





Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2015

<https://archive.org/details/b22273542>

3/2

19

S

SPEECHES

OF

MR. P. A. TAYLOR

AND

MR. C. H. HOPWOOD

ON VACCINATION.

*IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS, JUNE 19th, 1883.*

---

Revised from the Reporter's Notes.

---

LONDON :

E. W. ALLEN, 4, AVE MARIA LANE, E.C.

AND WM. YOUNG, 114, VICTORIA STREET, WESTMINSTER, S.W.

1883.

PRICE SIXPENCE.

# THE LONDON SOCIETY FOR THE ABOLITION OF COMPULSORY VACCINATION,

114, VICTORIA STREET, WESTMINSTER, S.W.

*Objects of the Society:—*

I.—THE ABOLITION OF COMPULSORY VACCINATION.

II.—THE DIFFUSION OF KNOWLEDGE CONCERNING VACCINATION.

III.—THE MAINTENANCE IN LONDON OF AN OFFICE FOR THE PUBLICATION OF LITERATURE RELATING TO VACCINATION, AND AS A CENTRE OF ACTION AND INFORMATION.

The minimum Annual Subscription constituting Members 2s. 6d. Every opponent of Compulsory Vaccination in the United Kingdom is earnestly invited to join and co-operate with the Society.

*President*—P. A. TAYLOR, Esq., M.P., 22, Ashley-place, S.W.

*Vice-presidents.*

R. P. BLENNERHASSET, Esq., M.P., 52, Hans-place, S.W.

THOMAS BURT, Esq., M.P., 17, Royal-avenue, Chelsea, S.W.

The COUNTESS DE NOAILLES.  
LORD CLIFTON, Cobham Hall, Gravesend.  
Sir JERVOISE CLARKE JERVOISE, Bart.,  
Idsworth, Hordean, Hants.  
Sir GEORGE PENROSE, Cork.  
COUNT ALFRED OF HOMPESCH, Rurich  
Castle, Rhenish Prussia.  
WILLIAM ADAIR, Maryport.  
JOSEPH ARCH, Barford, Leamington.  
Rev. WM. ALEX. AYTON, Chacombe Vicarage,  
Banbury.  
THOMAS BAKER, Kingscote, Wokingham.  
GEORGE C. BEALE, Glounthaune, Co. Cork.  
Mrs. JOSEPHINE BUTLER, The Close, Win-  
chester.  
W. J. COLLINS, M.D., L.R.C.P., Albert-  
terrace, Regent's-park.  
W. J. COLLINS, M.D., B.S., B.Sc. (Lond.), St.  
Bartholomew's Hospital.  
HENRY STRICKLAND CONSTABLE, ! Was-  
sand, Hull.  
MONCURE D. CONWAY, M.A., Bedford-park,  
Chiswick.  
JOHN DAVIE, Dunfermline.  
FRANCIS DAVIS, Junr., Enniscorthy, Wexford.  
H. D. DUDGEON, Quorn, Loughborough.  
Mrs. E. C. W. ELMY, The Low, Congleton,  
Cheshire.  
W. F. FOX, Dewsbury.  
GEORGE S. GIBBS, F.S.S., Derry Lodge, Dar-  
lington.  
JAMES GREIG, 6, Granby Terrace, Hillhead,  
Glasgow.  
SPENCER T. HALL, M.A., Lytham, Lanca-  
shire.  
RICHARD HODGSON, St. John's College,  
Cambridge.

GEORGE HOGGAN, M.B., C.M., 7, Trevor-  
terrace, Knightsbridge.  
Mrs. E. F. HOGGAN, M.D., 7, Trevor-terrace,  
Knightsbridge.  
J. HOMAN, 4, Regent's Park-road, London.  
Emeritus Professor JOHN KIRK, D.D., Edin-  
burgh.  
Rev. JOHN E. B. MAYOR, M.A., Fellow of  
St. John's Coll. and Professor of Latin in  
the University of Cambridge.  
R. ALSOP MILNER, Keighley.  
ALFRED MILNES, M.A. Lond., F.S.S., 59,  
Almerie-road, Wandsworth.  
H. N. MOZLEY, M.A., Barrister-at-Law, 22,  
Chancery-lane, London.  
Emeritus Professor FRANCIS WM. NEWMAN,  
Weston-super-Mare.  
HENRY PITMAN, John Dalton-street, Man-  
chester.  
ISAAC PITMAN, Phonetic Institute, Bath.  
H. PORT, Broad-street-corner, Birmingham.  
Rev. JOHN FAULKNER POTTS, B.A., 5, Eildon  
Villas, Mount Florida, Glasgow.  
EDMUND PROCTOR, Blythwood, Newcastle-  
on-Tyne.  
ROWLAND REES, J.P., 5, Esplanade, Dover.  
Chairman of the Board of Guardians, Dover  
Union.  
G. B. SKIPWORTH, Moortown House, Caistor.  
GEORGE TATHAM, J.P., Mayor of Leeds.  
Mrs. WALLACE, Oxford Mansions, Oxford-  
street, London.  
ALEXANDER WHEELER, Blackwellgate, Dar-  
lington.  
J. J. GARTH WILKINSON, M.R.C.S., 76,  
Wimpole-street, Portman-square, London.

HOWARD WILLIAMS, Harrow-road, London, W.

*Executive Committee.*

CHAIRMAN.—WILLIAM TEBB, 7, Albert-road, Regent's-park, N.W.

W. L. BEURLE.  
CORNELIUS PEARSON.  
COL. J. M. EARLE.

GEORGE TOMPSITT.  
WILLIAM WHITE.

*Hon. Treasurer.*

CORNELIUS PEARSON, 15, Harpur-street, Red Lion-square, W.C.

*Bankers.*

THE LONDON AND COUNTY BANK (Westminster Branch), S.W.

*Auditor.*

ANDREW GLENDINNING, 34, London-wall, E.C.

*Parliamentary and Travelling Agent.*

J. GRAHAM SPENCER, 114, Victoria-street, S.W.

*Secretary.*

WILLIAM YOUNG, 114, Victoria-street, Westminster, S.W.

