

**Manuscript version: Author's Accepted Manuscript**

The version presented in WRAP is the author's accepted manuscript and may differ from the published version or Version of Record.

**Persistent WRAP URL:**

<http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/94056>

**How to cite:**

Please refer to published version for the most recent bibliographic citation information. If a published version is known of, the repository item page linked to above, will contain details on accessing it.

**Copyright and reuse:**

The Warwick Research Archive Portal (WRAP) makes this work by researchers of the University of Warwick available open access under the following conditions.

Copyright © and all moral rights to the version of the paper presented here belong to the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. To the extent reasonable and practicable the material made available in WRAP has been checked for eligibility before being made available.

Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge. Provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

**Publisher's statement:**

Please refer to the repository item page, publisher's statement section, for further information.

For more information, please contact the WRAP Team at: [wrap@warwick.ac.uk](mailto:wrap@warwick.ac.uk).

# Conversations with Parliament: Women and the Politics of Pressure in 19th-Century England

SARAH RICHARDSON

In the long 19th century, women seized new opportunities offered by parliament and played a growing role in public politics long before well-known campaigns for the right to vote. As parliamentary politics grew more restrictive and formalised, women utilised older forms of interaction with the state and occupied spaces that were not explicitly barred to them. By looking at women's appearances before royal commissions and select committees, or women's participation in petitioning, this essay argues that women successfully pressured parliament and won their place in the blue books of government long before their names appeared on the electoral registers or in the columns of *Hansard*.

**Keywords:** parliament; pressure; select committee; women; petitions; royal commissions

Research has moved on since the 1970s and the groundbreaking analysis of 'pressure from without' published in a volume edited by Patricia Hollis with an array of leading 19th-century historians as contributors.<sup>1</sup> The index to that impressive collection contains only two entries on 'women's rights'; both are found in a chapter by Howard Temperley on 'Anti-Slavery', and both refer to the 'wrangle' at the World Anti-Slavery Convention which met in London in 1840 over the seating of female American delegates.<sup>2</sup> Hidden in the chapters on key associations, groups and people, there are references to influential women and female organisations such as the philosophical radicals, Harriet Grote and Sarah Austin, the sexual purity campaigner, Josephine Butler, and the British Women's Temperance Association. This

is perhaps surprising given Hollis's later impressive contributions to the field of women and political history, but reflected the prevailing orthodoxy of the time. This orthodoxy maintained that women were largely excluded, or at best played an auxiliary role in parliamentary and extra-parliamentary politics.<sup>3</sup> However, as *Pressure from Without* so clearly demonstrated, it is impossible to write a history of 19th-century pressure group politics without including women as key activists, policy shapers and organisers. Even if their contribution is not foregrounded, women are present on the pages of every historical record regarding public influence on parliament and on politics.

For women, the capacity to exercise influence on parliament to advance their favoured causes, virtually always came from 'without'. Although many could convince politicians by using 'private' methods of patronage and informal lobbying, only the queen had ability to legislate, a power that was increasingly hypothetical as the century progressed. There were no female ministers, parliamentarians or civil servants, therefore women utilised other strategies. This essay focuses on women's increasing exploitation of parliamentary processes and procedures to get their voice heard. These were tactics that ran in parallel with the more familiar organised pressure groups and voluntary associations that proved successful in abolishing slavery and repealing the corn laws and centred on women's exploitation of the petitioning process and engagement with royal commissions and select committees of inquiry.

A major turning point in the historiography of women and the politics of pressure, came in 1980 with the publication of Alex Tyrell's influential article analysing the important rhetoric of 'woman's mission' which acted as a device to enable middle-class women to partake in pressure group politics by portraying their work as an extension of philanthropic and humanitarian activities.<sup>4</sup> Tyrell, like Temperley, focused on the prominent anti-slavery movement of the early 19th century. But rather than depicting female campaigners as

troublesome, whose presence at the World Convention caused disputes between the American and British representatives, Tyrell demonstrated how they revitalised and transformed the movement, creating an environment where women could justifiably participate in crusades against ‘moral, social and political unrighteousness’.<sup>5</sup> Clare Midgley furthered this argument, arguing that the women’s anti-slavery movement allowed a distinctive political voice to emerge.<sup>6</sup> Women’s groups changed both policy and practice. Their commitment to the immediate abolition of slavery contrasted with the views of the more cautious male leadership which favoured a gradualist approach. In May 1830, the pressure they applied succeeded in persuading the national Anti-Slavery Society to drop the term ‘gradual abolition’ from its mission statement.<sup>7</sup> At the practical level, women participated in a robust petitioning movement and led a campaign for morally informed consumption persuading neighbours and kin to boycott slave-grown cotton and sugar. They articulated their abhorrence of slavery through poetry, didactic novels and moral tales as well as more overtly political pamphlets.<sup>8</sup>

‘Woman’s mission’ was a contested term in the early 19th century, with writers as diverse as Sarah Lewis, Marion Kirkland Reid, and Anna Jameson, debating the concept.<sup>9</sup> Whilst Lewis recognized women’s capacity for social and moral regeneration, she considered that this influence should be exercised from a solely domestic and neighbourhood base. Jameson observed tensions between woman’s mission and woman’s position, of which, she argued ‘no one dares to think, much less to speak’.<sup>10</sup> She went on to note that:

Man’s legislation for woman has hitherto been like English legislation for Ireland: it has been without sympathy; without the recognition of equality; without a comprehension of certain innate differences, physical and moral, and therefore inadequate, useless, often unjust and not seldom cruel.<sup>11</sup>

Reid offered a solution to the issue of men legislating on women's issues. She advocated the extension of the franchise to both men and women, arguing that this would allow female interests to be represented and inequalities to be redressed, in particular in the fields of marriage and education. The fact that 'woman's mission' spoke equally powerfully to conservative evangelicals and to radical proto-feminists, encouraged women of all political persuasions to embrace pressure group politics with enthusiasm and vigour during the mid 19th century. This rich seam of women's activism has now been carefully charted by historians.<sup>12</sup> For example, Simon Morgan, in his work on the women and the Anti-Corn Law League, noted that pressure group participation created a 'national community of women' working for a common cause. The League politicised women's role in the home, linking household economy directly to economic policy.<sup>13</sup> Kathryn Gleadle has charted how pressure groups for legal reform, sexual reform, and female education, were increasingly linked with calls for women's emancipation.<sup>14</sup>

