

WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE JOURNAL.

EDITED BY LYDIA E. BECKER.

VOL. XX.—No. 233. PUBLISHED MONTHLY.
REGISTERED FOR TRANSMISSION ABROAD.

MAY 1, 1889.

PRICE ONE PENNY.
BY POST THREE HALFPENCE.

Contents.

Leading Articles:—The loss of the Bill; Future Prospects of the Measure; The growing influence of Women in Politics; The Scotch Local Government Bill; Meetings during April; The forthcoming Evening Party; Women and Council Councils; The Deceased Husband's Brother.
Parliamentary Intelligence.
Public Meetings:—Westminster Town Hall.

Drawing-room Meetings:—Onslow Gardens, Brook Green.
The Marquis of Hartington and Mr. Chamberlain on Women and Politics.
Bill to enable Women to be Councillors.
Scotland:—The Convention of Burghs.
The Easter Adjournment of Parliament.
Prize Competition No. 3.

John Bright's Parrot.
Parliamentary Petitions.
Treasurers' Reports:—Manchester National Society for Women's Suffrage; Central Committee; Bristol and West of England Society.
Bristol and West of England Branch of the National Society for Women's Suffrage.

EVENING PARTY IN THE ART GALLERIES, CONDUIT-STREET, LONDON.

An Evening Party will be held at the Nineteenth Century Art Society's Galleries, Conduit-street, London, on

THURSDAY, MAY 30th, 1889,

under the auspices of the following ladies:—

The Dowager Countess of BUCHAN.	The Viscountess HERBERTON.	CLARA, Lady RAYLEIGH.
LOUISA, Lady GOLDSMID.	Lady ROBERTS.	Mrs. CHARLES HOLLAND.
Miss BECKER.	Miss DAVENPORT-HILL.	Miss MORDAN.
Mrs. BEDDOE.	Miss EMILY DAVIES.	Mrs. COURTENAY SCOTT.
Miss J. BOUCHERETT.	Mrs. EDWARDS-HEATH.	Mrs. HENRY SIDGWICK.
Mrs. EDWARD COTTON.	COTE.	Mrs. STEPHEN SPRING-RICE.
Mrs. LEONARD COURTNEY.	Mrs. FAWCETT.	Miss ANNA SWANWICK.
Mrs. JOSEPH CROSS.	Mrs. PENROSE FITZGERALD.	Miss TOD.
	Mrs. ASHWORTH HALLETT.	

TICKETS, FIVE SHILLINGS EACH,

May be obtained from any of the above Ladies, or from Miss BECKER, *Hon. Secretary*, 10, Great College-street, Westminster.

Reception at Nine o'clock. Carriages at Twelve.
Summer Exhibition of Pictures; Music, &c.

Reckitt's Blue.

MARRIAGE LAW DEFENCE UNION.

An Appeal from the Women of England ... 1d.
The Woman's View of the Question ... 1d.
A Letter to English Wives. By Edith Mary Shaw ... 6d.
A Lady's Letter to a Friend, on behalf of those who do not wish to Marry their Brothers ... 1d.
What Miss Lydia Becker says... 3d.
A Sister-in-Law's Plea for Mercy ... per doz. 2d.
A Woman's Opinion on the Wife's Sister Bill 1d.

May be had at 35, King-street, Westminster, S.W.

LIST OF PARLIAMENTARY FRIENDS OF WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE, April, 1889. Revised and reprinted by permission from the *Women's Suffrage Journal*. Published by the Central Committee of the National Society for Women's Suffrage, 10, Great College-street, Westminster. Price 1d.

OPINIONS OF CONSERVATIVE LEADERS ON WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE.

LEAFLET.—Opinions of the Marquis of Salisbury, the Duke of Rutland, the Earl of Carnarvon, Sir M. Hicks-Beach, the late Earl of Iddesleigh, the late Earl of Beaconsfield.

Published by the Central Committee, 10, Great College-street, Westminster, London, price 2s. per 100.

WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE JOURNAL.—Volume XIX. January to December, 1888. With coloured cover, price, post free, One Shilling and Sixpence.—London: Trübner and Co.; Manchester: John Heywood and Co.

MADAME BROWNJOHN, Court Dress-maker, 43, Cambridge-st., Eccleston Square, Belgravia, S.W. The most fashionable costumes of every description made at the shortest notice. Ladies' own materials made up. Estimates given. Evening Dresses, from 3½ guineas; Morning Dresses, from 2½ guineas. Wedding orders and foreign outfits promptly attended to. Perfect fit guaranteed.

GOLD MEDAL AWARDED
INTERNATIONAL
HEALTH EXHIBITION

BENGER'S

TINS, 1/6, 2/6 & 5/-
For Children and Invalids.

FOOD

"Retained after every other food has been rejected."
London Medical Record.

Of Chemists, &c., everywhere, or free by parcels post from the manufacturers,
MOTTERSHEAD & CO., 7, Exchange-street, Manchester

TOWLE'S

1s. 1½d. 2s. 9d.
4s. 6d. & 11s.

CHLORODYNE

Invaluable for Coughs, Asthma, Bronchitis, Cholera, Diarrhoea, Consumption, Spasms, &c. One Dose speedily relieves. TOWLE'S CHLORODYNE LOZENGES and JUJUBES. 6d. and 1s. per box. A. P. TOWLE, Chemist, 75, Back Piccadilly, Manchester, and of Chemists.—Post free 13d., 2s. 9d., 4s. 6d., and 11s.

NEAVE'S

FOR INFANTS,
GROWING CHILDREN,
INVALIDS, AND
THE AGED.

FOOD.

WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE JOURNAL.—Communications for the Editor and Orders for the Journal to be addressed to the Office, Queen's Chambers, 5, John Dalton-street, Manchester.

PARLIAMENTARY PETITIONS.

HOUSE OF COMMONS. PARLIAMENTARY FRANCHISE (EXTENSION TO WOMEN) BILL.—In Favour. FIFTH REPORT, 2-8 April, 1889. April Brought forward, Petitions 41— Signatures 615

Total number of Petitions 73—Signatures 2,497

These Petitions are substantially similar to that from York [APP. 1]. Your Committee have in the case of the Petitions from MIDDLESEX and ESSEX, from ESSEX, and from the CREWE Division, presented on the 5th April, by Mr. M'Laren, reported to the House the number of names appended thereto, but they are of opinion that many of the names are in the same handwriting, and that the orders of the House, which require that every Petition must be signed by the parties whose names are appended thereto by their names or marks and by no one else, except in case of incapacity by sickness (vide Commons' Journals 1675, Nov. 8; 1693, Nov. 14; 1774, June 2; 1826, Dec. 13; 1836, June 28), have not been complied with.

The Petitions marked thus (©) are signed officially.

The supporters of women's rights must claim Mr. Justice Stephen as a weighty authority on their behalf. Alluding to the case of a defendant who sought to escape liability for certain expenditure by throwing the blame of ordering it upon his wife, his lordship characteristically blurted out, "That is a very old excuse. I often felt that Adam—I mean—that is—well! I have always wished to hear Eve's account of that transaction." This rather novel allusion to the Fall of Man and the Origin of Sin opens up quite a new field of inquiry.—Pall Mall Gazette.

MANCHESTER NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE.

SUBSCRIPTIONS AND DONATIONS, APRIL, 1889. Mrs. Miller .. £5 0 0 Mrs. Taylor (Sheffield) .. £1 0 0 Captain Rose .. 5 0 0 Mrs. Alfred Hunt .. 0 10 6 Mrs. William Grey .. 3 0 0 Mrs. Frankland .. 0 6 6 Mrs. R. H. Anderson .. 2 0 0 Miss Alice Wood .. 0 5 0 Mrs. Slous .. 1 1 0 Rev. A. Chaplin .. 0 5 0 Mrs. Richard Smith .. 1 1 0 Miss Simpson .. 0 2 6 Mr. John Addison, Q.C., M.P. 1 1 0 Dr. Small, J.P. .. 0 2 6 Mrs. Gerard .. 1 0 0 Miss F. M. Evans .. 0 2 6 Mrs. Whateley Cooke Taylor .. 1 0 0 Mrs. Leatham .. 0 2 6 Mr. Jonathan Burt .. 1 0 0 Clara, Lady Rayleigh .. 1 0 0 £25 0 0

ROBERT ADAMSON, TREASURER, Queen's Chambers, 5, John Dalton-street, Manchester.

CENTRAL COMMITTEE.