## COMPULSORY VACCINATION.

---

At the Evening Sitting of the House of Commons, on Tuesday, June 19th, 1883—

MR. P. A. TAYLOR called attention to the subject of the laws relating to Compulsory Vaccination. The hon. member said: Mr. Speaker—I think it is likely that there are many hon. members who regard the question that I am about to bring before the House as a somewhat unimportant one, and who look upon me as having no right to take up a portion of the time of the House for its consideration in a Session that stands marked by the great block in its business and the great difficulty of progression. I hope to be able to convince many that this is an erroneous view; at any rate, I hold a very different opinion. In my opinion hardly a more important question could possibly come before the House of Commons than that upon which I have now to ask their attention. Whether we regard the question as a question of individual right against medical tyranny, or whether we regard it as a question of national health—because now it can no longer be denied that there is the possibility of the accumulated corruptions of our ancestors being transmitted to the coming generation—or whether I point to the view of the extreme suffering and wrong under which individual protestors against this law are now suffering, I think these are ample grounds for asserting the importance of the question. And in this view of the question, I am supported by the statesmen of the last generation as well as by some of the present time. George Canning and Sir Robert Peel declared, forty, or fifty, or sixty years ago, in almost identical words, that whatever might be their opinion of the value of vaccination, nothing

should induce them to make it compulsory, being a thing so entirely contrary to the spirit of British liberty and of individual freedom. Our own Premier, too, gave utterance to these words :

“ I regard compulsory and penal provisions such as those of the Vaccination Acts with mistrust and misgiving, and were I engaged on an inquiry, I should require very clear proof of their necessity before giving them my approval.”

It is quite clear, therefore, from the statements of these statesmen, that the question is one of very considerable national importance, and if I could convince the right hon. gentleman, the Premier—I am sorry I have not the honour of seeing him here at this moment—(Mr. Warton: Hear, hear)—if I could impress upon him the amount of persecution going on throughout the country in consequence of the infliction of these laws, if I could point out to him the number of persons who are suffering under fines and imprisonment for conscience sake, and if I could bring before his mind the hundreds and thousands of children who are suffering disease and death as a consequence of this system, I think I should have grounds for inducing him to make that inquiry of which he spoke in the words I have just quoted. I might point to another matter, although it is an entirely inferior one, and that is the lawless spirit of evasion which is quite sure to spring up in a community where wrong and tyranny are inflicted. I can tell him of fathers who neglect to register the births of their children in order to attempt to escape the infliction of this law. I can tell him where parents flit about from one part of the country to another in order, if possible, to avoid the surgeons and the police. The late President of the Local Government Board (Mr. Dodson), when appealed to by my hon. friend the member for Stockport (Mr. Hopwood), as to whether in cases where children had died from the infliction of vaccination there would not be a just appeal to the magistrates for mercy and consideration, said, with commendable kindness “that although it would not “of course alter the law, he hoped that in such cases such a “plea would be regarded with respect and consideration.” That, of course, was very kind of him, but in what an anomalous position does it place us. There have actually been cases where

magistrates have asked a father objecting to vaccination whether he has lost any of his children through it, because otherwise they could not entertain his objection. This may indeed be said to be out-Heroding Herod, and cutting off the first-born to save the lives of the remainder. (Hear, hear.) Whatever answer the House of Commons may give to my appeal to-night—and I am quite uncertain as to what it may be—of one thing I feel sure, both from my own experience and from what I have heard from many others, and that is, that the amount of support I shall get to-night will bear a very close ratio to the number of members who have thought it worth while to study this question for themselves. That has been my experience. I sat on the Select Committee of 1871 upon these laws, and I entered that committee with that traditionary conviction that ninety-nine men out of a hundred still have, that vaccination was a matter of course, and that nothing could be said against it. I signed that report which defended the excellence of vaccination and its safety. I did not, however, support the right of compulsion, and I submitted a clause to the committee which would have removed the difficulties of the case. I suggested that anybody should be free from the necessity of vaccinating his family who would sign a declaration that he had a conscientious objection to it, and in answer to a suggestion that there were many who had no real objection to it, and only neglected it from apathy, I replied, that a small fine in the form of a stamp should be appended to the declaration. Had that been done, the subsequent difficulties that have arisen would never have occurred. But the House will see that having committed myself to sign that report, it became a matter of conscience with me. I had done my little best to endorse and to maintain the opinion of the excellence of vaccination. I was led by my political objection to compulsion to look more and more into the medical and scientific side of the question, and I was at length brought to the conclusion, to my great surprise, that not only was there some evidence against vaccination, but that there was nothing whatever to be said in its favour—that it was an absolute delusion, a positive superstition, an unscientific error to begin with—and an utter failure from the very first. It became, therefore, my clear duty to

devote myself to the solution of this question, and to atone for the mistake into which I had, through ignorance fallen, by proclaiming the truth where I had endorsed the error, nor will I cease my humble exertions until this law is removed from the Statute Book. Now, I have questioned many people since I came to that conclusion, both medical and lay, and I can say I have not found one man who really took the trouble to examine this question for himself who came out of the consideration with the same fullness of conviction with which he entered it. Now, I should like, if the House will allow me, to bring in evidence in support of this allegation the opinions of some persons whose position renders those opinions of infinitely greater importance than my own. (Mr. Warton : Oh, no—(laughter). I acknowledge the kindness of the hon. member for Bridport, but I must not stop to listen to his flattery (laughter and cheers). Dr. G. F. Kolb, a distinguished German, Member Extraordinary of the Royal Statistical Commission of Bavaria, says :

“From childhood I had been trained to look upon the cowpox as an absolute and unqualified protective. I had from my earliest remembrance believed in it more strongly than in any clerical tenet or ecclesiastical dogma. Open and acknowledged failures did not shake my faith. I attributed them either to the carelessness of the operator, or the badness of the lymph. In the course of time the question of vaccine compulsion came before the Reichstag, when a medical friend of mine supplied me with a mass of pro-vaccination statistics, in his opinion conclusive and unanswerable. This awoke the statistician within me. On inspection I found the figures were delusive, and a close examination left no shadow of doubt in my mind that the so-called statistical array of proof was a complete failure.”

Dr. Vogt, Professor of Hygiene and Sanitary Statistics in Berne, and probably the largest collector of statistical information in the world, entered into an examination of the figures, firmly believing that he would confirm his conviction of the value of vaccination; he registered and abstracted the particulars of the deaths of 400,000 cases of smallpox, but was compelled finally to admit that his belief in vaccination was absolutely destroyed. Here is the case of a German physician going into the question for the express purpose of defending vaccination. We are told that Dr. Böing, a distinguished German physician, stung by the assaults of the anti-



vaccinationists, set himself to prove its value, and has to present, with unfeigned grief, the reverse.

