

The vaccination dilemma : &c.; A word to our legislators / by E. Haughton.

Contributors

Haughton, E.
London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine

Publication/Creation

London : Digby and Long and E.W. Allen, [1889?]

Persistent URL

<https://wellcomecollection.org/works/syc8hpxz>

Provider

London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine

License and attribution

This material has been provided by This material has been provided by London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine Library & Archives Service. The original may be consulted at London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine Library & Archives Service. where the originals may be consulted. This work has been identified as being free of known restrictions under copyright law, including all related and neighbouring rights and is being made available under the Creative Commons, Public Domain Mark.

You can copy, modify, distribute and perform the work, even for commercial purposes, without asking permission.



Wellcome Collection
183 Euston Road
London NW1 2BE UK
T +44 (0)20 7611 8722
E library@wellcomecollection.org
<https://wellcomecollection.org>

THE
VACCINATION
DILEMMA :
&c.

A Word to our Legislators.

BY
E. HAUGHTON, ESQ., M.D., B.A. ;
M.R.C.S.E., &c.

LONDON :
DIGBY AND LONG, 18, BOUVERIE STREET,
AND
E. W. ALLEN, 4, AVE MARIA LANE, E.C.

PRICE TWOPENCE.


PART I.

THE

VACCINATION DILEMMA:

An ADDRESS by E. HAUGHTON, M.D.

Delivered at Battersea, 8th May, 1889.

HE public are under the impression that the opposition which has been carried on for so long against the Vaccination Acts is mainly of a sentimental nature, and that there are statistical grounds of the most unimpeachable character for the state of the law as it now exists.

Those persons who think so would perhaps be surprised to learn that the first really serious opposition which the practice had to encounter was based upon statistics. Indeed, at the present day, notwithstanding every effort of well paid officials, it seems impossible to make out a statistical basis for the existence of the compulsory law; or even to show that a single life is ever saved by the practice of so-called "vaccination."

That the very name should be called in question, after being consecrated by the use of two or three generations, seems to savour of undue scepticism; but it must be recollected that the advocates of the practice have always shrunk from defining its nature; and that the pretended unanimity of the medical profession will not bear even the most superficial investigation. I need scarcely say that it has always been much against my will that I have been obliged to oppose the prevailing opinion of my professional brethren. But a sense of duty impels me to do so, as I am fully persuaded that they have been made the victims of even a more discreditable hoax than that recently practised upon a newspaper of world-wide reputation. The manner in which the hoaxing has been carried out is fully shown in Mr. William White's "History of a Great

Delusion," and in Dr. Charles Creighton's monograph upon Jenner. In the latter work the great apostle of blood-poisoning is shown to be a worthy representative of the fabulous cuckoo which his imagination has depicted, to the discredit of natural history, rather than a careful student of Nature and a generous benefactor of long-suffering humanity.

With regard to the Royal Commission of Inquiry, which has recently been proposed, it must not be taken for granted that it will settle any of the points under dispute. The official medical reports on the condition of Leicester and Birmingham have been largely occupied by the endeavour to prove that the well-vaccinated town of Birmingham would have had more small-pox if it had not been for vaccination, and that the comparatively ill-vaccinated town of Leicester owes its strange and long-continued immunity from small-pox to an oppressive system of isolation and re-vaccination. On the other hand, the elaborate report of Dr. Barry on the thoroughly vaccinated town of Sheffield gravely assures us that a study of the frightful epidemic of small-pox which has recently prevailed there, ought to convince the most obstinate anti-vaccinator of the priceless benefits of vaccination. The report, having proved a little too much, is "withdrawn for correction," after having been puffed in almost every paper in the kingdom.

There is absolutely *no* point in connection with the practice upon which there is anything like general agreement amongst modern physicians. Take, for instance, the following questions:—What is the true *source* of "vaccine lymph?" What is its *nature*, and what are its pathological *effects*? How *often* must we be vaccinated in order to be safe from small-pox? What is the *degree of protection* afforded? In what way should the operation be performed—*whether by one or many punctures*? &c.

