# WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE JOURNAL.

EDITED BY LYDIA E. BECKER.

Vol. VII.—No. 77. Published Monthly. Registered for Transmission Abroad.

JULY 1, 1876.

PRICE ONE PENNY.
By Post Three Halfpence.

Mr. Trevellyan's resolution in favour of the extension of household suffrage to counties was defeated on May 30th, by 264 votes to 165, a majority of 99, being an increase of 12 over the majority which rejected Mr. Forsyth's Bill. The number of members who voted was greater by 35 than the number who voted on the latter Bill.

The course of the debate on both Bills seemed to be pretty much the same, and with the two notable exceptions of Mr. BRIGHT and Mr. DISRAELI, who on this occasion changed sides, the speakers for and against the extension of the principle of household suffrage to counties were members whose speeches or votes had been for or against the principle of household suffrage in its integrity for boroughs. The arguments and objections on both sides were curiously similar, and the debate is extremely instructive in its bearing on the question of the enfranchisement of women.

Mr. TREVELYAN challenged honourable gentlemen opposite to bring forward a single valid argument which might convince those who asked for admission to the franchise that their claim had been thoughtfully and respectfully considered. Only one argument possessing some appearance of validity had yet reached his ears. It was said that if they insisted on conferring the franchise on those who had not already got it they would give the people something which had no tangible or material value, and which, therefore, they were just as well without. This argument had something about it so invidious, he had almost said so repulsive, that it was usually enveloped in a cloud of phrases which might render it a little more attractive to an English ear. It was said that the time of the House of Commons was too much taken up with useful matters-offact legislation to attend to grievances not so much of reality as of sentiment. It was for those who suffered from grievances to define their nature, and not for those who obstinately refused to redress such grievances. It was all very well for hon. members to suppose that they knew as much of the feelings and opinions of the outside public as was required to guide their deliberations. This was not the first Parliament in which such opinions had prevailed, but it had been clearly shown that the view

was an illusory one. If hon, members representing boroughs were bound to confess that household suffrage had had an unexpected influence on their political conduct and had added to their stock of political knowledge; and if they were obliged to couple with this confession the natural and inevitable deduction that the extension of household suffrage to counties would still further extend that knowledge, what must be the aspect of the situation to those who viewed it by the light of a great wrong inflicted upon themselves? These persons stood outside the fence of political privilege and heard their dearest interests discussed and decided in an assembly in which they had neither part nor parcel. It had been said that there was no demand for this measure, but the conference and meeting held in London last week fully answered that statement. The gatherings were large, and it was at great personal inconvenience that the persons who took part in the proceedings came together in London. When they remembered how slender were the finances of a cottager in a rural village, even when they were eked out by the sixpences and shillings of the neighbours of his class whom he had been chosen to represent, he thought they would allow that the assemblage of agricultural labourers who had travelled at their own charges from Dorsetshire, Cheshire, and Lincolnshire deserved, at least, as much consideration as those troops of well-to-do gentlemen in broad cloth who flocked up to London on public business on the eve of the Derby day. It was a very hard thing that those poor men should be forced to leave their work, which was not over-paid, to such a degree as to give them much margin for political leisure in order that, Session after Session and Parliament after Parliament, they might hang about the lobbies and haunt the galleries of the House, pressing hon. members to grant them a demand, the intrinsic justice of which not one of them could dispute. The peasantry of this country had not the time or the taste for being members of those annual deputations. Their object was to have a permanent deputation to watch their interests and speak their minds at Westminster in the old constitutional shape of members whom they had had their share in sending to

July 1, 1876.

Parliament. That was what they wanted. That was what they had a right to get; and he was sure that whoever might think fit to refuse them that boon on the ground that there was no call for it, such a response would never be heard from the members of that great party whose historical policy it had been to anticipate the demands of justice.

98

Mr. FAWCETT, in seconding the motion, observed that it would not be well for its supporters to underrate the obstacles they had to surmount. If there was a strong, he did not say a predominant, feeling in the country in favour of these proposals, it would be wrong that such a feeling should not find expression in the House. When a deputation waited on EARL RUSSELL in 1866, many wishing that his Reform Bill should go further, that distinguished statesman asked how many members of the House of Commons were in favour of such an extreme opinion as household suffrage; and somebody answered, "Not forty." Yet, within a year and a half from that time the PRIME MINISTER had educated his forty, and 350 members of the House of Commons supported household suffrage, thus enabling the right hon, gentleman to perform the greatest achievement of his life. He should not venture to predict when the minority of to-night would grow into a majority, but that it would become so no one could doubt, and all the more rapidly the oftener the subject was discussed.

Mr. DALRYMPLE said he had voted for the Bill in 1874, and wished to explain the reasons why he could no longer take that course. He knew that the franchise was not a panacea for all evils, social and political. He repudiated the notion that the franchise was an educator. He could not agree with the member for the Border Boroughs when he said that because a man had not a vote therefore he was unrepresented. He did not take so lofty a view of the franchise nor so low a view of representation. He should think himself a poor representative indeed if he could only represent the class to which he belonged. He must also express his strong dissent upon the opinion expressed, in terms of high approval, at the meeting last week in another part of London. Many statements were there made of an exaggerated and irresponsible character, which rather brought discredit than honour on a great movement. It was not the comparatively moderate proposal of his hon, friend, but manhood suffrage that was approved. He knew that the meeting wisely and judiciously guarded itself, but many who were present pointed to manhood suffrage as the glorious goal they had in view,

and towards which the movement of his hon, friend was a mere finger-post and stepping-stone.

Mr. Burt said he did not desire to argue the claim to enfranchisement on the ground of abstract right, although he believed, with the right hon, member for Greenwich, that every man not incapacitated or disqualified was morally entitled to come within the pale of the Constitution, and he had never yet met with the man who did not believe that he was one of those who had the moral right. In reply to what had been said by the hon, member for Bute, he would quote the advice of Lord PALMERSTON: 'Yield to-day that which is reasonably demanded, and resist to-morrow that which you would be borne out in resisting; do not let us put ourselves in the wrong to-day merely that we may find ourselves in the right to-

Sir W. BARTTELOT said if every working man could boast of having done as much as the hon, member for Morpeth, he should have nothing to say against the motion. All working men, however, were not in the same position. His own opinion was that if that class of men returned members to Parliament education was the last thing they would think of. When a working man was supported by the labour of his children it was a great sacrifice to give that up for the sake of educating his children. Then the truth was that men in the country never had the same means of educating themselves for the exercise of the franchise that those in the towns had; and even in towns many of those who possessed the franchise voted "yellow" or "blue," as the fancy took them, without having the slightest idea of politics. He knew an instance in which a member now sitting in the House had asked a man for his vote, on which the latter replied, "I never had a vote afore, and now I means to keep it."

Mr. Lowe said the promoters of the measure appeared to assume that the burden of proof lies on those who would withhold from any Englishman of good character, and the proper age, a right to the franchise, but he was at a loss to understand whence that assumption arose. The hon, member for Morpeth had placed the matter on the ground of abstract right, and argued that every man ought to have a vote in the affairs of his country, whether his possessing it were for the advantage of his country or not. If that were the case the right could not be limited to men, but must be extended to women, and even to children. They had been told they might learn something from the representatives of agricultural labourers. They did not however come there to learn, but for other purposes. They would not be justified in altering the constitution merely because a great many very worthy people would be very much pleased if they were relieved from the stigma that they had not the franchise. He was sure any man who studied the subject would see how impossible it would be to go on the old lines if this change were made. If they went one step beyond where they were they would enter on a course that would inevitably lead to manhood franchise. If they disturbed the present state of things, they would not be satisfied until with their own hands they had pulled down the noblest fabric of liberty and justice that human hands ever raised,

Mr. BRIGHT said that he thought many members of the House who were there about ten years ago then heard arguments somewhat of the same kind, and he was further led to imagine that a speech of the same kind might have been delivered previous to the year 1832. Every argument used by his right hon, friend against the step the House was now asked to take, would have been perfectly good from this bench if it had been addressed in company with Sir CHARLES WETHERELL and other opponents of the Reform Bill brought in by the Government of Lord GREY. It was a curious thing that those terrors and alarms should seize his right hon, friend or affect the minds of other hon, members. He did not deny that a wide suffrage must, as a matter of course, introduce a great many persons who were of no advantage to the constituencies and to whom the franchise could be no advantage, but that was inevitable, and on the whole, the result of what was done in 1867 with regard to the borough franchise had been satisfactory and given no cause for alarm. Ignorance had undoubtedly prevailed. but that ignorance was now more rapidly than at any former period giving way to instruction in schools; while corruption and intimidation, as shown by the experience of elections that have been held within the last ten years. were giving way to a growing and strengthening moral sense in the constituencies. Could any person give him a good reason why a person living in a £15 house in a country town should not have a vote if a person who occupies a £5 house in a represented borough is to vote? It seemed to him quite impossible and unreasonable on a speculative argument like that which had been used by his right hon, friend to shut out a million of persons from the franchise who would have the power to vote if they lived in boroughs. It had been said that one result of passing the resolution would be to lead to agitation for manhood or universal suffrage. So far from holding that custom, possibly the invariable custom, to treat ladies

view, his opinion was that the best means of putting an end to the possibility or the probability of such an agitation would be to give a free vote to every householder in the country. They would then have what he had described as the paralysis of half the political interests of the country removed and healed, and they would have the industry, the intelligence, and the freedom of both town and country brought to combine in the election of a really free Parliament that should be a credit and a permanent safeguard to a great and free people.