RECONSTRUCTED UNDER THE OLD RULES. SUBSCRIPTIONS AND DONATIONS FROM MARCH 28TH TO APRIL 25TH, 1889. Mrs. Tapson .. £2 2 0 Mrs. B. Clark .. £1 0 0 Mrs. Eason Wilkinson .. 1 1 0 Mrs. R. Christison .. 0 5 0 Miss Shaen .. 1 1 0 Miss Anderson .. 0 2 6 Miss Aylmer .. 1 1 0 Mrs. Percival .. 0 2 6 Miss Light .. 1 0 0 Sir Richard Temple, Bt., M.P. 1 0 0 £8 16 0 Mrs. HENRY FAWCETT, TREASURER. Office: 10, Great College-street, Westminster.

BRISTOL AND WEST OF ENGLAND SOCIETY.

SUBSCRIPTIONS AND DONATIONS FROM MARCH 26TH TO APRIL 26TH, 1889. Mrs. Hallett .. £7 10 0 Mrs. Charles Thomas .. 5 0 0 Miss Crawford BATH. .. £0 5 0 Mrs. Estlin .. 4 0 0 Mr. Charles King .. 0 5 0 Miss Rowlands (Fishguard) .. 0 2 6 Mrs. Theobald .. 0 5 0 Mr. John Davies .. 0 5 0 Mr. T. W. Gibbs .. 0 2 6 Miss Tullis .. 0 5 0 Mr. Dyke .. 0 2 0 Mr. W. Jones .. 0 2 6 Mrs. Jeffery .. 0 2 0 Mr. D. Richards .. 0 2 6 £19 14 0 Mrs. ASHWORTH HALLETT, TREASURER. Office, 69, Park-street, Bristol.

BRISTOL AND WEST OF ENGLAND BRANCH OF THE NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE.

During the recent visit of the Marquis of Salisbury to Bristol a memorial was presented to his Lordship from this society praying that the Government would take measures to ensure the discussion of the Women's Franchise Bill before the expiration of the present Parliament, and that they would give their support to the measure.

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

CONTENTS FOR APRIL 15TH, 1889.

- 1. The Marchioness of Dufferin's Report
2. A Methodist Argument against the Emancipation of Women.
3. John Bright.
4. Petition against Women on County Councils.
5. The Fate of the Women's Franchise Bill.

Guardian Angels. Record of Events.—Loss of Suffrage Bill for the Session—Meetings—Return of Women Poor Law Guardians at Hastings, Southport, Hammersmith, Hampstead, &c., &c.—Further Reports of Meetings where Returns are unknown—Woman Registrar, Overseer—London School of Medicine—Irish College of Surgeons—Women's Political Associations—Female Attendants in Police Courts—Painters in Water Colours, Lady Artists—Aberdare Hall, Cardiff—Somerville Hall—Deceased Wife's Sister Bill—Miscellaneous—Peace and Arbitration.

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

WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE JOURNAL.

EDITED BY LYDIA E. BECKER.

VOL. XX.—No. 233. PUBLISHED MONTHLY.

MAY 1, 1889.

PRICE ONE PENNY. BY POST THREE HALFPENCE.

HOPE is again deferred. The fair prospect which was opened when the chances of the ballot threw a favourable number into Mr. WOODALL'S hand was speedily clouded by the unfortunate selection of the Wednesday before Good Friday as the day for the second reading of the Bill—a day on which, as Mr. W. H. SMITH subsequently reminded Mr. WOODALL, the House had only once sat within the last twenty years. This selection was all the more unfortunate as the Wednesday a fortnight later, when the House is usually again in session after the Easter recess, was not taken when Mr. WOODALL was called. Had that day, the first of May, been secured for the Bill, nothing in the ordinary course of business could possibly have interfered to prevent a discussion and decisive decision upon the question of the extension of the Parliamentary franchise to women.

No sooner was it apparent that the Bill had been set down for a day which, in the ordinary course of things, falls within the Easter recess, than an effort was made by the friends in the House of Commons to avert the probable loss of the Bill. A memorial, signed by 146 members of Parliament, was presented to Mr. W. H. SMITH, praying that in making the usual motion for Easter, he would ask the House to sit on Wednesday, the 17th of April. But the opponents of the measure were not slow to take advantage of the tactical error which had been committed by setting down the Bill on that day. A counter memorial, even more numerous signed, was presented to the Government. This memorial did not contain any reference to the Women's Franchise Bill, it simply asked Mr. SMITH not to curtail the usual Easter holidays. Under these circumstances, it is not surprising that the Government did not see their way to interpose to help Mr. WOODALL out of the pitfall into which he had stumbled. The motion, therefore, was made for the adjournment of the House after the morning sitting, on Tuesday, April 16th.

We believe that in regard to the interests of the Bill itself,

the decision of the Government not to allow the discussion to be forced on to the abridgment of the Easter holiday was wise. We hold it to be most desirable in view of the success of the Bill that whenever the second reading shall be proposed the discussion shall take place under fair and favourable conditions on a day on which there is a reasonable prospect of a full House. Such conditions might have been anticipated on the first of May, if Mr. WOODALL had been fortunate enough to select that date. Such conditions could not possibly have been secured on the 17th of April, even if Mr. SMITH had acceded to the prayer of the memorialists to postpone the adjournment to that day. Under ordinary circumstances comparatively few members remain till the very last day before the adjournment of the House, and although more than usual might have stayed for such an important measure as the Women's Franchise Bill, such a day could not be regarded as favourable for obtaining the ear of the House for the discussion or for a large and decisive vote. We have, therefore, to confess that it was with a sense of relief and satisfaction that we learned that it was not the intention of the Government to subject the Women's Franchise Bill to the disadvantage of being presented to the House under these unfavourable conditions.

ALTHOUGH it is a matter for disappointment that a practicable Wednesday was not secured this session, we do not regard the delay as seriously inimical to the fortunes of the Bill. There remain, in all probability, at least two sessions of the present Parliament, and one of the objections which has been urged against the passing of the measure will become less and less plausible as Parliament becomes older. It is said that when anything in the nature of an electoral reform Act has been passed, it has been the custom to dissolve Parliament soon afterwards in order to give the newly-enfranchised electors an opportunity of recording their votes. We have never been able to see much force in this objection as regards the women's franchise. The number to be added to the register would be but a moderately small

percentage of the existing electorate, not, as in previous Reform Bills, a number as large as or larger than those already in possession of votes. Previous Reform Bills have increased the democratic element in the electorate by successive inclusion of classes lower and lower in the social scale, until the governing power has been absolutely transferred to the masses. But no such transference of power from one class to another is involved in the Women's Franchise Bill. The women to be enfranchised would not be of one class but of all classes, and their enfranchisement would not disturb the centre of gravity of the political system. Moreover, having suffered disfranchisement for so long, they can well afford, after being at last admitted to the possession of their long deferred rights, to wait patiently for the exercise of those rights until Parliament shall be dissolved in the natural course of political events. We believe, however, that the objection, unsound though it be, might have been urged by opponents with more or less embarrassing effect this session, but that even this appearance of plausibility will have well-nigh disappeared if the friends should be fortunate enough to secure a day next year, and will of course be altogether removed if circumstances should postpone the discussion of the Bill until the last session of the present Parliament.

THE influence and participation of women in the discussion of the political questions of the day increases by leaps and bounds. Women's Liberal Associations are springing up and growing in every great centre of political activity. Not less energetic are the Women's Liberal Unionist Associations; while the present month will witness the annual celebrations of that marvellous organisation the Primrose League, which owes so much of its prosperity and influence to the active co-operation of women.

The leaders of all the great parties in the State have addressed meetings of women and sought to enlist their support, the latest example of this being the addresses of the Marquis of HARTINGTON and Mr. CHAMBERLAIN to the meeting of Unionist ladies assembled at Birmingham, under the presidency of Mrs. ASHFORD. Both these gentlemen referred to the women's franchise question in guarded and doubtful language, as if they did not quite like the idea, but were prepared sooner or later to accept the inevitable. But it is not possible in the nature of things that women can go on working for political objects and contentedly acquiesce in exclusion from the suffrage.

Most of the ladies who take an active part in political movements are advocates of women's franchise, although having regard to the transcendent importance of the Imperial questions of the day, they are for the present content to subordinate other questions to these. But this acquiescence will not last for ever. Political leaders of all shades of politics will soon perceive that if they are to continue to receive the political support of women they must be prepared to pay the price by granting to these women the satisfaction of their legitimate demands for a moderate and reasonable share in the voting power of the people.