Under these circumstances it is quite useless to appeal to authority; for it may be asked which of the authorities we are to follow? Whether Jenner, who thought the virus came originally from a disease in the horse; or Dr. Martin, of Boston, who thought it must occur spontaneously in the cow; or Dr. S. Wilks, who doubts if there is such a disease as vaccinia; or the bulk of British medical opinion

represented by Dr. Ceely, who thought it was transmuted small-pox ; or Dr. Creighton, who thinks it more nearly related to phagadenic ulcers of a constitutional type ; or Dr. W. J. Collins, who asserts that the scrofulous matter from white-swelling of the knee will produce just such a "pearl on a rose petal" as Jenner described so sentimentally, when working for his Parliamentary grant? If sentimentalism be wrong, surely it is absurd enough to give a poetic description of the erysipelatous blush which surrounds the point of inoculation of scrofulous matter into the system of an infant fresh from the hands of its Maker. Would it were only sentimentalism ; and that the advocates of animal inoculation (for any purpose whatever) could rebut the charge of impiety to which they undoubtedly lay themselves open.

But, we will be told it is of no use to argue against facts, and that small-pox has diminished contemporaneously with vaccination ; therefore the practice ought to be enforced. By all means let the facts be admitted, but the inference is a little fallacious. For observe, if the small-pox death-rate began to diminish as soon as vaccination was discovered, it is evident that its diminution could not have been due to any such cause : for the inoculation of 5 people cannot protect 500,000, nor the vaccination of 50 persons protect 10,000,000. Yet this is practically what this silly argument relies upon. Only very few persons were vaccinated during the first decade after the introduction of cow-pox ; yet all the fevers began to diminish, and small pox especially experienced the advantages of the diminution of the practice of inoculation or "cutting for the small-pox," which was the quackery then fashionable. This is the true secret of the diminished death-rate ; as ought to be evident when we consider that the practice of inoculation was proved to spread the disease in every part of the kingdom. The fact is that all fevers have recently diminished, owing to sanitary improvement ; but small-pox has not, within recent years, diminished in the same ratio as typhus fever, or the exanthemata, or even as much as cholera and other filth diseases not classified as fevers. What we undertake to prove, and have proved over and over again,

is that the vaccinators kill the children to save them from dying; and that the slaughter which takes place in this way would make Herod the Great hide his diminished head as a person of mild insignificance in relation to infant mortality. We assert that cancer, leprosy and other vile diseases are daily inflicted on virtuous families unto the third and fourth generations, with full knowledge that science proclaims the possibility and experience the awful reality of the filthy contamination. We dare not palter with feeble condemnation when legalized homicide is under examination.

It is all nonsense about saving of life by vaccination. When small pox is present in the epidemic form, it merely replaces some other of the zymotic class of diseases; and the general death rate remains unaltered, or is even lessened. When it is absent, on the other hand, we often find the general death rate actually increased. This is easy to understand, when we know that there are over thirty more destructive diseases; and that when the more fatal prevail, the death rate is then really increased.

"Oh, but you know the small pox is such a dreadful disease!" It is now my turn to smile at the sickly sentimentalism and death-dealing vanity which is at the bottom of the whole matter. It is our pretty faces that all the fuss is about. What if it should turn out that even here we are egregiously in error. I subjoin from a recent paper the opinion expressed and formerly published by Mr. Albert Carter, an eminent dentist, as to the true reason why the present generation are losing their teeth, and mumbling about "beauty's truest friend" with their toothless gums; whilst their constitutions are affected with scrofulous diseases, causing eruptions and other much worse disfigurations.

CHILDREN'S TEETH AND VACCINATION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE ECHO.

