and many hundreds more had to be provided for than were expected. The speakers pointed out the many ways in which women were at the present day usefully employed in public positions. A vote of thanks was passed to the ladies who had originated the entertainment and to Alderman Brinsley for presiding.

TRUANT HUSBANDS.—During the past three months an officer, appointed by the Birmingham Board of Guardians, has been specially engaged in attending to cases of family desertion, and making inquiries after the truant husbands who have left their wives and children chargeable to the Union. His exertions have been satisfactory; far beyond the expectations formed by the guardians. During the quarter 61 inmates have been removed from the workhouse in consequence of the absconding fathers and husbands having been captured and punished, and 15 others will very shortly leave the house from the same cause. The guardians appear to be unanimously of opinion that the imprisonment which can be now inflicted is very inadequate for the offence of family desertion. They think such an alteration in the law is required as will enable the magistrates, not to inflict imprisonment merely, but also to make an order for the repayment by instalments of the whole or a portion of the costs incurred by the parish in maintaining the deserted family; such order to be only made when there is reasonable ground for believing the ordinary earnings of the defendant warrant it.—*Times*, March 16, 1871.

#### TO THE RIGHT HON. HENRY AUSTIN BRUCE M.P., SECRETARY OF STATE.

The Memorial of the undersigned Members of the Executive Committees of various branches of the National Society for Women's Suffrage—

RESPECTFULLY SHEWETH—

That your Memorialists have observed with regret the provisions of a Bill now before the House of Commons entitled "A Bill for the Better Protection of Infant Life." Your Memorialists entertain the gravest objection to this proposed measure on the following grounds:

While purporting on the face of it to be for the protection of infant life in general, the Bill is practically designed to meet the case of those children who are deserted by their fathers, and who are, consequently, exposed to death by violence or neglect. In the judgment of your Memorialists the provisions of the Bill would be costly and tyrannical in their operation in the case of poor women who take charge of infants for hire without sinister motives, while they would be ineffective to prevent the destruction of illegitimate children. The responsibility for the deaths of such children rests primarily with the father, who deserts the mother without making provision for the birth and maintenance of his offspring—secondarily with the mother, who is, however, usually incapable alone of adequately providing for it; and thirdly, on the nurses. It is beginning at the wrong end to begin with the latter. Your Memorialists object to the principle of a measure designed for the protection of infant life which absolves a father from responsibility for his acts, and casts upon a mother, in the moment of physical incapacity for such a charge, the responsibility for the life and nurture of her infant. The Bill would add to the burdens of a situation already well-nigh intolerable, that of finding a nurse with a magistrate's license to take charge of the infant; and the difficulty of doing this, especially in cases where the temptation or the necessity for concealment was overwhelming, would tend to cause direct infanticide and unnatural crimes. It would, therefore, be as ineffectual for the promotion of its professed object, as it would be cruel in its operation on women.

CLAUSE 2 would interfere in the most mischievous and oppressive manner with domestic arrangements. It is very common for women employed in non-domestic industry to put their babies out to be nursed while they are at work, and poor women are enabled to earn honestly a few pence by the performance of this neighbourly office. But these women would be alarmed and bewildered by the requirement to take out a magistrate's license. They would not know how to set about obtaining one, and they would not be aware that such a license was necessary till a series of prosecutions and convictions had impressed on the female population of a district the fact that an act which had hitherto been a kind, neighbourly, and womanly duty, had suddenly been transformed into a legal crime, for which they were liable to be summoned before the magistrates and condemned to imprisonment. It seems to your Memorialists to be a distinct proof of the unfitness of men alone to make laws for the governance of women, when a Bill is proposed to render a woman liable to fine and imprisonment for taking care of a neighbour's baby without the leave of a magistrate, even if she have thoroughly done her duty to the child. The Bill provides severe punishment for the purely technical offence which it creates, that of nursing without a license, while guilty neglect is not punishable except by the withdrawal of the license.

The prohibition in **CLAUSE 3** against the taking of more than two children under the age of one year by one person, seems arbitrary and unreasonable. With proper assistance a woman could take care of a larger number of infants than two. It would be utterly absurd to expect the very poor, to whom the provisions of this Act would be principally applicable, to pay for nursing at the rate of one nurse to every two infants, an amount of attendance which even the moderately rich are usually unable to afford. The prohibition against taking more than one child for the purpose of suckling would impose on a woman who had the misfortune to be confined of twins, the obligation of providing two wet nurses if she were from any cause unable to nurse them herself.