THE Scotch Local Government Bill was introduced last month by the LORD ADVOCATE, who, on explaining its provisions, was careful to state that the constituency which is to elect the County Councils would include the women ratepayers. After the experience of the English Act this provision was only what was to have been anticipated; nevertheless, every fresh extension of the area of women's suffrage, and every renewed affirmation of the principle, tends to hasten the period when this principle shall become co-extensive with representative Government everywhere in these realms, in imperial as well as in local affairs.

A LARGE meeting was held on April 9th in Westminster Town Hall in support of Mr. WOODALL'S Franchise Bill. Mrs. FAWCETT presided. Colonel COTTON moved a resolution expressing approval of the Bill in its present form, which was supported by Miss BECKER, Mr. W. S. CAINE, M.P., and Mrs. HENRY SIDGWICK, and carried unanimously. A vote of thanks to Mrs. FAWCETT, moved by Miss BECKER, and seconded by the Dowager Lady LYTTLETON, concluded the proceedings.

A drawing-room meeting was held in Onslow Gardens by invitation of CLARA Lady RAYLEIGH, the Hon. C. STRUTT in the chair; addresses were delivered by Mrs. FAWCETT and Mrs. ASHWORTH HALLETT. A meeting was held by invitation of Miss REID and Miss GUINNESS at their studio in Brook Green; Mr. THOS. WEBSTER presided, and Mrs. BEDDOE, Miss MORDAN, Miss ABNEY WALKER, and Miss BLACKBURN took part in the proceedings.

WE desire to call the attention of our readers to the evening party which is arranged to take place on Thursday, the 30th instant, at the Nineteenth Century Art Society's Galleries, Conduit-street. The entertainment

will be of a purely social and artistic nature, and the arrangements convey promise of an agreeable evening to those who may desire to take part in the gathering.

As was from the first anticipated, the decision of the Court of Queen's Bench has been adverse to the right of County Council electors to return a woman as their representative. Lady SANDHURST, the member chosen by the electors of Brixton for the London County Council, has been declared ineligible for election, and the seat has been awarded to the defeated candidate, Mr. BERESFORD HOPE. Notice of appeal has been given, but it seems a little doubtful whether the appeal will be persisted in, and, if it be, no one seems to have any doubt at all that the judgment will be upheld by the higher court, at least so far as regards the disqualification of women candidates.

THE judgment in this case sets at rest another objection frequently urged against the extension of the Parliamentary franchise to women, the allegation that the right to vote in an election carries with it or implies the capacity to be elected, and that consequently if women were allowed to vote for members of Parliament they might become members of Parliament themselves. We have never been able to see the smallest connection either in law or reason between the right to select or nominate a person for a particular office, and the eligibility or fitness to serve in that office, but still the objection is repeated as if it were an axiom or law of representative government, that the right to elect and the capacity to be elected go together. Yet it is very certain that the House of Commons, in passing the Local Government Bill, intended to extend the County Council franchise to women, and did not intend to make women eligible as members. The question was asked during the debate, and Mr. RITCHIE answered to this effect. The House accepted the answer as satisfactory. If it had considered that the right to vote implied the right to sit for County Councils, it would not have accepted this reply, but would have either denied the right of women to vote, or given them the power to sit if elected. Therefore there is no reason why the same rule should not prevail with regard to members of Parliament.

IN view of the adverse decision of the law courts, a Bill has been introduced by Mr. CHANNING for the purpose of rendering women eligible for seats on County Councils. We do not understand why in framing the measure the

Town Councils should have been left out. The measure in other respects appears to us to be somewhat crude, and we cannot believe that in its present shape it will be likely to pass into law. But whenever it does come up for discussion the question will be debated on the general grounds of whether the presence of women on County and Municipal Councils is likely to be acceptable and useful to the community, and whether municipal and county electors may safely be trusted with the power to elect women as representatives should they see fit to do so. If these questions are answered in the negative by the judgment of the House of Commons, the mere fact that women can vote in these elections will not outweigh such adverse judgment. On the other hand, should Parliament decide these questions in the affirmative, it will be because it considers either that the presence of women on County Councils is in itself desirable, or that their election is a matter that might be left to the judgment of the constituencies, and not because of the imagined connection between the right to vote and the right to sit, which by the legislation of last year Parliament has distinctly denied.

MR. M'LAREN'S amendment for extending the Deceased Wife's Sister Marriage Bill to the deceased husband's brother derives some support from a recent occurrence in Wales. The guardians of the Festiniog Union appointed as master and matron of the Penrhyndendraeth workhouse a couple who had married, the woman being the widow of the man's deceased brother. It is quite possible that the marriage ceremony may have been gone through in good faith, for we believe there is an impression among the people that marriages with a deceased husband's brother are legal, although marriages with a deceased wife's sister are not. Be this as it may, the Local Government Board naturally objected to allow the appointment as master and matron of a workhouse of a couple who were not legally man and wife. The guardians have resolved to send a deputation of remonstrance to Mr. RITCHIE and so the matter stands for the present.

The moral to be drawn from this story appears to be that, while the marriage law remains unchanged, people should refrain from contracting unions in contravention of its provisions; but that, if it is to be amended, men in the position of the master of the Penrhyndendraeth workhouse are neither more nor less entitled to *ex post facto* relief than men who have married their deceased wife's sister.

PARLIAMENTARY INTELLIGENCE.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, April 4th.

THE EASTER RECESS.

In answer to Mr. John Ellis,

Mr. W. H. SMITH said: I have endeavoured to gather the views of hon. members with regard to the Easter Holidays, and I believe that only on one occasion in the last twenty years has the House not risen on the Tuesday morning before Easter; and on that occasion it was because of circumstances of extreme pressure of public business. This being so, and feeling that I am following the general wish of the House, I shall move before Tuesday, the 16th, that the House adjourn after the morning sitting on Tuesday until the following Thursday week. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. WOODALL gave notice that on the motion for the adjournment over Easter he would call attention to the fact that the effect of the dates fixed was to confiscate the day fixed for the consideration of his motion on women's suffrage.

Mr. W. H. SMITH: I must call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that he has fixed his resolution for a day upon which, with one exception, the House has not sat for twenty years. (Laughter.)

April 11th.

WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE BILL.

Mr. R. COOKE asked the hon. member for Hanley whether he intended to proceed with the Women's Suffrage Bill this session; and, if so, whether he would endeavour to secure a day for its discussion, or engage not to take it except at a time when it might be fully debated.

Mr. WOODALL: The House is aware that, availing myself of the position obtained in the ballot, I put down the Women's Suffrage Bill for second reading on Wednesday next. The leader of the House, in the exercise of his discretion, has intimated his intention to follow the general usage in regard to the Easter holidays, rather than to act upon the precedent he himself established so recently as 1887. I do not propose to challenge this decision by putting the House to the trouble of a division on the motion for adjournment. And I have no hesitation in giving the assurances asked for by the hon. member, whose solicitude in regard to the Bill has been evidenced by his vigilant and persistent hostility. ("Hear," and a laugh.) There is, however, no chance of making further progress with the question this session in what remains of private members' time. But after the recent declaration of the Prime Minister in favour of the enfranchisement of women, I am not without hope that the Government will endeavour to give effect to the opinion of Lord Salisbury by affording me some facilities for taking the opinion of the House. ("Hear," and a laugh.) I propose therefore to defer the withdrawal of the Bill until I am assured that such an expectation is not likely to be realised.

PUBLIC MEETINGS.

WESTMINSTER TOWN HALL.