The extent of the female contribution to extra-parliamentary lobbying was also recognized by contemporaries. In the 1840s, Henry Brewster Stanton, American journalist and politician (and husband of the women's rights campaigner, Elizabeth Cady Stanton) wrote an overview of progress of the British reform movement entitled *Sketches of Reforms and Reformers of Great Britain and Ireland*.<sup>15</sup> He devoted a chapter to significant women who were advocating change in a number of spheres. These included Lady Byron, Harriet Martineau, Amelia Opie, and Mary Howitt, but many more were cited in other chapters on particular pressure groups, including Maria Edgeworth, Elizabeth Heyrick, Elizabeth Fry, and Eliza Cook. And by the 1850s, Lord John Russell, speaking to the recently-established National Association for the Promotion of Social Science in Sheffield, could confidently assert:

Everyone must have observed the new influence which has not been asserted or sought, but is falling to the lot of women in swaying the destinies of the world. It is not a share in directing the patronage of ministers or guiding the councils of kings, as in former times, but a portion in the formation and moulding of public opinion.<sup>16</sup>

In fact, Russell underestimated the authority that women possessed. Pressure groups enabled them to influence policy and shape public opinion. However, women were also engaged in more direct dialogues with parliament and with politicians in the 19th century. Some of this took place out of public view. Thus the private correspondence of leading government ministers contained many letters from women claiming expertise in particular areas of policy. Sarah Austin, author and translator, was a fervent advocate for public education and undertook extensive research comparing educational provision throughout Europe which she published in an essay entitled *On National Education*.<sup>17</sup> Behind the scenes, she used her political connections centred on the powerful London group of Philosophical Radicals to promote her cause. Her correspondence networks included important politicians such as Strutt, Derby, Romilly, and Gladstone. She wrote frequently to Gladstone representing herself in conventional terms, as a middle-class woman unused to the rough and tumble of public debate. For example, on the issue of national education she wrote that:

seeing the violence and bitterness with which the subject is, I will not say discussed, but handled by the Press, I take fright. I have always shrunk from appearing before the public in my own person or behalf, as the author or champion of any opinions whatever ... Will you read the few pages which I will ask Mr. Murray to send you? Will you tell me whether the party to which you in a wide sense belong are likely to attack me with the sort of rancour I see and hear now so much afloat on all sides. God forbid I should confound you with those who use such poisoned weapons. I judge you

as I wish to be judged by you, and I look to you and the small knot of friends with whom you act with an anxious hope you can hardly imagine.<sup>18</sup>

Yet, as this and subsequent interactions demonstrated, she had a steely determination to further the cause of national public education, reminding Gladstone of his commitment to the cause just before he delivered his first budget speech as chancellor of the exchequer in 1853, ‘Now is your time. The country is prosperous, the people in good spirits, and alive to all sorts of schemes of improvement.’<sup>19</sup> This ‘private’ method of campaigning was generally only available to political ‘insiders’, those with the necessary authority and personal connections to influence leading politicians. And women, as Sarah Austin noted, had to tread carefully so they were not seen to be transgressing gender boundaries. However, there were more public means for women, of all classes, to pursue ‘conversations with parliament’ to further their political and economic aims by utilising governmental processes and procedures to promote issues on which they had an interest.

The 19th century witnessed a spectacular increase in older forms of political engagement, and as access to these processes were open to all, the expansion enabled women’s ability to pressure parliament to proliferate. They were able to draw on many historical precedents: petitioning parliament and the crown, and the use of commissions and committees to investigate key policy areas had been utilised as strategies by the ordinary public to engage in political affairs. Thomas Erskine May argued that entitlement to petition was a right that had been exercised successively since before the time of Edward the Confessor.<sup>20</sup> As Miles Taylor’s essay in this volume suggests, numbers of petitions began to rise notably at the start of the 19th century as the method was embraced by female anti-slavery campaigners. By the middle of the century the numbers of petitions were reaching tens of thousands per year with hundreds of thousands of signatories.<sup>21</sup> As the formal arena of parliamentary politics grew more exclusive, many women looked to older forms of

interaction with the state. They petitioned on key matters of political and economic policy including the franchise, repeal of the corn laws, the new poor law and protectionist legislation, but also on more minor issues such as copyright law or the state of public roads.<sup>22</sup> Signing petitions signalled that women (and others excluded from the formal political system) were able to perform a role as active citizens on a national stage notwithstanding their lack of a vote.

There was a corresponding increase in the production of parliamentary papers. Royal commissions were the most conspicuous of these, but select committees of both Houses also examined aspects of British society and issued blue books appended by long transcripts of hearings and additional documents.<sup>23</sup> Royal commissions may be traced back to the Domesday Book, but the 19th-century format of employing commissioners to gather expert witness advice dates from the Commission on Inclosures in 1517.<sup>24</sup> Select committees were sections or subdivisions of the house of commons and house of lords and reported to those institutions. From the 1790s, select committees were given their own index entries in the *Commons Journals* and from that date appear to have developed a clear role as investigating bodies on issues as diverse as copyright and the police.<sup>25</sup> Royal commissions possessed power via delegations by warrant from parliament and the crown which conferred authority on them. The evidence of the commissions, which often ran to over 1,000 pages, demonstrated a desire for official transparency. As was with the case with petitions, the sheer quantity of official publications emanating from these committees was breathtaking. From 1731 to 1800, there were only 110 volumes issued by parliament. Whereas from 1801 to 1851, there were 1,794 volumes. In 1800, the annual number of volumes printed was 20; by 1850 this had risen to 60.<sup>26</sup> Blue books were not destined to be consigned to libraries unread. They were enthusiastically read and consumed by an informed and engaged public seeking to understand the challenges of early industrial Britain. Women were often the disseminators of

the vast quantities of knowledge contained in the pages of the reports. A notable example is Charlotte Elizabeth Tonna who published the best-selling, *The Perils of the Nation*, in 1843, summarizing evidence on the wealth and poverty of Britain.<sup>27</sup> The book contained a specific chapter on the role of female influence in improving living conditions. Tonna also used the evidence from the royal commissions on factories in her popular novel, *Helen Fleetwood*, published in 1841.<sup>28</sup>

At times, the publication of reports of both select committees and royal commissions turned into communal events, with the public eagerly awaiting the outcomes of particular inquiries. In 1852, there was without any sense of irony, a debate on whether a select committee should be established to consider whether parliamentary papers and reports should be freely distributed to the country's literary and scientific societies and mechanics institutes. In the debate, Disraeli celebrated the growth in the accessibility of this public official knowledge, maintaining it was a means to elevate the character of the people:

If we looked to manners, if we looked to the means of Government not only in this country but its dependencies, and indeed, to all those subjects which ought to afford the materials when the true history of a country was drawn, we should find that in Parliamentary literature, which had grown into importance in the last half-century resources were placed in the hands of public writers, such as never had been before possessed in any time or country.<sup>29</sup>

Many women activists accessed these key sources of knowledge to inform their interventions in debates on all aspects of public policy.

