

WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE JOURNAL.

EDITED BY LYDIA E. BECKER.

VOL. VII.—No. 81. PUBLISHED MONTHLY.
REGISTERED FOR TRANSMISSION ABROAD.

NOVEMBER 1, 1876.

PRICE ONE PENNY.
BY POST THREE HALFPENCE.

THE mind of the nation is turned with painful interest and suspense on the cloud lowering in the East, in which the fate of provinces and states and the happiness or misery of countless numbers of men, women, and children are enshrouded. Let us pray that the counsels of those Powers who must determine these mighty issues may be inspired by devotion to the interests of humanity rather than by thoughts of ambition or selfish aggrandisement; and guided by the wisdom needful to establish a government for the distracted provinces which shall afford to the people security for life and liberty, and opportunity for the development of their industry and culture. If the deliberations of the Powers be directed primarily to this end, it is probable that the secondary, if vaster, questions of the relative preponderance of each nation in the East of Europe, may receive a more satisfactory and lasting solution than if this were made the main question, to the exclusion or subservience of the consideration of the welfare of the people whose sufferings have given rise to the strife. Should Her Majesty's Government be enabled to contribute to the pacification and settlement of the Turkish provinces, and to provide in concert with the other Powers, against the recurrence of the atrocities, and at the same time to avoid all risk of collision between any of the great Powers, their efforts will deserve from the country a grateful recognition, which will be willingly and heartily accorded; and we trust that a more rational temper among the people, and wiser counsels in the Government, may preserve Europe from a repetition of the terrible and useless calamities incurred when the nations drifted into the Crimean war.

The time when one's neighbour's house is on fire does not seem the most propitious for setting one's own house in order, and it may be that the attention of Parliament and of the nation will be so painfully absorbed in foreign affairs, that questions of domestic reform may for a time recede into the background. Nevertheless, the efforts of those bent on promoting such measures should not be allowed for one moment to slacken in persistence or earnestness. All political questions have or should have for their object the promotion of the welfare of the

people, the good of individual members of society. Terrible evils exist among us; whole classes of the people of this country are suffering from the effects of unjust laws; are enduring wrongs from which the laws ought but do not protect them; are deprived of the means of cultivating their faculties; of the right to earn their own living by the exercise of those faculties, and of the fruits of their own industry. These are denied representation in the Legislature to whose action some of these grievances might be removed. These chronic evils do not cease to exist among us because other acute evils have occurred in other countries, and it would be wrong to allow our attention to be diverted from the endeavour to amend the evils at home for which the people and the Legislature of this country are primarily responsible, by the contemplation of horrors which have occurred beyond our jurisdiction and control.

Guided by these considerations, the promoters of the Women's Disabilities Removal Bill have determined to re-introduce the measure next session. Mr. FORSYTH has intimated his desire to resign the charge of the Bill into the hands of its original author, Mr. JACOB BRIGHT, and Mr. JACOB BRIGHT has accepted the trust. It therefore behoves all friends of the cause to use every effort to support the action of their parliamentary leaders by every means in their power, and the work of organising meetings and promoting petitions should be at once begun in earnest. Petitions are of cardinal importance in this question. Men can influence the Legislature not only by their petitions but by their votes. Petitions, therefore, are of less relative importance from men than from women. But women are denied votes, and the only recognised constitutional method by which they may seek to influence the Legislature is by petition for the redress of their grievances. These petitions should be at once prepared, and all women who wish to aid the movement are requested to apply to the office of this *Journal*, or to any of the Secretaries of the Women's Suffrage Society, for forms of petition, and for information as to the mode of procedure. We have no doubt that our friends will respond not less heartily and energetically to this call as

they have done in former years. We believe that there is no parallel in the records of the House of Commons to the steady and persistent demand by means of petitions for the franchise for women. For the last few years the number of persons who have petitioned for this object has been vastly greater than that for any other object in the same session, and it has not been a sudden spasmodic demonstration of a great number of petitions in one session and a subsidence of the demand in succeeding years, but a continual manifestation of interest by the same means kept up with sustained and increasing force. It is doubtless to this persistence in the demand for the measure, as well as to the conviction of its intrinsic justice, that the number of its parliamentary adherents is so large, and the support they give to the Bill continues so steady. Ours is not a party question, and our debates and divisions lack the exciting element of a party conflict; yet there is no measure now before the country, except those involving great and important party issues, which secures so large an attendance at the debate, and so great a number of votes, as the Women's Suffrage Bill; and whatever be his opinion on the merits of the case, no one can deny that a Bill which receives so steady an amount of popular support, and which commands 152 votes on a division in the House of Commons, is a measure of serious practical importance, and one which demands the earnest attention of Parliament and of the country.

THE BARONESS BURDETT-COUTTS, in a recent letter in reply to a request that she would be present at a workmen's demonstration at Exeter Hall, reminds us that "the page of history does not teach that the execrable deeds perpetrated by the Bashi-Bazouks are wholly unmatched in warfare, or by cruelties legally inflicted on a dominated people even in our own generation." We do not profess to be so profound an historian as the Baroness, and therefore are not aware of any cruelties which have been legally perpetrated by any Government in our own generation which are equally execrable with the wild and lawless deeds of the Bashi-Bazouks. But every newspaper may supply a confirmation of the next proposition enunciated by Lady BURDETT-COUTTS: "Nor are their wanting among ourselves instances of assault so brutal and dastardly that we have need to be careful in speaking of the ferocious and licentious acts of a wild soldiery as unparalleled." Bishop STROSSMAYER informed the Rev. MALCOLM M'COLL that the Turkish soldiers within his diocese had on one occasion impaled a woman who

was near her confinement. This allegation was met by storms of indignant denial that impalement was practised in Turkey. We are not here called upon to pronounce an opinion as to the trustworthiness of this denial, or the correctness of Bishop STROSSMAYER's information. But we confess that we are unable to perceive so very wide a distinction between causing the death of a woman by impaling her when near her confinement, and causing her death or endangering her life by kicking her when in the same condition. This occurrence is hideously frequent in this country, and the perpetrators of the outrage usually escape with a punishment grossly inadequate to the crime. We do not mean to affirm that for an Englishman to kick a woman with child, is in itself so frightful a thing as for a Turk to impale one. But, seeing that Englishmen pride themselves on superiority of civilisation and humanity to the "barbarous Turk," and that they especially plume themselves on having placed woman on a "pedestal" and shielded her from the rough and coarse realities of life, we think the deed of the Englishman comparatively worse. Moreover, the existence of this particular form of Turkish atrocity is the subject of indignant denial, and, if true, it is probably of exceptional occurrence, while the English form of the horror is daily exemplified in our midst, and is not thought of sufficient importance to call for any special attention or action of the Legislature.

LADY BURDETT-COUTTS says of Turkey, that "the savage perpetrators of those assaults which have made us shudder are reported to have been arrested by their own Government." Report says also that these have been either let off, or insufficiently punished. Report says just the same of the dealings of the English courts with men found guilty of aggravated assaults on women. A contemporary remarks that comparing the sentences passed on wife-beaters and on horse-beaters, it seems obvious that women would for the present do well to abdicate their pretensions to the rank of human beings, and to take shelter under the ægis of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals.