A well-attended meeting of the friends and supporters of the Parliamentary Franchise (Extension to Women) Bill was held at Westminster Town Hall, on Tuesday, the 9th ultimo, under the auspices of the Central Committee of the National Society for Women's Suffrage. Mrs. FAWCETT presided, and among those present were The Lady Frances Balfour, The Viscountess Harberton, The Lady Rayleigh, The Dowager Lady Lyttelton, Hon. Dudley Campbell, Lady Wilde, Captain Edwards Heathcote, M.P., Mrs. and Miss Edwards Heathcote, Mrs. T. W. Russell, Miss Becker, Colonel Cotton, M.P., Mr. Caine, M.P., Prof. Sidgwick, Mrs. Henry Sidgwick, Miss Davenport Hill, Miss Louisa Twining, Mrs. Beddoe, Mrs. and Miss Bigg (Luton), Mrs. Charles Holland, Miss Mabel Holland, Mrs. Penrose Fitzgerald, The Misses Fitzgerald, Miss G. Penrose Fitzgerald, Mrs. E. C. Morgan, Mrs. Hodgson, Mrs. Tolme, Mrs. Edmund Russell, Mrs. and The Misses Phillott, Mrs. Robert Christison, Mrs. Leighton, Miss M. H. Hart, Miss Harriet Robson, Miss Mordan, Miss Laura Cooper, Mrs. Stopes, Miss Alice Corkran, Miss Babb, Mrs. J. W. Turner, Miss Hamley, Miss Malcolm Kerr, Mrs. Leichti, Mrs. Vickery, Miss Goff, Misses Johnson, Misses Hill, Mrs. Howard Smith, Mrs. Grimes, Miss Grover, Mr. Eiloart, Dr.

and Mrs. Field, Miss Gardner, Miss Newton Foster, Mr. and Mrs. Sanderson, Mrs. Greenaway, Misses Wilkinson, Miss Reid, Miss Mylne, Miss Guinness, Miss Robertson, Mrs. Hugh Watt, Mrs. Wyllie, Miss Roberts, Miss H. Rowlands, Miss O'Connor, Mrs. Mylne, Mrs. and Miss Ogill, Mrs. A. Peile, Miss Armstrong, Miss Ford, Mrs. Ashworth, Miss Drew, Mrs. Fleming Baxter, Mrs. Cooper, Mrs. Cairnes, Mrs. J. Dimsdale, Mrs. Durham, Miss Blackburn (secretary), and many others.

Mrs. FAWCETT, in opening the proceedings, said she felt it a great honour to have been called upon to preside on that occasion, at a moment of very considerable practical importance in the history of the women's suffrage movement. In many respects the aspect of the question in which they were all interested was at present a little peculiar. In some respects they were exceedingly happy and, in others, unhappy. In some points of view their movement had been extraordinarily and exceptionally fortunate, while in others they were unfortunate. In divers instances—which would no doubt readily occur to the minds of most of those present—it seemed as if the very stars in their courses were fighting for them. Their movement had made extraordinary progress in general public opinion. They had received the support of the most eminent leaders of political thought. Taking such names, for example, as those of Mr. John Stuart Mill, Mr. Bagehot, and Sir Henry Maine downwards, they might claim that their movement had enlisted the support of the greatest leaders of political thought of the present half century, and they had lately also received the most important adhesion to their cause of the Prime Minister and other highly influential political personages. (Applause.) She also referred to the support given to their movement last autumn, at Manchester, by the Archbishop of York, who, addressing a working men's meeting in connection with the Church Congress, said, in reference to female enfranchisement, that in his opinion "there was nothing which stood between the accomplishment of their purpose at the present time but the evil will of man." And if she wanted to point to another fortunate circumstance which had marked the course of their movement, she would refer to the absolute dying away of all hostility to the principle of women's suffrage, as was shown in the local elections of this country. (Hear, hear.) In reading that morning the report of the speech of the Lord Advocate of Scotland, in introducing a local government Bill for that country, she noticed that his announcement that the Bill would confer the franchise upon all duly qualified women was received with cheering from all parts of the House of Commons. Glancing at a few of the more notable circumstances which had marked their career, she remarked that they had had good pilots and captains and, she ventured to think, good seamanship on the part of the crew. They had got their vessel in sight of port, when some practical difficulties had supervened and prevented them from finally getting their vessel into the port towards which they were steering. There was one particular difficulty with which they were all familiar—the difficulty of securing a day for the discussion of the Bill. Since this Parliament was elected in 1886, they had been so unfortunate as not to succeed once in obtaining a day for this purpose. Last year their Parliamentary leaders were unfortunate in the ballot. They did not secure a good place at the beginning of the session; and although several of them were unremitting in their efforts to find a place for the discussion of the Bill, they were not successful in doing so. This year, however, their Parliamentary leader was successful in balloting, but he was so unfortunate as to put down the Bill on a Wednesday on which it was almost certain it would not be discussed. He placed the Bill down for second reading on the Wednesday immediately preceding Good Friday, a day on which the House had not sat more than once during the last twenty years. So, through this practical difficulty of a comparatively insignificant kind, their hopes of success, in the present session at any rate, were postponed. She wished to mention another practical difficulty which stood in their way and which was of even a more formidable character—she referred to the differences of opinion which existed amongst many warm supporters of women's suffrage as to the limitations which were included in the Bill now before the House of Commons, limitations excluding from the operation of the measure married women who might be ratepayers. It should, she thought, be frankly confessed by the supporters of the Bill as it stood, that there was a great deal to be said on behalf of those who considered that this limitation could not be logically defended; but she earnestly appealed to any who held this opinion

to look at the question from the practical point of view. She asked them to consider how very gradual had been all measures of enfranchisement, in the case of men, since the great Reform Bill of 1832. What, for instance, would they have thought of those who advocated the passing of that Reform Bill if they had maintained they could not vote for it because they could not logically defend the limitation of the franchise to those whose houses were of the rental of £10 or £12? If they had refused to vote for the measure upon that ground, they would have laid themselves open to the suspicion that they did not wish for any reform at all. (Hear, hear.) Similarly, what would they have thought of those who professed a wish for any great measure of enfranchisement, if they declined to vote for the Reform Bill of 1884 extending household suffrage to the counties because it did not embody the principle of universal suffrage. It behoved them to regard the measure, as it now stood, as a very great enfranchising measure, not as covering the whole field of the enfranchisement of women, but as going a long way, and as involving the political enfranchisement of nearly one million persons. She thought any one who looked at the present measure from this point of view would see it was a very great measure of enfranchisement, and to carp and cavil at it because it did not go further suggested that those who did so did not wish to go even so far as the Bill itself. (Applause.) She felt so strongly upon the subject of the necessity of the enfranchisement of women, that she would accept as an instalment a Bill which even restricted the franchise to women with dark hair, or those who were six feet high. (Laughter.) She would not withhold her support from any Bill for enfranchising women, however far short of perfection it might be in her view. (Applause.) Inviting them to consider the subject from a practical point of view, she reminded the meeting that more than half of the present House of Commons had absolutely promised to support the Bill as it stood, and if it were altered in the direction which some desired, many of those members might consider themselves released from their pledges. What they had had to guard against in the past, even more than open opposition, had been the lukewarmness of those pretended friends who were not really very zealous that the Bill should pass into law. She did not wish to afford any excuse to such members to withdraw from their pledges in favour of the Bill, by making any alteration in the scope of its provisions. It seemed to her somewhat fanciful to treat the provisions of the Bill as it stood as involving any injustice to married women, because the same principle embodied in this Bill was part of the law of the land as regarded the local franchise which had already been extended to women. In all local elections, single women and widows, who were householders, were enfranchised, and it had not in practice been found to involve any injustice to married women whatsoever. (Applause.) The Bill, if carried with the present restriction, would have the great merit of making household suffrage a reality. It would give the vote to the head of the house, whether that head was a man or a woman. (Applause.) It was instructive to them to notice that all the most prominent and weighty of their opponents had wished and desired, and had done all in their power to induce them to abandon the restriction which now formed part of the Bill; in fact, all the most cogent arguments against the principle of women's suffrage were founded upon the supposition that this restriction was to be swept away. If they were to yield to the blandishments of these gentlemen in this matter, she thought they would be acting like a foolish farmer who took a fox's advice as to how to guard the hen roost. (Laughter.) If the franchise were limited, as in the present Bill, it would enfranchise a certain definite and definable number of women, whereas, if it were wider in its scope, no one could possibly see how wide it might or might not be. Some men might wish to enfranchise their wives, others would not do so. It would be impossible to define what the scope of the Bill would be. From this point of view, therefore, it was exceedingly desirable that the Bill should be limited in the way she had described. She was inclined to judge the sincerity of those who advocated the enfranchisement of women very much by the test which Solomon proposed to apply in discovering the true and the false mother when he was about to cut the child in two. The true friends of the movement wanted no cutting of the Bill into pieces. They wanted the Bill as it stood. They desired it to become law before the next general election. Hence she earnestly appealed to those who agreed with her in this matter, and who wished women's suffrage to become an accomplished

fact, to put their whole force and strength into the Bill as it stood, and not listen to the advocates of a wider and more sweeping measure. (Applause.)