Mr. DISRAELI said the resolution, if carried, would add enormously to the county constituency, and this county constituency, with its enormous numbers, would command much fewer seats than the borough constituency. They could not practically advance in that way without breaking up the borough constituency. The question was, were they prepared for that?

Mr. NEWDEGATE said that those who convened meetings in support of these resolutions had ulterior objects, and for such objects members were invited to support the motion of the hon, member for the Border Burghs.

The House divided, when the numbers were for 165, against 264, majority against 99. Mr. TREVELYAN said that after the division that had just taken place upon the first of his resolutions, he would ask the permission of the House to withdraw the second. The motion was by leave

VISCOUNT FOLKESTONE, in moving the rejection of Mr. FORSYTH'S Bill, endeavoured to alarm the House as to the consequences that would arise should women be made the political equals of men. "If this Bill be passed (said the noble lord) what would become of that refining and harmonising influence which is begotten of the respect and deference which now the stronger sex invariably pays to a woman?" We might reply, that as a woman will not cease to be a woman when some women obtain the parliamentary in addition to their municipal vote, the vaunted "respect and deference" need not be in any way disturbed. But if Lord Folkestone refuses the franchise to women on the assumption that "the stronger sex" invariably pay this respect and deference to a woman, he founds it on a figment of the imagination wilder than most of the inconsequent assumptions which men are fond of attributing to "the weaker sex." It may be true that in the select circle in which Lord FOLKESTONE lives and moves and has his being it is the

July 1,

100

21 days of hard labour. If a woman had encountered such treatment in the attempt to record her vote, we should be deafened by howls of indignation from men-not against the men who maltreated her, but against her for attempting or desiring to vote. Since these acts of violence were suffered in the occupation of ministering to the cravings of men for spirituous excitement, no indignation is wasted on the girls who suffered, and a very slight penalty imposed on the men who inflicted the assault. Men crave drink and desire that women should sell it to them, and the paternal legislation which, under pretence of protecting them, restricts the hours at which women may labour in useful trades, does not step in to limit the hours of the barmaid. Our legislators deem it not "unfeminine" for women to be at work sixteen hours a day in carrying on the liquor traffic, but they assume that a woman would be "unsexed" were she to take part in the election of a

who are his social equals with respect and deference. man who would endeavour to mitigate its horrors, or who might even desire to stamp it out altogether. When men become consistent in their treatment of women it will be time for them to appeal to the justice and considerate character of the laws they make, as a ground for refusing to women a voice in legislation.

> THE pressure on our space, caused by the report of the Parliamentary debate and the meeting in St. George's Hall, prevented the appearance of the list of petitions as they were presented. We continue the record of them now, in order that the friends who aided in this work may see that their labours have not been lost, and that their petitions helped to swell the grand total, described by Mr. FAWCETT as being ten times more than had been presented in favour of or against any other measure during the session. The total number presented at the date of the second reading was 356,000, and others which have come in since bring the numbers up to 1.103 petitions, with 369,649 signatures.

> Many of these are noteworthy from their representative character as well as their number. Among them we mark one from 2,413 electors of Huddersfield, headed by the leading inhabitants of both political parties, and containing most of the influential names in Huddersfield. Probably no other subject of practical politics could command such a demonstration in its support. In addition to this, there was a general petition from the inhabitants of Huddersfield, signed by 7,639 men and women. One to the same effect from perhaps the largest public meeting ever held in the town, and also a petition from the Town Council. All these petitions were presented by Mr. LEATHAM in the course of the session, and yet he said, they failed to convince him that his constituency was in favour of the measure. We wonder what Mr. LEATHAM would have. Petitions and remonstrances appear to produce no effect on his consciousness. It is related of DIANA VERNON that when she desired to escape the society of her cousins, she took refuge in the library. Her cousins never ventured there; she supposed they feared that the folio volumes might come down and break their heads, for she was sure they never could affect their heads in any other way. It appears as if Mr. Leatham's head was as impervious to the contents of the petitions and remonstrances that have been addressed to him as the heads of the young squires to those of the volumes in Osbaldiston Hall.

Another remarkable petition was presented by the Right Hon. SPENCER WALPOLE, signed by 15 Professors

of the University of Cambridge, nine Fellows of Trinity College, and 23 other Fellows, making 32 Fellows of the different colleges. Dr. Lyon Playfair presented a petition from Professors of the Scottish Universities, signed by Professor Masson, Professor Calderwood, chairman of the School Board; Professors Hodgson (Political Economy), SIMPSON (Midwifery), WALLACE (Church History), CHARTERIS (Biblical Criticism) in the University of Edinburgh; Principal TULLOCH, of St. Andrew's; Professor STRUTHERS (Anatomy), and Professor BAIN (Logic, etc.), of Aberdeen; also Dr. BALFOUR and Mr. KENDRICK, medical teachers and examiners in the Universities of Aberdeen and St. Andrew's, and many others. These names ought to quiet the scruples of those who fear that it may be contrary to Revelation to allow a woman who votes for a town councillor to vote for a member of Parliament. If this were so, it may be presumed that learned Professors of Church History and Biblical Criticism would have discovered the prohibition, and would not have signed the petition.

Petitions have also been presented from the Professors of the Memorial College, Brecon; from members of the Queen's Institute for the Technical Instruction of Women, from the Co-operative Shirt Makers of London, from the Executive Committee of the Hackney Advanced Liberal Association, from members of the congregation of Calvinistic Methodists, Holyhead; from ministers and representatives of the Calvinistic Churches of Wales, from professional women of Edinburgh, from Assistant Masters of Harrow school, from members of the Stanningley Reform Association, from the committee of the "Four Hundred" of the Liberal Association of Birmingham, from the Birmingham Women's Liberal Association, and from twentythree Town Councils in England and Scotland. Against this weight of opinion expressed in petition we have to set one solitary petition against the Bill from the Town Council of Kilmarnock, which serves to make conspicuous the absence of any demonstration against the measure, as the light of a solitary taper is said to make darkness visible.

WHEN women ask for the removal of injurious personal and property disabilities, they are sometimes told that corresponding exemption from liabilities is afforded them. But practically we find that these exemptions are apt to be removed by the Legislature without any corresponding relief from the disabilities. A married woman is disabled from the right to contract, and is otherwise placed in a disadvantageous position as regards earning her own living, not desire to be involved in the turmoil of contested elections,

even if she is deserted by her husband; on the other hand she did enjoy some exemption from liability for the maintenance of her children and other relatives. A case was recently decided in which the Bristol guardians sought to recover from a married woman, deserted by her husband, the cost of maintenance of her children in the workhouse. The superior courts held that the wife was not liable. But a Poor Law Amendment Bill is now passing through Parliament, and two or three days after the announcement of the decision in the Bristol case, Mr. Sclater Booth is reported in the Times to have said, in answer to a question as to the effect of clause 15, that the object of the clause was to render a married woman, living separate from her husband, responsible for the maintenance of her relatives who might become paupers. The explanation was accepted without a word of comment, and no member of that Parliament which, according to Mr. BRIGHT, is so ready to do justice to women, raised a protest against such one-sided legislation as imposing upon wives the liabilities hitherto attaching to husbands, without giving them the freedom of contract and industrial rights possessed by husbands to enable them to discharge these liabilities. In a local paper we read that, on June 21, "Mrs. Collins, a lady of independent means, was summoned before the Lydney magistrates to show cause why she should not support her husband, who had been receiving relief from the parish. The defendant, who conducted her own case, argued the matter with the Bench in a manner that would have done credit to a qualified legal practitioner, but she was, nevertheless, ordered to pay the amount demanded, and advised to make a weekly provision for her husband."

The Married Women's Property Act of 1870 enables justices to enforce upon a wife, for the maintenance of her husband, such order as by former Poor Law Acts they could enforce on a husband for the maintenance of his wife. But as the Act of 1870 did not secure to a wife her own property, it follows that a man may acquire by marriage the whole of his wife's property, may spend it on himself or out of his home, and may force his wife to maintain him afterwards. This is another instance of class legislation for women, and of legislation which could only be imposed on an unrepresented class.

