

sense, that woman has received from any of the great parties of the day. No doubt she will feel encouraged to urge on the enterprise she has undertaken. It is too late to cry down the female suffrage movement with contempt. Opponents of the proposed innovation in our political system must prepare themselves to grapple with a substantial foe. Already the advocates of female suffrage have made an impression in England. Among those who favor the idea are such powerful and practical statesmen as John Bright and John Stuart Mill; and the strength its friends exhibited in the British Parliament astonished the keenest observers of the times. In our own country the strong-minded females have organized into a league, started a lively newspaper organ, instituted a series of public meetings, and enlisted the services of popular speakers, like George Wm. Curtis, James M. Souville of New Jersey, and George Francis Train. In the recent elections in the State of Kansas the advocates of female suffrage were able to carry over nine thousand of the voters of the sterner sex with them, which was, at least one-third of the whole vote polled.

The *News* then states briefly, though with great candor, the main arguments for women's right of franchise, together with some of the popular objections to the measure, for which evidently it has not much respect. But it closes the article thus:

The right to vote will naturally carry with it the right to hold office. It is hardly to be presumed that the women, when they once get the ballot, will consent to let the men fill all the fat places in the land.

And here comes the practical difficulty. Suppose a female President with a female Cabinet controlled the affairs of the nation, it is quite probable they would be subject occasionally to the little circumstances incidental to their sex. Might not the retirement of the Secretary of State, for a brief period, upset some very important treaty; or in the absence of a dozen or more senators at a time, prevent the impeachment of a wicked Executive? We would like to hear from Miss Anthony on the subject.

The question raised by the *News* has often been considered, but the argument probably escaped its notice. The democrats not long ago killed a republican President, but that did not stop, only check the wheels of government. It is not likely that the birth of a new candidate for presidential honors would do more. Her Majesty of Great Britain has so often practically answered the presumed difficulty of the *News*, that we need not pursue it farther.

P. P.

FREE PUBLIC BATHING.

Boston has set an example to the world of free public bathing establishments. It is one of her very best assurances of advancing civilization, and the way this boon is improved by all classes and ages, and of both sexes, is another. The wonder is that such an institution has been so long in coming. But the ages have been content to admire the magnificent baths of ancient Greece and Rome with no attempt to imitate them. New York, with almost a million of inhabitants, and the mercury ranging from ninety to a hundred and four, has not one decent public bathing establishment for rich or poor. And God pity the children, they are arrested by the authorities for going into the filthy water about the piers, because pious, prudish, Black Crook fastidiousness is scandalized at sight of their naked bodies!

Meantime, we like what a Brooklyn Daily says on this latter subject, in answer to a correspondent, as follows:

An individual sends us a complaint against the Ferry Company, because they permit little boys to bathe in a nude state from a neighboring pier on the New York side of the Roosevelt street ferry, affording an "unwonted and most disgusting spectacle" to passengers on the ferry boats. Now, we don't sympathize with our correspondent at all in his jeremiad, and if he has no more serious

indictment than this to prefer against the Ferry Company, he had better save his ink and paper for graver purposes. In the first place, we don't think there is anything to "disgust," in viewing the naked forms of small boys; and since we have no free bathing houses in New York or Brooklyn, we would not exact the penalty of the law against children who take an occasional swim in public. Better that the little fellows should be clean and healthy than dirty and diseased. In short, we advise our correspondent to study charity, and look not with a jaundiced eye on everything that is not exactly up to his standard. We would encourage rather than prevent people from the pursuit of cleanliness.

CHEAP POSTAGE.

FROM the first "THE REVOLUTION" has demanded reduction of postage, especially ocean postage. It seems absurd that we should pay the same money to carry a half ounce letter across the Atlantic as for a sack of corn that weighs a hundred pounds. And yet, until the 1st of January last, we paid as much for a half ounce letter as for the carriage of a barrel of flour weighing more than two hundred pounds. The London *Cosmopolitan* urges the reduction of England's foreign letter postage to one penny to all countries, and half a penny at home. It thinks that if the postage on letters to America were thus reduced, fifty would be sent when one goes now. The *Cosmopolitan* thinks that if the people are taxed so excessively to support a standing army and an established church, they might submit even to little post-office deficit to give the poorest classes an opportunity to communicate frequently with their friends who have been driven by adverse fortunes to every remote part of the globe. And it farther thinks, that at any rate, if the government will not permit mail matter to be carried by any other than its own ships, it should at least convey that matter, whether letters or papers, as cheaply as other carriers would be glad to do it. It closes its article thus:

We should be very glad to enter into a contract to carry the mails between London and New York daily at a half-penny a letter, and between London and Paris twice a day at a farthing. For some two years the *Cosmopolitan* was distributed throughout the metropolis by the government at a penny each, or fifty-two pence a year. We now get the work done by carriers, at a halfpenny each. The great public grievance is this: the governments of the world assume a monopoly of the business of letter-carrying and charge five or six times the price that the same work could be done for by private individuals. As to the question of "safety and dispatch," we would rather trust to the enterprise of licensed carriers than to the slow coaches and irresponsible agents of the governments. What surprises us most of all in regard to this great and much-needed reform is, that none of the leading rulers of the nations seem to see not only the vast benefits that universal penny postage would confer on the world at large, but the immense popularity it would give to the statesman who takes the initiative. If the democratic party in the United States will have the sagacity to adopt universal penny postage, or free trade in letter-carrying on their election banners, they will win with a rush.

If the democratic or republican party either would "take the initiative" in any measure for benefiting the common people, and convince the people that it was done in good faith, that party would indeed win "with a rush," and hold the winning too, so long as loyalty and gratitude are attributes of the human character.

P. P.

WOMEN AS BARBERS.—The newspapers will have it that there is a first-class barber's saloon in Fifth Avenue, this city, conducted entirely by women, patronized only by men. We have not seen the sign, but will insert their Card in "THE REVOLUTION" if furnished, and perhaps become a patron of the establishment.

P. P.

WHO OPPOSE GEN. GRANT?

THE New York *Tribune* says:

The following celebrated characters are opposed to Gen. Grant: Wendell Phillips, Parker Pillsbury, C. L. Vallandigham, E. Cady Stanton, Brick Pomeroy, Susan B. Anthony, Fernando Wood. With such a combination against him he must be about right.

Not many months since the *Tribune* said, without italics:

Gen. Grant we esteem by no means a great man, nor even a very great general. We want a statesman; we desire Mr. Chief-Justice Chase. The republican party contains no purer, no worthier, no more gifted man. In what respect does Gen. Grant surpass Mr. Chase? "Is he a better republican?" we ask Gen. Grant. No reply. If we want to talk about horses or tobacco, we may find him the most voluble of men. *Not one word upon the question that racks the heart of the country!* "Take me if you will, as Ulysses S. Grant, general, and when I am President I shall do as I please. Perhaps we must take him, but we do not feel like cheering over it; certainly not so long as great statesmen remain in our ranks. "Give us Grant, because we can elect him." Again that cowardly argument. *Friends, is there nothing in this great party but office-hunger? Is the chief end of man the Post-office and revenue service? Are we willing to follow a doubtful leader into an uncertain battle for unknown principles?*

The proprietor and editors of "THE REVOLUTION," agreeing substantially with the *Tribune* in the above estimate of Gen. Grant, see no good reason yet for changing their opinion.

THE Belleville (Illinois) *Advocate* is a live sheet, with eye and ear open to see, hear and report the signs of the times. It saw the rising of "THE REVOLUTION," and generously heralded its coming by publishing its Prospectus, handsomely displayed in its columns. And last week it again called attention to it thus; a favor we will try hard to deserve:

"THE REVOLUTION," edited by Mrs. Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Parker Pillsbury is certainly one of the raciest, as well as most common sense paper that visits our table. We do not know how extensively it is patronized in this vicinity, but we heartily advise all our friends to make its acquaintance.

Equally magnanimous is the Pontiac (Michigan) *Sentinel*, giving our rather voluminous prospectus in full. We began a little more than six months ago our grand enterprise, unaided and alone. Most of the newspapers at first were cold, or worse, towards us as we humbly knocked at their doors. But a better acquaintance with us and our purposes soon mended their hospitality, and now we would scarcely exchange our friendships for those of any other on the continent. Every journal whose good opinion is of the slightest importance is at least friendly, and multitudes of them are wholly on our side.

SWIMMING FOR GIRLS.—Every week brings argument solemn as death itself for teaching girls to swim. Apart from its being an invaluable source of innocent pleasure as well as of health, under discreet regulation, to be able to swim would every year save very many lives that must otherwise be lost by steamboat and other disasters on the water. An intelligent woman says of swimming schools, in the Philadelphia *Evening Post*:

"They are especially needed for women, as boys and men often have opportunities for learning which women do not. In times of danger a man, though he may be a good swimmer himself, is greatly embarrassed by having a wife, and perhaps two or three daughters to look after, all of whom are perfectly helpless. It is the more necessary because our life-preserving apparatuses are more or less defective, and, such as they are, there is never a sufficient supply to meet the demand." The recent disasters on our lakes and rivers show with emphasis the wisdom of these words.