**CLAUSE 4** imposes an incongruous duty on medical officers, namely, that of keeping a register of all children who are out at nurse, and personally inspecting them every month. It does not need a medical officer to tell whether a child is well or ill cared for. If there are to be Government inspectors to visit babies at their homes, to see that their nurses feed and wash them properly, it seems wasteful to employ the time of a man who has had an expensive professional education on a duty which any experienced nursemaid is fully competent to perform. The visit of the medical officer should be required only in case of illness; doctors should not be constituted a sanitary police, and required to inspect patients whether ill or well.

Your Memorialists consider that it would be unjust to burden the taxpayers with the charge of the salaries of the registrars, inspectors, and sub-inspectors who would be appointed under the provisions of this Bill, inasmuch as the occasion for such costly machinery arises mainly from the state of the law which permits fathers to cast on society the care of their illegitimate offspring.

Your Memorialists further object to the Bill, because while dealing with women in the performance of that domestic office which is, by common consent, regarded as peculiarly their own—namely, the nursing of infants—it places the entire supervision, regulation, and authority in these matters in the hands of men. *Men only* are to grant the licenses—*men only* are competent to certify to the qualifications of the licensee—and *men only* are to visit the babies in their nurses' charge. This minute and galling supervision by men of the domestic and nursery arrangements of women, would be felt as grievously vexatious by the women of this nation, especially by the poorer classes.

The arbitrary power given to the medical officers is another objectionable feature of the Bill. A child may be in an unsatisfactory state of health and condition without wilful neglect or incapacity of the licensee. Yet, on a mere opinion derived from a cursory inspection, a doctor may suspend or revoke the license, and thus in a moment take the means of living from a poor woman's hands. Her only remedy is an appeal to a justice of the peace, after a formal notice in writing of intention to appeal; a process altogether beyond the capacities of the poor and helpless women concerned. No provision is made for the custody of the children when the license is withdrawn from their nurse. If she keeps them after that she is guilty of a misdemeanour; if she then and there ceases to attend to them they may die from neglect. The Bill, even for the carrying out of its professed intention, ought to impose on the medical officer the duty of making other provision for the nurture of children under the care of a licensee whose license he revokes, in order to relieve her at once from the risk of having to retain them, and thereby become guilty of a misdemeanour.

Your Memorialists consider it unjust to impose penalties on women for neglect or incapacity in the treatment of children entrusted to their care, while making no provision for the edu-

cation of women in matters pertaining to the proper nurture of children. It is but too well known that many thousands of infants die yearly from improper treatment by mothers and nurses who are animated by the most tender love and the best intentions, but who are ignorant of the most simple rules of health. They suggest that the establishment of training colleges, in which women of all classes might receive instruction in so much of the principles of physiology and the laws of health as would enable them to bestow intelligent care on children, whether in the capacity of mothers or nurses, would be a more effectual provision for the protection of infant life than the proposed system of supervision, which distributes all the penalties to the ignorant women, and all the emoluments to the instructed men.

Your Memorialists deprecate all attempts to legislate on matters affecting women without their consent, expressed by the constitutional method of representation by members of the Legislature, who shall be responsible to women for the votes they give.

Your Memorialists, therefore, respectfully request that you, on behalf of Her Majesty's Government, will oppose such proposed legislation as that of the Infant Life Protection Bill, and will further promote the removal of existing disabilities which prevent women from voting in the election of representatives, and thereby exercising a just influence in the settlement of questions which concern them as women, and as members of the body politic.

URSULA M. BRIGHT. E. C. WOLSTENHOLME.  
JOSEPHINE E. BUTLER. ETC., ETC.

The above Memorial has been signed by representatives of the committees of Bath, Bristol, Carlisle, Cheltenham, Cirencester, Glasgow, Gloucester, Manchester, Nottingham, Southampton, Stroud, Tavistock, and Wigan. It has been forwarded to Sir Thomas Bazley, Bart., M.P., for presentation to the Home Secretary.

For the above and other reasons it would be a misfortune should the proposed Bill pass into law, yet there is danger of this unless steps be taken to press on the legislature the objections to the measure. Petitions should be addressed to the House of Commons, praying that it will not pass the present Bill, but that it will take into consideration the best methods of dealing with the root of the evil of which the system of baby farming is but the fruit.

Forms of petition and other information will be supplied on application to Miss WOLSTENHOLME, Congleton. Application should be made without delay.

SONNET.