A Birmingham man was recently brought before the magistrates at Balsall Heath, and sentenced to fourteen days hard labour for "cruelly ill-treating, abusing, and torturing a horse by working it in an unfit condition." On the same day, a shoemaker named Moore was charged before the same bench with an assault upon his wife, whom he had, during the sixteen years of her married life, beaten on more than a hundred occasions, varying his brutality by frequently turning her out of doors. Owing to his intemperate habits, she and

her five children had been kept without sufficient food; the assault which was the immediate cause of the charge against the husband, consisted of a violent blow on the back, which severely injured her spine. For thus "cruelly ill-treating, abusing, and torturing" a woman, the fellow was simply fined two shillings and sixpence! At this rate, he can afford to commit many similar assaults, and the prospects of his victim are such that one can hardly avoid reckoning among the advantages enjoyed by the tormented horse over the ill-used woman, the fact that the former was, on its case becoming known, at once "put out of its misery."

One of the most pressing demands on behalf of the Bulgarian people has been to insist that they shall not be handed back defenceless to the tender mercies of the Turks, who have treated them so cruelly. It is surely not less reasonable to demand that women who have been battered, bruised, kicked, beaten, and starved by their "natural protectors" shall not be compelled to live with them again, or handed back to their condition of legal subjection to men who have proved themselves so unfit to have the custody of their person.

THERE is an opinion very prevalent among the lower classes of men respecting their rights over women which was illustrated by a wife-beater's declaration of his rights, recently given before the magistrates of Lymm, in Cheshire. JOHN RATCLIFFE was charged with brutally assaulting his wife. It was proved that without any provocation he had struck his wife on the side of the head and knocked her down; he then lifted her on to a chair by the hair of her head, and proceeded to kick her in the back and on the legs. The violence was such as to cripple the poor woman. When apprehended, the prisoner observed to the officer, "I'll give her magistrates! its a fine thing a man cannot do what he likes with his own wife." The man was sent to gaol for three months, with hard labour, and ordered to find sureties for his good behaviour for a further term of six months, at the expiration of which period he will be free to wreak his vengeance on his unfortunate "chattel."

We learn from the *Daily News* that this theory of the rights of men is capable of a still wider application. The right not merely of a husband to kick his own wife, but that of a man to kick any woman, has been openly and deliberately asserted as a principle. At the Bow-street Police Court, JOHN JACKSON, who was described as "a rough-looking man," when charged with a violent assault upon a woman, which included a good deal of kicking, proved himself not only bold enough to act on this supposed manly privilege, but to argue the point with the

magistrate. Mr. FLOWERS appealed to the prisoner whether it was a manly thing to kick a woman. The prisoner gravely replied that he thought it was when the woman deserved it, the question of desert being, as it would seem, reserved for the man to determine. "You think that!" the astonished magistrate exclaimed. The prisoner, however, became only more confirmed in his theory of his own right by the attempt to question it, for he declared this time that he not only thought so, but was sure of it. He did not however succeed in converting the magistrate, for Mr. FLOWERS declared that whether the prisoner possessed the privilege or not, he should not have the opportunity of exercising it for some time to come, and accordingly sent him to prison for six months. As he was leaving the dock, he made a desperate effort to vindicate his rights of conscience, and enjoy his supposed privilege, by trying to kick the prosecutrix again, and he had to be overpowered by main force to prevent his carrying out his intention.

The *Daily News*, whose words we have used in describing the above case, regrets that some very much severer punishment could not have been inflicted upon this brute. But as that expression might be considered libellous by the friends of the veritable brute creation, among whom maltreatment of their females is unknown, we think the *Daily News* should have been content to call the prisoner a man. We believe that the root of the evil is the notion that men have some rights of property or ownership in women, and that the only effectual protection for women from the abuse of this notion is to be attained through investing them with political rights.

WE have received from a legal correspondent some information which serves to show that the protection to the earnings of married women supposed to have been secured by the Act of 1870 is much less complete than was imagined by the promoters of the measure or intended by the Legislature, and that it amounts practically, in cases where the wife is living with the husband, that is, in the vast majority of the cases where it was designed to operate, to no protection at all.

There can be no doubt, says our correspondent, that the promoters of the Bill intended by clause 1 to protect the earnings of married women in any business or occupation of their own in which their husbands were not engaged, but it seems clear that section 1, as framed, falls short in carrying this out. The condition is, that the business or occupation shall be carried on

"separately from her husband," *i.e.*, from *him*. But, to carry out the promoters' wishes, the section should have declared, separately from her husband's *business*, *calling*, or *engagement*. At least one legal decision upon the section referred to bears out this remark. Shortly after the passing of the Act, a case in which our correspondent was concerned was decided under the Equity Jurisdiction conferred by the County Courts. The facts were shortly these:—The husband was a cashier, the wife a ladies' dress and mantle maker. The latter business was carried on by the wife and her own assistants, and the proceeds applied by her as she thought proper, she hiring and paying assistants, making purchases and giving receipts, at no time accounting to her husband, but contributing without any arrangement to do so to the general maintenance of the family. The husband, for some reason of his own, took upon himself to search his wife's boxes for papers, and found a sum of £90, the savings of the wife out of the business referred to. The husband kept the money, and the wife's solicitors instituted proceedings under the Married Women's Property Act to compel restitution to her. Of course the allegation was that the money belonged to the wife as separate earnings. Our correspondent was acting for the husband, and his contention was, through counsel whom he instructed, that, as the parties were living together during the carrying on of the business, the husband having access to it and all pertaining to it as a business, it could not be said that it was carried on separately from *him*. It was quite true the business was carried on separately and apart from his *business*, but the Act did not go so far as to give the wife the right so long as the business was not separate from *him*—the individual. The Court adopted this view, and dismissed the wife's claim to the money.

There can be no doubt, continues our correspondent, that it should have been the object of the Legislature to clearly protect the wife's earnings in such a case as this, and that case alone is sufficient to show the possible hardship to the wife in a thousand similar instances where this section might have to be applied. Two other cases were at some time later similarly decided, but were probably not reported. They may have been heard *in camera*, as was the case referred to, being in the nature of *ex-parte* motions.

No appeal was lodged against the decision referred to, and the logical effect of it is, that no wife is safe in carrying on a business or occupation if the husband can by any means have frequent access to the

place where it is carried on. If living with the wife, the husband can scarcely be deprived of such access, and eventually he may, by his own continued wrongful interference with it, be enabled thereby to show it has not been carried on *separately* from *him*. The section, therefore, to give effectual protection to a wife's earnings, makes separation next to, if not absolutely, a necessity. Of course it is a question of fact in each particular case, to be ascertained what has been done separately from the husband.

Whether the decision referred to by our correspondent is or is not a correct interpretation of the Act, and there seems no reason to doubt that it is correct, the fact that the Courts have given such a judgment destroys a safeguard supposed to have been provided. It throws an additional element of confusion and insecurity into the existing chaos of laws regulating, or rather disturbing, the property of married women, and furnishes a fresh proof of the necessity for some such amendment in the law as that to be proposed by Lord COLERIDGE on the re-assembling of Parliament.

THE law which vests in a husband absolute ownership of property belonging to his wife is sometimes attempted to be defended on the plea "that a husband is legally responsible for the maintenance of his wife." People who use this argument conveniently overlook the fact that the wife is also legally responsible for the maintenance of the husband. The responsibility is not direct in either case. Neither a husband whose wife refuses to maintain him, nor a wife whose husband refuses to maintain her, can compel the other to do so except by first becoming chargeable to the parish. Only the guardians of the poor can enforce the maintenance of either party to a marriage from the recalcitrant party to the contract. But the law gives the ownership of the wife's money to the husband, while it does not give to the wife the ownership of the husband's money.