The upwards trend in the numbers of commissions and petitions was not without its critics. Following the establishment of the royal commission on the poor law, William Cobbett noted:

These *commissioners* sit in London, it seems, and send forth roving deputy-commissioners to collect information about the country. These rovers give in written accounts of the result of their inquiries. A parcel of *extracts* from these accounts have been collected together and printed in the form of an octavo book, and sold at *price* four shillings, ‘PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY’, and the members of the House of Commons have each then been furnished with a copy of this book. This is a new way of doing the nation’s business.<sup>30</sup>

Joseph Hume, the noted guardian of public expenditure, pointed out the irony of the millions of pages of paper that the Commons produced, which were read by very few, in contrast to the taxes on newspapers which were limiting the spread of knowledge to the working class.<sup>31</sup>

Joshua Toulmin Smith also attacked the process of circumventing parliament and doing business by royal commission. He argued that commissions infringed on old freedoms by assuming functions historically formed by local authorities. Commissioners were nominated by the crown with no opportunity to challenge appointments. They departed from accepted modes of inquiry by eradicating the adversarial dimension that was at the core of parliamentary hearings. He argued that:

What evidence they please is taken and no more. All evidence is taken in secret; and so much published as, and when they like; and with such an accompanying gloss as they please to give it. No liberty of cross-examination, ‘that is, of extracting dissimilitudes,’ is admitted. Judgment is pronounced in the absence of every party affected, or whose property or interests are brought in question. An unlimited authority to squander money is assumed.<sup>32</sup>

Royal commissions were also criticized for the time they took to deliberate and the suspicion that they were merely there to prepare the way for predetermined government policies.

*Punch*, regularly satirised the establishment's propensity to turn to a royal commission to answer every burning question of the day. In 1888, following an enquiry into naval and military provision which urged retrenchment, they quipped [John Bull], 'has neither Army nor Navy, but he has a Royal Commission and several voluminous Blue Books'.<sup>33</sup>

The number of royal commissions increased rapidly with the reforming whig ministries of the 1830s and quickly became an established mode of parliamentary life (see Table 1). The 1850s were the highpoint for the establishment of inquiries, with 18 inaugurated in 1853 alone. There was a similar increase in the number of select committees with numbers averaging between 30 and 40 each year by the middle of the century. The print culture of parliamentary knowledge became an industry in the early 19th century. In 1799, the expense of printing the journals, votes and all other papers was £8,000; in 1827, it rose to £46,000 and by the 1850s exceeded £100,000 a year. Parliament did make some cutbacks on the printing and publication of information by restricting the numbers of petitions that were printed. In 1829 (a high point), 84% of petitions presented were printed. In 1843, only 2.8% were published and the average for the period to 1858 was around 12%.<sup>34</sup> Disraeli gave an indication of the significance of commissions, committees and petitions in a report to the Commons in August 1848:

there have been this year forty-five public Committees, some of more than usual importance, with an average number of fifteen Members serving on each Committee. Then there have been twenty-eight Election Committees, with five Members serving on each Committee; fourteen groups on Railway Bills, with five Members on each group; seventeen groups on private Bills, with five Members on each group; and there have been also one hundred and eleven other Committees on private business. Of the public Committees, that on commercial distress sat thirty-nine days; that on sugar and coffee planting, thirty-nine days; that on the Navy, Army, and Ordnance expenditure,

forty days; and that on the miscellaneous expenditure, thirty-seven days. There have, besides, been presented this year upwards of 18,500 petitions, showing an increase of 25 per cent above the greatest number presented in any former year, except 1843.<sup>35</sup>

>>>>>>>>TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE<<<<<<

Women were able to utilise these changing dynamics of parliamentary culture in order to gain a public voice. Petitions, requests for particular information and participation in select committees and royal commissions were all methods for promulgating views and promoting causes without the need for formal political representation. This contrasts with the views of some historians who have portrayed the period after the passage of the 1832 Reform Act as witnessing the growth of a masculine public sphere and the development of more formal, regulated political structures and institutions.<sup>36</sup> Obviously, the agendas of parliamentary commissions and committees were set centrally, by members of parliament (and increasingly by civil servants), but women, by dint of their experience, expertise, and authority, were able to play an important role once they had been established. In addition, petitions were generally initiated from the bottom up, allowing any citizen who had a grievance to make their point to parliament.<sup>37</sup> It was perhaps because of the closure of some avenues of informal political participation, that these older methods of interacting with parliament became so popular in the 19th century. Recent work on parliamentary space has revealed that women were always present, as spectators, participants and lobbyists.<sup>38</sup> Thus these modes of ‘conversations with parliament’ are an important source to gauge women’s interaction with national politics and their ability to put pressure on the personnel and institution of parliament.

As royal commissions and select committees were established to explore in depth the key social, economic, cultural and political issues of the day, they needed expert witnesses in order to operate effectively; and women were often best placed to provide that service. Their contribution often went unrecorded. So, for example, the royal commission on fine arts which

reported in 1842, relied heavily on the work of Mary Philadelphia Merrifield. Merrifield was an expert on Italian Renaissance art. In 1844 she translated Cennino Cennici's early-15th-century work, the *Treatise of Painting* (1844), which had been recently discovered and published in 1821 by the Italian antiquary, Giuseppe Tambroni. On the merits of this work, the royal commission employed her to investigate the history of painters' materials and techniques, which resulted in the publication of her book, *The Art of Fresco Painting*.<sup>39</sup> This reflected the commission's deep concern about the absence of a British school of history painting, and was both a collection of historical texts on the techniques of 12th- to 18th-century fresco painters and a functional manual for the practising artist.<sup>40</sup> In 1857, Merrifield was granted a civil-list pension of £100 in recognition of her services to literature and art. Although she was a key researcher for the royal commission on fine arts, Merrifield's name appears nowhere in its published report. Her evidence was, instead, subsumed under the contribution of Sir Charles Eastlake.<sup>41</sup>