Say to men, women starve, and will they heed?  
Say to them women drudge, and faint, and die,  
And sin, discrowning womanhood for aye;—  
Beseech men piteously to mind their need  
Of wisdom who must little children feed;—  
Implore them for her sake who stands on high  
Enthroned, yet nestled in each heart, to try  
If those (her sisters) may be saved indeed,  
Saved from starvation, saved from overstrain,  
Bloom ere they fade, not wither incomplete,  
So low, so fallen, such dust beneath the feet!  
Say this to man and wilt thou speak in vain?  
Time, like a mist, thine answer from thee veils,  
Yet cry, weak voice; cry while thy strength avails!

LUCY KNOX.

TO THE HONOURABLE THE COMMONS OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND IN PARLIAMENT ASSEMBLED.

The petition of the Municipal Corporation of the City of Manchester—

SHREWETH—

That your petitioners have observed with satisfaction the introduction into your honourable House of a Bill entitled "A Bill to remove the Electoral Disabilities of Women," and desire to recognise the importance of such a measure as affecting the political status and responsibilities of many thousands of their countrywomen.

That as the consequence of the Municipal Corporation Amendment Act of 1869 (32 and 33 Vic. c. 55), by which women ratepayers in municipal boroughs are entitled to vote in the election of Councillors, the names of 9,000 women have been added to the burgess roll for this city.

That a large amount of property, both in the boroughs and counties of the United Kingdom, is owned by women who are now excluded from the Parliamentary register.

Your petitioners believe that the exclusion of so large a body of ratepayers and owners of property from the Parliamentary franchise is unjust, and is in opposition to the true principles of popular representation, and pray that the Bill before referred to may receive the sanction of your honourable House.

And your petitioners will ever pray, &c.

The following petition has been signed by members of the Manchester School Board. It is desirable that members of School Boards in other districts should be asked to sign similar petitions.

TO THE HONOURABLE THE COMMONS OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND IN PARLIAMENT ASSEMBLED.

The humble Petition of the undersigned Members of the School Board of the City of Manchester—

SHREWETH—

That the recognition by the Legislature of the fitness of women for the responsible office of member of a School Board, renders anomalous the maintenance of the disability which excludes them from voting in the election of Members of Parliament.

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Honourable House will pass the Bill entitled "A Bill to Remove the Electoral Disabilities of Women."

And your petitioners will ever pray, &c.

W. ROMAINE CALLENDER, JUN.  
R. RUMNEY.  
RICHARD HAWORTH.  
&c. &c.

SUMMARY OF PETITIONS RESPECTING THE WOMEN'S DISABILITIES BILL, PRESENTED TO THE HOUSE OF COMMONS UP TO MARCH 21, 1871:—

|                                   | No. of Petitions signed Officially or under Seal. | Total No. of Petitions. | Total No. of Signatures. |
|-----------------------------------|---|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| Women's Disabilities Bill—Against | 1   | 1                       | 1                        |
| " " " In favour                   | 36  | 132                     | 58,322                   |

In the following list of petitions those marked ¶ have the addresses of some or all of the petitioners affixed. Those marked § are signed officially.

REPORTS OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC PETITIONS—1871.

**WOMEN'S DISABILITIES BILL.—Against.**  
Mar. 8. §Dundee, Provost, Magistrates, and Town Council of; William Hay, town-clerk (*Sir J. Ogilvey*)... 1