Colonel COTTON, M.P., moved: That in the opinion of this meeting the principle of women's suffrage as now established by common and statute law in local elections should be extended to Parliamentary elections, and while regretting the loss for the session of the Bill introduced by Mr. Woodall, which would have effected this object, this meeting respectfully request their Parliamentary friends to take steps for the re-introduction next year of the Bill in the same form as it now stands, and resolve to use every means in their power to promote its passing into law." He avowed a feeling of very considerable disappointment, he said, because when he had the pleasure of attending a meeting in that hall about a month ago he had hoped that they were on the eve of seeing the Bill, if not actually passed into law this session, at all events receive a very considerable impetus in that direction in the House of Commons; but since then—as Mrs. Fawcett had told the meeting—their hopes had been dashed to the ground. By some extraordinary mishap the Bill was put down for the second reading on the 17th of April, the Wednesday before Good Friday, a day on which the House had not done any business except, as Mrs. Fawcett said, on one occasion for twenty years. Of course, that afforded a very strong argument for the Government to use against granting the day. All Governments—no matter what creed they professed—were very chary of what they called "setting a precedent;" and no doubt it would have been a very dangerous thing if the Government had gone out of their way, in this one and peculiar instance, to afford facilities for the second reading of any Bill which was brought forward by a private member. Not only did the Government resist the application on the score of precedent, but also, he was bound to say, because on counting heads there was found to be a considerable majority opposed to postponing the adjournment in order to give the Bill a second reading. Two papers were prepared, one by the promoters and the other by the opponents of the measure, and whereas there were only 146 signatures in favour of utilising the day for the purpose named, there were over 180, nearly 200, against the proposal. Having regard to this fact he did not see how the Government could have acted differently. Still that meeting must deplore the result; and although he wished to show every loyalty to those who had laboured so greatly and strenuously in the cause of women's suffrage in the past, yet he could not but think it was a terrible mistake for an old Parliamentary hand like Mr. Woodall to have selected a day on which the House, he must have known, never as a rule sat at all. Other days—certainly one other day—were open to him, and he (Colonel Cotton) was at a loss to understand why, in the name of fortune, he did not take that other day. But it was no use crying over spilt milk. Having read the resolution, the Colonel said that the question of women's suffrage had been so often argued in that room that he was quite sure he should only be inflicting upon them stale news if he attempted to dilate upon the object of that meeting. Reference had been often made of late, and by Mrs. Fawcett that afternoon, to the subject of the admission to the franchise of married women. As to the possibility or not of that he desired to offer no public opinion at the present time. They had now, as Mrs. Fawcett said, a certain definite Bill before them which had been before Parliament for a great number of years, and they thought the best chance of enfranchising women generally was to adopt that Bill and no other at this particular time. In connection with the subject of the enfranchisement of married women he desired, however, to submit one or two things for their consideration. They were often told that the concession of the franchise to married women would tend to render the peace and happiness of homes insecure. Personally he had no fear of this. He believed that public thought and the progress of education were now based on such broad and liberal lines that people—no matter how closely they were related—had the good sense to agree to differ upon politics. There was, he should think, scarcely any family now-a-days in which some members did not hold very different ideas politically and on social questions to other members of it. He was sure it was so in his own family, in which a broad line of distinction was clearly marked. He did not think in his own family he could count a single supporter of the Liberal Unionists, whom Mrs. Fawcett represented. They were all either very strong Tories or very strong Gladstonians. (Laughter.) Hence he did not think that they need fear the admission of married women to

the franchise as likely to cause dissensions in private families. He believed, however, that a result of this would be to enormously increase what was known as the manufacture of faggot votes. At all events that would be a very great danger to be guarded against. As was often done at the present time between fathers and sons, or between two brothers or relations, nothing would be easier than for a man to give his wife sufficient property in order to secure for her a vote. While that might possibly have a good effect on the richer classes, it would have a very bad effect upon the poorer classes. A means would be provided for creating votes, practically speaking, only open to the wealthier classes; and personally he should be very sorry to see a principle introduced into a Bill which would promote the voting power of the richer classes at the expense of the poorer classes. (Applause.) He wished to suggest a possible practical reason why the Government at the present time did not seem in their corporate capacity as a Government to favour their movement in such a pronounced way as some ardent supporters of it might wish. People very naturally asked, seeing that Lord Salisbury, Mr. Balfour, and Sir John Gorst had declared themselves strongly in favour of the movement, why they could not act together and combine to bring in a Bill for an object of which they so emphatically approved. If they looked at Parliamentary history, they would find that all great enlargements of the franchise had occurred just before, or in the session immediately preceding, a dissolution of Parliament. It was felt that, when a large number of fresh voters were added to the voting power of the nation, it was only just to them to afford them an opportunity as soon as possible of recording their opinions by returning members of Parliament. That would scarcely be the case at present, and, therefore, this was a possible reason why, he thought, the Government were, perhaps, now standing rather aloof from their movement. He did not mean to say—for he did not profess to be in the secrets of the Government—whether they intended to support the Bill as a Government measure or not. He only suggested this as a possible explanation which they could give to those who were, he was afraid, now inclined to say that the Government were throwing cold water on the measure, and did not want it to pass. He sincerely trusted that that meeting and the various executive committees who took up the women's suffrage movement would, during the next twelve months, use every means in their power to promote the passing of the Bill next session, if possible; and that they would take very great care that no such blunder as had occurred this year—to use no stronger term—would have the chance of happening on a future occasion. (Applause.)

Miss BECKER, in seconding the resolution, said they were not, of course, met there to discuss the general question of women's suffrage, but to support a particular Bill, a Bill which had been challenged by some persons who had long been connected with the movement and whose opinions were naturally entitled to very great and very serious consideration. They had to defend their Bill by showing that it was a constitutional Bill, that it was according to precedent, that the limitations which it contained were essential to secure its success, and that the Bill itself was a moderate and reasonable measure. There had been no change whatever in the scope of the Bill since the very beginning of the movement. The Bill which was introduced by Mr. Jacob Bright in 1870, although it did not contain the proviso or limiting words which the present measure had, was well understood by all its advocates to apply only to unmarried women and widows. Even at that early stage of the movement, objections were made to it on that score, but it was defended by its author and mover in 1872, in words which seemed to her so applicable to the situation at the present time, that she thought she would not be wrong in quoting them to that meeting. "Mr. Jacob Bright, in introducing the Bill in 1872"—she was quoting from Hansard—"said he had been told that the Bill would give votes to married women. Well, his object was to give votes in accordance with precedent to women who were owners and occupiers of property. He confessed he did not know whether or not married women would be competent to vote if they had the qualification, but his attention had been called to the fact that the question had been mooted in Sunderland by way of objection to the votes of some married women whose names were on the municipal register, and who voted in their maiden names. The election was a very close one, and, therefore, those against whom they voted and who lost the day were very anxious to set aside the votes. The question,

as he understood it, was decided in the Court of Queen's Bench, and it was held that the circumstance of their having married disqualified them. That being so, the objection to his Bill that it would give married women votes would be set at rest. But then there remained the counter charge. There were some who complained that the Bill did not enfranchise married women, but he believed only the opponents of the Bill made that complaint." "In bringing in this Bill he was standing on the ancient lines of the constitution. He was asking that those who had the local vote should have the Parliamentary vote also. The common law prevents a married woman from voting. When a woman marries she loses her name, her freedom, her individuality, her property, her vote. Surely it was not for him, in his endeavours to give votes to the owners and occupiers of property, to run his head against the common law in regard to the changes which come about in the case of a woman who marries. It was enough for him to assert that every house should have a vote in accordance with the principle laid down by that great Act passed in the year 1867, the Household Suffrage Act." Now, they followed Mr. Jacob Bright's good example in 1872 by absolutely declining to run their heads and wreck their Bill against the common law. (Hear, hear.) It had been contended that this decision was given before the Married Women's Property Act of 1882, but, though it was true a woman no longer lost her property when she married, the fact that she lost her vote when she married had been entirely unaffected by the further extension of her property rights, therefore the mere withdrawal of the proviso in the present Bill would not enfranchise married women. Those who objected to the limiting words professed that they only desired the enfranchisement of married women who enjoyed separate property under the Married Women's Property Acts; but there was no limitation to that effect in the Bill. It said nothing about the Married Women's Property Acts. The terms of the Bill were sufficiently wide to cover all the existing electoral Acts, and if it were extended so as to apply to married women, she thought it was a moderate estimate to say that at least 2,000,000 of wives would be added to the electoral roll, in addition to the 800,000 unmarried women and widows whom it was now proposed to enfranchise. She arrived at this estimate of 2,000,000 of wives in this way: The Bill applied to all the Acts of Parliament, the Act of 1832 giving the £10 occupation qualification with the provision that if two persons occupied a house at a rental of £20, each should have a vote, and that if three persons occupied a house of £30, and their names were put upon the register as ratepayers, each should be entitled to a vote. The Bill also included the Act of 1867, which extended that qualification to £12 houses in counties. There were, she believed, about 5,000,000 of men electors in the United Kingdom, 2,000,000 of whom were enfranchised under the Acts of 1832 and 1867, and 3,000,000 under the last Act of 1884. It was, she thought, safe to say there were over 2,000,000 of inhabited houses with a rental of over £20 a year in this country. That would give votes to husband and wife in each of those houses. But those who were so strenuously urging them to omit the proviso thought it exceedingly convenient to ignore the operation of the general Acts on this question, and were endeavouring to produce the impression that in the removal of the common law disqualification for which they were asking, they were only seeking to enfranchise a comparatively small number of wives, not as many wives as single women. She thought a closer examination of the subject would show that this contention was entirely without foundation, and that the Bill if it were extended so as to include married women would have the large effect which she had described. It must be evident to all practical politicians that this measure, this large enfranchising measure which would enfranchise 2,000,000 of wives, was a very different question indeed, and stood upon a different footing, to the extension of the franchise for which they had worked for twenty years, namely, the Parliamentary enfranchisement of those women whom the common law already recognised as independent persons, and as voters in local elections. (Applause.) Further, she contended that if the day was ever to come when the wives in this country were to be enfranchised wholesale, that day would not be in any degree retarded by the unmarried women having previously had the vote. (Hear, hear.) She did not say the day would be hastened by it, but she did not think it would be at all retarded in consequence. All she said to those who were asking for votes for married women was that they would lose nothing