# MR. MACIVER, M.P., ON WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE.

At a luncheon which followed the consecration of a church at Tranmere, Birkenhead, on June 1st, Mr. MacIver, M.P. for Birkenhead, in the course of a speech, said he would have been inclined to support a Bill to give women the suffrage if he believed his constituents in Birkenhead desired it, but he was of opinion that the great majority of women in England did

July 1. 1876.

## PUBLIC MEETINGS.

LONDON.-DRAWING ROOM MEETING. LEGAL AND SOCIAL POSITION OF WOMEN.

A numerously attended and very interesting drawing-room meeting was held last Friday, at the residence of Mr. and Mrs. T. Taylor, Hyde Park Gardens. The object of the gathering. which assembled upon the invitation of Mrs. Taylor, was the giving of information upon the legal and social position of women at the present day, with a view of showing that their claim for the Parliamentary franchise is both just and expedient. The invitations were addressed to ladies and gentlemen supposed to be unfamiliar with the subject in its details, but having sympathy with social and political reform and progress; hence of the three hundred and sixty guests who thronged Mrs. Taylor's spacious drawing-room, only about thirty of the avowed friends of the movement were present. Dr. Rae, F.R.S., of Arctic discovery fame, presided, and among the company were Professor Fawcett, M.P., and Mrs. Fawcett; Mr. Maclaren, M.P., and Mrs. Maclaren; Mr. Hopwood, M.P., Dr. Smyth, M.P. Professor Hunter, Lord Garvagh, Sir W. Tyrone, Sir H. Colley Scotland, Rev. Brooke Lambert, Rev. C. Voysey, Mr. and Mrs. Du Maurier, the Hon. Mrs. Maurice Drummond, the Hon. Emmeline Canning, Mr. Peter Bayne and Mrs. Bayne, Mr. James Clarke, Lady Power, Lady Belcher, Lady Wilson, Lady Jessel, Miss Frances P. Cobbe, Miss Anna Swanwick, Miss Mary Gurney, Miss Ashworth, Miss Lilias Ashworth, Miss Becker, &c.

The CHAIRMAN said it was not his duty to make a speech on that occasion, as he might be accidentally anticipating something which would be much more forcibly and eloquently put by others. Before calling on those speakers, he was desired to mention that Mrs. Taylor had received a letter from Lord Coleridge, expressing his great regret that his official engagement in connection with the case of the "Franconia" prevented his attendance on that occasion.

Mrs. FAWCETT: I may give a few words of explanation as to the attitude and aims of what is vaguely known as the Woman's Rights Movement. We think that womanly virtues and graces would only be strengthened and ennobled by opening a wider sphere for the intellectual activity of women; and by enabling some of those women who possess the requisite qualifications to enter upon the privilege of Parliamentary representation. It has been said that if a woman is educated, or if she is public-spirited, she ceases to be a woman. This dictum would exclude from the ranks of our sex nearly all the noblest women who have ever adorned it. It is said that this movement is based on an assumed constant irreconcilability between the two sexes. This charge has lately been repeated by a very high authority, and I wish to take this opportunity of giving the most flat and positive denial to it that I can give. I confess it is difficult sometimes when one is listening in the ladies' gallery to the speeches made during the debates on the Women's Suffrage Bill, to hear the shouts of laughter and applause which greet the coarse jests of the members for Huddersfield and Cambridge, without being tempted to paraphrase a certain exclamation which David tells us he made in his haste. (Laughter.) But no amount of provocation can make us forget the generous support which this movement has received from the best men of the present day. No day passes when we have not to record our gratitude for the help which this movement receives from gentlemen. I know dozens of men in Cambridge and elsewhere who work hard and make large pecuniary sacrifices, for their means, in order to afford to women the means of obtain-

have given days and nights of hard work to some measure which they believe involves the welfare of women. We cannot see these great efforts and these noble sacrifices made on our behalf without gratitude, and, I think whatever may be the feelings which are provoked on the question, we can never forget how much this movement owes to the help which it has received from such men, amongst others, as Lord Coleridge, who was to have been here to-day. (Applause.) But in regard to this charge, that our movement is based on an assumed and irreconcilable hostility between the sexes. we are placed in a dilemma, for we are asked sometimes why women want the suffrage; and we reply, amongst other reasons, in order to insure the passing of just laws for women. It is admitted by many strong opponents of woman's suffrage, amongst others by Mr. Fitzjames Stephen, that there are many laws which have been passed in the supposed interests of men. which are really injurious both to men and women. Mr. Bright himself has indirectly admitted the existence of some of these laws, by placing his name on the Bill for enabling the medical licensing bodies of Great Britain to admit women to their examinations and their degrees. But if we enumerate the respects in which we think the law is unjust to women, our opponents turn round upon us, and say that we charge men as a body with wilful injustice to women. Now, surely this style of argument is grossly unfair. Every kind of reform might be opposed in a similar spirit. Catholic emancipation and the abolition of University tests might have been opposed in the same way, on the ground that these reforms tended to stir up controversial rancour, and every extension of the suffrage might be argued against on the ground that it would set class against class. As a matter of fact we know, as everyone knows, and I think everyone who has inquired into the subject admits, that there are many laws which are unjust to women. And if these laws occasion some bitter heartburning, some unwise and incautious expressions of hostility on the part of those who suffer from them, surely it is the state of the law that is at fault, and not the incautious anger which is sometimes expressed against it. (Applause.) The state of the law on many subjects, such as marriage, property, divorce, the guardianship of children, has been stamped by all the highest legal authorities, Lord Coleridge amongst them, as a disgrace to a civilised country. But, perhaps, you will say that if this injustice, if this grievance is so generally admitted, there is no fear but that it will be remedied without giving women votes, without making any change in the electorate. Now I think this is a mistake, and I will tell you why. The time of Parliament is now fully, and more than fully, taken up in remedying injustices, or dealing with cases which involve the interests of the present electorate. Every session there is some great measure, or some series of measures, that must not be neglected; that press for attention because they are supported by some large and influential section in every constituency. For instance, one session there is the Agricultural Holdings Bill, that must not be neglected because something must be done to soothe the feelings of the farmers who supported the Government so heartily at the last general election. (Laughter.) Then there is the Army Exchanges Bill, and there is the Public Worship Regulation Bill; each of these gets attention because it is supported by a large and influential section of the community. Then there is the Merchant Shipping Bill; this is attended to because the shipowners are powerfully represented, and because Mr. Plimsoll has aroused a strong feeling on the subject among the present electors. Thus the time of Parliament is fully taken up in dealing with questions which involve the interests and fortunes of the present electorate. But suppose that in the ing a higher education. I know members of Parliament who | general pressure of public business, it is necessary to resort to

what is called the "Massacre of the Innocents," what measures will be selected for immolation? Those which are not supported by a large and influential section of the electorate. For instance, the Protection of the Person Bill, which was mainly designed for the protection of women and children against brutal assaults, gets squeezed out of existence. To give you another example, rather more than a year ago the Government addressed a series of questions to the Medical Council respecting the medical education of women, and the Medical Council replied favourably to the admission of women to medical degrees and diplomas. Although this practically admitted the existence of a grievance on the part of women who desired medical education and are not able to obtain it, nothing further has been done by the Government in the matter. I do not blame them. Each member of the Government and every member of Parliament is primarily the servant of his constituents; he must attend to their interests and fulfil their claims, before he can give his time and attention to the claims of other persons. Everywhere, and on all occasions, we see the same thing—that an unrepresented class cannot command the time and attention of Parliament. I use the word "class," I must confess, with some little trepidation, for Mr. Bright has lately said that it is an odious and scandalous libel to speak of women as a class; and in a passage of real eloquence he said. "They are our wives, our mothers, our sisters, and our daughters." I think there is much in this protest against speaking of women as a class that will find an echo in every heart. We feel that it is true in nature that women are not a class, and that they are only artificially created, if I may use the expression, into a class by Act of Parliament. (Applause.) When we are asked by Parliament to remove some of the invidious class distinctions to which women are at present subject, what words are we to use, if we are not to use this word which is so much disliked? Mr. Bright himself is asking Parliament to remove one of the invidious class distinctions from which women at present suffer in the matter of medical education. Mr. Forsyth is asking Parliament to remove another of the class distinctions, and is asking that those women who fulfil the requisite qualifications should be admitted to the Parliamentary franchise. If these and other reforms are carried, much will have been done to make Mr. Bright's words really true. In a book which everyone is now reading, and every page of which is full of the mature wisdom of a great mind, I found the other day a passage which bears on the so-called logical argument against change. Daniel Deronda says :- "I think that way of arguing against a course because it may be ridden down to absurdity would soon bring life to a standstill. It is not the logic of human life, but a roasting-jack, that must go on to the last turn when once it has been wound up." (Laughter) Apply this for a moment to the subject before us. Do not, let me beg of you, be led away by the roasting-jack logic, that if you are asking a claim that is reasonable and just, you must necessarily go on to grant something else which no one asks for, and which nearly everyone supposes will be injurious. (Applause.)

