

tion, but she stood up nobly for her religious rights and became a strong advocate of the liberties of the Polish Hebrews. This brought her into prominence and the acquaintance of eminent men and women in all the European countries, and in 1834 she was chosen to preside at the formation of a cosmopolitan association of all classes and parties and conditions, for the amelioration of mankind.

She was married in England in 1833 to William E. Rose, and afterwards lectured in the British Isles and the United States. She appeared before various legislative bodies in this country as an able advocate of equal rights to women, in person and property and politics. For thirty years Mrs. Rose worked in this country in the interest of her sex and then returned to Europe.

Once when speaking on women's rights in South Carolina she was denounced as an abolitionist, and was asked by a slave owner whether she understood what was done in that region to folks who meddled with slave labor. She confessed her ignorance and asked for information. The planter replied: "We tar and feather them." Mrs. Rose said: "I did not come here to speak against slavery, but you have shown me my duty. I shall now do so. You Southern gentlemen are too idle; you have not enough to do; I will give you some some work; get your tar and feathers ready." She then delivered an oration against slavery and followed it up with other abolition speeches but was not disturbed.

On the suffrage question she once said:

"I have sometimes been asked, even by sensible men, 'If woman had the elective franchise, would she go to the polls to mix with rude men?' Well, would I go to church to mix with rude men? And should not the ballot-box be as respectable, and as respected, and as sacred as the church? Aye, infinitely more so, because it is of greater importance. Men can pray in secret, but must vote in public. Hence the ballot-box, of the two, ought to be the most respected, and it would be if women were once there, but it never will be until they are there."

On the question of the equal rights of women with men to hold property Mrs. Rose said:

"Educate women, to enable her to promote her independence, and she will not be obliged to marry for a home and a subsistence. Give the wife an equal right with her husband in the property acquired after marriage, and it will be a bond of union between them. Diamond cement, applied on both sides of a fractured vase, re-unites the parts, and prevents them from falling asunder. A gold band is more efficacious than an iron law. Until now the gold has all been on one side, and the iron law on the other. Remove it; place the golden band of justice and mutual interest around both husband and wife, and it will hide the little fractures which may have occurred, even from their own perception, and allow them effectually to re-unite. A union of interests helps to preserve a union of hearts."

This, for that early day was advanced thought, and there is no doubt that the able efforts of that gifted woman helped to bring about the reforms that have since been accomplished in this direction.

On the anniversary of American Independence in the year 1876, Mrs. Rose wrote a letter from which the following is an extract:

"The glorious day upon which human equality was first proclaimed ought to be commemorated, not only every hundred years, or every year, but it ought to be constantly held before the public mind until its grand principles are carried into practice. The declaration that 'All men (which means all human beings irrespective of sex) have an equal right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness,' is enough for woman as for man. We need no other; but we must reassert in 1876 what 1776 so gloriously proclaimed, and call upon the law-makers and the law-breakers to carry that declaration to its logical consistency by giving woman the right of representation in the government which she helps to maintain; a voice in the laws by which she is governed, and all the rights and privileges society can bestow, the same as to man, or disprove its validity. We need no other declaration. All we ask is to have the laws based on the same foundation upon which that declaration rests, viz.: Upon equal justice, and not upon sex. Whenever the rights of the man are claimed, moral consistency points to the equal rights of woman."

These are striking words, and the excerpts we have given show the quality of mind of the able woman who has departed. She was buried in the grave of her husband, who died ten years before, and has left a record which should be prized by the reformers of her sex in both hemispheres.

ESCAPED FROM QUARANTINE.

TODAY'S dispatches contain a statement affecting the efficiency of the New York harbor quarantine that will perhaps startle a good many people. It has been discovered that two Jewish immigrants—both women—who were brought over on the "Moravia" have been discovered on Long Island. The manner of their escape from the quarantined ship—one of the most plague infected vessels that have yet reached the harbor—is not given. The bare fact of the incident having occurred is, however, suggestive of a strong probability that quite a number of other people have escaped quarantine from the "Moravia" and perhaps other vessels. If those two presumed ignorant and unsophisticated women could get ashore and join their relatives and friends, shrewd people could surely accomplish the same feat. So it appears the quarantine has been very far from tight after all the blow that has been made about. The facilities for spreading the plague infection seems to have been quite ample.

A RABBI ON THE "REVIVAL."

THE following letter has been sent to the *Tribune* of this city, and as it comes from one who has been incidentally attacked by the Presbyterian preacher who thinks Hebrews and "Mormons" have not the same rights as orthodox sectarians, we copy it verbatim.

"Editor *Tribune*.—The reply of a Presbyterian minister to the most lenient comments of your editorial on the matter of Wednesday's closing justifies some re-

marks from me, which would have appeared long before this were it not that my own promptings are very often hampered by the timidity of some of those whom I represent. But timidity would now be poltroonery in the light of the superciliousness of Mr. McNiece's article. His dragging in of the Mormons and Jews is due, I suppose, to the delicious little article in Tuesday's *Times* signed "Hebrew." It is a pity that the writer did not sign his name. I should like to pay him my acknowledgements. Would that I could write so calmly and collectedly upon this subject.

"Mr. McNiece states that the courts have decided that this is a Christian country. With all respect to Justice Story, to which I presume this most logical divine has reference, I fail to see how any judge can go beyond the powers of the charter that gives authority. Amendment I to the Constitution of the United States contains the dual clause, 'Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.' But even if this is a Christian country, has it anywhere been decided that it is Protestant? It may be Catholic, Episcopalian, Unitarian or Spiritualist. I have in my pocket a letter from a very prominent Christian in this city, and one most highly respected, who is a Spiritualist, denouncing the entire attitude, methods and presumption of revivalism. His opinion is entitled to deference even from those who do not believe as he does. If the gratuitous intrusion of one's peculiarities of views and methods is at all times unmannerly, it becomes emphatically so when churches are guilty of it, since they especially should be distinguished in the virtues of modesty, humility and good manners. As to the Mayor, he is as much the Mayor of Catholics, Episcopalians, Unitarians, Spiritualists, etc., even if with bumble deference to the broad-minded Presbyterian divine, we deny that he is the Mayor of the Jews and the Mormons. I should be apt for my part to exclaim if he is not: 'Thank God that he isn't!' What right has he, therefore, by official proclamation, to pronounce himself distinctively on the side of the Evangelical Churches?

About the glory of God being revealed in this mid-week Sunday, let me tell your readers a few things. One prominent Mormon representing the largest firm in this city tells me that he signed to close because he was told the whole thing hinged upon his house, and he consented in apprehension that if the matter were so and refused, these Christian ministers would denounce him and his people as fanatically anti-Christian. Evidently God then works through intimidation, or, as modern parlance would call it, "by bulldozing." I have, on reliable statement, that one gentleman, a Christian, was so incensed at the overbearing manner in which the Wednesday-closing committee addressed him that he ordered them out more forcibly than politely. The list of closers, in order to make a good showing, was inflated with names of lawyers and offices; in one case, at least, I can say positively, even with a flimsy firm. I should be sorry were I to think that God's methods adopted such misrepresentations.

The moral good effected by these methods I must deny. They may exert a certain hypnotic influence for the time, not over the morally but the mentally weak, and must inevitably suffer reaction. If one criminal came out and confessed Christianity here in this city as the result of these meetings, I should say that there may be some good flowing from them after all. But as it is, I shall fear for my slender purse on dark nights as much as I ever did last winter, and shall even maintain that this city should