**WOMEN'S DISABILITIES BILL.—In favour.**

|          |   |  |       |
|----------|---|--|-------|
| Feb. 14. | ¶Chelsea,   | Inhabitants of ( <i>Sir Charles Dilke</i> )                            | 2,240 |
| " 14.    | Greenwich,  | Inhabitants of ( <i>Mr. Taylor</i> )                                   | 66    |
| " 15.    | ¶Marylebone,  | Inhabitants of ( <i>Mr. H. Lewis</i> )                                 | 2,286 |
| " 15.    | ¶Bradford,  | Inhabitants of ( <i>Mr. Miall</i> )                                    | 319   |
| " 15.    | Batley Carr,  | Inhabitants of ( <i>Mr. Miall</i> )                                    | 39    |
| " 15.    | §Windhill,  | Meeting at; Thos. Longfellow, chairman ( <i>Mr. Miall</i> )            | 1     |
| " 15.    | §Worksop,   | Meeting at; Edwin Priest, chairman ( <i>Mr. Wheelhouse</i> )           | 1     |
| " 15.    | §Buxton,  | Meeting at; J. T. Cooper, chairman                                     | 1     |
| " 15.    | §Heaton,  | Meeting at; George Brockway, chairman                                  | 1     |
| " 16.    | §Haworth,   | Meeting at; Joseph Heap, chairman ( <i>Lord F. Cavendish</i> )         | 1     |
| " 16.    | §Idle,  | Meeting at; Joseph Rhodes, chairman ( <i>Lord F. Cavendish</i> )       | 1     |
| " 16.    | §Huddersfield,  | Meeting at; W. White, chairman ( <i>Mr. Leatham</i> )                  | 1     |
| " 16.    | §Dewsbury,  | Meeting at; Francis Gutteridge, chairman ( <i>Mr. Serjeant Simon</i> ) | 1     |
| " 16.    | ¶Patience Hodgkinson and others ( <i>Mr. Charles Turner</i> ) |  | 54    |
| " 17.    | ¶Manchester (Cheetham Ward),                                  | Inhabitants of ( <i>Mr. Jacob Bright</i> )                             | 4,195 |
| " 17.    | ¶Ambleside,   | Inhabitants of ( <i>Mr. Lowther</i> )                                  | 76    |
| " 17.    | Monk Coniston,  | Inhabitants of ( <i>Mr. F. Stanley</i> )                               | 65    |
| " 20.    | ¶Salford,   | Inhabitants of ( <i>Mr. Charley</i> )                                  | 345   |
| " 20.    | ¶Bury Saint Edmonds,  | Inhabitants of ( <i>Mr. Greene</i> )                                   | 42    |
| " 20.    | §Hebden,  | Meeting at; L. R. Patchett, chairman ( <i>Mr. Stansfeld</i> )          | 1     |
| " 20.    | ¶Birkenhead,  | Inhabitants of ( <i>Mr. Taylor</i> )                                   | 270   |
| " 21.    | ¶Tower Hamlets,   | Inhabitants of ( <i>Mr. Ayrton</i> )                                   | 2,026 |
| " 21.    | §Longwood,  | Meeting at; name of chairman illegible ( <i>Mr. Henry Beaumont</i> )   | 1     |
| " 21.    | Manchester (Saint Michael's Ward),                            | Inhabitants of ( <i>Mr. Birley</i> )                                   | 2,000 |
| " 21.    | §Rothsay,   | Meeting at; A. Mackirdy, chairman ( <i>Mr. Charles Dalrymple</i> )     | 1     |
| " 21.    | Westminster,  | Inhabitants of ( <i>Capt. Grosvenor</i> )                              | 134   |
| " 21.    | ¶Grange and Patterdale,                                       | Inhabitants of ( <i>Mr. Wyndham</i> )                                  | 36    |
| " 22.    | ¶Bradford,  | Inhabitants of ( <i>Mr. W. Forster</i> )                               | 400   |
| " 22.    | §Bradford Moor,   | Meeting at; William Willis Wood, chairman ( <i>Mr. Wm. Forster</i> )   | 1     |
| " 22.    | §Bradford,  | Meeting at; Wm. Draper, chairman ( <i>Mr. Wm. Forster</i> )            | 1     |
| " 22.    | §Greenock,  | Meeting at; James Morton, chairman ( <i>Mr. Grieve</i> )               | 1     |
| " 22.    | ¶Scarborough,   | Inhabitants of ( <i>Sir H. Johnstone</i> )                             | 185   |
| " 23.    | §Irvine,  | Meeting at; G. Paulin, chairman ( <i>Mr. Crawford</i> )                | 1     |
| " 23.    | Peterborough,   | Inhabitants of ( <i>Mr. Wells</i> )                                    | 1,389 |
| " 23.    | ¶Stockport,   | Inhabitants of   | 504   |
| " 24.    | Launceston,   | Inhabitants of ( <i>Mr. Lopes</i> )                                    | 100   |