Professor W. A. HUNTER: There is one observation made by Mrs. Fawcett upon which I wish to make a single remark, and that is with regard to the guardianship of children. It is a very strange thing in our law that a father has the power, when he dies, of bequeathing the guardianship of the children away from the mother. There is no reason why she should be deprived of that guardianship. Now, there is a still more remarkable fact about that, and it is this; our law with regard to many points has been derived from a very ancient body of law, the Roman law. In one point, however, we have not followed the Roman law, and that is in the law relating to

but, strange to say, the only one point on which our law follows the Roman law is in this question of guardianship. The question of guardianship, which was logical in the Roman law, is entirely illogical with us. In this instance it seems that our law has, so to speak, gone out of its way in order to inflict an injury upon the female sex. The point, however, that I wish particularly to bring before you, is one of a rather dry nature—it is a question of statistics. We are told that the great difficulty in the way of the so-called women's movement is, what I may call, the domestic argument. It is said that the movement to give women votes for Parliament, to admit them to a higher education, and to the professions, is a movement in the wrong direction; that it takes women away from that domestic life in which they find their best happiness, and in which they are of most use to society in general. Well, I certainly am prepared to go this length, that if this movement involved these consequences, if it were opposed to that ideal of domestic life that is pursued by the great mass of people in England, I should not hesitate to predict for the movement a speedy and inglorious end. But it does not yet appear that anything that has been asked is inconsistent with the existing duties even of wives. There is, however, another large aspect of the question. Members of Parliament are for the most part married men; successful men everywhere are for the most part married men, and it is a natural fallacy on their part to think that they constitute the whole world. But there remains outside all this domestic life a very large proportion of the population; how large it is, I am afraid, a great many of us do not always remember. There is a short table in the census that gives us the material information that we want upon that subject. If we take women from the age of 20, we find that in England and Wales there are rather more than six and a-half millions. Of these, less than four millions are married, leaving a balance of two and a-half millions unmarried. Millions are large figures to take; but in the rough, we may say that out of every seven women above the age of 20, four are married and three unmarried. With regard to the three not married, we may divide them into two parts-first. spinsters, and secondly, widows. At that age widows bear a proportion of one to two. Going a little further on—because it may be said that figures taken at a particular age are not a fair indication of the whole—taking the age of 25 and upwards. the result comes to this—that out of every eleven women seven are married and four are not married; but out of these four. two are spinsters, and two widows. That is a very fair indication at that age. Now, to complete the comparison, let us take the age of 40 and upwards. Then we find that the proportion is altered; that is to say, that out of every 13 women above the age of 40, seven are married and six are unmarried. Then we come to this fact, which we should naturally expect, that out of the six unmarried, two are spinsters and four are widows. Taking the age of 25, and comparing women above that age in England and Wales who are not married with the six who are married, we may put it broadly in this way-and it is rather favourable to the matrimonial scale—that out of every six women, two are not married; and that fact remains at every age of life, for after that age, for every woman who drops, so to speak, into matrimony, one drops out—that is, the number of widows continually increases, and the number of spinsters decreases. Any theory of life, however, must be based upon facts; sentimental fancies will not deal with solid facts, and unless a theory, whatever it may be, is capable of dealing not only with the facts of domestic life, but with the facts beyond domestic life, we may say that it is a theory which does not meet the case. parent and child. Our law relating to parent and child is just | Now, we must remember that this extraordinary proportion of

as opposite to the Roman law as you could possibly imagine.

July 1, 7

of the regular distribution of the sexes; and as long as the present constitution of society exists, we can have very little hesitation in saying that the proportion cannot be very materially altered. Now, with regard to this large proportion of the sexes for whom this domestic theory does not provide, different solutions have been offered at different times. We know that in Catholic countries a large proportion of the women find their way into nunneries. That is a solution that is not possible in this country. Then there is another theory started by some brilliant, eccentric French philosopher, who proposed that every woman not married should be provided with a pension at the public expense. (Hear, hear, and laughter from several ladies.) Well, that is a very fine solution; but it has this awkward difficulty about it: when you confront theory with fact, and ask how the pensions for 21 millions are to be provided, it will be a difficult question for any Chancellor of the Exchequer to answer. Then there is another way of looking at this case. When we are told that we must not take women away from domestic life, the question is how many women are already away from domestic life? How many are actually compelled to provide for themselves, to maintain themselves by their own work? Upon that, again, the census gives us full information. I shall not trouble you with the statistics, but I may briefly summarise the result, which is this—that if you take women over the age of 20, 21 millions have to maintain themselves. Now, I do not see why, if these are facts, a woman should not have a selection; why the only career that should be open to her should be marriage, considering that this is a career which cannot be open to more than two-thirds of the sex. I do not go the length of saying that marriages should be made in heaven; probably they might as well be made there as in solicitors' offices-(laughter)-but it must be obvious that there are innumerable reasons why persons, if they like, should have some other occupation than marriage. If we look to the House of Commons, for example, we shall find, even amongst the ranks of the most devoted admirers of the domestic theory, men who have got every possible attraction. They have got what reporters call "a prepossessing appearance;" they have got wealth; they have got renown; they have got eloquence; they have got a seat in the House of Commons; and the way that they evince their attachment to the domestic theory of life is by leading a dignified bachelor existence in clubs. I do not mention that as any inconsistency on their part; but I do think that it is somewhat ungracious in these men to say that, looking to the facts of the case, women should have no other career than marriage. Now, it appears to me that the real question is not whether women should be engaged outside the domestic circle, but whether they should be confined to the low-paid, the under-paid, sort of drudgery, or whether the better paid, the more lucrative offices, the more agreeable kind of work shall be open to them. It is in vain to talk to us of confining the work to the domestic circle; that is an impossibility. There is an immense number for whom the domestic circle does not and cannot exist, and for these there remains either a sort of penurious pension upon their relatives—in the majority of cases an impossibility—or those avenues of wealth that are open to men as alternatives to marriage, whereby they may obtain for themselves an independent and satisfactory livelihood. It would weary you too much to go into the details of the occupations of women, but I may briefly sum up the matter in this way—that out of 21 millions of women who have to maintain themselves, one million are engaged as domestic servants or waiters-that, of course, we should expect-and one million are engaged in factories, in agricultural and industrial pursuits. That accounts for two millions. Then 100,000

104

married women in England is not a temporary fact, it is part are put down as engaged in professional life, but when we inquire in what forms of professional life they are embarked. we find that they are chiefly actresses, singers, and school teachers. So that if we take the higher branches of professional life, or the more advanced positions in the industrial world, we find that these, and these alone, offer the kind of work from which women are excluded. I venture, therefore, to think that, looking at the present distribution of the sexes, those who say that women should not be allowed any avenue, any career, except that of marriage, in order that they may not be drawn away from their domestic life, are presenting to women somewhat cruel and bitter mockery. (Applause.)

Miss Becker: I think that all women who take upon themselves to address a meeting of this kind must do so under a sense of grave responsibility. We are told, over and over again, by members of Parliament that they would grant us the franchise could they be convinced that women desire it, and for the desires of women they look to the casual expressions of opinion that they meet with in drawing-rooms. Now, I believe it is quite possible that many young ladies—and I am sure that the opinions of young ladies are amongst the most powerful influences that can be brought to bear upon susceptible gentlemen-that these young ladies, perhaps in sheer thoughtessness, or from not having considered the question at all, hazard a remark adverse to the movement for women's rights, or for the franchise of women, or for enlarging their spheres and capacities to any extent. These words, so lightly spoken, may have a very grave effect indeed, and may seriously retard the progress of the movement. I would ask, then, all young ladies here present when anyone asks them—"Do women want the franchise?" to pause, to think, to take some pains to consider whether they want it or not; and more than that, whether they ought to want it or not, and to answer at least in such a way as to show that the matter is worthy of respectful attention. We are often threatened with the loss of certain privileges and considerations accorded to women. Fancy pictures are drawn of the present privileges and position of women. Men say, "How kind we are to women! How much we do for you; what delight we take in your society." Then, again, pictures are drawn of the sweets of domestic life, and we are shown mothers with their children, surrounded by all that can make a home life happy; and it is said, "will you exchange all this for the turmoil of politics?" This assumes, as a matter of fact, that some exchange must be made; and that if women become political units, they must give up some of the social and domestic consideration which they enjoy. But this objection is based on the fallacy of supposing that the consideration which is given to women in society and in the home is given for negative and not for positive qualities; that a husband loves his wife, not because she is a sweet, amiable, loving woman, but because she does not vote in the election for members of Parliament. (Laughter.) The same argument is carried to everything else. Now, our contention is that women would not only not cease to be women, but that they would not lose any of those qualities for which men like and respect them, because they had a right to vote. When men think and talk so much of the respect and the sacrifices they make for women, I would ask them to look back, and review the whole course of their existence, from the cradle up to manhood, to consider how much of the comfort and happiness of daily life they have owed to some care, some ministration, some manifestation of kindness, or regard, or affection, or personal sacrifices of women, and to ask themselves seriously whether in the social respect and deference that they have accorded to women they have given to the sex more than they have received at their hands? I believe if this question were asked and