Five years after Merrifield's sterling work for the royal commission on fine arts, Caroline Chisholm gave evidence to two house of lords select committees examining aspects of Australian settlement. In contrast to Merrifield's experience, Chisholm was publicly listed as the only female witness to both committees and her immense specialist knowledge and expertise was readily acknowledged. At one point the peers asked if she was enabled to carry out her work by her 'own Influence and Authority, without any auxiliary Aid?' She replied: 'Entirely by my own Influence.'<sup>42</sup> Other witnesses to the committee heralded her skills and experience. Chisholm possessed formidable organisational skills but was also adept at promulgating her views. In Australia, she had tirelessly worked to provide services and employment for emigrants and convicts whose sentence was completed, taking on the colonial administration, magistrates, clergy and industrial vested interests. She collected evidence in the form of personal testimonies and economic statistics. In addition to her

confrontations with the male establishment, she also challenged Australian middle-class women who employed female migrants as servants. She supported servants who had been penalised by having their wages docked for accidental damages (stating experience of 51 cases) and maintained that employers should use the magistrates to claim damages for breakages rather than take the law into their own hands.<sup>43</sup>

In April 1847, Chisholm, who had returned to England the year before, was summoned to the house of lords select committee on the criminal law. She was subject to rapid fire questioning but acquitted herself with aplomb. She gently steered the debate away from conditions in Norfolk Island and Van Diemen's Land (where, she asserted she had no first-hand experience and thus was not prepared to comment on conditions or employment opportunities for convicts) to focus on Sydney and the interior. She provided factual and statistical information on employment opportunities both for ticket-of-leave men and for female emigrants, stating that she had aided around 14,000 people in the past seven years.<sup>44</sup> In July the same year she appeared before a select committee on colonization from Ireland where she set out a scheme to aid emigration by loaning potential emigrants a portion of their fare to Australia, which would be recouped once they obtained employment. Her testimony which ran to over 20 pages, is characterised by the substantial evidence-base she provided to support her statements on emigration and employment in Australia. This included statements from emigrants, reformed convicts, employers, and government officials; statistical information; and detailed business plans for emigration schemes. She was also judicious. Pressed on whether she favoured a particular class or ethnic origin of emigrant, she retorted:

I made no Difference; the Good of the whole was my Object. I also included any Ticket-of-Leave Men, Emancipists, – any Persons that wanted Work that would go into the Country. My Object was to remove them into the Country to lessen the City Population. I had English, Irish, and Scotch, – Episcopalians, Presbyterians,

Catholics, Orangemen, and Repealers, – and I never found any Difficulty beyond such Difficulties as must always be expected in a Work of the Kind.<sup>45</sup>

Caroline was the only woman to be heard directly by the committee, but she allowed the voices of many female emigrants to be heeded by reading out verbatim testimonies and by retelling their experiences.

The evidence she gave to the select committees was direct, straightforward and empowering. She set out her schemes to help those wishing to emigrate (and those already in Australia), in great detail, supported by comprehensive budgets and expected returns on investment. Little reference was made either by herself, or by the questioning peers, of her sex. Her authority was absolute and her experience transcended any barriers of gender. Chisholm's appearance before the committees received barely any attention from the press in England, although it was reported in detail by the *Sydney Morning Herald*.<sup>46</sup> By continual lobbying of the home office and ministers such as Earl Grey and Sir James Stephen, she achieved her immediate objective: that of obtaining free passage to Australia for wives and children of convicts now settled in the colony.<sup>47</sup> Her scheme to provide loans to those wishing to emigrate for employment or to join family members, received only lukewarm support, however. She kept up her propaganda offensive on the government, issuing a public letter to Earl Grey and by gathering a formidable array of influential supporters, including Charles Dickens and Angela Burdett-Coutts.<sup>48</sup> Eventually, in 1849, she established the Family Colonisation Loan Society independent of the government, underwritten by Coutts Bank. Caroline Chisholm thus achieved mixed success from her appearances in front of the select committees but she had proven that women could wield influence and apply pressure to ministers if they possessed sufficient status and authority.

Chisholm's positive experiences of utilising the committees and commissions of parliament to pursue causes close to her heart were mirrored by those of Mary Carpenter a

few years later. When Carpenter gave evidence to the select committee on criminal and destitute juveniles she spoke for over two days, and her evidence amounted to over 50 pages in the written report. Like Chisholm, she quickly set out the basis of her authority:

the evidence which I now give particularly relates to Bristol as regards my personal experience; but I have besides, during the last two or three years, studied the reports of benevolent institutions connected with juvenile delinquents all over the kingdom and have corresponded with various individuals who have had opportunities of knowing their condition, particularly chaplains of gaols and others. Therefore the evidence which I give will be founded on the opinions which I have formed upon all these matters partly from my own experience and partly from other sources.<sup>49</sup>

She was grilled by the committee on aspects such as morality, religious instruction in reformed schools, the economic and financial aspects, and regulation. But her evidence demonstrates that she was well informed; knowledgeable; and robust in her responses. She was willing to contradict and challenge the commissioners on issues such as regulation and funding of reformatory schools. Her testimony did much to bring pressure to bear on parliament to recognize a need for reform. The Youthful Offenders Act of 1854, owed much to her influence authorising the establishment of reformatory schools by voluntary bodies, certified by the state and partly funded by the treasury. The act represented a major change in penal policy and established a pattern of relations between statutory and voluntary bodies that would serve as a model for the future. Her influence was also felt in the act of 1857, which applied similar procedures and support to industrial schools. Carpenter has often been categorised by historians as demonstrating the limits of women's influence in the public sphere. Her refusal to deliver her paper to the Social Science Association in 1851 for fear of 'unsexing herself' has been often cited to illustrate the dangers of women lobbying in public arenas.<sup>50</sup> She has been portrayed as the embodiment of maternalist policies which would be

short-lived as the state gradually occupied spaces previously dominated by private philanthropists.<sup>51</sup> However, in spite of this shaky beginning to her career as a public lobbyist, Carpenter went on to deliver 36 papers to the Social Science Association, more than any other member, and gave evidence to the select committee on poor relief in 1861.<sup>52</sup>