SIR,—May I be allowed to quote a few brief references on this subject from a pamphlet written several years ago by another surgeon-dentist, Mr. Albert Carter, who had travelled in many lands, and whose professional experience was unique. He was most distinctly of opinion that vaccination subverts dentition, and is a cause of the prevalent deformity and decay of the teeth. After noticing the various opinions put forth to account for the inferiority of the

present to the previous generations in regard to teeth, Mr. Carter emphatically remarks that he had examined the teeth of men in nearly all conditions of civilization and barbarism, and that the outcome of his observations amounted to this, namely that wherever the people are not vaccinated their teeth are sound. but wherever the practice of vaccination has been introduced the teeth of the people deteriorate, just in proportion as the population comes under the influence of vaccine. Space will not permit me to do more than hint at the thoroughness of his enquiries. Throughout the length and breadth of the Indian peninsula he found no people suffering from dental decay except those who had been vaccinated. In Ceylon, while the natives had good teeth, the young people of European parentage who had been vaccinated, were suffering dreadfully. Much the same also in Burmah and Australia, and among the Malays and Chinese in Java and the Straits Settlements. He asks, fairly enough, that since vaccination is, in all parts of the world, accompanied by rottenness of the teeth, is it unreasonable to conclude that it is in some way the cause of that rottenness? He says it must be remembered that a child's health is affected by vaccination just when the germs of the permanent teeth are undergoing their earliest formation, and he adds that it is a fact well known to physiologists that any severe constitutional derangement in early childhood leaves an indelible mark upon the teeth. J. H.

April 2.

Were it indeed necessary to sacrifice beauty rather than put our neighbour's life in danger, or even put him in prison without a just and righteous reason therefor, I dare say there are even now many ladies who would prefer Christian principle to outward attractiveness. But the Almighty has not so constituted the universe that physical beauty can be advanced by moral evil. In this case we shall find much more truth in the vulgar proverb "handsome is that handsome does," than at first sight might appear. Purity of mind, serenity of disposition, righteousness and temperance are eminently calculated to improve the appearance of their possessors; and may we not expect still more from cleanliness, which is next to godliness, especially when it is interpreted so as to mean the exclusion of all impurity from the food we eat, the water we drink, the air we inhale, and the blood which circulates within our bodies? The blood is the life of the flesh; and we have no right to pollute it. If we do so against the dictates of reason—the tenor of revelation—the teachings of experience, and the voice of our own conscience, who shall say that we are guiltless? It is not boasting too much to assert that women are influential enough to abolish this fetish if they

would only speak out. It will never stamp out small-pox or anything else, as it has not itself a "leg to stand upon."

In addition to the many contradictory utterances of the most distinguished advocates of vaccination, collected by Mr. Alfred Milnes, F.S.S., I beg to call attention to the controversy lately carried on in the pages of the *Lancet* between Dr. Samuel Wilks of Guy's Hospital and Professor Cruikshank of King's College, as to the existence or non-existence of any such disease as vaccinia or true cow-pox; and the recent statement of Dr. DUJARDIN-BEAUMETZ of Paris, as to the change of opinion on the continent with regard to the use of so-called "lymph" of variolous origin, which I now submit for your examination.

Dr. Dujardin Beaumetz, of Paris, Member of the Academy of Medicine, in a recent lecture says: "Jenner, as you see, attributed to horse-pox the origin of vaccine. This view seems to-day to be abandoned, and if we may trust to the experiments made by the Lyonesse Commission, under the direction of Chauveau, vaccine is really cow-pox, and not horse-pox. There is a still more plausible view, namely that cow-pox and horse-pox is in reality only the small-pox of the animal. Unfortunately this is not the case. Despite the experiments made by Sunderland, in 1831, who covered the teats of cows with small-pox scabs; despite the researches of Theile in Russia, who inoculated small-pox in the cow, then took lymph from the eruption to transmit the disease back to man; despite the labours of Cely and Leonard Vogt of Hamburg, this question appears to be settled in a manner distinctly contrary to our previsions, and constantly small-pox gives small-pox, and vaccine vaccine. It seems, then, to be decided that these two diseases are clearly separated the one from the other. All these processes seem to be abandoned; and the *medical profession* has returned to the point from which it started, namely, to the employ of the Jennerian vaccine. If we add that, by reverting to the cow for our supply of lymph we avoid one of the dangers of vaccine, to wit, the inoculation of syphilis, you understand why animal vaccine has become so popular, and we may say to-day that in all the countries of Europe this kind of vaccine is generally preferred, and in Germany it is universally resorted to." The Doctor further states that in the case of heifer-

vaccination, lymph must not be taken from the vesicles after the sixth day, or in human subjects after the seventh, as the vesicles become purulent and the exudation loses its active properties." 'Twere well, indeed, if it did ; as thereby many lives might have been saved.