“No one,” he candidly states, “can lament more than I do that the results of investigation should fall out in disfavour of compulsory vaccination. It is certainly not pleasant to be obliged to change one’s convictions on so important a subject, and it is the more painful because it involves the relinquishment of a legislative measure, by means of which we believed ourselves able to cope with one of the most fearful scourges of human society.” (Hear, hear.)

Now, Sir, this question naturally divides itself into two portions—vaccination and compulsion. It is quite possible to conceive that vaccination might be good, and compulsion unjustifiable. At the same time if I can prove that vaccination is an evil I shall of course weaken the basis of compulsion. I will address myself, with the leave of the House, for a short time to the question purely of compulsion. I think that even were vaccination to provide all the benefits that its defenders maintain, the grounds against compulsion are amply sufficient to justify its abolition. I object, then, to compulsion in the first place, because it is the most absolute invasion of the sacred right of the parent, of the right of individual liberty, at the bidding of medical supervision, that this country knows. There is, in my opinion, no law upon the Statute Book, not obsolete, of so tyrannous and crushing a nature as that which compels vaccination. Let the House look for one moment to what extremities such a law leads. It amounts to the State declaring that families shall not choose their own medical men. There are plenty of medical men now who are opposed to vaccination, and yet if such a man enters a family and gives his advice against vaccination, the State declares that the parent shall not have the right of taking such advice. A physician, distinguished not only in this country but abroad—Dr. Wilkinson—was the medical adviser of a man whose child was ordered to be vaccinated. The doctor remonstrated, and said, “apart from any question of my belief in vaccination, the child is not fit to be vaccinated. It is suffering from a severe skin disease, and in my opinion, no decent doctor would venture to have it vaccinated.” But the vaccination officer and the magistrate at Westminster laughed at the opinion of

Dr. Wilkinson, because they found he was vice-president of the Society for the Abolition of Compulsory Vaccination. It did not much matter in this case, because the man was able to pay the fine; but in the case of a poor man, the declaration of the magistrate would have sufficed to condemn the child, perhaps to death. Secondly, I object to compulsion, quite irrespective of its alleged usefulness, because, *ex hypothesi*—on the very ground on which it is defended—it is proved to be not needful. No one will say that the State has a right to interfere with the medical treatment of particular children for the sake of their own health. The only plausible ground for intervention is the safety of the community. It is said that an unvaccinated child is a source of danger to the public. How can it be so when all the community are protected by vaccination? Everybody can be protected who desires to be, and when, therefore, you call this unvaccinated child a centre of danger and disease to the whole community—the whole protected community—I say that it is an insult to the common sense of Englishmen. Again, I object to compulsion—indeed I should object to it if I believed in vaccination—because, under any circumstances, it must be highly impolitic, because the enforcement of a particular medical system, even if it were the best ever invented, would be sure to create many opponents. Those who really believe in vaccination, who believe in pure lymph, in good administration, in careful operation, and so forth—it is their business to bring to the homes of the poor all these things freely, and not to make them antagonistic to their favourite system by a compulsion which under no circumstances can be justifiable.

Further, I object to compulsion as a flagrant illustration of class legislation. It is a flagrant case of oppression of the poor. The wealthy and those well to do don't suffer from these laws. At the worst they have to pay a fine, which is nothing to them, and in nine cases out of ten, or in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, the courtly medical man does not trouble his client with more than a simple remonstrance. That is not the case with the poor. They cannot afford to pay the fine. They are sent to prison. If I could compress into a few sentences the matter contained in the numberless letters I have received in remonstrance and

complaint and indignation, some of them accompanied with the hideous photographs of their mutilated infants dying from the infliction, I think I should have the most powerful argument I could produce. Take the case of the poorest of the poor—the inmates of our workhouses. There the surgeon and policeman carry on their campaign unchecked. There are operated upon by the score and the hundred new-born infants, and mothers immediately after their confinement. A witness at an inquest the other day said he had vaccinated 1,500 women in that condition; it was said that they did not object. They did not object! No; the order is made to a woman probably only half-conscious of what is going on around her, “Strip your arm,” and the operation is performed upon a patient who is declared to have given her consent. Does it not make one’s blood boil merely to hear of such doings in a civilized country? May I ask what hon. members of this house would say if their wives were to be ordered to be vaccinated on the day of, or the day after their confinement?

We often hear it said that these abstract assertions about individual liberty must not be allowed to stand in the way of saving the thousands of lives who would otherwise perish of this terrible disease; but it is a curious and well recognized fact, that the mortality caused by smallpox cannot be regarded as an addition to the average mortality of the community, seeing that the years when most perish under smallpox epidemic are not the years of largest general mortality. The reason is obvious; one zymotic disease succeeds another, and the most deadly of them is not smallpox. Dr. Farr, in his letter to the Registrar-General on the causes of death in England, well expressed this idea in these words:

“To operate on mortality, protection against *every one of the fatal zymotic diseases* is required, otherwise the suppression of one disease opens the way to others.”

A wild suggestion has lately been thrown out, indeed, by M. Pasteur, proposing to inoeulate, as in the case of smallpox, the poison-matter of every zymotic disease, by way of safeguard to the health of the community, a scheme which, I need not say, would transform the country into one huge hospital. Less, perhaps, than at any other

time can the demand for compulsion be maintained now, because a wiser and truer school of medical science has arisen of late years, which preaches that doctrine which was preached by the late Lord Beaconsfield—the advantages of sanitation. There are now men such as Dr. Richardson, Dr. Alfred Carpenter, the celebrated surgeon, Mr. Lawson Tait, of Birmingham, and others, who are not adverse to vaccination, but whose opinions, I think, I do not in any degree misrepresent, when I say that they declare that vaccination never can stamp out smallpox, but that smallpox, and all other zymotic diseases, can, may, and shall be stamped out by sanitation.