answered fairly, no living man would say that he had tained their machines to go on with them; but they would not given to women more than a fair equivalent for what he had received. In this mutual interchange of happy and pleasant offices lies, in my judgment, the highest human happiness of which we are capable, and it is in order to promote this happiness, not mar it, that I advocate the placing of women in a position of legal and social equality with men. These things are more readily and more happily given between equals than they are in the position of legal superiors and inferiors. But there might be a still more plausible appearance in this objection if this respect and deference were uniformly accorded. We meet with it always in drawing-rooms, and almost always between men and women who are acquaintances or friends; but how about the innermost private life? We are told in a story that has been quoted before, that when Grandcourt took Gwendolen home to visit his uncle, after he had been married a few weeks, when something annoyed him, he permitted himself to use strong language. Now, I think all men are not Grandcourts, yet in ordinary daily life, when this polish of society is worn off, there is danger that both men and women may allow a little temper to brush away the bloom from this exceedingly chivalrous devotion; and unless there is a solid growth of respect and deference, founded on something deeper than this social custom, there is a danger that the domestic harmony may be broken. But if we go into the lower classes of society, we come into regions where these social, pleasing ways are not known. We come upon men accustomed to think of their own pleasure; accustomed to go into public-houses; accustomed to the rough ways of the world; accustomed to look upon their wives and families in the light more of drudges than of companions, and then we find the necessity for some legal equality very great indeed. I believe the most effectual means of repressing crimes of violence against women, wife beating, and that class of crimes, will be to produce, by an Act of Parliament, a conviction that a woman is a person with rights equal to those of a man. (Applause.) We find that when men are banded together in trades unions, they make laws for their own work, and that they make laws with the special purpose of preventing women earning their own livelihood. A few years ago, in Manchester, an attempt was made to teach women type-setting. The women set the type, and sent it to the office to be machined; and when that had been done for a few weeks, a new rule was made by the type-setters union in Manchester, and it was ordered that every man should leave the workshop of any master who allowed type set up by women to be worked off his machines. This was a matter which came under my own personal observation. I can give another instance from Manchester. A lady, a member of our committee, told me that she knew a mill in Manchester where they made a kind of fringe, where they had men and women workers. The making of this particular kind of fringe was light and easy work, and well paid for; but the men said that the wages were too high for women to earn, and they told the master that if he took in any more women to learn this fringemaking business all his hands would strike. Of course the master was obliged to give way, and no more women were allowed to learn that profitable work. Some time ago I paid a visit to Yorkshire, and to the woollen factories there; and I found a factory where they had broad and narrow looms, and at the broad looms a good deal more money could be earned than at the narrow looms. I found it was a rule that the women were not allowed to work at the broad looms, because that would be earning too much money for women. At Nottingham there is a machine for making stockings, at which good wages can be earned, but women are forbidden to work at these. Men would allow the women who had already ob- vote would do them. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) But the

allow the master to take any more. At Kidderminster we know there was a great controversy among the carpet weavers. I paid a visit to that town shortly after the strike, and on going to the looms I thought I would try what the work was that was considered to be so improper for women. I got upon a loom, and contrived to weave two or three inches of carpet. I found that I had nothing to do but to stand upon a little platform, and watch the machine do all the hard work. Then I went to another workshop, where I was shown what was considered to be proper work for women; that was to weave heavy rugs, and I thought I should like to try that too. I found that I had to push treadles with my feet, and work the shuttles; in fact, it was hard muscular exertion, in spite of which I succeeded in making an inch of rug. Undoubtedly the men's work is very much more easy than the women's. That is a specimen of the consideration that women meet with from the masses of men, not, I believe, from thoughtlessness, or from any desire to do wrong, but because you cannot get into the minds of these men that women have equal right to live, and equal right to enjoy the good things of life. We have heard a good deal of laws about women. Professor Hunter spoke of the Roman law with respect to the guardianship of children. I have heard a story told by Sir John Lubbock, which appeared to me to show where we got this idea from. He was referring to the story of Orestes, who was pursued by the Furies for the murder of his mother. He asked why the Furies did not pursue his mother for the murder of his father, and the gods told him that the husband was no relation to the wife, therefore the Furies could not pursue her. Then he said he was no relation to his mother, and he asked why should they pursue him? This appeared to puzzle the gods, they debated the question on Olympus, and they carried it by a majority of one, that a child was no relation to his mother. (Laughter.) That must be the foundation of the English law declaring that the father alone has the right of guardianship to the child. We find, however, exceptions allowed to that. When it comes to a question of making parents liable for their children, the law holds the mother liable. We have heard, of course, of women earning their own living. Perhaps it is not known, or not thought of. how often they have to maintain their families. The other day I saw that a man was brought up by some authority, who asked him what his occupation was. He was rather an ignorant man, and did not quite understand the question, "Occupation," said he, "what is that ?" Said the interrogator, "How do you earn your living?" "Oh," said the man, "my wife is a dressmaker." (Laughter.) Now, I think if we look over the columns of wills and bequests which so often appear in the papers, we cannot fail to be struck with the fact that the daughters generally get very much less of the family fortune than the sons, and I suppose this is defended on the idea that men have wives and families to keep, and that if women have money, they need only spend it upon themselves. There is a very great fallacy underlying that notion. I think that women have as much need of money as men have. If women are married and have a large income, they will spend their money in their house, and on their families as much as men do; and I cannot see why, in such cases, a wife should not have, and be allowed by law to have, an equal right in the household with the husband, and be considered a person of as much consequence in the household. Now, the possession of money does, in this world, give us most other things, and the general deprivation of money which women suffer is one of their greatest grievances, and one which, I think, cannot fail to be appreciated even by those who do not quite understand what good a Parliamentary

PRESENTED BY

## PETITIONS.

WOM

NO.	DATE.	PLACE.	PRESENTED BY	NO. OF SIGNA- TURES.
	Feb.	Brought forward, Petitio	ns 83-Signatures	51,756
510	18	HACKNEY		1,436
511	18			411
512	21	CHARLESTOWN, Salford	Mr. Cawley	501
513	21	Salford, Women of		640
514	21		1,	1,320
515	21	,, ,,	11	
		T ,,		1,047
516	21	LIMERIGG and SLAMANNAN		
			monstone	45
517	21	Limerica, Public Meeting, John		
	127-	Hogg, chairman	,,	1
518	21	HUDDERSFIELD, Public Meeting,	No. 1155	
		John F. Brigg, chairman	Mr. Leatham	1
519	21	BURNLEY, Public Meeting, J. H.		
		Scott, chairman	Mr. Rylands	1
520	21	SAINT JOHN'S WOOD	Mr. Stansfeld	505
521	21	SOUTHWARK	14	913
522	22	MANCHESTER, Medlock Ward	Mr. Birley	313
523	22	A 11 C .:. 4-1 XX 3		412
524	22	QL ()1- W1		1,435
525	22	Modlook Word	**	259
526	22	Or Michaella Wand	"	853
527	22	Waman	AND THE PARTY OF T	687
528	22	Madlada Wand	111	288
529	22	CA Minhadia Wand	,,	795
		" St. Michael's Ward	,,	
530	22	T 11 11	15 (1) 1	1,027
531	22	LOWER BROUGHTON		1,223
532	22	SALFORD		1,245
533	22	CHESTER	Mr. Dodson	578
534	22	KENSINGTON	Mr. W. Gordon	896
535	22	Holloway, Women of	Mr. 'Torrens	2,540
536	22	,, Men	,,,	1,561
537	22	FINSBURY	.,	1,589
538	22	WOLVERHAMPTON	Mr. Weguelin	56
539	22	BURTON STATHEY, Members of		
1000		Autumn Rose Lodge of Good		
		Templars	Mr. Winn	15
510	22	Leeds		750
				.00

