

## SCIENCE AND SUGAR

### Dr. Wiley Appears Before House Committee

#### He Declares Cuban Appeal for Aid Is Misplaced

#### The Cause Should Be Pleaded In Europe

#### Bounties Granted There Cause Most of Trouble

Washington, Jan. 28.—Dr. H. W. Wiley, chief of the Bureau of Chemistry, Department of Agriculture, was before the Ways and Means Committee today in connection with the Cuban reciprocity question. His statement covered the scientific phases of the production of sugar. Dr. Wiley's emphatic declaration that Cuba's appeal to the United States was misplaced and would not afford relief attracted much attention. This came after he had shown that the European bounty and cartel systems were the controlling factors in the sugar situation. Dr. Wiley said:

"The cause of the trouble the Cuba planters are fighting is not in the tariff duties of the United States but in the over-production of sugar due to bounties granted by Europe. Their cause should be pleaded in the Parliaments of Europe not in that of America." At another point Dr. Wiley said it was a question whether the relief sought for Cuba would have the effect of killing outright the cane and beet sugar industries of this country, or merely paralyzing them.

#### ALL CUBA IS INTERESTED

#### Valuable Reciprocal Concessions Would Be Made to the United States

Havana, Jan. 28.—Americans who have large business interests here have organized an American club, and through it have issued an address as to the economic crisis in Cuba, which they propose to distribute widely in the United States. The address says in substance: "The industrial crisis can be relieved only by prompt action on the part of the congress in granting the tariff reductions asked for by the commission and recommended by the President. Every merchant, planter, mechanic and laborer in the island is equally interested in the question. In return for tariff concessions on Cuban products, the island will make such reductions on merchandise from the United States as to insure for its wares an exclusive market in Cuba. This would mean an increase of exports of American provisions and manufactures to this country of at least \$60,000,000 within a year. We beg that you at once telegraph or write your senators and congressmen, urging favorable action."

## ALL OPPOSED VACCINATION

### Physicians and Laymen Unite in Condemning Legal Interference—Hearing Before the Legislative Committee on Public Health

The Committee on Public Health gave a hearing this morning on the bill accompanying the petition of Rufus F. Brown and others taken from the floor of last year, for the abolition of compulsory vaccination. William Bassett opened the case for the petitioners. He said that he would put the committee in good humor by reading the remarks of Mr. Denby on Christian Science, in which the latter said that if more windows were opened and less patients, the doctors would be more successful. Mr. Bassett said he was a member of the New York and Boston stock exchanges. He looked upon vaccination as a poison intended to induce disease. It is unlike any other remedy in that it is administered to a healthy person. He quoted Dr. Charles Critchton of London, Herbert Spencer, Professor Newman, Albert Russell Wallace and Professor Edward M. Crookshank of London to the effect that vaccination was a grotesque suggestion. Mr. Bassett said the compulsory vaccination law was not critically examined when it was placed on the statutes. Many leading physicians and pathologists believed vaccination to be an injury rather than a benefit. He quoted from newspapers many recent cases of lock-jaw resulting from the injection of vaccine. He said that compulsory vaccination was obnoxious to the people and the opposition to it was growing.

Mr. Bassett called attention to the fact that in the last few years the English law has been modified by Parliament so that vaccination is no longer compulsory. He quoted the Boston Medical and Surgical Journal to the effect that a majority of the profession have never had a chance to become familiar with smallpox. He said the law does not restrict a passage of physicians who are treating smallpox patients from house to house. He said the opponents of vaccination do not seek to escape from the wholesome regulation of quarantine. All they ask is the custody of their bodies and those of their children.

In response to questions, Mr. Bassett said that he believed vaccination to have no relation to smallpox. Massachusetts has expended millions of dollars in procuring pure water, and an adequate sewerage system, and this will do more to check disease than any medicine can.