Having now proved that the practice of what is erroneously called " Vaccination " is invariably useless as regards protection from small-pox, and sometimes dangerous to life, and is moreover opposed to the wishes of a large and intelligent section of the community, I now submit that it ought never to have been introduced, and cannot long continue to be compulsory.

Compulsory Vaccination may truly be said to be founded on vanity, and kept alive by covetousness.

It is the degradation of science, an offence against liberty, a scandal to the law, a disgrace to christianity, a disturbing force in society, and an insult to the intelligence of the age ! Away with the sham at once ; lest an indignant people turn round and demand that all persons presuming to infect their neighbours with any animal poison whatsoever,* should be put on their trial and punished for this serious misdemeanour.

* VACCINATION AGAINST YELLOW FEVER.—The researches which have during the past two years been made by Dr. Domingos Freire have now reached a new point of departure. This investigator has prepared an attenuated virus with which he proposes to vaccinate individuals, with a view to rendering them proof against the occurrence of yellow fever. The Emperor of Brazil, having regard to the alleged innocuousness of the prepared virus, has authorised the practice of vaccination. Dr. Freire has accordingly vaccinated five hundred individuals. Three captains and all the crews of English vessels have been vaccinated with a view of escaping the infection from yellow fever, which prevails at Rio Janeiro. M. Bouley, who gave the facts to the Académie de Médecine, whilst implicitly believing the above-narrated facts, does not yet implicitly accept the views of Dr. Freire on the micrococcus xanthogenicus.—*Lancet*, Nov. 29, 1884.



PART II.

QUACKERY BY ACT OF PARLIAMENT.

[A paper read by Edward Haughton, M.D., at the Monthly Conference of the London Society for the Abolition of Compulsory Vaccination, December 8th, 1884.]

A good many years ago, when an endeavour was made in the House of Commons to obtain some mitigation of the penalties of the Vaccination Act, the late Mr. Andrew Leighton, of Liverpool, met, on the steps of the House, going down into Westminster Hall, the Member for Liverpool, the late Mr. S. R. Graves, a relative of my own, who, I regret to say, voted against any mitigation of the aforesaid penalties. He was suffering in the flesh from re-vaccination, and had his arm supported by a sling. Glancing at his arm, Mr. Leighton smiled and said, "You seem to have something wrong with your arm, Mr. Graves." In reply, Mr. Graves simply said, "You gentlemen who oppose vaccination assume great responsibility." His idea evidently was that no responsibility of a similar kind attached to those who used whatever influence they possessed to support an unconstitutional enactment which has since been proved to have been attended with a terrible increase of inoculable diseases. Alas! it is easy to follow a multitude to do evil; and what is worst is, that under such circumstances the sense of individual responsibility is liable to be weakened, perverted, or even annihilated. It is now too late to answer a troublesome anti-vaccinator after the fashion adopted by Mr. Graves. For him there was the excuse that almost the whole medical profession then believed vaccination to be both harmless and beneficial. But he must be a bold partisan who would now come forward and make such an assertion, in the present state of medical knowledge. The fact is, there can hardly be found a medical man who is so ignorant as to make so unqualified a statement. In every civilised community we have made good our standing-ground; and that which, not very long ago, could hardly be whispered into the ear in closets may now be proclaimed from the house-tops.