It is generally asserted and believed that the opinion of the medical profession is practically unanimous in favour of compulsory vaccination, and I must say that that opinion greatly retarded my own conversion to the truth. I am quite sure that this is very far from being the case. I have sought medical opinion on this subject for many years, and I can answer for it that it is by no means unanimous. In the first place, medical men, like laymen, had for the most part not examined into the question at all. They simply had taken the tradition as they found it, and had not examined into its history or statistics. But I have found many medical men who were doubtful in their opinion, some who were antagonistic to it altogether, and I don't hesitate to say that it is at least my firm conviction that not only might compulsion go, but that vaccination might go altogether, without causing any great stir amongst the great body of the medical profession. Now, it must be remembered that medical men, I don't say more than, but as much as any other class of the community, are subject to the public opinion that surrounds them, and to the public opinion of their *confrères*, and they dare not, therefore, take a step that would be hostile to the prejudices of the day. Dr. Alfred Carpenter, explaining the other day how it was that all medical men were not teetotallers, after giving some reasons for their prejudices, their traditional opinions and their mistakes, and so on, uttered these pregnant words:—

“The medical man would do what is right *if the public made it worth his while*. All medical men cannot afford to be total abstainers, because if they were they would be tabooed and boycotted (hear, hear).”

The same thing applies here, and I have not the least doubt that many medical men are very doubtful about vaccination. I have appealed to one or two young men—medical students—and I have said, “Won’t you examine “this question? Don’t take the traditions of your predecessors.” I am sorry to say the reply has been—

“We can’t afford it. We have our livelihood to make, and we must take the course open to us. We are made to say these things, and to assert the truth of vaccination before we are allowed to pass, and to make sixty practical operations. We cannot, therefore, afford to take up your abstract theories.”

Now, I have thought it worth while to get the opinion and advice of a number of men whom I might call the medical attendants of the poor—the chemists in our large towns—and I have received a number of expressions of opinion from them entirely adverse to compulsory vaccination. I will not trouble the House with them, but I will venture to give the House one as a sample:—

“I have had many opportunities of witnessing the evil effects of vaccination, as large numbers of mothers bring their children to me for advice when suffering from vaccine inflammation, and I have seen scores of the most distressing cases, where the poor child’s arm has been one mass of scab and corruption; and in not a few cases I have known it to prove fatal. Consequently, for years I have believed the law of compulsory vaccination to be a curse and a disgrace to our nineteenth century civilization.”

But there is, I admit, one small portion of the medical profession of whose conversion I entertain no hope whatever, and that is the small body of highly paid medical gentlemen who sit behind the throne of the President of the Local Government Board, and who are more powerful on these matters than is the President of the Local Government Board himself. They are, I have not the slightest doubt, honourable and intelligent men, but they are men whose *raison d’être* is vaccination, and they can no more be expected to question its excellence than can the bench of bishops to question the Thirty-nine Articles. They are irresponsible in the advice they give, or they are only responsible to the President of the Local Government Board. My right hon. friend has probably not very deeply studied the question of vaccination. It is very

natural that he should not have done so, and if I may be permitted to say from the answers he has given in this House I should assume certainly that he had not done so (laughter) But surely it is a most unfortunate and painful position for right hon. gentlemen to be made the mouthpiece of a set of medical experts upon doctrines upon which they have and can have no valid opinion of their own.

In confirmation of this, I will venture to refer to two answers given by the right hon. gentleman a few days ago to my hon. friend the member for Stockport (Mr. Hopwood) and to myself. To my hon. friend he declared his opinion that cases of vaccinosyphilis were so infrequent as to be hardly worth notice (on this I shall have something to say presently); but in answer to a question which I put to the right hon. gentleman, namely: whether it was not a fact, as tested by the highest medical authority, that it was impossible in many cases to detect syphilitic taint in a child from whom lymph is taken, he replied that he understood the report of the committee would show that in such cases the fact of the existing taint must come under the observation of the operating surgeon. Now, if my right hon. friend had taken the trouble to ask the opinion of one distinguished member of that Board—Dr. Ballard—he would have come to a very different conclusion. Many years ago Dr. Ballard wrote an excellent essay upon vaccination which gained a prize, and Dr. Ballard said—

“There were numerous cases on record to prove that vaccine virus and syphilitic virus may be introduced at the same spot by the same puncture of the vaccinating lancet.”

It is true that since his appointment on the Medical Board, we have heard no more on the subject from Dr. Ballard, but, indeed, upon this point the evidence is overwhelming. Mr. Jonathan Hutchinson told the members of the Chirurgical Society, in April, 1871, First, that a child born of syphilitic parents may exhibit no signs of disease for months after its birth; Second, that the public vaccinator may operate on the child and use lymph taken from it without being able to detect the presence of syphilitic poison; and in October last Mr. J. Brindley James, a public vaccinator, felt it his duty to warn the British

Medical Association that any practitioner might be misled by the plump, clear-skinned and healthy appearance of a syphilitic child. Nor can the tainted character of the lymph be more easily discerned, if at all. Dr. Warlomont, the late eminent director of the Belgian Government Animal Vaccine Department, stated before the Vaccination Conference, held in London, December, 1879, that "a vaccine vesicle highly "syphilised presented an appearance perfectly irreproachable;" and there can be no doubt that it was owing to this circumstance that the French Government distinctly exculpated the military surgeon at Algiers who infected and practically ruined by vaccination fifty-eight unfortunate recruits.

But it is not only over the President of the Local Government Board that this board of experts exercises so powerful an authority. They command the press—the medical press absolutely, and to a prodigious extent the lay press also, especially in London. They send articles to the great London journals—for the source of the manufacture is unmistakable—and by the help of the editorial "we," they teach the public to believe that the credit of vaccination is unimpeachable, or is only impeached by—to use their favourite phrase—"half-a-dozen fanatics." (Laughter.) It would be more correct, in my opinion, to assert that the fallacies and falsehoods by which vaccination is upheld is the work of some dozen fanatics, whose whole function consists in upholding a crumbling superstition. Of course I do not blame these gentlemen for doing their best to fulfil the conditions for which they were appointed, but I hardly think they do justice to themselves as men of science, and as judges between opposing views, when they transform themselves into *nisi prius* advocates of a sinking cause. Take the case of the Norwich inquiry last year. It was with great difficulty that the Government was induced to institute an official inquiry into that lamentable case. There was nothing new in such a case—similar cases have occurred again and again, and have been passed over, either without inquiry or the results of the inquiry have been concealed from the public. What took place at the Norwich inquiry was this: The Government sent down two inspectors

to examine into the case. Those inspectors acted with the utmost justice and impartiality. They endeavoured honestly to bring out the truth of the matter, although doubtless they would have been glad to find some excuse for the system of vaccination. The theory was broached and worked out, whether or not blame attached to the operator for using a certain kind of instrument, known as ivory points. It was discussed and it was disproved—disproved because several of the cases had not been so operated upon. The inspectors honestly said, “We give it up; we want no more witnesses on that part of the case.” Subsequently they made their report, which was naturally not entirely satisfactory to us, inasmuch as it did not distinctly trace the mortality to vaccination, but left the cause unexplained. But upon this report coming under the cognizance of the Local Government Board, it was issued, with an addendum, by Dr. Buchanan, who had, of course, neither been present at the inquiry, nor, therefore, heard the evidence produced, in which he disinterred the exploded theory of the ivory points, and, slapping his own inspectors in the face, declared the cause made manifest and the credit of vaccination saved.