Dr. Charles A. Paige, who said that he had been a practicing physician in this city since 1884, was the next advocate of the granting of the petition. He read a letter from Martha Frederick, M. D., chairman of the Board of Health of Cleveland, O., to the effect that compulsory vaccination had been abandoned in that city on account of the very undesirable results developed. This letter also stated that for four years the Cleveland Board of Health had used vaccine and it had undermined the public health. In that time the cases of smallpox had doubled. Since that time the board had used disinfection instead and very few cases had developed in the city. Dr. Paige said that vaccination does not mitigate the disease; there have always been mild cases even where no vaccination was performed.

In response to questions, he said that he had always refused to vaccinate persons, and under no circumstances would put a vaccine point into even a stray dog. He was a graduate of the regular medical schools.

Dr. James D. Judge, an allopathic physician and a graduate of the University of Pennsylvania, said that in 1872 he had been medical adviser for a large institution in which there were 450 boys. Fifty-four cases of smallpox developed. Those vaccinated had the disease worse than those who were not vaccinated, but none of the patients died. He believed this due to his use of a preparation containing nuxomide and belladonna. He said that the advocacy of vaccination was a matter of dollars and cents with the physicians.

Dr. Caroline E. Hastings of Boston said it seemed to her that this was a matter which should be referred to the Judiciary Committee, for it was a question of the legal right which the individual has to protect his body from the assaults of anyone, whether under the authority of the State or not. It is a question of individual right, but if it can be shown that vaccination protects the public, then the individual should give way. But she insisted that it cannot be shown that vaccination protects from smallpox. Dr. Hastings quoted from the report of Chief Surgeon General Lippencott of the United States Army that on April 1, 1899, less than eleven months after the army in the Philippines had been all carefully vaccinated and revaccinated, there were among the soldiers 236 cases of smallpox and seventy-seven deaths. Soon after that twenty-three other deaths were reported, making 300 in all. In his report

General Lippencott says: "I believe I can say that no army was ever so carefully looked after in the matter of vaccination as ours. Vaccination and revaccination went on as systematically as the drills of a well regulated post." And yet the result, after all this vaccination and revaccination, was that one hundred soldiers died of smallpox. "I don't believe in forbidding vaccination by law any more than I believe in compulsory vaccination," said Dr. Hastings. "If people want to put poisons into their bodies let them do so, if they think it is harmless." Dr. Hastings said that on the financial side of the question a conversation between two physicians in a Boston street car was instructive. One doctor said to the other, "I don't like vaccination. I don't believe in the use of virus. I hate the stuff, but there is a good deal in it for us." The reply was, "Yes, so there is; I have paid off the mortgage on my house by it."

Dr. W. B. Sanders said in part: "We ask you to protect our babies, who cannot protect themselves. Protect the coming generation from the poison which is being put into their bodies. We can stand vaccination, per se; that is our business. But it is our duty to protect those who cannot protect themselves. The Boston Board of Health has published false and misleading reports, and by doing so has spread an epidemic. It is responsible for the smallpox scare that passed over the city. There is no certainty about the utility of vaccination, and in all cases of uncertainty the children should have the benefit of the doubt. Medicine itself may be truthfully said to be the greatest farce, with the exception of theology, on the face of the earth. It is wrong that we should be compelled by law to uphold and support this delusion for the benefit of a medical trust and that it may profit. It is your duty to consider the babies of the coming generation. It is only when a thing is distrusted and becomes so damnable that no one believes in it that a law is necessary to force it down the throats of the people. The body should be as well protected from assault as the house which is our castle."

Asked by a member of the committee if smallpox is not contagious, Dr. Sanders said it was contaminating, but not contagious.

John K. Hastings said that he did not believe in a law that says how the body of a person shall be treated and by whom it shall be treated.

George W. Allen told of experiences he had had with vaccination and of cases that had come under his observation as a traveling man.

J. M. Green told of the uncertainty that exists in medical science as shown by the history of a practice which a few years ago had a patient till he was almost dead, poisoned him by the use of calomel and mercury, and denied him water when he was burning up with fever.