But we are not sufficiently thankful for small mercies. We have some points of sympathy with the sailor who was

getting fifty lashes at the hands of the boatswain, and who was "dissatisfied" whether they were given to him "high" or "low." We are not even content with getting off fines and penalties, and begin to growl ominously about disestablishment of the vaccination interest, and prohibition of all kinds of inoculation with septic animal poisons, especially when the victims are helpless infants or children who have no knowledge of the mischief which foul matter is capable of inflicting on the human body. "Oh, but," say the advocates of compulsion, "we don't compel you to use foul matter. We are very particular that you shall only be compelled to use the purest lymph in vaccination." I have gone into this matter before, in an article in *Modern Thought*, June, 1881, not being able to find a medical publisher willing to accept an unorthodox article on the subject. I shall, therefore, simply refer you to the sources from which vaccinators profess to obtain the "pure lymph" which they are so particular about. First, we have the disease called "vaccinia" in the cow, which, when occurring spontaneously, Jenner declared to be "non-protective" against small-pox, and which produced, when inoculated on the human subject, a sore very hard to distinguish from that produced by a similar inoculation of the matter of rhinderpest, or cattle plague—*vide* Mr. Hancock's case, reported by the late Mr. Ceely, of Aylesbury. Yet, although no general assent amongst vaccination authorities can be obtained in proof of the genuineness of such cases occurring in modern times, the matter obtained therefrom is freely used and circulated, even by those acting under Government authority, as pure vaccine lymph.

When we consider, moreover, that such cases are accounted for by sanitarians as arising directly from the dirty condition of the byres in which cows are kept, we have reason to doubt the purity of the lymph which can be procured from such a source. If, on the other hand, we regard such cases from a pathological point of view, we are confronted by the singular circumstance that this is the only blood disease, properly so called, represented as peculiar to one sex only. It is, forsooth, the "*cow-pox*," but not the "*bull-pox*." Future generations may, perhaps, regard it as a joke that such a palpably impossible freak in natural history should have been believed in by any

scientific society. True, we hear also of the new "calf-pox," but here, again, we find an animal which only has the disease when it is artificially conferred upon him.

This brings us to the second variety of pure vaccine lymph—namely, that in which small-pox itself is the acknowledged source of the virus; and which only differs from the original disease by the alteration in its character, which is assumed to be brought about by the dilution of the poison through being passed into the system of the animal selected, as an ass, pig, cow, calf, or any of the mammalia. Is it reasonable to predicate the same results from the use of two or more different substances; or to claim as genuine fruits of a particular method that which appears to arise from the employment of entirely different agencies? On the one hand, we have an enactment which positively forbids, under heavy penalties, the employment of "variola" matter in any form or in any amount; and, on the other hand, we have the more recent Acts, which magistrates say they must enforce, without reference even to their true meaning. These Acts are interpreted so as to require parents to submit their offspring to inoculation with matter openly confessed to be "variola" as regards its source, and which can be proved to be variola by its experimental effects.

We now come to the third variety of this interesting substance—namely, the original horse-pox or "horse grease," which Jenner declared to be the true and genuine life-preserving fluid, protective against the contagion of small-pox. Notwithstanding the antiquity of this kind of lymph, it is now the least fashionable of the three, though it has some living advocates, of whom I may mention Dr. Hands, of Hammersmith, formerly pupil of Jenner, and Dr. Pietra Santa, of Paris, Editor of the *Journal d'Hygiene*. The idea of horse-grease—a scrofulous disease—was too suggestive of an increase of tuberculous maladies in the human subject; and so it became necessary to throw Jenner himself overboard. They cannot say now that "there is but one vaccine-lymph, and that Jenner is its prophet."

In America they know how to make a commercial article of a new and improved variety, to be obtained only at the establishment of the late Dr. Martin, who, when

called upon to bless our new small-pox lymph, at a meeting of the British Medical Association, characterised it as "an abomination which might give the people actual small-pox." The same was the opinion of Dr. Wyld, who some years ago took a great deal of trouble to obtain from the Continent a supply of lymph, and who publicly contradicted me when I expressed doubts as to the pedigrees of any of the stocks now in use. The only answer I wish to make to Dr. Wyld is the retort courteous. I have never doubted his sincerity; and if it were possible for me to believe in any virus as wholesome and good, I would be as favourably inclined to his as to any other. But knowing human nature to be what it is, and that innumerable sources of fallacy beset those who wish to stand guarantors for matter which has passed through many generations before being offered to the British public, I cannot accept even his authority for the purity of any "vaccine lymph," whatever may be the confidence with which he vouches for its excellence. It is not to honest enthusiasts that I refer when I use the term "quackery" in the title of this essay.