|          |   |       |          |   |       |
|----------|---|-------|----------|---|-------|
| Feb. 24. | §Wednesfield, Meeting at; J. Griffiths, chairman ( <i>Mr. Villiers</i> ) ...              | 1     | Mar. 10. | ¶Stranraer, Inhabitants of ( <i>Lord Advocate</i> ), Meeting at; D. D. Robertson, chairman ( <i>The Lord Advocate</i> ) ... | 1,002 |
| „ 27.    | ¶Hastings, Inhabitants of ( <i>Mr. T. Brassey</i> ) ...                                   | 171   | „ 10.    | §Whithorn, Meeting at; F. W. Newman, chairman ( <i>Mr. Morley</i> ) ...   | 1     |
| „ 27.    | ¶Southampton, Inhabitants of ( <i>Mr. Gurney</i> ) ...                                    | 347   | „ 10.    | §Bristol, Meeting at; F. W. Newman, chairman ( <i>Mr. Morley</i> ) ...  | 1     |
| „ 27.    | §Lockerbie, Meeting at; Wm. Mackindoe, chairman ( <i>Major Walker</i> ) ...               | 1     | „ 13.    | ¶Horncastle, Inhabitants of ( <i>Col. Amcotts</i> ) ...   | 164   |
| „ 28.    | Manchester (Medlock-street Ward), Inhabitants of ( <i>Mr. Birley</i> ) ...                | 1,042 | „ 13.    | A. W. Nicholson and others ( <i>Mr. Job. Bright</i> ) ...   | 493   |
| „ 28.    | ¶Manchester (Oxford-street), Inhabitants of ( <i>Mr. Birley</i> ) ...                     | 202   | „ 13.    | ¶Margaret R. Hughes & others ( <i>Mr. Job. Bright</i> ) ...   | 173   |
| „ 28.    | §Annan, Meeting at; W. Battey, chairman ( <i>Mr. Jardine</i> ) ...                        | 1     | „ 13.    | ¶Lichfield, Inhabitants of ( <i>Colonel Dyott</i> ) ...   | 348   |
| Mar. 1.  | §Helensburgh, Meeting at; Thomas Steven, provost, chairman ( <i>Mr. Arch. Ewing</i> ) ... | 1     | „ 13.    | ¶Plymouth, Inhabitants of ( <i>Mr. Edwards</i> ), Seal, ( <i>Mr. Grieve</i> ) ...   | 46    |
| „ 2.     | ¶Manchester, Inhabitants of ( <i>Sir T. Bazley</i> ) ...                                  | 1,010 | „ 13.    | §Greenock (Members of the Town Council, <i>Mr. Hardcastle</i> ) ...   | 1     |
| „ 2.     | ¶Manchester, Inhabitants of ( <i>Sir T. Bazley</i> ) ...                                  | 663   | „ 13.    | Bury Saint Edmund's, Inhabitants of ( <i>Mr. Hardcastle</i> ) ...   | 29    |
| „ 2.     | §Renfrew, Meeting at; Robert Gallacher, chairman ( <i>Mr. Pleydel Boverie</i> ) ...       | 1     | „ 13.    | ¶Finsbury, Inhabitants of ( <i>Mr. Lusk</i> ) ...   | 2,048 |
| „ 2.     | ¶Oxfordshire, Inhabitants of ( <i>Mr. W. Cartwright</i> ) ...                             | 175   | „ 13.    | Westminster, Inhabitants of ( <i>Mr. W. Smith</i> ) ...   | 1,941 |
| „ 2.     | ¶Maidstone, Inhabitants of ( <i>Sir J. Lubbock</i> ) ...                                  | 41    | „ 14.    | Stoneykirk, Inhabitants of ( <i>Lord Garlies</i> ) ...  | 49    |
| „ 2.     | Helstone, Inhabitants of ( <i>Mr. A. Young</i> ) ...                                      | 180   | „ 14.    | Castle Douglas, Inhabitants of ( <i>Mr. Macavell</i> ) ...  | 53    |
| „ 2.     | §Moffatt, Meeting at; Samuel Neil, chairman, and others ( <i>Major Walker</i> ) ...       | 4     | „ 14.    | §Pontypool, Meeting at; Thomas Thomas, D.D., president ( <i>Mr. Richard</i> ) ...   | 1     |
| „ 2.     | Maidenhead, Inhabitants of ...  | 127   | „ 14.    | §Tavistock, Meeting at; R. Luxton, chairman ( <i>Mr. Arthur Russell</i> ) ...   | 1     |
| „ 3.     | ¶Finsbury, Inhabitants of ( <i>Mr. W. M. Torrens</i> ) ...                                | 2,038 | „ 15.    | Manchester (Medlock-street Ward), Inhabitants of ( <i>Mr. Birley</i> ) ...  | 576   |
| „ 6.     | ¶Leeds, Inhabitants of ( <i>Mr. Baines</i> ) ...  | 515   | „ 15.    | ¶Manchester (Medlock-street Ward), Inhabitants of ( <i>Mr. Birley</i> ) ...   | 511   |
| „ 6.     | §Cirencester, Meeting at; Henry Austin, chairman ( <i>Mr. Bathurst</i> ) ...              | 1     | „ 15.    | Annan, Inhabitants of ( <i>Major Walker</i> ) ...   | 85    |
| „ 6.     | ¶Sunderland, Inhabitants of ( <i>Mr. Candlish</i> ) ...                                   | 105   | „ 15.    | ¶Truro, Inhabitants of ( <i>Sir F. Williams</i> ) ...   | 64    |
| „ 6.     | Jane M. Symon ( <i>Admiral Erskine</i> ) ...  | 1     | „ 16.    | ¶Edinburgh, Inhabitants of ( <i>Mr. M'Laren</i> ) ...   | 1,017 |
| „ 7.     | ¶Bury, Inhabitants of ( <i>Mr. Philips</i> ) ...  | 247   | „ 16.    | Sawrey, Inhabitants of ( <i>Col. W. Patten</i> ) ...  | 49    |
| „ 7.     | ¶Marylebone, Inhabitants of ( <i>Mr. T. Chambers</i> ) ...                                | 2,328 | „ 17.    | ¶Mary Wayne and others ( <i>Mr. Birley</i> ) ...  | 519   |