In attacking the law of compulsory vaccination, it is impossible not to perceive that one great obstacle is a sort of bastard conservatism which might be repudiated even by so good a Tory as the hon. member for Bridport (Mr. Warton), because it is neither based upon truth nor antiquity, and it consists merely in the principle of upholding at all costs any Act that may have got itself inscribed upon the Statute Book, without regard to the manner in which it got there, or to its intrinsic value. This Act, for instance, in which compulsion was made the law of the land, was passed at the bidding of a small body of medical experts; it was not understood nor even discussed throughout the country. With our present knowledge and experience upon the subject, it would be utterly impossible to pass such a law, and yet now we have to get up an agitation through the country, and move heaven and earth to get rid of a law whose results experience has shown to be wholly mischievous. But we are now told by the upholders of vaccination that not only compulsion is necessary—that is fine or imprisonment for non-compliance—but punishment must



be cumulative, repeated—that is, indefinitely in the case of each unvaccinated child. Now the existence of the law in this condition is veritably the fluke of a fluke. It was not a recommendation of the Select Committee on whose report the Bill of 1871 was introduced. The only reason why this clause, rejected in the House of Lords, was not re-inserted by the framer of the Bill when it returned to the House of Commons was, that at the time the Session was within a few days of its close, and it was feared that any further alteration in the Bill would have prevented its passing. Yet now that fluke of a fluke has become a sacred pillar of the constitution. (Cheers and laughter.) So much, then, for compulsion.

And now a few words upon vaccination itself. Does it not on the first view strike the House as an astounding theory to inoculate with disease every human being that comes into the world, in order to protect it from a worse form of that disease? especially as it must be borne in mind that vaccination is no longer regarded as a quite unimportant and harmless affair, but to quote the words of Dr. Ballard, must, in order to be effective, be “a real and absolute disease;” and it is now, moreover, admitted by the faculty, that it is perfectly impossible to test what they call the purity of the lymph by either chemical or microscopic test; that the healthiness—as they are pleased to term it—of the lymph employed can only be determined by the result produced. You see a little coffin, and discover that the lymph was deadly. Again, you thus poison every individual in the community in order to save from the risk of infection a very small portion of the population; because the tales industriously spread about by vaccinists of the probability of a whole population taking smallpox if unvaccinated, are fallacies or falsehoods which will not stand the light of examination for a moment. Take, for example, the records of smallpox mortality in London during the last century, of which the most exaggerated reports have been circulated. Now the highest recorded mortality in any year was 4,000. We know by all the authorities that about twenty persons died of every hundred that were attacked. It follows, therefore, that the total number of smallpox cases in the filthy and unsanitary London of that day amounted to some 20,000,

which would amount—taking the population at half-a-million, to just four per cent., and it brings us to this conclusion, that if vaccination could have been enforced upon everybody, you would have poisoned the blood of the half-million in order to protect from risk that four per cent.

And now let us consider for a moment how far the boasted protection is borne out by facts. I am not going to weary the House with statistical details, but I assert that failure is marked in broadest characters on the plain statement of small-pox mortality. I have not, perhaps, so high an opinion of Dr. Jenner as many entertain, but I do give him credit to the extent of believing that he would have recognised the utter failure of his theory could he have foreseen that in an epidemic (1871-2), when it is boasted that at least ninety per cent. of the population had been vaccinated, there died of smallpox in England and Wales 44,840 persons. Or again, when it is admitted that in the Metropolitan Hospitals in that same epidemic, out of 14,808 smallpox patients, 11,174 had been vaccinated, and probably many more. The same broad evidence of failure is marked all over the world, of which I will only trouble the House with one more example.

Dr. Kolb, the eminent statistician, observes :

“In the kingdom of Bavaria, in which the cowpox was introduced in 1807, and where for a long time no one except the newly-born escaped vaccination, there were in the epidemic of 1871 no less than 30,742 cases of smallpox, of whom 29,429 had been vaccinated, as is shown in the documents of the State Department.”

But I may also appeal to various advocates of vaccination in evidence of its failure. My hon. friend, the member for Glasgow (Dr. Cameron) wrote in 1879 :—

“The recurrence, therefore, in the latest period of mortality almost as high as that experienced prior to the Vaccination Act, shows either that the protective virtues of vaccination are mythical, or that there is something radically wrong in our national system of vaccination.”

And Dr. W. B. Carpenter, in an article in the *Nineteenth Century*, expressly explains and apologises for the enormous mortality by smallpox in the last epidemic, by saying that it was such a severe one! The learned doctor seems profoundly unaware that a system of protection, which only protects when no danger is near, is not of much advantage.

I should like to give the House, in a few words, a comparison between the real history of vaccination and the current tradition which has for so many years maintained the practice. The current tradition is simple enough—that before the time of Jenner, the world was decimated by continual epidemics of smallpox and from the moment vaccination began smallpox declined—declined in precise proportion to the number of persons vaccinated, and that now with a little more care and a great deal more compulsion we may hope to stamp out smallpox from the category of human plagues. And now for the real history. I think that any impartial mind going back to the time of Jenner will be surprised to find how little remains of the tradition of splendid inductions and scientific experiments which it has been the fashion to attribute to Dr. Jenner. His experiments appear to have been crude and unscientific, and his conclusions rash and unfounded. In fact, his most noted experiments, even had they been wholly successful—which they were far from being, as the terrible condition of the vaccinated patients in the London Smallpox Hospital in 1810\* may be taken as evidence—would not have warranted the conclusion that vaccination was a protection against epidemic smallpox. The most they would have amounted to would have been, if successful, to show that you may inoculate with a disease which will prevent for a time inoculation of another disease; but it does not follow that the operation would be protective against an ordinary epidemic attack. I only allude to this now as it appears in curious harmony with the result of M. Pasteur's experiments. M. Pasteur protected the sheep by inoculation, but many died afterwards of epidemic. The student, pursuing his examination, will find that before the commencement of vaccination, and for many years afterwards, smallpox was declining—largely, no doubt, on account of the diminution of the insensate practice of inoculation, and partly, one may suppose, through some progress being made in sanitation. This is no imagination on my part. Dr. Farr writes:—

“ Smallpox attained its maximum after inoculation was introduced: this disease began to grow less fatal before vaccination was discovered;

---

\* See Baron's Life of Jenner.

indicating, together with the diminution in fever, the general improvement in health then taking place."