The hardship of this state of the law falls more especially on the poor, and is illustrated by the following case which has just occurred in Manchester: Mrs. B., sixty years of age, has for eight years maintained her imbecile husband; a month ago she was compelled to place him in the poor-house. The poor old woman having been thrifty and careful, had subscribed to a club from which she now received 3s. per week. From this pittance the guardians claim 2s. 5d. per week for the maintenance of her husband; the club keeps 7d. per week for her subscription. Thus, the unhappy woman, having tried to lay by for a

rainy day, is far worse off than if she had been a spend-thrift; in that case the parish must have kept her husband. If she works four days a week she gets only 6s.; at her age four days' hard work is no trifle, and work is not always to be had.

The law imposing this obligation on wives is only a recent enactment. Prior to 1870, we believe that the guardians would have had neither the power nor the obligation to enforce from a poor hardworking woman, struggling for her own living, the maintenance of a husband who, in the eye of the law, should have provided for her. But in the year 1870, a Legislature in which women are wholly unrepresented, being moved to some endeavour to remedy the iniquity of the existing common law, passed a clumsy, confused, unintelligible measure, which, while falling far short of the just demands of women, conceded what it did concede in so imperfect a manner as to be practically inoperative for good. The law took away with the one hand, but did not give with the other, and, by removing some of the scant measure of immunity and protection heretofore accorded by the old law, has been the means of inflicting incalculable hardship and misery on the most helpless classes of the population.

Members of Parliament who, in resisting the claim of women to representation, allege the readiness of the House of Commons to take into consideration any wrongs the law inflicts on them, must answer, if they can, the question why they allowed such a one-sided measure to pass, and why they permit the injustice it inflicts to continue for one session without prompt and complete redress. Our answer is the simple one, that the injustice is suffered only by that sixteen millions of the people which has not one vote in the election of the House of Commons. It is for those who deny the correctness of this solution to produce a better one of their own.

We referred last month to the commendable action of the proprietors of the *Cape Argus* in introducing girls into the composing department of the office of that newspaper, in spite of the interested opposition of the male compositors. Since then we have been informed that several printers in this country have successfully tried girls as compositors. A large portion of a Scotch country weekly newspaper, the *Blairgowrie Advertiser*, is put in type by girls. The experiment was tried in the office of that paper about the beginning of the present year, and we understand that the proprietor considers it highly successful. He finds that the girls are more easily taught than boys, and that

they are more careful and quiet. Printing may not be one of the healthiest of occupations, but with comfortable, well-ventilated offices, it is no more unhealthy than many other trades, and it is one at which intellectual, well-educated girls can be employed with advantage both to themselves and to master printers. We fear that the special suitability of women for type-setting is the main reason why many male compositors are so afraid of having to compete with them. A. B.

WE learn from the Paris correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian* that the occasion of the coronation of a new Rosière, or Rose Queen, at Pateaux, was made use of by the deputy of the arrondissement for a discourse on woman's place in society, which seems to have been full of good sense. One remark made by the speaker was so closely in accordance with an argument used by Mr. MILL, that it might have been an echo of the words of our English authority. It is complained, said the French orator, that women are too commonly under the influence of priests. What is the reason but that for the most part legislators have hitherto ignored their claims, and only among the clergy have they found much sympathy and attention?

THE opinions of unrepresented classes have always been taken for granted by political alarmists with a degree of precision commensurate with the ignorance which necessarily prevails on the subject. Some so-called crotchet, supported by a few of the most intelligent or energetic among them, is taken as a sample of the collective views of those classes, and put forward as an excuse for their continued exclusion from the political arena. When it first became obvious that the qualification for the suffrage in this country must be extended, the opponents of electoral reform used to expatiate on the folly of giving the franchise to men so ignorant as to believe that the introduction of machinery was an injury to the working man, or so bird-witted as to be hurried into deeds of violence by the arguments of the first stump orator who chose to address them. The event, however, falsified all such arguments against the enfranchisement of working men, and there are few electors of this class who are not now fully acquainted with the true conditions of industrial success, and who are not as well able to weigh the merits of any agitation in which its promoters seek to involve them as any other class of the community. The fact that they can give effect to their opinion in a regular and constitutional manner has had its natural result in producing

a sense of responsibility in the formation of that opinion. The sort of criticism to which in the beginning of this century the supposed views of the working classes were subjected, now reappears in the strictures which have from time to time been published ever since it has become evident that the rights of women to some share in the representation of the country cannot much longer be denied. The fact that some women take part in certain movements, on the wisdom of which the opinion of competent judges is greatly divided, is regarded by the opponents of their enfranchisement as a sure indication that all women are agreed on the questions involved, and the most sinister predictions as to the character of the direct influence of women in politics are freely enunciated, regardless of the fact that there exists at present no means by which the opinion even of that section of the women of England possessing the necessary qualification for the suffrage can be fully ascertained. The generalisations on this subject, in which certain journals hostile to the political emancipation of women so freely indulge, are especially rash, since women are not a class in the same sense that factory operatives or agricultural labourers are a class. Their circumstances, and consequently their views of things in general, vary as much as do those of the male electorate, and it is most probable that there is no such thing as a compact body of feminine public opinion. Meantime, the rare and fitful attempts made by women to influence the Legislature by the few means they can at present command, are regarded by such journals with an amount of jealousy which leads them to conclusions most incongruously unfavourable to the judgment of the dominant sex. So far from accepting as a proof that there is nothing infra-political or utterly unpractical and utopian in the so-called "feminine movements" of the day the fact that all these movements receive the support and co-operation of men, they get over this difficulty by stating, more or less distinctly, that in giving such support these men must have abdicated the use of their reason and political experience. This conclusion curiously illustrates the confusion engendered in otherwise intelligent minds by a habit of regarding women as persons entirely outside the pale of politics, and actuated in everything by some uniform yet mysterious bias. When women are represented, it will be seen that, like men, they are on most questions divided into separate camps, and that the composition of the female electorate is far too heterogeneous to admit of its action producing an appreciable modification of the general tenor

of legislation, except as regards matters immediately affecting their own legal and social position. On general questions, the considerations that affect men so differently will doubtless produce variety of opinion among women. That this should be the case, however, is a probability in no way detracting from the great importance to women of being able to give effect to their wishes by direct influence upon the composition of the Legislature. The question never has, and never can, with any show of justice, turn upon the use women will make of the suffrage, but on the right of those whose sex is their only disqualification to the exercise of the franchise. Whether women are sentimental, priest-ridden, and ignorant or not, whether they will form a compact body of electors pledged to carry out a certain class of measures or not, they are justly entitled, in a land boasting of a representative government, to the boon which, whenever it is granted, has the effect of fostering, if not of creating, the qualities necessary to its intelligent use.

A. DRUMMOND.

P O E T R Y.

WOMAN'S PLEA FOR EQUALITY.

Is there a joy or a sorrow
Men know, that we have not known?
We have shared your fears, your smiles and tears,
Shall we not share your throne?

Would not the toil seem lighter,
Sooner and sweeter the goal
Of your lonely race, with the aid and grace
And the light of a woman's soul?

Our foes are the foes of your battle,
Let us take our place in the ranks;
Content if so we can strike a blow,
We need no guerdon of thanks.

H. B.

"IN MEMORIAM" GIFT TO GIRTON COLLEGE.

Mr. Thos. Taylor, of Aston Rowant, Oxon, has sent to Miss Shirreff a letter containing a cheque for £1,000, which he desires may be handed to the treasurer of the building fund of Girton College, as a memorial of his late daughter Edith. He says that it was her wish to enter Girton this term as a student, and knowing the great interest she took in the college, and her sincere desire for its success, her parents feel that they could not better show their respect and love for her than by making this gift to its funds. In doing so they seem but to be carrying out one of the earnest desires of their daughter, to help forward the cause of women and advance their higher education.