Dr. Pfeiffer told of his experiences with Dr. Durgin of the Board of Health in regard to visiting the pest house to prove that an unvaccinated person is in no danger from smallpox if proper precautions are taken.

Representative Foster of Somerville declared that his children had been kept out of the public schools of Somerville because they were not vaccinated and in defiance of the certificates they had received from a physician in accordance with law; and how the certificates were subsequently destroyed by the school authorities. He described the spread of smallpox through inoculation, which at the behest of doctors had been made compulsory, and which was only checked by a law making it a crime. He said the day was not far distant when the vaccinationists would see their error as the inoculationists had. "If I don't care to take the risk of vaccination," said Mr. Foster in conclusion, "you have no right to compel me to take it."

Mrs. Louie of Rockland said that the testimony of doctors should not be given more weight than that of laymen in a hearing of this kind, for the courts have found that in all cases where medical experts appear, just as much testimony can be had from one side as from the other; so they believe neither. "Is it right," she asked, "that the liberty of a person should be so far denied that his body can be seized and poison injected into it against his will?"

J. W. Sparrow, who was converted to anti-vaccination of the day he was to be vaccinated, made an impassioned appeal for the protection of the right of the individual to judge for himself in a case where there is such a diversity of views among the doctors themselves. "We only ask you to do what has been done by the legislatures of New York and other States, by the British Parliament and in the British army, on the judgment of the highest medical authorities."

R. Adams Green, the last speaker, said that the best kind of preventative of disease is a clean life and pure blood, and the only way to have clean blood is to lead a clean life. This is better than any vaccination.

This closed the case of the petitioners. The remonstrants will be heard on Friday morning next at 10.30 o'clock.

## QUESTION OF UNION BUTTONS

### Driver Frank Riley Explains the Differences, but Says They Are All of the Same General Type—Teamsters' Strike Court Case Drags Along

As the interest in the teamsters' strike, from the view point of the spectators on the street, is beginning to wane, so there seems to be a falling off in the attention of those who habituate the court house during the progress of a more or less interesting case. When Judge Bragley took his place on the bench at 2.20 o'clock this afternoon to continue the hearing on the petition for a permanent injunction brought by the Brine Transportation Company, there were not more than forty people in the room, exclusive of counsel, court officials and newspaper men.

Frank Riley of South Boston, who testified yesterday, was again on the stand. He is still suffering from the injured knee, which was struck by a brick during a riot on Dorchester avenue. He has not been able to work since. He said he expected to go to work again when he recovered if he could. He told of his dealings with the Team Drivers' Union, and that Mr. Wallace had said that they could not give him financial assistance. His case was referred to the trustees. He had once been a member of the union before going to work for the Brine Company. He had had a badge, and knew the badge when he saw it; also he would be able to identify members of the union.

Mr. Matthews, in cross-examination, was particular in trying to bring out the facts in connection with the assault on Riley, and the latter admitted that he did not see the men who threw the missiles, and therefore could not tell whether they were union buttons or not. He identified a union button, and said that there were two styles used by local 25, varying slightly. Buttons worn by other unions differed slightly, although they were all on the same general type. He thought he could distinguish between them at some distance. A moment later he thought he would not be able to distinguish between them. Mr. Matthews asked regarding several other union buttons, and finally brought out the fact that all the union men wore buttons of a similar nature and that there were a great many of these buttons worn in Boston. Riley produced a button that he had worn when he was a member of the union, and admitted that it was very much like the one on exhibition in court.

#### Stole from Harvard Students

Three boys were arraigned before Judge Abrey in the Third District Court, Cambridge, today on the charge of stealing from Harvard students. Two of them were convicted, and sent to the Lyman School. They are Frank Higgins and Rupert E. Banks. The third, Ambrose J. Arthur, was placed on probation. It was charged against the boys that they entered various dormitories and stole many articles, including jewelry.