None the less the vaccinists attribute to vaccination all the credit of a diminution in smallpox mortality, from the first years of this century, although, in fact, it may be further stated that at that time the amount of vaccination was so trivial that it could not possibly have affected the mortality to any appreciable extent. Following down its history, we shall find a series of testimonies of the failures of vaccination both in the House of Parliament and outside. I must not trouble the House with more than a very few links in the chain of evidence.

Baron, in his life of Jenner, says, "From 1804, reports of "failures in vaccination had begun to multiply." Dr. Birch, surgeon of St. Thomas's Hospital, says (1804), "Every post "brings me accounts of the failures of vaccination;" and Lord Henry Petty, in 1809, said in the House of Commons:—"Unless Dr. Jenner was completely blinded by conceit he must have recognised that the general faith in vaccination, exhibited in 1801, had been much shaken by the experience of the succeeding seven years."

I will ask the House to let me read a little longer extract from the *Medical Observer*, published in 1810, in which are recorded the particulars of 535 cases of persons having smallpox after vaccination, including their names, with an index pointing to the authorities as witnesses; also similar details of 97 fatal cases of smallpox after vaccination, and of 150 cases of injury arising from vaccination, together with the addresses of ten medical men, including two Professors of Anatomy, who had suffered in their own families from vaccination. Concerning these remarkable evidences, Dr. Maclean observes:

"Although numerous, they are few in comparison to what might be produced. It will be thought incumbent on the vaccinators to come forward and disprove the numerous facts decisive against vaccination here stated on unimpeachable authority, or make the *amende honorable* by a manly recantation. But experience forbids us to expect any such fair and magnanimous proceeding, and we may be assured that under no circumstances will they abandon so lucrative a practice until the practice abandons them." (Oh, oh, hear, hear, and cheers.)

In this respect, there is a great similarity between the vaccinists of 70 years ago and of the present day. I might multiply these evidences of failure to any extent. About 1853,

dissatisfied with the slow progress of the practice of vaccination, our medical experts resolved on attempting to pass a measure of compulsion. They asserted with great truth that in many parts of the country vaccination was greatly neglected, and in some places almost entirely discontinued. They did not, however, attempt to show that there was any relation in places where vaccination was neglected with any increase in smallpox mortality; nay, it happens very curiously that in 1853 the mortality from smallpox in London was the lowest ever known, being only 211, while in England and Wales in that year the mortality was 3,151, against more than double that number in two previous years. Well, they passed their first compulsory law, and since then smallpox mortality has increased—I will not say by leaps and bounds, but certainly to a somewhat serious extent. Since the passing of the first compulsory Act we have had three small-pox epidemics, and the deaths were:—

1857-9	...	...	...	...	14,244
1863-5	...	...	...	...	20,059
1871-2	...	...	...	...	44,840

I need not point out that through all these years the practice of vaccination had become more and more general. Does this look like stamping out smallpox by vaccination?

I know how easy it is to make statistics show almost anything by selecting years and manipulating averages; such a case came under my notice a few days ago, when this dodge was practised. It happened that there were two successive years of very high smallpox mortality. A line was drawn between these two years, and the one was made the last of a long series of previous years, and the other was made the first of a series of low succeeding years, and so two decent averages were triumphantly displayed. I will therefore put my figures in another form, as, indeed, they appear in the Report of the Registrar-General, just issued for the year 1881. The smallpox mortality for each decade, beginning about the time when compulsion was established, was for—

1851-60	...	...	...	...	42,071
1861-70	...	...	...	...	34,786
1871-80	...	...	...	...	57,422

What are the answers we get to these tremendous facts? They are of the most trivial character, and I am almost ashamed to hear how they influence men in this House.

Can anything look less like stamping out smallpox by vaccination? And now one word about the statistics of Scotland. My right honourable friend the member for Edinburgh University (Sir L. Playfair), who is about to answer me, told me some time ago that he was content to base his faith in vaccination upon the experience of Scotland, and I felt it would be very unhandsome on my part if I did not take some notice of the statistics upon which he relied so strongly. Whether they bear out his theory I leave to the House to say. The facts are these. In 1861-2 only about 20 per cent. of births were recorded as vaccinated, at which time there was no epidemic of smallpox, and the mortality was of no abnormal extent. In 1864 compulsion came into force, and a subsequent low rate of mortality from smallpox was, of course, attributed to the fact, and by the year 1868 it was boasted that no less than 97 per cent. of the births were vaccinated. Then came the test of epidemic and in the four years 1871-4, 6,260 persons died of smallpox or 50 per cent. more than had died in the four years preceding compulsion. Since then there has been no epidemic, and I daresay my right honourable friend will declare once more—as I believe he did in 1871—that smallpox has been stamped out in Scotland. In the same way Sir Dominic Corrigan declared that in Ireland vaccination had finally stamped out smallpox. In fact, there was, I believe, one quarter of a year in which no death occurred, but immediately afterwards an epidemic broke out of the most terrible severity, slaying in some of the towns a proportion far greater than the deaths in London during the last century. It is the old story for ever repeating itself; when there is no epidemic, people, vaccinated or not, do not die of smallpox, and when there is an epidemic they do die, vaccinated or not.

I think the House will admit that I have made out a tolerably strong *primâ facie* case against vaccination; now what have the vaccinists to reply? With the facts which I have stated fully before them, by what arguments do they propose to main-

tain the popular faith in vaccination? First they tell us a bogus story to the effect that no hospital nurses, all duly re-vaccinated, have ever been known to take smallpox. I am astonished to perceive the effect this assertion has produced upon the minds of hon. members, especially as it has been again and again exploded and exposed. In the first place, it does not happen to be the fact that no hospital nurses have taken smallpox. In the second place, it is a well recognised fact that nurses and doctors—acclimatised, as it were, to disease—are not as susceptible to contagion as the ordinary population, in confirmation of which we have on record the statement of the surgeon to the Smallpox Hospital at Dublin :

“ With reference to re-vaccination I have no faith in it ; not one of the 36 attendants of the South Dublin Union sheds has taken smallpox ; only 7 of the number were re-vaccinated, and as the remaining 29 enjoy the same immunity, wherein is the necessity of the operation ? ”

And Dr. Colin, to whom Dr. Carpenter has made special reference, observes in regard to the great epidemic of 1871–2 in Paris :

“ We had no case among the forty members of the sisterhood who resided in the hospital, although the great majority of them forbore to permit themselves to be re-vaccinated.”