As their experience of engaging directly with parliament via royal commissions and select committees increased, many women linked their appearances more explicitly with feminist agendas. An article in the *English Woman's Journal* in the summer of 1861, celebrated the extensive evidence given by Louisa Twining, Mary Carpenter, and Ellen Woodlock, to a series of select committees appointed to consider and report on the subject of poor relief in England and Ireland.<sup>53</sup> With perhaps a hint of hyperbole, the article stated that the calling of these women 'to council' marked an 'epoch in social history'.<sup>54</sup> All three women argued forcefully against the institution of the workhouse, offering practical alternative solutions based on their own personal experiences.<sup>55</sup> They were subjected to vigorous interrogations. Ellen Woodlock, who had established an industrial school in Dublin to take poor and orphaned children away from workhouses, was asked repeatedly by the committee if the establishments could be reformed or modified to meet her concerns. Eventually she replied: 'I imagine the workhouse ought not to be made such an institution; it is only intended to relieve the destitute and poor, and I think orphan and deserted children should get such an education as would fit them to take their place in society like any others.'<sup>56</sup> All three women provided comprehensive evidence to the committees, giving practical examples underpinned by more theoretical and intellectual reflections from papers they had given to the Social Science Association. Twining brought formidable expertise from her role as president of the Workhouse Visiting Society; she was author of numerous pamphlets and periodical articles. Carpenter and Woodlock contrasted their positive experiences of youths educated in industrial (and in the case of Carpenter) reform schools

with those who had been incarcerated in workhouses receiving limited education and training. Other (male) witnesses were also asked to testify to the women's reputation as reformers in the field, with all giving a favourable response. Thus the *English Woman's Journal* could fairly state that their, 'Intelligence, social position, wide experience, were superadded; so that nothing was wanting to impress upon their testimony the stamp of unquestionable authority.'<sup>57</sup>

The experience of testifying to the various committees was summarized evocatively by the *Journal* [SHOULD THIS BE THE *Commons Journal*?] which emphasized the women's proximity to the decision-making process:

a summons which required the necessity of crossing the lobby of the House of Commons, confronting the chairman, answering methodically the interrogatories of the honourable gentleman who undertook to conduct the inquiry, and withstanding the shock of a cross-examination by members on the 'other side,' may have been received with a feeling more or less akin to a natural feminine shrinking from the obligation of occupying too conspicuous a position.<sup>58</sup>

All three women proved more than capable of the task, avoiding any 'feminine shrinking' which led the periodical to call for a wider scope for women to exercise public roles in their areas of expertise.

A similarly feminist agenda was pursued by women giving evidence to the royal commission on the consolidation of the factory and workshops act in 1875 which sought to impose maximum working hours for women and regulate their work.<sup>59</sup> There was an organised feminist opposition in the cities where the commissioners were to hold hearings and meetings of both middle- and working-class women to collect evidence to present to the commission and to drum up opposition to the acts among female workers. One striking example of how far women had progressed in their utilisation of parliamentary inquiries to

advance their interests was in the large number of female witnesses who testified: over 60 women appeared before the commissioners, of whom over half were described as ‘working women’ as opposed to ‘philanthropic ladies’. The report noted ruefully that save for a couple of nailmakers and bleachers who sought further protection, all the female contributors were opposed to the proposed legislation.<sup>60</sup>

The delegation from Leeds, for example, consisted of Lucy Wilson and Alice Scatcherd (both active in a number of women’s causes), Miss Roberts (a saleswoman in a shop), Mrs Wood, Mrs Ellis, Miss Conron, and Mrs Marsden (all power loom weavers). The chief speaker was Lucy Wilson of Leeds, a member of the executive committee of the married women’s property committee from 1876 to 1882, a leader of the Ladies National Association, a member of the executive committee of the Vigilance Association and founder of the National Union of Woman Workers.<sup>61</sup> Wilson accused the committee of seeking a ban for married women engaging in factory work as they ‘ought to attend to their families’. She argued that such a ban would bring economic hardship to families and ‘alter the conditions of marriage for women if you reduce them to an inability to maintain themselves’.<sup>62</sup> Dr Eliza Walker Dunbar, house surgeon of the Bristol Hospital for Sick Children, who was asked whether women who had been recently confined should be excluded from factory work for a period to recuperate, made the analogy with housework:

I think that the demands of housework are just as great as any demands in factories, and it is very usual for working women to return to their house work, to scrub and wash, and do hard labour, within the eight days. I have allowed it myself, but they do it. You would not legislate for housework, and why, therefore should you legislate for factories work.<sup>63</sup>

Eliza Sturge who headed the Birmingham ‘Deputation of Ladies’ argued that men had given evidence on the subject of women’s labour without taking the opinion of the women

concerned. Sturge ‘asserted the right of women to work, side by side with men, for the public good’ and she was critical of the inability of politicians to suggest practical methods of making a living for women reduced to poverty, as well as the undervaluing of women’s work and activities.<sup>64</sup> Sturge’s evidence highlighted the fact that class, not gender, frequently dictated the treatment meted out to women, and that women were blamed for being the product of a social and educational system designed to restrict their intellectual and economic contributions.

Nearly 20 years later, the key contributions that women were able to make to royal commissions and select committees were finally recognized by the appointment of three female commissioners to the royal commission on secondary education in 1894.<sup>65</sup> Sophie Bryant, mathematician and headmistress of North London Collegiate School, Lucy Cavendish, a member of the Girls Public Day School Company and the Yorkshire Ladies Council of Education, and Eleanor Sidgwick, principal of Newnham College, Cambridge, were trailblazers; yet their role was also limited. They were given a separate brief from the male commissioners: to consider whether girls required a different curriculum from boys, and how this might be delivered in a mixed-sex environment.<sup>66</sup> They were also described as either widows or, in the case of Sidgwick, as wife of Henry Sidgwick, Esquire, doctor in letters, professor of moral philosophy, University of Cambridge, though at least Sophie Bryant was accorded her status as a doctor of science. However, in spite of the restrictions, the last barrier had been breached and women were thenceforth able to play a full role in inquiries by the state giving full status credit to their extensive expertise, skills, knowledge and experience.