| „ 7.     | §Frome, Meeting at; Joseph Chapman, chairman ( <i>Mr. T. Hughes</i> ) ...                 | 1     | „ 17.    | ¶Manchester, Inhabitants of ( <i>Mr. Job. Bright</i> ) ...  | 507   |
| „ 7.     | ¶York, Inhabitants of ( <i>Mr. Leeman</i> ) ...   | 295   | „ 17.    | ¶Salford, Inhabitants of ( <i>Mr. Charley</i> ) ...   | 626   |
| „ 7.     | ¶Southwark, Inhabitants of ( <i>Mr. Locke</i> ) ...                                       | 1,854 | „ 17.    | ¶Chelsea, Inhabitants of ( <i>Sir C. Dilke</i> ) ...  | 2,120 |
| „ 7.     | Wigtown, Inhabitants of ( <i>Lord Advocate</i> ) ...                                      | 125   | „ 17.    | Shrewsbury, Inhabitants of ( <i>Mr. Figgins</i> ) ...   | 108   |
| „ 7.     | §Wolverhampton, Meeting at; John W. Barker, chairman ( <i>Mr. Villiers</i> ) ...          | 1     | „ 17.    | §Kirkcudbright, Meeting at; James Sproat, chairman ( <i>Mr. Jardine</i> ) ...   | 1     |
| „ 8.     | ¶Kilmarnock, Householdors of ( <i>Mr. Boverie</i> ) ...                                   | 17    | „ 17.    | §Plymouth, Meeting at; W. F. Collier, chairman ( <i>Mr. Morrison</i> ) ...  | 1     |
| „ 8.     | ¶Kilmarnock, Householdors of ( <i>Mr. Boverie</i> ) ...                                   | 30    | „ 17.    | Moffatt, Inhabitants of ( <i>Major Walker</i> ) ...   | 114   |
| „ 8.     | §Bridge of Allan, Meeting at; H. Dove, chairman ( <i>Admiral Erskine</i> ) ...            | 1     | „ 17.    | ¶Buxton, Inhabitants of ...   | 116   |
| „ 8.     | Knaresborough, Inhabitants of ( <i>Mr. Illingworth</i> ) ...                              | 109   | „ 20.    | Newton Saint Loe, Inhabitants of ( <i>Mr. Allen</i> ) ...   | 79    |
| „ 9.     | ¶Manchester (St. Michael's Ward), Inhabitants of ( <i>Mr. Jacob Bright</i> ) ...          | 545   | „ 20.    | Thetford, Inhabitants of ( <i>Sir Wm. Bagge</i> ) ...   | 79    |
| „ 9.     | ¶Manchester (St. Michael's Ward), Inhabitants of ( <i>Mr. Jacob Bright</i> ) ...          | 591   | „ 20.    | ¶Scarborough and Filey, Inhabitants of ( <i>Mr. Dent</i> ) ...  | 132   |
| „ 9.     | Leeds, Inhabitants of ( <i>Mr. Carter</i> ) ...   | 1,182 | „ 20.    | Harrow, Inhabitants of ( <i>Visct. Enfield</i> ) ...  | 120   |
| „ 9.     | Salford, Inhabitants of ( <i>Mr. Cavley</i> ) ...   | 1,048 | „ 20.    | Glenluce, Inhabitants of ( <i>Lord Garlies</i> ) ...  | 570   |
| „ 9.     | §Birmingham, Meeting at; James Austin, chairman ( <i>Mr. Dicon</i> ) ...                  | 1     | „ 20.    | Portpatrick, Inhabitants of ( <i>Lord Garlies</i> ) ...   | 138   |
| „ 9.     | Sheffield, Inhabitants of ( <i>Mr. Hadfield</i> ) ...                                     | 510   | „ 20.    | ¶Greenwich, Inhabitants of ( <i>Mr. Wm. Ewart Gladstone</i> ) ...   | 979   |
| „ 9.     | Pinner, Inhabitants of ( <i>Lord G. Hamilton</i> ) ...                                    | 162   | „ 20.    | ¶Rugby, Inhabitants of ( <i>Mr. Newdegate</i> ) ...   | 1,052 |
| „ 9.     | §Edinburgh, Meeting at; D. M'Laren, chairman ( <i>Mr. Mille</i> ) ...                     | 1     | „ 20.    | ¶Lincoln, Inhabitants of ( <i>Mr. Seely</i> ) ...   | 212   |
| „ 9.     | ¶Hackney, Inhabitants of ( <i>Mr. Reed</i> ) ...  | 2,015 | „ 20.    | Dowlais, Inhabitants of ( <i>Mr. C. Talbot</i> ) ...  | 66    |
| „ 9.     | §Bath, Meeting at; J. Hulbert, mayor, chairman ( <i>Sir Wm. Tite</i> ) ...                | 1     | „ 20.    | Lockerbie, Inhabitants of ...   | 152   |
| „ 9.     | ¶Chelsea, Inhabitants of ...  | 2,269 | „ 21.    | ¶Manchester (Collegiate Church Ward), Women citizens of ( <i>Sir T. Bazley</i> ) ...  | 14    |
| „ 10.    | ¶Manchester (Medlock-street Ward), Inhabitants of ( <i>Mr. Birley</i> ) ...               | 503   | „ 21.    | ¶Manchester (New Cross Ward), Inhabitants of ( <i>Sir Thomas Bazley</i> ) ...   | 678   |
| „ 10.    | ¶Salford, Inhabitants of ( <i>Mr. Cavley</i> ) ...  | 636   | „ 21.    | ¶Manchester, Inhabitants of ( <i>Sir T. Bazley</i> ) ...  | 508   |
| „ 10.    | §Cambeltown, Meeting at; D. McDougall, chairman ( <i>Mr. Craufurd</i> ) ...               | 1     | „ 21.    | ¶Manchester (Medlock-street Ward), Inhabitants of ( <i>Mr. Birley</i> ) ...   | 512   |
|          |   |       | „ 21.    | ¶Salford and Keynsham, Inhabitants of ( <i>Mr. Richard Bright</i> ) ...   | 54    |
|          |   |       | „ 21.    | Corston, Inhabitants of ( <i>Mr. Donald Dalrymple</i> ) ...   | 136   |
|          |   |       | „ 21.    | Brighton, Inhabitants of ( <i>Mr. White</i> ) ...   | 1,200 |