But apart from particular instances, what would be the advantage of showing—if it could be shown—that no nurse had ever taken smallpox? It would fall under the logical blunder of proving too much. Within the last dozen years tens of thousands of persons declared to be successfully vaccinated have died of smallpox. What distinction is to be drawn between them and the nurses? Not vaccination, for that was common to both. If, therefore, the assertion were true, it could only be held to prove that the air of a smallpox hospital was more protective than vaccination. (Hear, hear, Oh, and laughter). An equally fallacious argument is based upon the assertion that fewer people are now seen marked with smallpox than used to be the case. What a roundabout method of proving a fallacy! The implication, of course, is that people are no longer marked with smallpox, because either so many fewer

take the disease, or because the type is so much milder. But, as we have seen, some 45,000 persons died in the last epidemic—an epidemic, according to Dr. Carpenter, of most malignant type. There are, therefore, existing, according to the established average, about a quarter of a million of persons who survived this malignant attack. If they are not marked, why are they not marked? I think the medical profession might fairly take to themselves the credit of saying in reply, that it is due to the fact that the stupid and brutal treatment of a century ago had been greatly modified and improved. There is another, and at present, still more prevalent form of argument—or rather of unsupported statement—put forward by the vaccinist expert. It is asserted that a careful discrimination had been made in all cases of persons dying of smallpox between those who had been vaccinated and those who had not, and they assert, as the result of this subdivision, that an enormously greater proportion died of the unvaccinated than the vaccinated. A more hollow argument it is impossible to conceive. It is well known that with regard to those who die of confluent smallpox, it is simply impossible to discern whether they had been vaccinated or not. It is also an acknowledged fact, that in very many cases, for the sake of upholding the honour of vaccination—honest, or rather I would say, impartial returns—are very frequently not given. I had a communication a few days ago from the late master of a workhouse in one of our large towns, who declared that on occasion of a late smallpox epidemic it was a matter of regular routine to place the word “unvaccinated” at the bed-head of one who had died of smallpox, while where the patient recovered, or had a very slight attack, his ticket was endorsed “vaccinated.” (Cries of “name.”) I have no authority to name the person. But far beyond these considerations is the fact, that what is called the unvaccinated *residuum* consists, first of children in so bad a state of health that even a vaccination officer dares not operate upon them, and generally of that portion of the community residing in the worst districts and wretchedest slums of London, whom the vaccination officer cannot reach at all, and who by the unsanitary character of their lives are certain to die of any



epidemic that may be prevalent in a ratio altogether greater than that of the average population. The conclusion to which this line of argument leads those who rely upon it is alone sufficient for its refutation. It is this : That with all the sanitary and other improvements of the present time, unvaccinated people who take smallpox die at twice or thrice the rate that unvaccinated people died a century ago ! Arguments such as these, Mr. Speaker, cannot be called the inductions of science ; they are the coruscations of quackery.

To sum up, then, I denounce vaccination as having proved itself ineffective: I charge it with having caused in multitudinous cases disease and death by erysipelas, and other cognate forms of inflammation which it sets up. I charge it further as having been proved capable of communicating to the infant vaccinated any taint which may exist in the blood of the vaccinifer. I can name medical practitioners who have given special attention to cancer, and who declare their belief that the spread of that terrible disease is largely attributable to the practice of vaccination. But then there is another and still more terrible disease—more terrible than smallpox itself—of which, from this time, no man will dare to say that there is no danger of inoculation. I will not comment upon the case which has recently occurred to a medical man at the leading vaccine establishment in London, simply because it proves nothing but what was known and recognised before.\* It pleased the President of the Local Government Board, in replying to the hon. member for Stockport, to assert that these cases were of almost infinitesimal infrequency, and Dr. Carpenter has similarly asserted that, of millions of cases of vaccination, very few cases indeed have occurred. These opinions are set at nought and

---

\* The following statement has gone the round of the press :—“The theory of the non-communicability of disease by vaccination is likely to receive a rude shock through a recent sad announcement. A popular and much-esteemed officer of one of the Government medical departments, Dr. Cory, having unbounded faith that vaccination by lymph was not under any circumstances a possible medium for other diseases, as stated by opponents of vaccination, has experimented on himself with lymph from a syphilitic child. Result—the usual local signs of that disease, followed by meningitis and partial paralysis.”

contradicted on far higher authority than either of those I have named. Mr. Brudenell Carter says:

“I think that a large proportion of cases of apparently inherited syphilis are in reality vaccinal.”

And what says my hon. friend the member for Glasgow? (Dr. Cameron.) Writing in 1879, he declared:

“I suspect that isolated examples of syphilitic infection through vaccination are much more common in this country than is generally admitted.” (Cheers.)

Again, writing to the *Times* in 1879, my hon. friend gravely rebuked the blindness of the medical profession to this danger. He said:

“In France, where the chief of the National Vaccination Service clung less closely to this theory, he saw the danger much earlier, and in 1867 published a list of upwards of 160 cases of syphilitic infection through vaccination, which had been brought under his notice in little over a year.”

But if the President of the Local Government Board had consulted his late colleague, the Under Secretary (Mr. Hibbert), he would not have fallen into the mistake that he has made. That hon. gentleman, in a letter to his constituents in 1880, made this deplorable statement:

“This return shows an increase of deaths from syphilis of infants under one, from 255 in 1847 to 1,554 in 1875,”

or six times as many,

“in my opinion one of the most unsatisfactory features in connection with vaccination, and one which leads me to support the proposed modification of the vaccination law now before the House of Commons.” (Cheers.)

I think if my hon. friend had not been a member of the Government, he would have gone a step further, and declared with M. Ricord that vaccination must at once be put a stop to.