			10	1915	1	LLANDUDN
ot	JRTH REPORT. 23-29 A	Pebruary, 1876.		1916	1	Wallings F. Wel
eb.	Brought forward, Petition	s 114-Signatures	74 657	1917	2	LEEDS
23	MANCHESTER, All Saints' Ward			1918	2	.,
23	Oldham			1919	2	BEDMINSTE
23	BURTON ON TRENT and BURTON	MII. CONNECTION	0,110	1920	2	BATLEY, I
	UNDER NEEDWOOD	Mr Evans	50			Marrio
23	Teignmouth	Mr. Garnier	80	1921	2	LEEDS
23	LAMBETH, Public Meeting, Geo.	Mr. Carmor	00	1922	3	MANCHEST
	M. Murphy, chairman	Sir J. Lawrence	1	1923	3	
23	Wallsend, Public Meeting, Jas	or o. navionec	L But T	1924	3	"
	Purvis, chairman	Mr. Palmer	1	1925	3	11
23	London, Co-operative Shirt	mi. i aimei	1	1926	3	SOUTHWAR
-0	Makers of	Mr. W. Smith	20	1927	3	THETFORD
23	Westminster		280	1928	3	CHARLESTO
23		"	240	1929	3	MELROSE
23	John Thompson and Others		21	1930	3	CHESTERFI
24	Corston	Major Allen	203	1931	3	Row, Pub.
24	MANCHESTER, Medlock Ward		214	1931	0	chairm
24		Mr. Birley	214	1932	3	CAMDEN T
44	LACEBY, Welcome Lodge of Good		15	1933	3	MARYLEBO
24	Templars	Mr. Chapman		1934	3	Somers To
21	LOWER BROUGHTON	Mr. Charley	1,436		3	CHATHAM
4 1	Beston, Pioneer Lodge of Good	15. T	1 =	1935	3	HEATON C
	Templars	Mr. Ingram		1936		Kingston
24	STANTON PRYOR	Mr. Paget	119	1937	3	
24	Lincoln, Mayor, Aldermen, and	15 0 1	a 10	1938	3	Тнаме
	others of the City of	Mr. Seeley		1939	3	LEITH
25	NORTH WOOTTON		16	1940	3	EDINBURG
25	MANCHESTER, Medlock Ward		299	4017		Living
25	,, All Saints' Ward		397	1941	3	STOCKBRID
25	,, St. Michael's Ward	11	971	111111111111111111111111111111111111111	- 121	Meetin

July 1, 1876.

NO. OF SIGNA- TURES.	PRESENTED BY	PLACE.	DATE.	NO.
51,756	ns 83-Signatures	Brought forward, Petitio	Feb.	977
1,436		HACKNEY	18	510
411	,,		18	511
501		CHARLESTOWN, Salford	21	512
640	,,	SALFORD, Women of	21	513
1,320	,,		21	514
1,047	1,		21	515
-,	Sir William Ed-	LIMERIGG and SLAMANNAN	21	516
45	monstone	Dimensor and Obananaa		,,,
10	monstone	LIMERIGG, Public Meeting, John	21	517
1		Hogg, chairman		
	,, ,,,,,,	HUDDERSFIELD, Public Meeting,	21	518
1	Mr. Leatham	John F. Brigg, chairman	21	110
	MI, Deatham	Burnley, Public Meeting, J. H.	21	519
1	Mr. Rylands	Scott, chairman	21	010
505	Mr. Stansfeld	SAINT JOHN'S WOOD	21	520
913	MI. Stallsfeld		21	521
313	Mr. Birley	MANCHESTER, Medlock Ward	22	522
412		A 11 Cl.: 4-1 337 3	22	523
1,435	,,		22	524
259	,,	,, St. George's Ward	22	525
853	,,	" Medlock Ward	22	526
687		,, St. Michael's Ward	22	- Pathery
	11	,, Women Medlock Ward	22	527
288	,,	CA Mi-basks Wash	22	528
795	,,	,, St. Michael's Ward	22	529
1,027	M. (1)	T - 31 31	22	530
1,223	Mr. Charley	Lower Broughton	22	531
1,245	W D 1	Salford		532
578	Mr. Dodson	CHESTER	22	533
896	Mr. W. Gordon	KENSINGTON	22	534
2,540	Mr. Torrens	Holloway, Women of	22	535
1,561	. ,,	,, Men	22	536
1,589		FINSBURY	22	537
56	Mr. Weguelin	WOLVERHAMPTON	22	538
		BURTON STATHEY, Members of	22	539
		Autumn Rose Lodge of Good		
15		Templars	20	
750		Leeds	22	510

	Fot	JRTH REPORT. 23—29 I	February, 1876.	İ
	Feb.	Brought forward, Petition	s 114-Signatures	74.657
795	23	MANCHESTER, All Saints' Ward		
796	23	Отрнам	Mr. Cobbett	
797	23	BURTON ON TRENT and BURTON		-,
		UNDER NEEDWOOD	Mr. Evans	50
798	23	TEIGNMOUTH	Mr. Garnier	80
799	23	LAMBETH, Public Meeting, Geo.		
	-	M. Murphy, chairman	Sir J. Lawrence	1
800	23	Wallsend, Public Meeting, Jas	on or manifolio	
	-	Purvis, chairman	Mr. Palmer	1
801	23	London, Co-operative Shirt	MI. I dimot	
001	~0	Makers of	Mr. W. Smith	20
802	23	Westminster	11	280
803	23	11	,,	240
804	23	John Thompson and Others	Mr. Whitwell	21
805	24	Corston	Major Allen	203
806	24	MANCHESTER, Medlock Ward	Mr. Birley	214
807	24		MI. Dilley	214
001	44	LACEBY, Welcome Lodge of Good	Mu Chanman	15
808	24	Templars	Mr. Chapman Mr. Charley	
809	21	LOWER BROUGHTON	Mr. Charley	1,436
000	41	Beston, Pioneer Lodge of Good	Mr. Tanana	15
810	24	Templars	Mr. Ingram	
811		STANTON PRYOR	Mr. Paget	119
011	24	Lincoln, Mayor, Aldermen, and	W C 1	9 10
610	0=	others of the City of	Mr. Seeley	
812	25	NORTH WOOTTON	Sir W. Bagge	16
813	25	MANCHESTER, Medlock Ward	Sir T. Bazley	
814	25	,, All Saints' Ward	"	397
815	25	,, St. Michael's Ward	11	971

TI	HIRD REPORT. 21—22 F	ebruary, 1876.		816 817	25 25	MANCHESTER, Medlock Ward	Sir T. Bazley	226 266
EN	'S DISABILITIES REMOVA	L BILL—In Far	vour.	818 819	25 25	,, St. George's Ward	Col. Beresford	317 968
DATE.		DDDGGDVMED DV	NO. OF SIGNA-	820 821	25 25	Manchester, All Saints' Ward Macclesfield and Bollington	Mr. Birley Mr. Brocklehurst	167 43
	PLACE.	PRESENTED BY	TURES.	822	25	WAINFLETE, Members of Good		
Feb.	Brought forward, Petitio		1,436	-823	25	Templar Lodge	Mr. Chaplin	15
18 21	Correspondence S. 10 . 1	Mu Comlan	411 501	024	1 632	Hand Lodge of Good Templars	Mr. Chapman	15
21	CHARLESTOWN, Salford		640	824 825	25 25	London	Mr. Goschen	14 891
21	,, ,,	11	1,320	826	25	CLIFTON	Mr. K. Hodgson	744
21	LIMERIGG and SLAMANNAN	Sir William Ed.	1,047	827 828	25 25	Joseph Bryant and Others Belfast, Public Meeting, R.	;;	1,212
-	Dimensor and Diamanaan	monstone	45	020	20	Boag, Mayor, chairman	Mr. W. Johnston	1
21	Limeniag, Public Meeting, John	La Table	III PL	829	25	CHESTER	Mr. Raikes	612
21	Hogg, chairman	,,	1	830 831	28 28	Burntisland	Sir R. Anstruther Mr. Ashbury	114
	John F. Brigg, chairman	Mr. Leatham	1	832	28	,,	,,	1,012
21	Burnley, Public Meeting, J. H. Scott, chairman	Mr. Rylands	1	833 834	28	CHARLESTOWN	Mr. Cawley	503 824
21	SAINT JOHN'S WOOD	Mr. Stansfeld	505	835	28 28	Notting Hill and Kensington Croydon	Sir Charles Dilke Mr. Grantham	16
21	SOUTHWARK	N. 701.1	913	836	28	BEDMINSTER	Mr. K. Hodgson	631
22 22	MANCHESTER, Medlock Ward, All Saints' Ward	Mr. Birley	313 412	837 838	28 28	HACKNEY and other places VICTORIA PARK and other places	Mr. John Holms	141 208
22	" St. George's Ward	,,	1,435	839	28	LAMBETH	Mr. W. M'Arthur	792
22 22	,, Medlock Ward St. Michael's Ward	,,	259 853	810	29	MANCHESTER	Mr. Jacob Bright	1,337 284
22	,, St. Michael's Ward	,,	687	811 842	29	,, St. George's Ward Medlock Ward	"	310
22	" Medlock Ward	,,	288	843	29	,, ,,	11	471
22 22	,, St. Michael's Ward	,,	795 1,027	844 845	29	SALFORD St. George's Ward	Mr. Charley	316
22	LOWER BROUGHTON		1,223	846	29	Killworth	Mr. Downing	90
22 22	Salford	Mr. Dodson	1,245 578	847	29	CHELSEA	Sir Charles Dilke	1,108
22	Kensington	Mr. W. Gordon	896	843	29	D. Smith, chairman	Mr. Forsyth	1
22	Holloway, Women of		2,540	849	29	CROSSHILL, Public Meeting, James		Sea like
22 22	Finsbury	. ,,	1,561 1,589	0=0	20	Crawford, chairman		1 134
22	WOLVERHAMPTON	Mr. Weguelin	56	850 851	29	Belfast		1,108
22	BURTON STATHEY Members of							,

Total number of Petitions 171-Signatures 98,662

FIFTH REPORT. 1-3 March, 1876.