If we are told that but few cases are entered as "deaths from vaccination," we say that it appears wonderful that any can be found so entered, when we see the efforts everywhere made to suppress the truth. Members of Parliament ought to know that every such case reported represents a hundred hushed-up; and, if they refuse to pay attention to the cry of the people against the poisoning of the blood of their children, either with modified small-pox, horse-grease, or any other kind of noxious matter, stronger measures must be taken to bring them to their senses. The fact is, anti-vaccinators have contented themselves too long with begging for mercy when they should have shown their teeth. They should make it very hot at election times for all candidates for Parliament who make war against the health of the people. In due time they will be able to disestablish the blood-poisoners; and even to forbid the cultivation of Pasteur's germs of hydrophobia and yellow-fever within the bodies of sensitive living creatures.

Is, therefore, every medical man who uses any of the "pure vaccine lymphs" a quack? By no means. If I

were ever so sure of the infallibility of my own judgment, I should still like to spare the sinner whilst I scourged the sin. But I confess that my sympathy is not with the sentimental grievance implied in the condemning of a man's medical creed. It is rather on the side of the helpless poor, who are practically obliged by a cruel law to take that which no medical man would use in his own family—namely, any unguaranteed sample of humanised virus that is offered for inoculating their children, whose source is often unknown to the operator. Such virus is admitted to be liable to serious and frequent contamination; and I do not hesitate to say that the people are justified in resisting its use. My assertion is, that the Act of Parliament is in itself “quackish.” Now what is quackery? It implies not only error but deception; and it broadly hints that pecuniary emolument furnishes the motive for that deception.

There have been men who have lowered the general death-rate of important districts by the sanitary measures which their influence and advocacy have brought to pass; yet no special honours have been conferred on these heroes of humanity. But when Pasteur (who poses as a medical genius, without having ever studied medicine) proposes to add a dozen new diseases to “the thousand natural shocks that flesh is heir to,” he is received with frantic enthusiasm, and every little “pitiful whipster” in Europe is imitating his cruelties upon animals, and repeating his hitherto useless experiments.

It is not for the House of Commons to take such philosophers at their own estimate, or that of their injudicious henchmen. Inoculation with small-pox matter (undiluted) once had the sanction of all the Universities; and the Royal College of Physicians “doubted not that it was highly beneficial to mankind.” Yet it is now a penal offence. The German Imperial Commission on Vaccination have just completed their labours, and there can be no doubt as to what they say of the wearing out of the protective influence of vaccination. They say that influence cannot be counted on beyond ten years on an average, and that, therefore, at least two vaccinations during a life, ought to be practised.

What kind of sanitary legislation is that which, while

it attacks infants for being in good health, has nothing to say against a similar condition in the occupants of the Judicial Bench? Why are not members of the House of Lords examined as to the evidences of successful vaccination as well as emigrants or schoolboys? It is a pity that a measure could not be passed which would require all adults to be inoculated every ten years, so as to place the people in a thoroughly "protected" condition. Truly this would be the "last dying speech" of a very absurd superstition.

When an epidemic of small-pox has subsided, we are said to be "protected" by the revaccinations which have taken place in the last "scare." When it breaks out again it is discovered that "vaccination has been greatly neglected." When an epidemic breaks out in France, the medical scribe of a leading journal thinks it good taste to say that French doctors do not know how to vaccinate. Then it is said, almost in the same breath, that the operation is so simple that almost anyone can perform it. If there is an epidemic in London "it is from want of revaccination; but Scotland and Ireland are safe—they are well vaccinated." Then, when it breaks out in those countries, "it is all the fault of the 'unvaccinated residuum.'" Yet, nevertheless, when the unvaccinated residuum constituted ninety-nine hundredths of the population at the beginning of this century, we are gravely told that the diminution of small-pox at that period should be attributed to the introduction of vaccination. We ask for statistical proofs of the alleged mortality from small-pox during the same and previous periods; and we are told that the supposed death-rate of London is to be taken as the measure of the mortality throughout the whole of the country.