There has been such an influx of young ladies at the commencement of this term at Cambridge that Girton College and Newnham Hall are unable to accommodate them, and many are compelled to take lodgings.

STATE INTERFERENCE IN THE INDUSTRIAL
EMPLOYMENTS OF WOMEN.

The following is an abstract of a paper read at the Social Science Congress, in Liverpool, by Whately Cooke Taylor, Her Majesty's Inspector of Factories:—

The object of the paper is to advocate the principle that it is desirable for the state to regulate to some extent the employments of adult women, and to seek to define the extent to which it is right and just to do so. It is very important that this principle should be clearly set forth, especially considering the exceptional character and continually-expanding area of restrictive labour legislation. Three parties to the discussion may be signalised. Those who argue against all interference; those who are against the industrial employment of women; and those of less extreme views either way, who find that without some protective measures women are usually oppressed. The last is the more powerful party, and it is to them that labour-regulating Acts are due, such as the Mines, Factories, and Workshops Acts. What is remarkable, however, is that the principle of these Acts seems to be little understood, and there is consequently a danger that they may be extended rashly, to the detriment instead of the advantage of those concerned. Under a "vivid impression" of the dangers thus created, the paper proposes to show what are "the true sanctions for any interference with adult female labour in the industrial world, those sanctions which, avowed or unavowed, unrealised or realised, are the only justification for it." As to the "natural right" of women to work as they like, that is an argument that cannot be supported, as no man or woman in a civilised country is a perfectly free agent. But, moreover, the argument is not of the right to work, but of the right of employing others at work, and the labour market, which is quite free to men, is not equally so to women; they are, in fact, the victims of a monopoly, in part necessary, in part artificial—the monopoly of sex. Hence their labour is at a disadvantage compared with that of men, and will ever tend to become more and more so if left entirely to itself. "Partly by the mere fact of their preponderance over men numerically, partly by that of the more lucrative professions and occupations being monopolised by the dominant sex, and partly by their defenceless position, for the most part politically engendered, women are forced to the lowest and worst paid employments, as surely as water finds its own level. By the same infallible process they are ground down to the margin of endurance, even in these, and must still oftener than they do, sink below it, did not some other influence intervene." The logical justification then for the legislative regulation of women's work rests on the monopoly which exists in men's favour in the labour market. Should the monopoly ever wholly cease the interference would be no longer justifiable economically, though it might still be socially so. But it is not likely ever to cease wholly, that is, to the extent of making the army and navy and all careers equally open to men and women alike, and the great difficulty remains of defining the limit to which it may properly be pressed. There is such a principle of limitation, but it has been in a most extraordinary manner ignored. "It is this—that protection means something more than rejection, or even than restriction; that protective legislation for women's work cannot justly begin and end with its mere subjection to the work of men. The depriving women of employment without providing them with other means of support is protection of a very sinister kind, and by no means resembles what is generally understood by that word. If the state may determine for what occupations women are unfit, and throw obstacles in their way in entering them, it may also determine for what occupations they are fit, and afford them

proportionate facilities. Nor is the one course of action more a breach of economic propriety than the other, while socially and morally and physically women are surely more in need of help than men." The paper concludes:—"I contend, then, that if the state is justified in shutting up certain occupations from women—and I believe it is—that it is equally justified in opening up and facilitating their entry into others, and that the extent to which it exerts itself in the one direction should measure more or less accurately the extent to which it may justly occupy itself in the other."

SOCIAL SCIENCE CONGRESS.

The proceedings of this Congress attracted, as usual, a large number of ladies. Some papers were by ladies, and others were read bearing, on women's questions. Perhaps the one of most practical importance was that by Mr. Whately Cooke Taylor, one of Her Majesty's Inspectors of Factories, on Legislative Restrictions on Women's Labour, of which we have given an abstract above. The official position of the writer lends weight to his views, which are opposed to the further extension of the operation of the Factories and Workshops Act so far as regards adult women; and though he appears to think that some regulation of their labour as regards some occupations is inevitable, he points out that any artificial restrictions on their labour in one direction should, to be just, be accompanied by care to provide facilities for their employment in other directions. Papers were also read by Miss Lankester, on the advantage of Health Lessons to the Poor; by Mrs. Lowe, on Lunacy Law Reform; by Miss E. A. Shirreff, on the Training of Teachers; by Miss Mary Carpenter, on the progress of Female Education in India, and on Day Industrial Feeding Schools; by Miss E. A. Corlett, on the Queen's Institute Art Department, Dublin; and by Miss Rhoda Garrett, on How to Improve the Interior of Modern Houses, with special reference to their Furniture and Decorations. This last paper, as we gather from the newspaper reports, secured the largest attendance of any paper read at any of the meetings of the sections.

THE MARQUIS OF HUNTLY ON WOMEN'S
RIGHTS.

At a meeting of working women, held at the Social Science Congress, the Marquis of Huntly, in addressing the meeting, said that he felt there were subjects in connection with his visit to Liverpool which made it his duty to be present that evening. In his inaugural addresses at the Philharmonic Hall he had alluded to the duties of women, and he could assure those present that in the few years he had been in public business he had come to the conviction—and it was a conviction which they would all share with him—that women had a great influence on men and the future generations of this country. He thought that if all ladies were as eloquent as the lady he had the advantage of listening to a short time previously (Miss Rhoda Garrett) they would soon enjoy the privilege of franchise and have seats in Parliament. (Applause.) He had some inclination towards giving ladies the power to vote, but he was respectfully informed at home—being a married man—that he was to say nothing on that point. (Laughter.)

Mr. Gladstone said, in the House of Commons, that he often saw in the hands of a man, employment that ought more properly to be in the hands of a woman. We were reminded of this by observing an advertisement in a Manchester paper, from a young man who desires a situation as a confectioner, and who announced as a qualification that he "could pipe a bridescake."

PUBLIC MEETING.

BRIGHOUSE.

A crowded public meeting in support of the Bill to Remove the Electoral Disabilities of Women was held on October 25th, in the Town Hall, Brighouse; Thomas Ormerod, Esq., occupied the chair, and Mr. Scatcherd and Miss Becker attended as a deputation on behalf of the National Society for Women's Suffrage. Resolutions in support of this Bill were moved and seconded by the Rev. Mr. Candelet and the Rev. Mr. Galbraith, and carried with one or two dissentients. Votes of thanks concluded the proceedings.

BARONESS BURDETT-COUTTS ON THE PROTECTION OF CHILDREN.