		LILIII IV	E1 0101. 1—0 m	with, 1010.			
	Mar. Brought forward, Petitions 171—Signatures 98,662						
1915	1			Mr. Pennant			
1916	1	WALLINGFOR	D, Public Meeting, T.	nela sera saveli.			
	1000	F. Wells	, mayor	Mr. Wells	1		
1917	2			Mr. Carter	900		
1918	2	.,			906		
1919	2			Mr. K. Hodgson	692		
1920	2	BATLEY, Pu	blic Meeting, J. T.				
		Marriott,	Mayor, chairman	Mr. Serj. Simon	1		
1921	2			Mr. Wheelhouse	975		
1922 .	3	MANCHESTER	, Medlock Ward	Sir Thos. Bazley	345		
1923	3		,,	,,	258		
1924	3		,,		237		
1925	3	11	1,		307		
1926	3	SOUTHWARK		Col. Beresford	391		
1927	3	THETFORD		Sir R. Buxton	163		
1928	3	CHARLESTOW	N	Mr. Cawley	561		
1929	3	MELROSE		Sir Geo. Douglas	26		
1930	3		D	Admiral Egerton	284		
1931	3	Row, Public	Meeting, J. Armour,				
		chairman		Mr. Ewing	1		
1932	3	CAMDEN TOV	VN	Mr. Forsyth	493		
1933	3	MARYLEBONE		,,	1,113		
1934	3	Somers Tow	N	Mr. Gorst	138		
1935	3	Снатнам		Mr. Gorst	214		
1936	3	HEATON CHA	PEL	Mr. Hardcastle .	50		
1937	3	KINGSTON		Mr. Henley	89		
1938	3	THAME		,,	43		
1939	3	LEITH		Mr. Macgregor .	284		
1940	3	EDINBURGH,	Public Meeting, Mary	denough to the			
		Livingsto	one	Mr. M'Laren	1		
1941	3	STOCKBRIDGE	, Drawing Room				
			Lilias Craig		1		
		-					

Parliamentary vote is the keynote to all these things, not by the exercise of it directly, but by the change that it would produce in the opinion of men with regard to women. The evil that men do by legislation and by social custom is not from will, but want of thought. And as soon as it can be brought home to the consciences of men that they have been and are doing a wrong, then I have enough faith in their conscience to believe that they will do their very best to mend that wrong. It is that hope and belief, and with the assurance of sympathy from all pure and just-minded men, that gives us the courage to persist and persevere, and enables us to confide without doubt in the ultimate triumph of a righteous cause. (Applause.) The CHAIRMAN said he had known, in his little experience,

women suffer very much from hardships inflicted on them from the fact of their not having a vote in Parliament. He had known women who had been left as widows, capable of managing a farm quite as well as their husbands, who had been turned out simply because they had no vote. He wished to mention a curious fact that it was only among some of the greatest savages he had known women occupy her true and right position. Among the Esquimaux neither the man nor woman was educated. The woman was not worked like the Red Indians, and she had nothing to do but to attend to her own household duties. She was treated with kindness and respect by her husband, and her intellect was superior to his. He believed that the experience of all Arctic travellers agreed with his own; and when they wanted information for the charts, the woman was best able to sketch out the line of route. That showed that where woman had equal advantages with man, she was at least his equal in intelligence. In the case of the Red Indians, where the woman had all the drudgery to perform, her mental qualities were not equal to the man's, though her physical powers were greater. The same thing might be said of fish women on the coast of Scotland, some of whom he had seen lifting their husbands about like children. He believed that he could pick out a dozen of these women, who would very soon clear the streets of London of two or three dozen men .-(Laughter.)

Mr. Duncan Maclaren, M.P., at the request of Mrs. Taylor, thanked the chairman for his attendance, and the speakers for the addresses.

Mrs. Maclaren also tendered her thanks to Mrs. Taylor for the use of her beautiful rooms, and expressed the hope that other ladies having sufficient accommodation would follow her excellent example.

Tea and coffee were provided in the dining-room, and thither many of the company repaired, while others lingered for gossip, and to look more closely at the splendid modern pictures and other works of art in the rooms and on the staircases, and departed evidently well pleased with the occupation of the afternoon-or, as most of the ladies present would, perhaps, say, morning, though the meeting did not break up till six

[We are indebted for the foregoing admirable report of this meeting to the *Christian World*. The report is slightly abridged.]

Drawing-room meetings have been given by Mrs. Mylne, 33, Ladbroke Square, addressed by Miss Cobbe, Prof. Amos, and Miss C. Biggs; and by Mr. and Mrs. Henry Lawrence, 34, Victoria Road, Kensington, addressed by Mrs. Webster, Miss A. Shore, and Miss L. Ashworth. Petitions were adopted at each of these meetings.

### SHEPHERD'S BUSH.

WEST MIDDLESEX BRANCH OF THE WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE Society.—A public meeting was held on February Sth, in the | Petitions were adopted at all these meetings.

and resolutions were moved and seconded by Mr. George Sims, Miss Babb, Mr. Graham, and Mr. Simon, all of whom expressed themselves strongly in favour of the claim, and a petition to Parliament was unanimously adopted by the meeting.

Lecture Hall of Avenue Road Church, Shepherd's Bush, the Rev. R. Macbeth presiding. Miss Fenwick Miller lectured,

A meeting was held in the Lecture Hall, Ipswich, on the 4th April. The chair was taken by Dr. Chevallier, and other gentlemen on the platform were Rev. J. R. Turnock, Rev. A. H. Smith, Rev. V. W. Maybery, Mr. Vulliamy, Mr. B. Birkett, Mr. S. Alexander, Mr. W. B. Jeffries, Rev. J. Calvert, Mr. E. Grimwade, and Mr. R. C. J. Rees. Miss Becker and Miss L. Ashworth formed the deputation. The meeting was largely attended, and the resolutions carried unanimously. Customary resolutions were moved by the Rev. V. W. Maybery, Mr. Vulliamy, and Mr. S. Alexander.

## SCOTLAND.

## MISS CRAIGEN'S MEETINGS.

Miss Craigen held a meeting in the Parish School, Limerigg, Stirling, on February 9th. Limerigg is a little cluster of cottages, not more than twenty, standing on a little hill overlooking a country colliery district. Though the snow was thick on the ground the workmen came from nearly all the collieries round. 'The attendance was good, and the petition passed. One old woman, with a shawl over her head, had walked many miles to the meeting. She came after it was over to sign the petition, declaring that she had suffered enough from bad laws, and would do anything to get them mended.

Another meeting was held on the 12th February, in the Old Schoolroom, at Row, Dumbarton, Mr. James Armont in the chair. Row is a very small village, but there was a good meeting, and the petition passed. On the 15th, a meeting was held at GLENELG; that is not a village, it is a glen on the Breadalbane property, in the Argyle Highlands, with the houses scattered about a mile or two apart. There was a splendid meeting the schoolroom was perfectly crammed; there seemed to be a general turn out of the whole population for ten miles round. The Rev. Donald M'Alister, Free Church minister, took the chair. In the petition of inhabitants both ministers and their wives signed, and nearly everybody within reach. Of course the whole glen could not be reached; it is nearly eight miles long, and that was out of the question. On the 16th, in the Schoolroom, Glenorchy, Argyleshire, Rev. David M'Alister, minister of the Free Church, in the chair. On March 2, in the Volunteer Hall, Coldingham, Berwick, the minister of the Established Church in the chair. April 3, in the Assembly Room, Newton Stewart. April 5, in the Town Hall, WIGTON. April 6, in the Templar Hall, GARLIESTON. April 7, in the Town Hall, WHITEHAVEN.