by assisting the movement to extend the franchise, as now established by common and statute law for unmarried women and widows in local elections, to Parliamentary elections. (Applause.)

Mr. W. S. CAINE, M.P., in supporting the resolution, said he must at once confess his incapacity for making a careful and studious speech upon the question of women's suffrage as it stood at the present moment. His time and attention had been greatly occupied during the last few months with other questions, and he had not, until he heard the lucid speech which had just fallen from Miss Becker, entirely grasped the controversy which appeared to be raging in the ranks of those who were earnestly supporting the great and important movement. He had come, not to make a speech upon any particular aspect of the women's suffrage movement, but at a time when a great many old supporters appeared inclined to drop away from the movement because it was reaching a stage in which a practical settlement was possible, he was desirous of putting in some public appearance to let the friends of the movement generally know that, as far as he was concerned, he stood firmly by the movement, and was determined to do everything he could to bring it to a practical and real issue. (Applause.) Miss Becker's speech was a powerful argument in favour of a principle for which he had always contended since he had been a politician—that which was now known as the one man one vote question. What he wanted now, to clear away the difficulties not only from the path of women's suffrage but of every other movement, was the simplification of the qualification for electing members of Parliament. The difficulty into which they had drifted was evidently the result of obsolete franchises being maintained in different Reform Bills and having a great number of different qualifications. At the General Election of 1880, he found himself in the possession of seven votes, in seven different constituencies, for seven absolutely different qualifications; and, in the consideration of the Bill now before Parliament, they had undoubtedly to take into account what would be the effect of giving to women exactly the same qualification as was now enjoyed by men. With regard to married women voting, he had always contended and always should contend, that married women who had the same qualification as single women or married men and single men, ought to enjoy the franchise. (Hear, hear.) But holding that view, he had, as a practical politician, to consider whether the strong advocacy of that view was likely to jeopardise the carrying into law of the principle of women's suffrage in the election of members of Parliament, and he must say that a letter which he recently had from Miss Becker, and especially the speech to which he had just listened, had altered his views considerably with regard to this particular measure; and he thought it would be wiser for the whole women's suffrage movement to combine to secure, in the first instance, the franchise for single women and widows, and place upon the statute book the equality of women before the law with respect to the election of those who made the laws. (Applause.) There was no doubt whatever that the idea of placing upon the registers of the country of a very large number of married women was repugnant to many friends of the suffrage movement. They were not prepared for so great a step as the admission to the Parliamentary franchise of such large numbers as were indicated by Miss Becker. If these objectors existed in a sufficient number to prevent any Women's Suffrage Bill being passed at all, he, although not one of the objectors, should deem it his duty to stand aside so far as his advocacy of married women's privileges were concerned, and to join hand in supporting the Bill which seemed to have the likeliest chance of passing into law. Personally he thought that if on the Wednesday of the following week they had been able to ensure discussion for the measure as it stood, it would in all probability have become law, certainly it would have passed second reading, and, he believed, it would have got through during the present session, assuredly during next session. He had received many letters from ladies for whom he had the most profound respect, and whom he had regarded as leaders in that great movement, who went so far as to say they would rather stand out for a thousand years—(laughter)—that was one of the expressions used—than give way upon the question of securing votes for married women. It appeared wise, and common sense, and right for them to take up and stick to the Bill to which they were accustomed, the Bill they had advocated for so many years, and to secure at any rate for single women and widows that right to which they were undoubtedly entitled. Hence he had no hesitation in supporting the

resolution. He hoped it would be passed unanimously, and he trusted that next year—there was no further chance this year—some Bill would be devised which should be clear and definite and admit of no misconception of its meaning, which would be carried to a practical issue. He was told that there were some members of Parliament who hesitated to vote for the present Bill because the placing of 800,000 new electors on the register would bring about a general election. Well, he had no fear or dread of a general election. He thought the septennial act placed too long an interval between one general election and another. So far as a general election was concerned he personally had no dread of it whatever the result might be. He found many objecting to the Bill because it was coming within the range of practical politics. The Bill had arrived at a phase which every practical measure had to encounter. People voted for Bills at times when they knew they were not likely to become law, with a view of securing some popularity in their constituency or to please friends; and he believed they would find, when they came to a division, that many of their old friends who had been voting with them would fall off, because their measure was brought within the range of practical politics. He did not think, however, they should be discouraged by conduct of that kind. Personally he could not understand men voting for a movement in its initial stage and then backing out when there was some chance of carrying it through. (Hear, hear.) He could understand the reverse policy. It had generally been his practice as a politician to vote for whatever he believed to be right, however popular or unpopular it might be. He hoped that the differences now existing in the ranks of the women's suffrage movement would be speedily healed up, and that by wise conference some mutual agreement would be arrived at whereby they would carry to a successful issue what, in his judgment, both the country and the House of Commons were prepared to concede, namely, the extension of the Parliamentary franchise to single women and widows. His interest in the question was unabated, as was his determination to do all he possibly could to secure the accomplishment of the object they had in view. (Applause.)

Mrs. HENRY SIDGWICK, who also supported the resolution, said educational work at Cambridge had brought her largely into connection with women of the professional classes who were working for their own support, and often for that of their families as well; and it was from their point of view that the question of women's suffrage naturally presented itself to her. She thought it was often forgotten how numerous those women were, how large a proportion of the women of the more educated classes were unmarried and dependent on themselves. They were apt to lead somewhat isolated lives, and, being out of sight, to be out of mind. Nevertheless, they were existent, and large numbers of them were very active and useful members of society. And it seemed anomalous and indefensible that they should be left to struggle for existence—just as they would if they were men—should have the burdens of responsible and independent citizens, as men had, and yet that whatever protection to their interests Parliamentary representation would afford them should be withheld from them. Recent extensions of the franchise had left scarcely any classes of the community unrepresented—certainly no large classes—except women who were unmarried and who were not supported by their friends. For in these days of eager competition, and close combination in defence of sectional interests, it could hardly be maintained that they were represented either through their male relations or their male fellow workers. But it was not only in the interests of the women themselves that she hoped they would obtain the franchise, but in the interests of the community at large—(applause)—for it seemed to her that the importance of the social and educational work which many of them were doing, rendered it specially desirable that they should be led in every possible way to feel themselves an integral part of the body politic. (Hear, hear.) The question no longer was whether women were to take an interest in political questions, or even to exercise an influence on their decision. The question was rather whether their influence was to be exercised in an irregular and irresponsible way, or with the sobering sense of responsibility which would naturally attend the prospect of being called upon to perform constitutional duties. (Applause.)

Mr. EILOART asked if there was any chance of securing another day during the present session for the second reading of the Bill. Some strong references had been made to Mr. Woodall, and certainly

he (Mr. Eiloart) was very much surprised that a gentleman who had been very properly described as "an old Parliamentary hand" should have made such a mistake as he had done. He should very much like to know whether Mr. Woodall had anything to say for himself.

Mrs. FAWCETT said that Mr. Caine would perhaps be able to reply to the first question. As to the other questions she was afraid they must lapse into the region of unanswered questions. (Laughter.)