In a letter to the *Daily Telegraph* Baroness Burdett-Coutts says:—The case of Elizabeth Funkin, a child of nine years, brought before Mr. Vaughan on Sept. 19, shows an urgent need for the rectification of the law in order to secure due protection to infants and children from persons convicted of offences against them. As the law now stands, parents and guardians retain, on the termination of their term of punishment, the same authority and the same uncontrolled charge they have abused, that they exercised before conviction, over the helpless objects who are unfortunate enough to be in their power. The subject has already received some consideration, and Lord Selborne, Lord Harrowby, and others ever interested in all social and moral questions, have frequently discussed the means best calculated to ascertain the extent of the evil and to further its remedy, and during the busiest period of the session last summer Mr. Secretary Cross kindly gave me an interview for information on particular points in connection with this subject. The first step which appeared requisite was to obtain the number of convictions from the country at large for assaults, violence, and ill-treatment against the persons of infants and children. This return will, I hope, be asked for in the coming session; but the case of the girl Elizabeth Funkin affords such a striking and startling exemplification of the present defect in the law that, whilst it opens out to view the possible, if not probable, fate of many children left in merciless hands for other description of wrong, it touches to the quick all we hold most dear and most bound to defend in the girlhood of our land. There may be difficulties in the remedial measures required, but nothing that is right to be done can be impossible, and there would seem precedent and agencies available to remedy this lapse of justice. Under certain circumstances it is already held right to restrain the privilege of personal liberty, and to abrogate the acknowledged right of men and women over their children. The holders of "tickets of leave" are placed under a system of surveillance which their antecedents have rendered necessary for the protection of the property or the life of persons who, unlike young children, are at least competent to look after their own interests, and in some measure to defend themselves. Lunatics are not left to the charge of parents or guardians who notoriously maltreat them, and young persons entitled to property and fortune may be guarded from fraud and violence, and brought, as wards in chancery, under the care of the state, which also assumes a charge over the youthful criminal and vagrant, and endeavours to guide them back to society "clothed and in their right mind." Why should it not likewise protect the innocent babe, the most helpless of all created beings? If it is "better that a millstone should be hanged about the neck of a man than that one of these little ones should be offended," surely it is binding on a country professing Christianity to insist that its young children should be placed under state protection when natural guardianship fails in its duty towards them.

A TURKISH LADY ON THE CONDITION OF WOMEN IN EUROPE.

A correspondent furnishes us with the following remarks made by a Turkish lady in comparing the condition of European women with that of women in Turkey:—

"In what," says Fatima Hanum, "is our position inferior to that of the men? If we do not mix in their common society, they do not mix in ours; and the loss is assuredly on their side. A husband labours to gain a fortune, his wife to spend it; a woman shares in all the advantages, privileges, and honours, of her husband's state, and even with more splendour than that which he himself enjoys. Is he rich, and has he his Selamluk crowded with attendants, her apartments are no less thronged, and she is no less observed and waited upon. Is he a vizier? Does he receive the visits of the grandees of the empire? His wife receives the ladies of the grandees, and his patronage is dispensed by her through her female friends. Does a husband attend the levee of his sovereign? So does his wife. (At the Sultan's levee of ladies they are all unveiled), and moreover, she pays her court to the various Sultans and Caduns of the palace, whose favour a grandee can only arrive at through his wife. A Turkish lady is independent of the political dangers that assail her husband except through him. Her life, her person, her property, even her establishment is sacred and secure. Her tongue is free and uncontrolled, and neither husband, pasha, nor Sultan could dare to interfere with its use. If the husband has the faculty of divorcing his wife, the wife also can divorce the husband; and the mother of a son is absolute mistress. The women have as much freedom as the men, and much more enjoyment in excursions, parties of pleasure, visiting, shopping, and going to bath. A woman's property is as secure as that of a man's. A wife's fortune is her own, and does not, as amongst you, become the property of her husband. The women receive as much and the same education as the men. The women are treated by the men with a respect which still they do not always show in return, and when a woman addresses a man he reverently casts his eyes on the ground. In what, then, are we the slaves of our husbands? In what are we inferior to the women of Europe? Is it because the men do not stare at us impudently in the face, and through quizzing glasses? You talk of your great advantages in the selection of husbands and wives; but are your marriages happier than ours, and have you the means of separating if you do not agree? And who would care for a husband who goes, giving his arm, and giggling and laughing, with other women? And what husband can love a wife that other men can finger and twirl about?"

MEDICAL LADIES.

Our Paris correspondent, in a note dated August 14th, informs us that on Saturday last the amphitheatre of the School of Medicine was crowded by doctors and medical students of both sexes to witness the examination of Madame Franceline Ribard, who presented her thesis for the doctorate of medicine. She was put through a most searching examination, not only on the subject of her thesis, but on collateral subjects, which lasted more than an hour, and the members of the examining board, MM. Gavarret, Gubler, Dieulafoy, and Lecorché, congratulated her on her success. The subject selected by the new doctress was, "Drainage of the eye in the various affections of that organ, especially in *décollement* of the retina"—rather a difficult subject, more so on account of its novelty. A few days previously, three English ladies passed the preliminary examinations; one the fourth examination for the doctorate.—*British Medical Journal*.

WOMEN AND THE LEGAL PROFESSION.

A correspondent asks for information on the following points: (1) Can a lady practise any branch of the law in England? (2) Would a lady attending the University College (London) Law Classes be allowed to enter for the examination?

We have no information respecting the latter point, but the following paragraph from the *Englishwoman's Review* bears on the first question:—"If the medical profession may now be considered as having unlocked its doors to women, it has been reserved for 1875 also to find an 'open sesame' to the legal profession, and to see an office opened for women lawyers. The two ladies who have lately opened an office in Chancery Lane, are not, it is true, entered as barristers at any of the Inns of Court. A woman may be capable of paying fees, but she is not yet considered qualified to 'eat her terms.' But the capacity of these ladies is already well proved, and so much work has already passed into their hands, that we are told they have been compelled from want of time to decline some. It is certain that there must be some cases in which women would rather consult a woman 'counsel learned in the law' than any man. There is nothing unfeminine in drawing conveyances, settlements, or wills, or even declarations, pleas, or rejoinders, and it is not probable that the same spirit of antagonism towards the efforts of women will be roused in the legal, as has been shown in the sister learned profession."

The London *Examiner*, in an article on Lord St. Leonards' will, says of Miss Sugden—"She had become, in the course of her long life with her father, little short of a skilled equity draftsman. Her good faith was not questioned. Her legal ability stood evident; and lastly, her testimony was nowhere contradicted, and everywhere supported by such collateral evidence as the case admitted. Miss Sugden, in short, occupies a position fully as conspicuous in the history of English law as that held by her father, and even more unique. She is a precedent to the effect that a single lady can thoroughly understand equity drafting, and can actually carry the provisions of an important document in her memory. . . . It may certainly be conceded that Miss Sugden's example sufficiently demonstrates conveyancing and equity drafting to be a craft, the difficulties of which have been unduly exaggerated, and are more terrible in the show than in the reality."

THE "DAILY TELEGRAPH" ON EDUCATION.

Addressing ourselves to the larger subject, that of the real need of any higher education for women than the female members of the well-to-do classes receive already, we may point out that by far the major part of the contravening arguments, urged by those who deny the existence of any such want, are entirely beside the question. If it were true, as they are in the habit of alleging, that the scheme is but part of a movement of mere revolt, inducing women to unsex themselves, to abandon their legitimate sphere of action, and to force their way unsought and undesired into the occupations of men, even then it would be the duty of all thinking minds to consider whether this spirit of resistance was not largely due to real grievances which need redress, and in a still greater degree to the lack of that very higher education which would presumably enable women to appreciate the situation more accurately. The instances which history affords of social or political risings where there was nothing really to complain of, and where the insurgents were mentally competent to understand all the merits of the question at issue, are too minute and obscure to be discoverable. If, then, women have mistaken all the