Miss Craigen has addressed meetings in England,—On March 11, in the Institute, CHELMSFORD; April 21, in the Primitive Chapel, DEARHAM, Cumberland; April 24, in the Templar's Hall, Workington, Mr. Valentine in the chair; on April 28, in the Primitive Methodist Chapel, FLIMBY, Cumberland, chairman Francis Moore, miner; on May 12, in the Reading Room, GLENRIDING, Patterdale, Geo. Armstrong, chairman; at CLEATOR, Cumberland; at an open air meeting, in a field, near BACKBARROW, Lancashire; on May 29, at the Temperance Hall, Millom, Cumberland, Mr. David Lang, chairman; on May 30, in the Mechanics' Institute, Coniston, Mr. Geo. Howells in the chair; and on June 14, in Crooklands Meadow, Dalton-in-Furness, Mr. Richard Dunn in the chair.

	10	8	VI	OMENDO	OFFI	NAGE JOURNAL. [ 1876.
1945   3   20   20   20   20   20   20   20	NO.	DATE.	PLACE.	PRESENTED BY	SIGNA-	MANCHESTER NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE.
1944   3   Caurr   Sir W   Maxwell   257   Maxwell   258   Maxwell   259   M				M. F. M.:Man	1	SUBSCRIPTIONS AND DONATIONS, JUNE, 1876.
Residents al.			CRIEFF			Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Crook
1919   3   S.R. K. W. LIGON and Others.	Alto It	11-	Residents at		1 TAC	Lady Goldsmid
1919   3   Laurs   Mr. Villers   119   1919   3   Laurs   Mr. Villers   111, 185   1	1916	3	SIR R. K. WILSON and Others		1,078	Mr. Henry Lightbown
Total number of Petitions 206—Signatures   11,185						Mr. Thos. Chorlton
SIXTH REPORT. 6					961	Mr. G. B. Longstaffe (two years) 1 1
Mar			Total number of Petitions	206—Signatures	111,186	Mrs. Wilkins (Melbourne) Journal 1 0
Same Range   Sam		5				Mr. A. Ward
1009   6					111186	Miss L. Nicol 0 10
100	3098	6	STONEY STRATFORD	,,		
Mr. A. Porter   Mr. A. Porte						Miss E. R. Scott 0 10
Mr. J. Goldsmid   218				Mr. Dundas	46	Mr. A. Porter 0 5
Silvar						Mr. M. Ridgway 0 5
					100000000000000000000000000000000000000	MIL GEORGE I COK II III III III III III III
Biloff   7			Edinburgh, Drawing Room Meet-			Miss H. Lupton 0 5
1910   7	3106	7			0.000	Miss Porter 0 5
Marchiester, All States Variable   1988	3107		Brighton	Mr. Ashbury	1,812	
3111   7   PENDERFON   Mr. Cinarley   501     3112   7   MARYLERONE   Mr. Coddard   48     3113   7   WARBOROUGH   Mr. Goddard   48     3114   7   WARBOROUGH   Mr. Goddard   48     3115   7   WARBOROUGH   Mr. Goddard   48     3116   7   Robert Macbeth, chairman   Mr. K. Hodgson   245     3117   7   MIRDON, Public Meeting, James   Campbell, J.P., chairman   Mr. K. Hodgson   245     3118   7   GLENORUM   Mr. C. Holmson   50     3119   7   Public Meeting, Donald   Mr. Legh   55     3120   7   Public Meeting, Donald   Mr. Legh   55     3121   7   ROBERN   Mr. Wheelhouse   900     3122   7   ROBERN   Mr. Wheelhouse   900     3122   7   ROBERN   Mr. Wheelhouse   900     3123   8   Mary McIanne   Mr. K. Hodgson   200     3124   7   ROBERN   Mr. Wheelhouse   900     3125   7   ROBERN   Mr. Wheelhouse   900     3126   8   Mary McIanne   Mr. Raikes   81     3230   8   EDINBUGH, Drawing Room Meeting, Enight Howen   Mary McIanne   Mr. Mare   606     3233   8   Mary McIanne   Mr. Wheelhouse   900     3233   8   Mary McIanne   Mr. Wheelhouse   900     3234   8   ELEMBERI S. D. MITCHELL   Mr. Howel Wils   Mr. Mare   900     3234   8   ELEMBERT S. D. MITCHELL   Mr. Howel Wils   Mr. Mare   900     3235   8   ELEMBERT S. D. MITCHELL   Mr. Howel Wils   Mr. Mr. Yatea   900     3234   8   ELEMBERT S. D. MITCHELL   Mr. Howel Wils   Mr. Howel Wils   Mr. Howel		7		Sir Thos. Bazley		Miss Cheetham
Sailt				Mr. Charley		
Mr. Goddard.		7	SAINT PANCRAS, Vestry of	Mr. Forsyth		Mrs. Addison 0 2
		7		Mr. Goddard	48	Rev S. Evans (Ironbridge) 0 2
			SHEPHERDS BUSH, Public Meeting,			Miss S. Mackie
Transmill	3115	7	HENDON, Public Meeting, James		1	Mr. Gendall 0 2
Second Companies   Second Comp		7 7	Bristol			S. ALFRED STEINTHAL, Treasurer. £62 15
Total number of Petitions 232—Signatures 118,746   Mr. Wheelhouse   Seventh Report   Seve	3118	7	ALDERLEY EDGE and WILMSLOW	Mr. Legh		CENTRAL COMMITTEE.
SEVENTH REPORT. 8—10 March, 1876.   Mr. Wheelhouse   Mr. Miss E. Brook			" Public Meeting, Donald			CONTRIBUTIONS RECEIVED FROM MAY 21st TO JUNE
Total number of Petitions 232—Signatures 118,746   Mr. Hopwood, M.P.			Bodedern			Mrs. Frederick Pennington 10 0
SEVENTH REPORT. 8—10 March, 1876.   Mirs. Davidson.   Mirs. Play (1876)   Mirs. Molecular (187	3122	1 7 1				Miss E. Brook 4 0
SEVENTH REPORT. 8—10 March, 1876.   Mar   Brought forward, petitions 232—Signatures 118746   Sa33   8   EDINBURGH.   Mr. M'Laren   696   Mr. M'Caren   696   Mr. Morther   Mr. Mor			Total number of Petitions	s 232—Signatures	118,746	Mrs. Davidson 1 1
Sample		1			110710	Miss Horn
331						Mr. W. Shaen
Bolthkoffer, Damp Room Meeting, Emily Rosaline Masson, chairwoman   1   Lady Molyneux   Mrs. Yates   Mrs. Yates   Mrs. Yates   Mrs. Donkin   Mrs. Howell   Mrs. Turner   Mrs. Rose Baines   Mrs. Pickering Clarke   Mrs. Pic	2331	8	MARY McInnes	,,	. 1	Mr. Howel Wills 1 1
Sarage   S	2332	8	ing, Emily Rosaline Masson,	and the second second	Jaki	Miss Mabel Holland 1 0
Salage	3323	Q			1	Mrs Vates
Same	3334	8	ELIZABETH S. D. MITCHELL	""		Miss M. Chapman
3336   8	3335	8	ing, Elizabeth Anne Mac	and the second	1	Mrs. Howell
3337   8   M. L. Bell	3336	8	FLIZABETH HUNTER and another		. 2	Mrs. Pickering Clarke 0 5
Sarphy	3337	8	M. L. Bell	,,		Miss Donkin
3340   8   T. Young						Mr. P. J. Lascaridi 0 5
State   Stat	3340	8	T. Young	to the state of th	. 1	Mrs. Reid
Miss Fanny Fitz-Gerald   Mrs. George Hopper   Mrs. Jackman   Mrs. Jackman   Mrs. Jackman   Mrs. Jackman   Mrs. Pennack   Mrs. Starkey   Mrs						Mrs. Johnson 0 2
Salator   States, and Council of   Mr. Leith   Seal.   Mrs. Jackman   Mrs. Jackman   Mrs. Pennack   Mrs. Penn						Miss Fanny Fitz-Gerald
Sade   Sade   Dewsburk, Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses of			ABERDEEN, Lord Provost, Magi-		Seal 1	Mrs. Jackman 0 2
3346   8   HOLMFIRTH	3345	8	DEWSBURY, Mayor, Aldermen, and			Miss Reeves
3347 9 Manchester Mr. Birley 232 3348 9 ", 182 3349 9 ", 283 ALFRED W. BENNETT, T	3346	8				Miss Statter
3349 9 ", ALFRED W. BENNETT, T	3347	9		Mr. Birley	232	£37 2
					000	ALFRED W. BENNETT, Treasurer.
350 9 ,, Medlock Ward ,, 359 64, Berners Street, London, W.	8350	9			050	64, Berners Street, London, W.