The House of Commons cannot plead ignorance of the statistical tricks which have from time to time been practised upon it. But I forbear to enter upon this part of the subject. It is evident that no manipulation of figures can set aside the fact that the death-rate of unvaccinated persons cannot be greater in proportion to the vaccinated than when the whole community was unvaccinated. Yet such is the lame and impotent conclusion of some modern compilers of hospital statistics, who thereby proclaim

themselves to be three times as unskilful in the treatment of small-pox as were their compeers of eighty years ago, though destitute of many an implement and means of art which are now at their own disposal. It is impossible, within the brief limits of this essay to give the statistical evidence which we can so easily furnish of the utter failure of vaccination; but a few figures may be permissible. We find from the death-register for England and Wales, that between the years 1838 and 1853, while vaccination was voluntary, the annual small-pox mortality varied from 2,713 to 16,268; and between the years 1854 and 1872, with vaccination largely increased under compulsion, from 1,320 to 22,907. The variations in London for the same periods respectively were from 211 to 3,817, and from 156 to 7,876. Whilst in Scotland the small-pox mortality for the years 1855 to 1864, under voluntary vaccination, was from 426 to 1,741; and for the years 1865 to 1873, under compulsion, from 15 to 2,448. According to the calculations of Mr. G. S. Gibbs, the tables of the Scotch Registrar-General also show an excess of 5,972 deaths of infants during the first nine years of compulsion over and above what would have been the mortality from all causes at the rate of the preceding ten years; the explanation appearing to lie in the fact that "during the same period of nine years, disease other than small-pox, had carried off 6,600 more infants under six months of age, and 2,079 more infants between six and twelve months old than they would have done had the proportionate mortality been the same as in the preceding ten years." Nor have the results of vaccination been at all better in France. There, according to the figures politely furnished to Mr. Gibbs by the Minister of Agriculture and Commerce, we find that in those departments where the proportion of vaccinations to births reach 50 per cent., the cases were (in proportion to 10,000 births), in 1865, 569 as compared with 222 in the less vaccinated departments, averaging 33 per cent. of the births. In 1866 the corresponding record is 400 to 130, and in 1867, 254 to 83. He adds, "Here we have clear evidence that the extension of vaccination does not necessitate a diminution of small-pox." But the most terrible figures brought forward by Mr. Gibbs were presented by him to the Committee of inquiry appointed by

the House of Commons in 1871 ; by which he showed an annual increase of the infant death-rate in England and Wales, amounting to 7,600 ; and he further showed that, according to Mr. Simon's calculation that compulsion had doubled the number of vaccinations, that this figure ought also to be doubled, in order to give the total increase of mortality. We, therefore, arrive statistically at the awful total of 15,000 infants annually destroyed by the compulsory vaccination law. Nor has the utmost ingenuity of our opponents been able to suggest any causes not formerly in operation, in order to account for this terrible mortality amongst children under five years of age.

Are we to be regarded as persons merely under the influence of a crochet, when we insist on this matter being sifted to the bottom ? We have not only the statistics of England and France to guide us, but, what is far better, the proportionate small-pox rates prevailing in the different Swiss Cantons, where the different stages of legislative intelligence may be seen working side by side. Some Cantons still enforce vaccination, others have ceased to do so ; and the result is enough to astonish and confound our adversaries. Indeed, the Swiss people have taken the lead in this matter, having already abolished compulsory vaccination in the army ; and the most influential Cantons have also abolished it for the civil population, with the full consent and advice of many eminent physicians. Let it not be said any more that medical men are inaccessible to reason on this subject. As soon as Parliament ceases to bribe them to do wrong, and liberty of speech can be obtained in the medical journals, we shall find that most astonishing change has taken place in medical opinion, and that the author of this paper will be very far from standing alone when he ventures to charge the Houses of Parliament with the following offence, to wit, that they have aided and abetted, endowed, and enforced quackery : a course of action which has for its natural results the wholesale destruction of little children, and daily increasing disrespect for, and resistance to, the law, in consequence of the misery which it has inflicted on an otherwise law-abiding and long-suffering people.