conditions of the agitation which has certainly begun in some form, the simplest remedy is to teach them its real bearings; and, as their minds must be made capable not only of hearing arguments, but of understanding them, it follows that even from the ultra-conservative point of view it has become necessary to go wider and deeper than we have hitherto done in the instruction of women. There would be fewer strikes in our iron and coal trades if the workmen knew enough political economy to comprehend that they were driving capital abroad and forcing employers out of the country, so as to kill home production; and similarly, if women have no genuine wrongs, the most certain way to convince them of that fact is to lead them to see the fallacy of the arguments by which they have been misled. Those whose prejudices lead them to believe that by keeping women in a state of permanent tutelage they are but recognising and enforcing the precepts of both Old and New Testaments, and thus acting on behalf of religion, ought to turn their attention to France, and see what is the result of permitting, nay, encouraging a sort of divorce between the masculine and feminine minds. It is little more than the bare truth to say that the great majority of Frenchmen are Voltairian because most of the women are Ultramontane; and although the puerile forms which piety has taken in minds carefully kept in convent schools from light and air cause a sceptical reaction in men, yet the desire for domestic peace, threatened in a million households by the clerical influence exercised over the devout wife, induces the materialist husband to connive at, if not actually to promote, the schemes of the anti-national party whose one aim is to employ France as the means of restoring the temporal power of the Papacy. Let such a divorce of thought on the highest of all possible subjects once become common in England, and the heaviest of blows will be struck at religion. And it must come, sooner or later, if, while men are gradually increasing their knowledge and growing familiar with the ever-fresh results of inquiry in every field of erudition and science, women are kept bound down to the superficial pursuits which make up what the proprietors of "academies for young ladies" are pleased to style fashionable accomplishments. No one, of course, will venture to deny the absolute and irrefutable truth of the statement made again and again by the enemies of educational improvement for women that home, with the duties of wife and mother, is their real sphere of action, and that their lives are incomplete if they do not attain this goal. But the axiom thus propounded tells for and not against progress. How can a woman be in the highest sense of the term a helpmeet to her husband if all she can do for him is to be cook, housekeeper, or nurse—offices which he could have filled perhaps more efficiently, and certainly at a much lower yearly cost, by hired domestics? It is true that Talleyrand, on being asked why he married such a thoroughly stupid woman as Madame Grand, answered that she gave him repose after all the intellectual talk he was forced to hear. The average British husband, however, is by no means a Talleyrand, nor is he, generally speaking, fatigued by the brilliancy of his associates, so that an intelligent partner at home cannot be regarded as a superfluity.

The *Saturday Review* writes as follows:—"It is curious that so few mothers recognising the difficulty of finding husbands for their daughters, do not bring them up with views beyond marriage, and give them at least a chance of some other calling if matrimony should fail them. A man does not make a bad husband because he has a profession. A woman who knows that in remaining single she did not leave herself without interest and occupation would both double her chances of marriage and be able to judge calmly of an offer when it comes."

SHAH JEHAN BEGUM.

Believers in the political and administrative capabilities of women might make a strong case for themselves by referring to a recent Government Report concerning Central India. The little native State of Bhopal has been governed by women for the last quarter of a century, and well would it be for other native states could they boast of such excellent rulers. Secunder Begum, the mother of the present princess, was no doubt a most energetic lady, whose talents are only surpassed by those of her daughter, Shah Jehan Begum. It was the mother who first formed the scheme, which Shah Jehan has carried into effect, of having the land surveyed and assessed by professional surveyors. Secunder Begum herself did much to improve the condition of the ryots, and relieve them from the corrupt oppression of unjust stewards. She caused the boundaries of each village to be marked out, and the areas to be ascertained by a nuzzerpamaish (a summary survey), granting leases also for fifteen years, and allowing culturable waste land an immunity from revenue for five years. However, "nuzzerpamaish" and new assessment systems notwithstanding, results were not altogether satisfactory, for lack of those "professional surveyors." Unprofessional surveying was discovered to have given an altogether false estimate of the area of villages, and to have made assessments on anything but equitable principles. Shah Jehan has now ordered a new survey and assessment, and these settlement operations are progressing favourably. In Bhopal no proprietary rights are recognised between the state and the cultivator of the soil—the ideal solution of the land question, where the state represents justice and order. Evidently the Begum of Bhopal is minded to realise this ideal, as far as in her lies. Early in the year she undertook a tour of inspection through her domains, "to afford redress to the oppressed, and to mete out punishment to bad characters." Of this tour we have her own report, addressed to the Government. We hear of her highness causing jungles to be cleared which before afforded shelter to thieves and bad characters, and proved an obstacle to bringing land into cultivation; of her increasing the number of armed police, and with the same motive of suppressing dacoity and rendering travelling in Bhopal a less perilous business, issuing a law—which, we grieve to learn, the jungles on the other side of Bhopal will render it sufficiently easy to evade—that no armed travellers will be allowed to cross the frontier without showing a licence to carry arms. Our spirited Begum, too, has an eye to details. Shopkeepers and pedlars have had their weights and measures tested, and when these have been found defective they have been destroyed, and fresh ones supplied by the Government—at the expense of the delinquent traders. Shah Jehan is not less scrupulous in attending to her own obligations. Secunder Begum, her cleverness and energy notwithstanding, must have tripped a little on the side of economy. At any rate she left a debt behind her of 700,000 rupees. This sum has been paid off, save for a paltry matter of 988 rupees owing to creditors abroad, who are now straightly informed by our business-like Begum that they had best prefer their claims *at once*, or they will be struck off the state debt altogether. Moreover, Shah Jehan is a strict disciplinarian, and chooses that, if her people's morals are not *sans tache*, it shall not be for lack of looking after. In the city of Bhopal no woman, irrespective of caste, is henceforth to appear in the streets after dusk, without carrying a light to begin with, and also a pass from the police stating the motive for her night-flitting. Shah Jehan, too, will have no cockfighting in her capital; we fear that even pigeon-shooting might not find favour in her sight. We hear that our Begum once undertook a trip

to Bombay to receive the Star of India. Whilst there she took the opportunity of conferring with Mr. Addis, the patentee of the single-line railway, concerning the cost of a small line for Bhopal. The estimate proved somewhat formidable, with that debt of 700,000 rupees still darkening the horizon. Now that this cloud has been dissipated, let us hope the railway may become *un fait accompli*; and the jungles of Bhopal, as the habitation of brigands, tigers, and other "fallow deer" inimical to civilised life, become narrow exceedingly. After all that has been said, it may possibly arouse certain misgivings in the reader's mind as to the domestic position of the spouse, Raja Pertab Sing, whom this strong-minded lady took unto herself in April last. It must remain a subject of interesting speculation, so far as we are concerned, whether or no Pertab Sing is condemned to the distaff and household occupations, whilst his more brilliant partner manages the affairs of state. Let us hope for the best; and whilst the pleasures of cock-fighting, we know, are denied him, imagine the Raja not wholly debarred from those manly diversions which maintain the dignity of the princely condition in more civilised lands. Meanwhile, here is Shah Jehan Begum's announcement of her marriage to the world at large:—"After the death of my late husband, Nuzeer-ool-dowlah Omrow Doolah Baku Mahomed Khan Shah Bahadoor (!), in accordance with the precepts of the Mahomedan religion, and with the approval of the Governor of India, I married my present husband, Syud Mahomed Sadeek Hossain Khan Sahib. As a temporary measure, the vacant appointment of second Minister, with a jaghire yielding 24,000 rupees per annum, was conferred upon him; but in a social and religious point he was placed in the position filled by my former husband"—whatever that may have been. Altogether these administration reports are by no means such dry reading as might be imagined. Writers at home, who complain of the artificial and monotonous sterility of modern times, might here get glimpses of life not to be reproached, at any rate, with the unpicturesqueness of an extreme civilisation. It seems a pity that these administration reports should not fall into the hands of Mr. Carlyle. Plenty of wrestling with blind forces and the powers of chaos would he find here; nay, perchance not one hero only of the stamp he loves. Is not even the Begum of Bhopal, on the whole, a more satisfactory figure to fix one's eyes upon than Dr. Francia of Paraguay? Decision of character and originality she would seem to possess to at least an equal extent with the South American Dictator; and it does not surely detract from her position as a heroine that in her case we have not those forty persons summarily executed to weigh against her good actions.—*The Examiner*.