Mr. CAINE stated that a Bill which had missed its day had no chance of being revived during the session. All the Wednesdays and eligible days were taken up by other Bills; and he was quite certain the Women's Suffrage Bill had not the remotest chance of being revived during the present session. He had known Mr. Woodall a great number of years, and he was sure that a more loyal friend to any measure he undertook to advocate could not be found.

The resolution was then put and passed unanimously.

Miss BECKER proposed a vote of thanks to Mrs. Fawcett for presiding.

The Dowager Lady LYTTLETON seconded the motion, which was adopted *nem. con.*

The meeting then terminated.

DRAWING-ROOM MEETINGS.

ONSLow GARDENS.

A drawing-room meeting was held on April 11th, at the residence of Clara Lady Rayleigh, 90, Onslow Gardens. The Hon. C. Strutt took the chair. Lady Rayleigh read letters from several influential people who were unable to come. Mrs. Fawcett then, in an interesting speech, dealt effectively with various objections to women's suffrage. Mrs. Ashworth Hallett followed, with telling arguments on grounds of justice and of expediency. Mr. Strutt called attention to the highly conservative character of the speeches as reassuring to unadventurous minds; and the meeting ended with votes of thanks to the speakers, and to Lady Rayleigh, who had worked for the cause, not only in England, but also most effectually in Canada. Mrs. H. Sidgwick, the Dowager Lady Sandhurst, Hon. Mrs. R. Strutt, and other well-known supporters of women's suffrage were present.

BROOK GREEN.

On April 6th, a drawing-room meeting was held by invitation of Miss Reid and Miss Guinness, at their studio, Augustine Road, Brook Green. Mr. Thomas Webster, M.A., was voted to the chair. The meeting was addressed by Mrs. Beddoe, Miss Mordan, and Miss Abney Walker. Mr. Austin Brown and Miss Blackburn also took part. A resolution in support of Mr. Woodall's Bill was carried unanimously.

THE MARQUIS OF HARTINGTON AND MR. CHAMBERLAIN ON WOMEN AND POLITICS.

In connection with the Liberal Unionist meetings at Birmingham, a women's meeting was held in the Town Hall, on April 26th, under the presidency of Mrs. ASHFORD. There was a crowded attendance. Addresses were delivered by Mrs. Ashworth Hallett, Miss Richardson, B.A., Lady Grant Duff, Mrs. Henry Fawcett, and Mrs. Westlake.

The MARQUIS OF HARTINGTON moved a vote of thanks to the ladies for their able and instructive addresses. In the course of his speech he said, I don't know whether the time is approaching which Mrs. Fawcett has referred to when women may be invested with a larger share of political power. If it be so it is well that they should prepare themselves for the exercise of that power, by taking a part in the discussion of a most important branch of political affairs. But if that time is not so near as Mrs. Fawcett hopes, nevertheless there are many means by which women have the power of approaching more effectually than we can, and equally legitimately with us, vast classes of our fellow-countrymen. (Hear, hear.) They have exercised, they are exercising, and under any circumstances they will continue to exercise a large influence on political opinion in this country.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, in seconding the resolution, said Lord Hartington has referred to a sentence most adroitly introduced by Mrs. Fawcett into her admirable speech, in which she endeavoured

to draw as a logical conclusion from this meeting the approaching advent of women's suffrage. Well, ladies and gentlemen, I am not quite certain whether that necessarily follows. I am not quite certain whether, after all, because, as Mrs. Fawcett says, we have conceded to the women, we have invited women to meet in this great assembly, and we have invited other women to address it—I am not certain whether that is a sufficient concession necessarily to bring with it the one to which she refers. I remember an anecdote about a discussion which took place at a school committee in America. There had been there, as there has been here, a good deal of controversy on the subject of women's rights, and the question before the committee was as to whether a certain woman should be appointed to the office of school visitor, and after a time they asked for a report from their secretary. He presented to them a most admirable report, which he concluded by saying that as this post offers neither honour nor credit he didn't see why it should not be filled by a woman. Now, whether women's suffrage is coming or not, there is no doubt that the co-operation of women in politics is more general than it used to be, and if it be right and proper for women to take and express their interest in general politics, still more is it right and proper that they should express their feelings in the great crisis through which the nation is now passing. (Hear, hear.)

BILL TO ENABLE WOMEN TO BE COUNCILLORS.

The following is the text of the Bill, introduced by Mr. Channing, to enable women to be elected as County Councillors. The Bill is backed by Sir John Lubbock, Mr. Firth, Baron Dimsdale, Professor Stuart, Mr. Walter M'Laren, and Mr. Bernard Coleridge: "A Bill to enable Women to be Elected and to act as County Councillors. Be it enacted, &c. "(1) It shall be lawful for women to be elected and to act as County Councillors and aldermen in the same manner and on the same conditions as men. Any woman so elected prior to the passing of this Act shall be deemed to have been duly elected to such office, unless proceedings shall have been taken before the 15th day of April, 1889, to void such election; (2) This Act may be cited as the County Councillors (Qualification of Women) Act, 1889."

SCOTLAND.

THE CONVENTION OF BURGHS.

At the Convention of Royal and Parliamentary Burghs, in the High Court of Justiciary, Edinburgh, on April 3rd, Lord Provost WHITTET, Perth, in the chair.

The JUNIOR ASSESSOR for EDINBURGH moved that the Convention should agree to petition Parliament to extend the Parliamentary franchise to women. He said the basis of representation had always been that of taxation, and he thought it was a most invidious and contemptible thing that ladies having houses upon which they paid rents and rates and taxes should be considered unworthy of exercising the franchise.

The ASSESSOR for PITVENWEE seconded the motion with all his heart.

The CHAIRMAN: Capital. (Laughter.)

The ASSESSOR for KIRKWALL (Mr. Brochie), seconded by the ASSESSOR for CULROSS (Mr. F. S. Melville, Edinburgh), moved the previous question.

In reply to the Assessor for Inverbervie, the JUNIOR ASSESSOR for EDINBURGH said that the motion was intended to apply to ladies who were householders and ratepayers.

On a division the motion was carried by thirty-eight votes to twelve for the amendment.

Petitions in favour of the Bill have also been adopted by the councils of Paisley, Helensburgh, Galashiels, Montrose, Dunbar, Linnithgow, Greenock, Aberdeen, Dysart, Elgin, Stirling, and Port Glasgow.

[We are compelled to postpone several reports of town council and other meetings.]

THE EASTER ADJOURNMENT OF PARLIAMENT.

A deputation, consisting of Mr. Woodall, Mr. M'Laren, Sir Richard Temple, Baron Dimsdale, and Captain Heathcote, waited on Mr. W. H. Smith in his private room at the House of Commons, on March 29th, for the purpose of presenting the memorial asking that the Easter adjournment should not take place until Thursday, April 18.

Mr. WOODALL presented the document, which he said was signed by 140 members of all sections of the House. He was aware that a strong feeling existed amongst many hon. gentlemen against shortening the holidays by even one day, but he thought the large number of signatures attached to the memorial was sufficient evidence of the importance attached to the women's suffrage question by the House generally to justify this appeal.

Mr. SMITH said he thought the promoters of the Women's Suffrage Bill had every claim to consideration. He was not in a position to make a definite statement on the subject on his own responsibility, but he would consult his colleagues, and would lay the memorial before them. He believed that another memorial was in course of signature, and of course that would have to be considered at the same time. He hoped to be able to announce the decision of the Government in the course of next week.

Mr. WOODALL stated that several members who signed the memorial when it was first drafted had since appended their names to the opposition memorial under a misapprehension. On being questioned as to their apparent inconsistency they had informed him that overlooking the fact that the Women's Suffrage Bill was the first order for Wednesday, April 17, they had signed the second document simply for the purpose of getting a longer holiday at Easter.

Later in the evening Mr. Chaplin and Mr. Baumann handed to Mr. Smith the second memorial signed by nearly 170 members, which urged the Government to fix the date of adjournment for Tuesday, the 16th prox.

The memorial signed by the friends of the measure was as follows:—

TO THE RIGHT HON. W. H. SMITH, M.P., FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY, &c., &c.

Sir,—We, the undersigned members of the House of Commons, beg to inform you that the first place on Wednesday, April 17th, has been secured for the Parliamentary Franchise (Extension to Women) Bill, this day being the Wednesday before Good Friday.

This subject has not been discussed during the present Parliament, as, during the last two sessions, the days secured for this Bill were taken by Government for their business.