## PETITIONS TO THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

The Women's Disabilities Bill is now before the House of Commons, and the second reading is fixed for May 3. During the interval it is of the utmost consequence to strengthen the hands of our Parliamentary friends by a formidable array of numerous signed petitions. We earnestly exhort our friends to help the cause by promoting petitions in their several localities. The following is the form recommended:—

To the Honourable the Commons of Great Britain and Ireland in Parliament assembled.

The humble Petition of the undersigned

SHEWETH,

That the exclusion of women, otherwise legally qualified, from voting in the election of Members of Parliament, is injurious to those excluded, contrary to the principle of just representation, and to that of the laws now in force regulating the election of municipal, parochial, and all other representative governments.

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Honourable House will pass the Bill entitled "A Bill to Remove the Electoral Disabilities of Women."

And your petitioners will ever pray, &c.

Write out the above form without mistakes, as no word may be scratched out or interlined, and sign it on the same piece of paper, obtaining as many signatures as you can to follow. After the written heading is signed extra sheets of paper may be attached to hold more names. The petition may be signed by men and women of full age, whether householders or otherwise.

Make up the petition as a book-post packet, write on the cover the words "Parliamentary Petition," and post it, addressed to the member who is to present it, at the House of Commons. No stamp is required, as petitions so forwarded go post free.