A LEARNED LADY OF THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY.

The *Manchester Guardian* states that the Free Library in that town has lately acquired the "opuscula" of Anna Maria Schurman (Trajecti ad Rhenum, 1653), an interesting work which perpetuates the memory of that "noble maiden," whose learning caused her to be one of the wonders of the seventeenth century. She was said to be conversant with a dozen languages. Her literary remains are in Latin, Greek, Hebrew, and French. She discussed the question of the propriety of the higher education of women and Hebrew roots with equal facility. The volume has her portrait for a frontispiece, and ends with a collection of eulogies of this "tenth Muse" by various authors, and the cautious printer points out that he has disposed them in alphabetical order without prejudice. Anna Maria Schurman was painter, sculptor, and engraver, as well as author.

TURKISH ATROCITIES.

MEMORIAL TO THE QUEEN FROM THE WOMEN OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

The Women's Memorial to the Queen has been forwarded to her Majesty, at Balmoral, and the following reply has been received by the secretary, Miss Albert—

"Whitehall, 19th Oct.

"Madam,—I am directed by Mr. Secretary Cross to inform you that he has had the honour to lay before the Queen the address, forwarded by you, numerously signed by women of Great Britain and Ireland, on the subject of the atrocities reported to have been committed in connection with the present war in Turkey, and that her Majesty was graciously pleased to receive the same.—I am, madam, your obedient servant,

"GODFREY LUSHINGTON."

Only three weeks had elapsed since the first meeting of ladies took place, yet the number of signatures amounts to 43,845. The memorial is headed by the names of Mrs. Plimsoll, Mrs. William Grey, Mrs. Nassau Senior, Miss Anna Swanwick, Mrs. Fawcett, Miss Mary Carpenter, Mrs. Freeman, Miss F. P. Cobbe, Mrs. Gladstone, Miss Gladstone, Mrs. Garrett Anderson, M.D., Miss Octavia Hill, Lady Young, Lady Reed, Mrs. Lucas, and Miss Pearson. The following abstract has been made of the numbers signing in various towns and counties:—London and Middlesex, 9,417; Kent, 1,314; Surrey, 783; Sussex, 821; Hants and Isle of Wight, 856; Calne and Wilts, 315; Dorset, 305; Devonshire, 1,760; Cornwall, 367; Somerset, 2,621; Gloucestershire, 226; Oxfordshire, 160; Berkshire, 395; Buckinghamshire, 210; Hertfordshire, 373; Essex, 1,541; Bedfordshire, 641; Northamptonshire, 789; Cambridgeshire, 97; Suffolk, 598; Huntingdonshire, 45; Norfolk, 583; Leicester, 359; Worcestershire, 417; Warwickshire, 852; Hereford, 215; Shropshire, 177; Staffordshire, 678; Derbyshire, 460; Nottinghamshire, 543; Lincolnshire, 624; Yorkshire, 1,519; Cheshire, 326; Manchester, 1,876; Accrington, 1,077; the rest of Lancashire, 1,781; Westmorland, 231; Darlington and Durham, 1,161; Northumberland, 234; Wales, 1,669; Scotland, 1,110; Ireland, 1,474; and miscellaneous signatures, arriving too late to be classified, 2,856. The Bulgarian delegates, Zanhof and Balabenow, have sent a very cordial response to the letter from the Committee, telling them of the memorial.

To the Editor of the Women's Suffrage Journal.

Dear Madam,—As you have stated your willingness to receive contributions of money for Miss Irby, may I ask you to be good enough to remind your readers that I have undertaken, at the request of Miss Irby and Miss Johnston, to receive and forward to them, as well as to Dr. Humphry Sandwith, gifts of clothing sent to the fugitives. These gifts I receive at 29, Queen Square, Bloomsbury, London, with (in almost every case) a contribution towards the expense of carriage to the distributors. I will gladly acknowledge the receipt of gifts, and give any information in my power to those who wish to assist the objects of the "Clothing Relief Fund for the Christian Fugitives from Turkey." Every parcel sent to me should have the name and address of the sender outside of it.—I am, dear Miss Becker, yours sincerely,
ELIZABETH MALLESON.
Camp Cottage, Wimbledon, Oct. 19th, 1876.

From the "Metropolitan Notes" in the *Labour News*, we learn that the jute factories about Hackney are somewhat busy, and that there are vacancies for girls. The women who shell peas and walnuts in Covent Garden are paid sixpence a basket, and are able to "do" five or six baskets a day.

THE PROPERTY OF MARRIED WOMEN.

The Committee have great pleasure in announcing that the Right Hon. the Lord Coleridge will, early next session, introduce a Bill to amend the law relating to the property of married women. The object of the Bill will be to secure to a married woman her own property, and to make her liable for her own contracts, as if she were a single woman.

The Married Women's Property Act of 1870, whilst giving a married woman a right to her own earnings, earned after marriage, and after the passing of that Act, does not give her the right to her own property acquired either by inheritance or by gift, unless she inherit under an intestacy, or the bequest be less than £200.

It enables her to retain to her separate use any moneys invested in savings banks or post-office savings banks, and by going through a special formal process for each separate investment, any property in the funds, any fully paid-up shares in a joint-stock company, and any shares in an industrial or provident society. It also enables her to retain to her separate use any property belonging to her before marriage which *her husband* shall, by writing under his hand, have agreed with her shall belong to her after marriage as her separate property. It further empowers her to maintain in her own name an action for the recovery of any such investments, earnings, or property; but it does not give her the power to make any contract, nor is any contract which a married woman may make binding upon her in law, so that her employers have no remedy against her for breach of contract.

The Committee earnestly urge their friends everywhere to assist them at once:

- (1) By collecting signatures to petitions in support of the Bill.
- (2) By inducing local newspapers to discuss the question, and by contributing letters and papers for this purpose.
- (3) By bringing the question under the notice of their parliamentary representatives, by writing letters or forming deputations to ask their support, and, if they should prove favourably disposed, by questioning them on the subject when they meet their constituents.
- (4) By reporting to the Executive Committee cases of hardship, caused by the existing law, which have come under their personal observation.
- (5) By contributing to the funds of the Committee.

All persons willing to help are requested to communicate at once with the secretary, E. C. WOITSTENHOLME ELMY, Congleton, Cheshire, from whom petition forms (written and printed), leaflets, and other papers may be obtained.

Cheques and post-office orders should be made payable to URSULA M. BRIGHT, Alderley Edge.

October, 1876.

SUBSCRIPTIONS AND DONATIONS RECEIVED IN
OCTOBER, 1876.

	£	s.	d.
Mr. John Pennington Mellor	50	0	0
Mrs. Nichol	5	0	0
Madame Venturi	2	2	0
Miss Rose Hall	1	1	0
Mrs. Lucas	1	1	0
Mr. Ashurst	1	1	0
Mrs. Arthur Arnold	1	1	0
Mrs. Henry Taylor	1	1	0
Mr. H. Nicol	1	1	0
Mrs. Russell-Carpenter	0	10	0
Miss H. Rigby	0	10	0
Miss C. G. Lloyd	0	10	0
Mrs. Green	0	5	0
Per Mr. Russell Gurney	0	3	0
Miss Downing	0	2	6

URSULA M. BRIGHT, Treasurer.