Alongside their work on royal commissions and select committees, women also took a full part in the revival of another form of parliamentary pressure: petitioning. The petitioning movement was revitalised in the 19th century, due in no small part to women’s

efforts particularly in raising the profile of the anti-slavery and anti-*sati* movements. The ability to make direct representations to parliament allowed women to articulate their concerns, and be heard by the foremost institution in the country. Further, it provided them with a political education, a chance to organise and mobilise public opinion, and ultimately to shape policy. Petitions were the consummate method of expressing ‘pressure from without’, and hundreds of thousands of men and women participated. The public appetite for petitioning may be summed up by this summary in a mid-century issue of the *Manchester Times*:

There are now 4,859 petitions against opening the Museum and galleries on the Lord’s Day, signed by 599,870 persons, and 100 in favour of doing so, signed by 19,189 persons; 298 petitions against the abolition of church-rates without providing an equivalent, signed by 12,855 persons; 44 in favour of the Church rate Abolition Bill, signed by 3,559 persons; and 12 for the repeal of the Maynooth Act, signed by 2,083 persons. There are also 102 against the Police Bill, signed by 29,000 persons, and 13 for a repeal of the Scottish Public-houses Act signed by 6,117 persons. There is a long petition from 3,015 ‘women of Great Britain, married and single’, for a law for the enforcement of the property rights of married women. The petition is headed by the signatures of Mary Howitt, Anna Jameson, and Jessie Meriton White.<sup>67</sup>

Women supported petitions for a wide range of public political and more private matters.<sup>68</sup> There were ‘monster’ petitions such as those against the institution of slavery, for the repeal of the corn laws, for universal suffrage, and for the reform of the contagious diseases acts. But there were also intensely personal appeals for redress, offering a glimpse of the strategies open to women under duress. Thus in 1849 Martha Wrede petitioned for relief, complaining that certain sums of money bequeathed to her by her husband had never been paid, in consequence of the neglect and mismanagement of the property by the executor.<sup>69</sup>

Appropriately, after having been so influential as a method for female political activism for most of the 19th century, petitioning played a pivotal role in the women's suffrage campaigns. The movement was inaugurated with a circular petition organised by the women's suffrage petition committee in 1865. A year later, 1,499 signatures were presented to parliament, marking the beginning of the continuous women's suffrage movement in Britain.<sup>70</sup> This was followed by further petitions culminating in the women's suffrage special appeal of the mid 1890s. More than 3,500 women worked to collect a total of nearly 250,000 signatures to the appeal, which was finally presented to parliament in 1896. Permission was granted by the Speaker to use the Westminster Hall to display the appeal, and the women maximised their opportunities to engage MPs directly:

Fifty feet of tables were arranged in a modest corner, and delegates from England, Ireland, and Scotland took charge of the precious volumes ... By a coincidence the ladies found themselves at the feet of James the First, the monarch in whose reign their privileges were first whittled away. A little farther on Charles the First had his shoulder turned to them, ignoring the progress of thieving, and there the ladies passed the afternoon and evening. As the members began to arrive for the sitting of the House many visited the hall. Friends of the ladies brought down as many of the violent opponents as possible, and playfully introduced them to the lists of their own constituents, whose names were in evidence.<sup>71</sup>

There were further attempts to persuade parliament of the need for reform of the franchise (see Table 2). In 1902, Priscilla Bright McLaren wrote to her grandson: 'there is a very important Deputation of Women graduates going up to London to present a Petition today, in favour of Women's Suffrage – 1,800 names – there are about 2,000 graduates – but many of these are spread over the Globe, but have sent letters warmly approving it. About 66,000 Textile weavers presented a like Petition last month. These Petitions are very

educational – and the women will help to raise the men to see that justice ought to be extended to women and this would be well also for men.<sup>72</sup> In 1903, Sarah Reddish was employed as a ‘petition worker’ for the north of England collecting signatories from Lancashire cotton mill factory women, Scottish textile workers, women trade unionists from the chain maker trades in Coventry and hosiers from Leicestershire.<sup>73</sup> However, it was the refusal of parliament to listen to the ‘special appeal’ which encouraged many women to turn to more militant tactics. The Pankhurst’s did not abandon the strategy entirely, and in 1914 Emmeline was arrested and imprisoned for attempting to present a petition to the king, after failing to engage his ministers.<sup>74</sup> The campaign for the extension of the female franchise exposed the limits of the petitioning system for women. Frustration with parliament’s unwillingness to listen or engage in even moderate reforms of the electoral system encouraged many to pursue more confrontational and aggressive approaches. Women were no longer satisfied with raising their voices. They demanded to be heard and for action to be taken by parliament.

>>>>>>>>TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE<<<<<<

Women thus seized the opportunities offered by parliament as a means of actively engaging in the public sphere. As parliamentary politics grew more restrictive and formalised, women were not excluded but utilised older forms of interaction with the state and occupied spaces that were not explicitly barred to them. Whether they were presenting petitions or attending commission and committee meetings, they demonstrated that parliament was not a closed institution to the women of England. Petitions enabled women of all social classes to express opinions and raise grievances. Women were able to utilise their authority as experts to contribute to committees and royal commissions. This signalled that they were performing a role as active citizens on a national stage; that their voices should be heard and taken seriously; and the issues raised should be addressed. The function of these

parliamentary procedures and processes as a device to mobilise and to politicise should not be underestimated. They demonstrated the blurred boundaries between the public and the private in the world of extraparliamentary pressure; the wide space of debateable ground which needs to be explored to understand women's citizenship before the suffrage. The petitions, commissions and committees covered aspects as diverse as decimal currency, animal welfare, mercantile law, and bankruptcy, as well as key issues of concern such as health, education, and crime. They also provide an important source for understanding imperial and foreign affairs. Women's contributions are sometimes implicitly, but often explicitly, reflected in the burgeoning print culture of the blue books published by parliament, demonstrating their expertise in sometimes unusual areas. Women could, and did, make important interventions in matters of public policy in 19th-century England.

## TABLES

Table 1: *Royal Commissions of Inquiry*

Decade	Number of royal commissions
1830–9	48
1840–9	52
1850–9	85
1860–9	71
1870–9	50
1880–9	52
1890–9	39

Source: H.D. Clokie and J.W. Robinson, *Royal Commissions of Inquiry* (Stanford, CA, 1937).

Table 2: *Support for Women's Suffrage, 1890–1906*

Session	Number of petitions in favour of women's suffrage	Number of signatures
1890	165	3,127
1890–1	147	3,277
1892 (session 1)	253	7,318
1893–4	344	19,765
1894	12	4,602
1895 (session 1)	16	312
1896	29	1,459
1897	1,289	43,399
1898	19	853
1899 (session 1)	192	6,127
1900 (session 1)	5	7
1901	21	30,178
1902	11	39,079
1903	10	13,990
1904	15	11,946
1905	55	8,153
1906	1	1

Source: *Return showing the Number of Petitions to the House of Commons in Favour of Women's Suffrage for each Session from 1890 to 1906, Inclusive; and the Number of Names Attached to Such Petitions* (1906).

Note: the figures exclude the women's suffrage special appeal which was presented to parliament in 1896.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Pressure from Without in Early Victorian England*, ed. Patricia Hollis (1974).

<sup>2</sup> Howard Temperley, ‘Anti-Slavery’, in *Pressure from Without in Early Victoria England*, ed. Hollis, 46, 49.