Write, and send along with the petition, a note (post-paid) asking the member to present it, and to support its prayer. Any member may be asked to present a petition, but it is desirable to select one in whose constituency the petitioners reside. Members of Parliament deem it their duty to present any petition from their constituency, whether they agree with its object or not: and as a rule they are very willing to take charge of any that may be entrusted to their care.

N.B.—The printed forms issued by the Society are used only for collecting signatures. Printed petitions are not received by Parliament, consequently, in using these forms, the printed part must be cut off, and the names attached to a written and signed copy of the petition.

Written headings and printed forms for the collection of additional signatures will be supplied on application to Miss BECKER, 28, Jackson's Row, Albert Square, Manchester.

## BAZAAR AND EXHIBITION IN AID OF THE FUNDS OF THE MANCHESTER NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE.

It is proposed to hold a Bazaar and Exhibition for the above purpose at Manchester in October, 1871. The expenses of the agitation for the Women's Disabilities Bill during the coming session will be necessarily great, and whether it pass into law or not, a large expenditure of funds by the Society will be requisite. To meet this demand the Executive Committee have decided on holding a Bazaar, and earnestly request the aid of their friends in all parts of the country and all parts of the world to render the undertaking successful. The following ladies and gentlemen have already promised to become patrons:—Sir Thomas Bazley, Bart., M.P.; Lady Bazley; Jacob Bright, Esq., M.P.; Mrs. Jacob Bright; Alfred Illingworth, Esq., M.P.; The Hon. Mrs. Thomas Liddell; E. Miall, Esq., M.P.; Peter Rylands, Esq., M.P.; Mrs. Rylands, and others whose names will appear in future announcements.

Contributions of the following nature will be gratefully received:—Articles of plain and fancy work of all descriptions, for sale. Photographs, paintings, engravings, and other works of art, on loan or for sale. Curiosities, antiquities, and articles of vertu, on loan or for sale. Ornaments and articles of jewellery, for sale. Banners and decorations of all sorts, on loan. Ornamental plants, on loan. Perishable articles, such as game, fruit, flowers, and refreshments, for sale. Volunteer services in musical performances, and other entertainments. Laces, needlework, fans, and other products of women's artistic and industrial skill, on loan for exhibition, &c., &c., &c.

The following ladies have kindly consented to receive contributions:—Miss Ashworth, Claverton Lodge, Bath; Mrs. Carroll, 13, Kensington Gate, W; Miss Ramsay, 40, Royal York Crescent, Clifton, Bristol; Mrs. Slatter, Battle, Sussex; Mrs. Leech, Fair View, Pemberton, Wigan; Mrs. Feast, Sandwell House, West Bromwich; Mrs. Ashford, Speedwell Road, Birmingham; Miss E. M. Sturge, 17, Frederick Road, Edgbaston, Birmingham; Miss Swaine, 1, the Crescent, York; Miss Rigby, Monk Coniston, Ambleside; Miss Helen Taunton, The Marfords, Bromborough, Cheshire; Mrs. Mc.Kinnel, Hope Place, Maxwelltown, Dumfries; Mrs. Brine, Shaldon, Teignmouth; Mrs. Smith, 4, Walton Crescent, Glasgow; Mrs. W. Hargreaves, 34, Cravenhill Gardens, Hyde Park, London; Mrs. Paulton, 15, Cleveland Square, Hyde Park, London; Mrs. Griffith, Clan Teivi House, Montpellier Grove, Cheltenham. Ladies willing to assist in this way are respectfully requested to notify such willingness to the Secretary. Articles not of a perishable nature may be at once forwarded to Miss Becker, 28, Jackson's Row, Albert Square, Manchester.

WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE JOURNAL. Edited by LYDIA E. BECKER.—Volume I., 1870.—In coloured cover, price 1s.; post free, 1s. 3d.—London: Triibner and Co., Paternoster Row. Manchester: A. Ireland & Co.

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

Printed by A. IRELAND & Co., Pall Mall, Manchester, for the MANCHESTER NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE, and Published by Messrs. Triibner and Co., Paternoster Row, London.—April 1, 1871.

Any trustworthy person, residing in any part of the United Kingdom, desiring to become acquainted with **THE WILLCOX & GIBBS** Sewing Machine, will, on application with references, receive it, free and carriage paid to the nearest station, for a **Month's Trial** at her own home.

16, **CROSS STREET,**  
Royal Exchange,  
**M A N C H E S T E R**