£65 8 6

MANCHESTER NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR
WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE.

SUBSCRIPTIONS AND DONATIONS, OCTOBER, 1876.

	£	s.	d.
Onlooker	100	0	0
G. T. S.	100	0	0
Mrs. Oates	5	0	0
Miss Rose Hall	2	2	0
Rev. Alfred Dewes, D.D.	1	1	0
Rev. S. Alfred Steintal	1	1	0
Mr. Mark Price	1	1	0
A Friend to Justice	1	1	0
Mr. H. G. Hart	1	0	0
Mr. Lawrence Horrocks	1	0	0
Mrs. Skerry	1	0	0
Rev. Dr. Turnbull	0	10	0
Mrs. Gay	0	10	0
The Dowager Lady Lytton (<i>Journal</i>)	0	10	0
Mrs. Dixon	0	10	0
Mr. J. Bowron	0	10	0
Mrs. Livens	0	6	0
Miss Borchardt	0	5	0
Rev. T. G. Crippen	0	5	0
Mr. T. Jones (Broseley)	0	5	0
Mr. James Crompton	0	5	0
B	0	5	0
Miss Mackenzie	0	4	6
Mrs. Wayham	0	2	6
Mrs. M'Kerrow (Southport)	0	2	0
GREAT GRIMSBY.			
Mr. Alderman Winttingham	0	10	6
Mr. Councillor Dyer	0	10	6
Mr. Councillor Smethurst, senr.	0	5	0
Mr. Councillor Smethurst, junr.	0	5	0
Mr. Thos. Stephenson	0	5	0
Mr. Walker Moody	0	5	0
Mr. Councillor James Thorpe	0	5	0
Mr. Councillor Wm. Mudd	0	5	0
Mr. Councillor Harrison Mudd	0	5	0
Mr. Geo. Jeffs, jun.	0	5	0
Mr. Thos. Ready	0	5	0
Mr. J. Meadows	0	5	0
Mr. J. Alward	0	5	0
Mr. Joseph Boston	0	5	0
Mr. R. Smith	0	5	0
Mrs. Grange	0	5	0
Mr. J. Russell	0	5	0
Mr. J. Smethurst	0	5	0
Mr. Geo. Dobson	0	5	0
Mr. Councillor Jackson	0	5	0
Mr. John Earle	0	5	0
Mr. Francis Sinclair	0	4	0
Mr. Joseph Mount	0	3	0
Mr. Bulpit	0	3	0
Mr. J. O. Hawke	0	2	6
Mr. David Pick	0	2	6
Mr. Melhuish	0	2	6
Mr. Raddings	0	2	6
Mr. Baxter	0	2	6
Mr. Alfred Dowse	0	2	6
Mr. J. Gidley, senr.	0	2	6
Mr. J. Gidley, junr.	0	2	6
Mr. G. Alward	0	2	6
Mr. J. Francis	0	2	6
Mr. T. Gray	0	2	6
Mr. Salsbury	0	2	6
Mr. Thos. Cooke	0	2	6
Mr. J. Wenney	0	2	6
Mr. Molyneux	0	2	6
Mr. John Bridge	0	2	0
Mr. John Randall	0	2	0
Mr. Walton	0	2	0
Mr. Simon Mudd	0	2	0
Mr. Thomas Walsh	0	2	0
Mr. Pearce	0	1	6
Mr. H. Jeffs	0	1	6
Mr. Tenby	0	1	0
RIPON.			
Mrs. Baynes	0	10	0
Mrs. Alfred Smith	0	5	0
Mrs. J. B. Lee	0	5	0
Mrs. Garnett (2 years)	0	5	0
Mrs. G. Severs	0	5	0
Mrs. Gatenby	0	5	0
Mrs. Heal	0	5	0
Mrs. Ebdel	0	2	6
Mrs. Severs	0	2	6
Mrs. Thompson	0	2	0
Mrs. Snow	0	2	0

	£	s.	d.
DARLINGTON.			
Mr. Arthur Pease	10	0	0
Mrs. Gurney Pease	5	0	0
Mrs. Fell Pease	2	0	0
Mr. Henry Pease	1	0	0
Mrs. S. B. Pease	1	0	0
Mrs. Kitching	1	0	0
Mr. W. Cudworth	1	0	0
Mrs. Bowman	0	10	0
Mr. W. Coor Parker	0	5	0
Mr. S. Hare	0	5	0
Mr. G. S. Gibbs	0	5	0
Mr. W. Fothergill	0	5	0
Miss G. M. Prideaux	0	5	0
Miss Proctor	0	5	0
Mr. W. Harding	0	5	0
Mr. J. H. Bell	0	5	0
Mr. Peachey	0	5	0
Miss E. J. Kipling	0	5	0
Miss Louisa Wright	0	3	0
Mr. W. Foggett	0	3	0
Mrs. J. Saunders	0	2	6
Mr. S. G. Fisher	0	2	6
Mr. J. Webster	0	2	6
Mr. D. Fox	0	2	6
Mr. H. Brooks	0	2	6
Mr. E. Hutchinson	0	2	6
Mr. S. Fothergill	0	2	6
Misses Fawcett and Acomb	0	2	6
Mrs. Wheeler	0	2	0
Anonymous	0	1	0
HULL.			
Mr. James Ricketts	1	1	0
Mr. Dowsing	0	10	6
Mr. B. Carill	0	10	6
Mr. James Stuart	0	10	6
Mr. Thomas Gregson	0	10	6
Dr. Munroe	0	10	0
Mrs. M. A. Thorne	0	5	0
Mr. Elam	0	5	0
Mrs. S. E. Gregson	0	5	0
Mr. A. Frost	0	5	0
Mr. Thomas Witty	0	5	0
Mr. Cohen	0	5	0
Mr. R. Micks	0	2	6
Mr. G. Raven	0	2	6
Mr. T. Haller	0	2	6
Mr. B. Tongue	0	2	6
Mr. H. Robinson	0	2	6
MIDDLESBOROUGH-ON-TEES.			
Mr. J. Jennings	0	10	6
Mr. W. Taylor	0	10	6
Mr. J. Jordison	0	10	0
Mr. S. Wright	0	5	0
Mr. Archibald	0	5	0
Mr. Amos Hinton	0	5	0
Mr. John Hargreaves	0	4	0
Mr. C. Bell	0	2	6
Mr. J. S. Calvert	0	2	6
Miss Purcell	0	2	6
NORTHALLERTON.			
Mr. Joseph Brain	0	10	6
Mr. W. A. Hutchence	0	5	0
Mr. R. M. Middleton	0	5	0
Mr. James Guthrie	0	5	0
Mr. H. T. Akers	0	5	0
Mr. J. Stainsby	0	5	0
Mrs. Ayre	0	5	0
Mrs. J. Awde	0	5	0
Mr. G. Dowson	0	2	6
Mr. T. Ayre	0	2	6
Mr. G. F. Clarkson	0	2	6
Mrs. Fairburn	0	2	6
Mrs. Guthrie	0	2	6
Mr. Joseph Fairburn	0	2	6
Mr. C. Hodgson	0	2	6
Mr. Cooper	0	2	0
THIRSK.			
Mr. B. Smith	0	5	0
Mr. W. Ayre	0	5	0
Mr. R. Pearson	0	5	0
Mr. Geo. Ayre	0	2	6
Mrs. Geo. Ayre	0	2	6
Mrs. J. W. Hall	0	2	6
Mr. Jacques	0	2	6

S. ALFRED STEINTAL, Treasurer.

£268 14 6