<sup>3</sup> Patricia Hollis, *Women in Public, 1850–1900: Documents of the Victorian Women’s Movement* (1979); Patricia Hollis, *Ladies Elect: Women in English Local Government, 1865–1914* (Oxford, 1987).

<sup>4</sup> Alex Tyrell, ‘“Woman’s Mission” and Pressure Group Politics in Britain (1825–1860)’, *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester*, lxiii (1980), 194–230.

<sup>5</sup> Tyrell, ‘“Woman’s Mission”’, 208.

<sup>6</sup> Clare Midgley, *Women Against Slavery: The British Campaigns, 1780–1870* (1992).

<sup>7</sup> ‘Proceedings of a General Meeting of the Anti-Slavery Society and its Friends Held at the Freemasons Hall on Saturday, the 15th of May’, *Anti-Slavery Monthly Reporter*, iii (1830), 234–42. The motion was put by Thomas Fowell Buxton and seconded by Lord Milton.

<sup>8</sup> See Midgley, *Women Against Slavery*, esp. ch. 3; Lynne Walker and Vron Ware, ‘Political Pincushions: Decorating the Abolitionist Interior, 1878–1865’, in *Domestic Space: Reading the Nineteenth-Century Interior*, ed. Inga Bryden and Janet Floyd (Manchester, 1999), 58–83.

<sup>9</sup> Sarah Lewis, *Woman’s Mission* (1839); Marion Kirkland Reid, *A Plea for Woman: Being a Vindication of the Importance and Extent of her Natural Sphere of Action* (Edinburgh, 1843); Anna Jameson, ‘Woman’s Mission and Woman’s Position’, in Anna Jameson, *Memoirs and Essays Illustrative of Art, Literature and Social Morals* (1846).

<sup>10</sup> Jameson, ‘Woman’s Mission’, 134.

<sup>11</sup> Jameson, ‘Woman’s Mission’, 132.

---

<sup>12</sup> To cite just a few indicative examples: Clare Midgley, ‘From Supporting Missions to Petitioning Parliament: British Women and the Evangelical Campaign against *Sati* in India, 1813–1830’, in *Women in British Politics, 1760–1860: The Power of the Petticoat*, ed. Kathryn Gleadle and Sarah Richardson (Basingstoke, 2000), 74–92; Lilian Lewis Shiman, *Crusade Against Drink in Victorian England* (Basingstoke, 1988); Hilda Kean, *Animal Rights: Political and Social Change in Britain since 1800* (1998).

<sup>13</sup> Simon Morgan, ‘Domestic Economy and Political Agitation: Women and the Anti-Corn Law League, 1839–1846’, in *Women in British Politics, 1760–1860*, ed. Gleadle and Richardson, 115–33.

<sup>14</sup> Kathryn Gleadle, *The Early Feminists: Radical Unitarians and the Origins of the Women's Rights Movement, c. 1831–1851* (Basingstoke, 1995).

<sup>15</sup> Henry Brewster Stanton, *Sketches of Reforms and Reformers of Great Britain and Ireland* (New York, 1850).

<sup>16</sup> Lord John Russell, ‘Presidential Address’, in *Transactions of the National Society for the Promotion of Social Science, 1858*, ed. George Hastings (1859), 17.

<sup>17</sup> Sarah Austin, *On National Education* (1839).

<sup>18</sup> Janet Ross, *Three Generations of English Women: Memoirs and Correspondence of Susanna Taylor, Sarah Austin and Lady Duff Gordon* (1893), 150: Sarah Austin to William Ewart Gladstone, 27 May 1839.

<sup>19</sup> Ross, *Three Generations of English Women*, 285–7.

<sup>20</sup> Thomas Erskine May, *A Treatise upon the Law, Privileges, Proceedings and Usage of Parliament* (1844), 300; see also Mark Knights’s essay in this volume for 18th-century contests over 17th-century rights of petitioners.

<sup>21</sup> See also Colin Leys, ‘Petitioning in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries’, *Political Studies*, iii (1955), 47.

---

<sup>22</sup> For a detailed analysis of women's petitioning in this period see Sarah Richardson, *The Political Worlds of Women: Gender and Political Culture in Nineteenth-Century Britain* (2013), ch. 5.

<sup>23</sup> Oz Frankel, *States of Inquiry: Social Investigations and Print Culture in Nineteenth-Century Britain and the United States* (Baltimore, MD, 2006), esp. 39–71.

<sup>24</sup> Thomas J. Lockwood, 'A History of Royal Commissions', *Osgoode Hall Law Journal*, v (1967), 172–209.

<sup>25</sup> Peter Jupp, *The Governing of Britain, 1688–1848: The Executive, Parliament and the People* (Abingdon, 2006).

<sup>26</sup> Hansard, *Parl. Debs*, 3rd ser., cxxiii, col. 1065: 7 Dec. 1852.

<sup>27</sup> [Charlotte Elizabeth Tonna], *The Perils of the Nation: An Appeal to the Legislature, the Clergy and the Higher and Middle Classes* (1843).

<sup>28</sup> Barbara Kanner and Ivanka Kovacevic, 'Blue Book into Novel: The Forgotten Industrial Fiction of Charlotte Elizabeth Tonna', *Nineteenth Century Fiction*, xxv (1970), 152–73.

<sup>29</sup> Hansard, *Parl. Debs*, 3rd ser., cxxiii, cols 1069–70: 7 Dec. 1852.

<sup>30</sup> *Cobbett's Political Register*, 6 July 1833, p. 398.

<sup>31</sup> Hansard, *Parl. Debs*, 3rd ser., cxxiii, col. 1067: 7 Dec. 1852.

<sup>32</sup> Joshua Toulmin Smith, *Government by Commissions Illegal and Pernicious* (1859), 168–9.

<sup>33</sup> 'The British Ollendorff', *Punch*, 9 June 1888, p. 268.

<sup>34</sup> *Parliamentary Papers* (1854–5), liv: General Index to the Reports on Public Petitions, 1833–52.

<sup>35</sup> Hansard, *Parl. Debs*, 3rd ser., ci, col. 671: 30 Aug. 1848.

<sup>36</sup> The most articulate expression of the concept of 'closure of democratic political forms' in this period is James Vernon, *Politics and the People: A Study in English Political Culture, c. 1815–1867* (Cambridge, 1993).

---

<sup>37</sup> Richardson, *Political Worlds of Women*, ch. 5.