We therefore respectfully request that, in making the usual motion for adjournment for Easter, you will ask the House to sit on Wednesday, the 17th of April. (Signed)

W. Abraham (Rhondda Valley)	W. Crossman
Wm. Abraham (W. Limerick)	L. L. Dillwyn
J. T. Agg-Gardner	Robert Dimsdale
John Austin	George Dixon
J. Spencer Balfour	F. D. Dixon-Hartland
Geo. E. Banes	Arthur Duncombe
Edward Birkbeck	J. H. Edwards-Heathcote
Chas. Bradlaugh	Thomas Ellis
T. R. Buchanan	P. Esslemont
Thos. Burt	Frank H. Evans
W. S. Caine	Sydney Evershed
Charles Cameron	Henry Eyre
J. Macdonald Cameron	R. Farquharson
F. A. Channing	C. Fenwick
G. B. Clark	J. F. B. Firth
H. P. Cobb	R. U. Penrose-Fitzgerald
Bernard Coleridge	F. W. Fitzwygram
Compton	James C. Flynn
C. A. V. Conybeare	P. J. Foley
John Corbett	Charles Forster
E. T. D. Cotton	R. N. Fowler
Leonard Courtney	Lewis Fry
Joseph Craven	Sydney Gedge
William Crawford	Alfred Giles
Edward Crossley	James Gilhooly
	Edw. T. Gourley

R. B. Cuninghame Grahame	John Wynford Philipps
R. B. Haldane	W. Plowden
F. S. Hanbury-Tracy	W. Pomfret Pomfret
C. Seale-Hayne	T. P. Price
Maurice Healy	J. H. Puleston
A. Raymond Heath	David Randell
Geo. Holloway	James Rankin
W. H. Houldsworth	J. E. Redmond
George Howell	William Redmond
Henry H. Howorth	H. Byron Reed
James Hozier	Edward J. Reed
Edwin Hughes	J. Bryn Roberts
Alfred Illingworth	John Roberts
Lewis H. Isaacs	T. Roe
Alfred Jacoby	Albert K. Rollit
L. J. Jennings	J. Round
Wm. Johnston	T. W. Russell
Jeremiah Jordan	Godfrey B. Samuelson
H. Kimber	Charles E. Schwann
John G. S. Kinloch	Henry Selwin-Ibbetson
Alfred Lafone	H. Seton-Karr
Richard Lalor	T. Harrop Sidebottom
William J. Lane	James Stansfeld
H. L. W. Lawson	Francis Seymour Stevenson
Wilfrid Lawson	Mark J. Stewart
James Leahy	James Stuart
Robert Leake	Donal Sullivan
E. Lechmere	T. D. Sullivan
Thomas Lewis	William Summers
Frank Lockwood	Angus Sutherland
Leonard Lyell	Edmund Swetenham
C. Fraser Mackintosh	John Swinburne
John W. Maclure	Charles K. Tanner
J. G. Swift MacNeill	T. K. Tapling
A. M'Arthur	Richard Temple
W. A. M'Arthur	Alfred Thomas
Justin M'Carthy	D. A. Thomas
Joseph N. M'Kenna	W. Thorburn
Peter M'Lagan	James Taite
Walter S. B. M'Laren	Hugh Watt
Pierce Mahony	E. W. Watkin
W. T. Makins	Thomas Wayman
Miles W. Mattinson	T. Bazley White
Thomas Mayne	Arthur J. Williams
Samuel Montagu	Henry J. Wilson
O. V. Morgan	John Wilson
W. Pritchard Morgan	William Woodall
C. T. Murdoch	Caleb Wright
Lewis Petty	H. Smith Wright

PRIZE COMPETITION No. 8.

ORIGINAL ENIGMA.

Most people see me every day,
But what is my nature no one can say;
Neither solid nor liquid nor vapour am I,
Yet my form and my colour you all may descry;
I'm apparent to feeling, to eye, and to ear,
And my presence betokens rejoicing or fear.

A prize of five shillings will be given to the first person who shall send the correct solution of the above enigma to the Puzzle Editor, office of the *Women's Suffrage Journal*, 5, John Dalton-street, Manchester. If two or more correct answers arrive by the same post, the prize will be given to the one which may chance to be first opened.

JOHN BRIGHT'S PARROT.

The late Mr. Bright, it is well known, was very fond of animals. Among his pets was a parrot, which frequently was the companion of his journeys. On one occasion the cage, carefully enclosed in wraps, stood on the platform at Rochdale Station awaiting the train. A porter picked it up, exclaiming, "What's this?" He was startled by hearing a voice from the interior of the package, "I'm John Bright's parrot!"

CASH'S CAMBRIC FRILLINGS.

Made in the following Patterns, viz.: PLAIN, LACE EDGE, IMPERIAL,
SPIRES, LILY, VIOLET, HEM-STITCH, &c.

NEW ILLUSTRATED BOOK OF DESIGNS FREE BY POST.

J. & J. CASH, COVENTRY.

SORE THROATS CURED. EASY TEETHING.	DO NOT UNTIMELY DIE. Sore Throats Cured with One Dose. FENNINGS' FEVER CURER. BOWEL COMPLAINTS cured with One Dose. TYPHUS or LOW FEVER cured with Two Doses. DIPHTHERIA cured with Three Doses. SCARLET FEVER cured with Four Doses. DYSENTERY cured with Five Doses. Sold in Bottles, 1s. 1½d. each, with full directions, by all Chemists. Read Fennings' "Everybody's Doctor." Sent post free for 13 stamps.	DO NOT LET YOUR CHILD DIE. FENNINGS' Children's Powders Prevent Convulsions. ARE COOLING AND SOOTHING. FENNINGS' Children's Powders. For Children Cutting their Teeth, to prevent Convulsions. <i>Do not contain Calomel, Opium, Morphia, or anything injurious to a tender babe.</i> Sold in Stamped Boxes at 1s. 1½d. and 2s. 9d. (great saving), with full directions. Sent post free for 15 stamps. Direct to ALFRED FENNINGS, West Cowes, I.W. Read Fennings' "Every Mother's Book," which contains valuable hints on <i>Feeding, Teething, Weaning, Sleeping, &c.</i> Ask your Chemist for a free copy.	COUGHS. COLDS. BRONCHITIS. FENNINGS' LUNG HEALERS. The Best Remedy to Cure all Coughs, Colds, Asthmas, &c. Sold in Boxes at 1s. 1½d. and 2s. 9d., with directions. Sent post free for 15 stamps. Direct to ALFRED FENNINGS, West Cowes, I.W. The largest size Boxes, 2s. 9d. (35 stamps post free), contain three times the quantity of small boxes. Read Fennings' "Everybody's Doctor." Sent post free for 13 stamps. Direct A. FENNINGS, West Cowes, I.W.	SAFE TEETHING. BRONCHITIS CURED.
	FENNINGS' EVERY MOTHER'S BOOK sent post free on application by letter or post card. Direct Alfred Fennings, West Cowes, I.W.			
	THE UNIVERSAL HOUSEHOLD REMEDIES!!!			
	HOLLOWAY'S PILLS & OINTMENT			
	<p>These excellent FAMILY MEDICINES are invaluable in the treatment of all ailments incidental to every HOUSEHOLD. The PILLS PURIFY, REGULATE and STRENGTHEN the whole System, while the OINTMENT is unequalled for the removal of all muscular and outward complaints. Possessed of these REMEDIES, every Mother has at once the means of curing most complaints to which herself or Family is liable.</p> <p><i>N.B.—Advice can be obtained, free of charge, at 78, New Oxford Street, late 533, Oxford Street, London, daily between the hours of 11 and 4, or by letter.</i></p>			



ESTABLISHED 1835.

Proprietors, **G. WHELPTON & SON, 3, Crane Court, Fleet Street, London, E.C.**

[7495.

Printed for the Proprietors, by THE MANCHESTER PRESS COMPANY LIMITED, successors to A. Ireland and Co., Manchester, and Published by Messrs. Trübner and Co., 57 and 59, Ludgate Hill, London, and Mr. JOHN HEYWOOD, Manchester.—May 1, 1889.—Entered at Stationers' Hall.

WHELPTON'S PILLS

The Best Family Medicine.

Recommended for disorders of the **HEAD, CHEST, BOWELS, LIVER** and **KIDNEYS**; also in **RHEUMATISM, ULCERS, SORES**, and all **SKIN DISEASES**, these Pills being a **DIRECT PURIFIER OF THE BLOOD**.

WHELPTON'S HEALING OINTMENT.

The best remedy for **BURNS, SCALDS, ULCERS**, and all **SKIN DISEASES**.

Pills and Ointment in Boxes at 7½d., 1s. 1½d., and 2s. 9d., of all Chemists.
Free by post in the United Kingdom for 8, 14, or 33 stamps.