<sup>38</sup> See, e.g., Richardson, *Political Worlds of Women*; Kathryn Gleadle, *Borderline Citizens: Women, Gender, and Political Culture in Britain, 1815–1867* (Oxford, 2009).

<sup>39</sup> Mary Philadelphia Merrifield, *The Art of Fresco Painting, as Practised by the Old Italian and Spanish Masters, with a Preliminary Inquiry into the Nature of the Colours used in Fresco Painting, with Observation and Notes* (1846).

<sup>40</sup> Merrifield continued her major, if unsung, contribution to intellectual life. Her *Original Treatises on the Arts of Painting* [ARE THERE MORE DETAILS FOR THIS PUBLICATION? ] was a collection of early technical information which was a standard reference book for artists well into the 20th century. Modern art historians consider her to be the pioneer in the field of art technological source research. In 1854, her book *Dress as a Fine Art*, [ARE THERE MORE DETAILS FOR THIS PUBLICATION? ] publicised the dress reforms of Amelia Bloomer and advocated practical, modest, and elegant fashions and displayed a considerable sympathy for the dress reforms of Amelia Bloomer.

<sup>41</sup> *Parliamentary Papers* (1842), xxv: ‘Report of the Commissioners on the Fine Arts’.

<sup>42</sup> *Parliamentary Papers* (1847), vi: ‘Report of the Select Committee of the House of Lords on Colonization from Ireland; Together with the Minutes of Evidence’, 411.

<sup>43</sup> Caroline Chisholm, *Female Immigration Considered, in a Brief Account of the Sydney Immigrants’ Home* (Sydney, Australia, 1842); see also Joanna Bogle, *Caroline Chisholm: The Emigrants’ Friend* (Leominster, 1993).

<sup>44</sup> *Parliamentary Papers* (1847), vii: ‘Second Report from the Select Committee of the House of Lords appointed to Inquire into the Execution of the Criminal Law’, 395–9.

---

<sup>45</sup> *Parliamentary Papers* (1847), vi: ‘Report of the Select Committee of the House of Lords on Colonization from Ireland’, 411.

<sup>46</sup> *Sydney Morning Herald*, 12 Feb. 1848.

<sup>47</sup> *Sydney Chronicle*, 11 Nov. 1847.

<sup>48</sup> Caroline Chisholm, *Emigration and Transportation Relatively Considered* (1847).

<sup>49</sup> *Parliamentary Papers* (1852), vii: ‘Report from the Select Committee on Criminal and Destitute Juveniles’, 90.

<sup>50</sup> J.E. Carpenter, *The Life of Mary Carpenter* (1881), 126.

<sup>51</sup> Seth Koven, ‘Borderlands: Women, Voluntary Action and Child Welfare in Great Britain 1840–1914’, in *Mothers of a New World: Maternalist Politics and the Origins of Welfare States*, ed. Seth Koven and Sonya Michel (1993), 96–106.

<sup>52</sup> Lawrence Goldman, *Science, Reform, and Politics in Victorian Britain: The Social Science Association 1857–1886* (Cambridge, 2002), 144–5.

<sup>53</sup> ‘The Ladies’ Evidence. Poor Relief’, *English Woman’s Journal*, vii (1861), 405–10.

<sup>54</sup> ‘The Ladies’ Evidence’, 405.

<sup>55</sup> The evidence of Louisa Twining and Mary Carpenter is recorded in *Parliamentary Papers* (1861), ix: ‘Fourth Report from the Select Committee on Poor Relief (England)’, 1–31; and also in the indexes presented in *Parliamentary Papers* (1861), ix: ‘Sixth Report from the Select Committee on Poor Relief (England)’. Ellen Woodlock’s evidence was published in *Parliamentary Papers* (1861), x: ‘Report from the Select Committee on Poor Relief (Ireland)’, 216–27.

<sup>56</sup> *Parliamentary Papers* (1861), x: ‘Report from the Select Committee on Poor Relief (Ireland)’, 227.

<sup>57</sup> ‘The Ladies’ Evidence’, 405–6.

---

<sup>58</sup> ‘The Ladies’ Evidence’, 406.

<sup>59</sup> *Parliamentary Papers* (1876), xxix: ‘Report of the Commissioners Appointed to Inquire into the Working of the Factory and Workshops Acts’, i; see, e.g., the evidence from the Women’s Provident and Protective League, 192–3.

<sup>60</sup> *Parliamentary Papers* (1876), xxix: ‘Report of the Commissioners Appointed to Inquire into the Working of the Factory and Workshops Acts’, i, p. cix.

<sup>61</sup> For more on the National Union of Woman Workers and links to the wider suffrage movement, see Sandra Stanley Holton, *Suffrage Days: Stories from the Women’s Suffrage Movement* (2002), 35–6.

<sup>62</sup> *Parliamentary Papers* (1876), xxix: ‘Report of the Commissioners Appointed to Inquire into the Working of the Factory and Workshops Acts’, i, 321.

<sup>63</sup> *Parliamentary Papers* (1876), xxx: ‘Report of the Commissioners Appointed to Inquire into the Working of the Factory and Workshops Acts’, ii, 654.

<sup>64</sup> *Parliamentary Papers* (1876), xxx: ‘Report of the Commissioners Appointed to Inquire into the Working of the Factory and Workshops Acts’, ii, 337–341.

<sup>65</sup> *Parliamentary Papers* (1895), xlivi: ‘Royal Commission on Secondary Education: Report of the Commissioners’, i, p. iv.

<sup>66</sup> Jane McDermid, *The Schooling of Girls in Britain and Ireland, 1800–1900* (2013), 87–97.

<sup>67</sup> *Manchester Times*, 5 Apr. 1856.

<sup>68</sup> For an in-depth analysis of women and petitioning, see Richardson, *Political Worlds of Women*, ch. 5.

<sup>69</sup> *Parliamentary Papers* (1854–5), liv, 983: General Index to the Reports on Public Petitions, 1833–52.

---

<sup>70</sup> Ann Dingsdale, ‘“Generous and Lofty Sympathies”: The Kensington Society, the 1866 Women’s Suffrage Petition and the Development of Mid-Victorian Feminism’, University of Greenwich PhD, 1995.

<sup>71</sup> *Englishwoman’s Review*, 15 July 1896.

<sup>72</sup> Elizabeth Crawford, *Women’s Suffrage: A Reference Guide, 1866–1928* (2003), 402–3.

<sup>73</sup> Crawford, *Women’s Suffrage*, 593.

<sup>74</sup> June Purvis, *Emmeline Pankhurst: A Biography* (2002), 257.