And now, in conclusion, I will make the strongest appeal in my power to the House to pass the resolution which I have brought before it. I would say—Let us not be the last to get rid of this curse of vaccination. It was owing to our initiation that it has been spread over the world, and caused what evil it has done. We owe it to our own honour, and to the credit of our country to be amongst the first to set a better example to

the world. Already Switzerland has thrown off the yoke ; in France there is a strong and increasing opinion against the practice ; Germany, which has suffered, perhaps, more than any other country through vaccination, is now rising against it, and our friends there are not without hope that there may be found a majority in the Reichstag to seal its fate. Some of our own colonies are up in arms against it ; at Montreal, within a few years, the people assembled in crowds in the market-place and smashed the windows of the town-hall in token of their repudiation of compulsion ; while in the United States associations are being widely established with the view of putting an end to this long-cherished delusion. Some hundred and fifty years ago, inoculation, the detested parent of vaccination, was in full blast in this country. Some forty years ago, it was made a misdemeanour to practise inoculation. To be logical we should, perhaps, now place the system of vaccination under the same outlawry, but if this is too much to expect, let us, I implore the House, now, at once, and for ever abolish the hateful tyranny of compulsion. (Loud cheers.)

MR. HOPWOOD said : My hon. friend (Mr. P. A. Taylor) has left me no easy task to follow him, but I trust the House will allow me a few minutes while I express my own belief in the cause he has championed, and while I say that like him, but without concert with him, I came to the conclusion that vaccination is a myth and a delusion, and is productive of constant mischief to the community. This was brought about by having my attention called to the injustice of accumulated penalties. These penalties, I am sure the House will see, are insupportable, and productive of most cruel wrong to the population ; and I am glad that this is one of those social questions which this Parliament has found time at last to deal with. It will hear the plain truth on this subject spoken to-night, as it has already heard it from my hon. friend, and there will be an accumulation of facts such as I think my right hon. friend the member for the University of Edinburgh (Sir L. Playfair) will find it difficult to destroy. I have no doubt that he will meet it by statistics. I have no doubt the House has not altogether followed the statistics of my hon.

friend (Mr. Taylor.) (“Hear,” from Mr Warton.) Why? Because it is impossible to deal with the statistics advanced on either side unless, like the hon. member for Bridport, members will apply their own intelligence to them—(a laugh)—and after investigation decide for themselves who is right. This social question must be determined on its merits. But it is said by honourable friends of mine to whom I have spoken on the subject, “My medical man tells me you are all wrong.” Well, I have great respect for the medical profession, when it is engaged in scientific inquiry, unpaid by State emoluments and untempted by the fees extracted from a vast community of patients whenever a rumour of smallpox epidemic presents itself. But the medical profession has been marked in the past by many absurd errors, many differences of opinion, and men of successive generations have gradually emancipated themselves from old superstitions. Therefore if I say anything to-night respecting the medical profession, it is in the most respectful manner to invite it to use its disinterested powers in the settlement of this great scientific question. (Hear, hear.)

My friends say, “How can you argue in this way? I assure you my old mother or aunt used to tell me that people were “always pock-marked, and you never see anything of the kind “now.” And yet the same persons ought to be aware that at that period we did what we could to propagate smallpox by almost universal inoculation, which is now an unheard-of evil, and prohibited by law. Every member of this House is wise enough now to see that it was an evil. Why not then? Because the medical profession pursued and promoted the practice, and did everything short of obtaining an Act of Parliament to perpetuate it on the Statute Book. Happily for us, it was not so perpetuated. My hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) has shown that smallpox began to decrease in the beginning of this century. Why? Because people became cleaner than their ancestors. They began to pay more attention to sanitary precautions. If you want any proof of it, where do you find smallpox? Is it in the handsome mansion, with the luxuries of modern civilization about it? No. You go into the courts, the miserable alleys, and the rookeries

of the great cities. Why, this is a disease of great cities, but it is happily yielding to sanitation. Clear away your rookeries, open out your alleys, and clean your dirty ways, and small-pox will die out. That is the remedy that is obvious, and I can scarcely bear to speak of any other. (Hear, hear.)

Inoculation seems to have come like a fetich from the East, as something which was to be worshipped here ; and the people of England fell down on their knees and worshipped it. That went on from the middle of the last to the early part of this century. And what was offered to the public instead? The author in effect said, "Here is something which I cannot explain, which is to be found in sores on the udder of the cow. I have a shrewd suspicion that it may have been an infection conveyed to the animal by the rough hands of the stable boys employed in milking, and brought horse grease from the festering, suppurating heels of the horse, thus communicated to the cow." No one to this day can say what cowpox is, and if you want it renewed you are obliged to depend upon some mythical account of a case of cowpox being manufactured in some province of France or part of Belgium. Some of our medical men have actually inoculated the cow with the smallpox, and then, treating that as lymph, have vaccinated thousands, aye, hundreds of thousands, of our fellow countrymen. Nobody can tell where the genuine article began, this "benign vaccine lymph," as it is called in cant phraseology. Instead of inoculating an infant, a surgeon would say, "Here is a simple matter that will create possibly a swelling on your arm, and possibly cause some constitutional disturbance, but I promise you it will give you immunity from smallpox." That was a tempting offer. What wonder, then, that the practice of inoculation died down, that smallpox became less frequent, and that vaccination has gradually and slowly taken up in its place? At first immunity was promised. A few years went by, and they found it would not give immunity for a lifetime. Then they said, "You must be vaccinated every seven years." Next it was said, "You must have four or five marks from the operation, and according

to the extent and proportions of the cicatrices so you will have immunity.

Here are signs of a great profession failing in their own belief—tottering in their faith in this extraordinary remedy; and so my hon. friend the member for Glasgow (Dr. Cameron) points out to them that they will avoid all difficulties if they will use calf lymph. That will not transmit syphilis and skin diseases, he says; but who knows what else it may transmit? Has it been scientifically investigated? There are diseases in cattle, and there are states of health in cattle which may become disease when put into an infant. My right hon. friend the President of the Local Government Board, when answering a question from me on this subject—frequently he answers a question by only seeming to answer it—said it was quite true that calf lymph does create even more constitutional disturbance, inflammation, swelling, pain, etc., than human lymph. Why, Dr. Seaton, one of the doctors of the Poor-law Board, was of that opinion, and was against introducing it for that reason; and nothing but the strong representations of the hon. member for Glasgow (Dr. Cameron) induced the Board to procure calves and station them somewhere in the neighbourhood of Holborn, to enable those who preferred it to try this benign animal lymph.

Many members of this House can relate sad instances of suffering among their own friends from the effects of vaccination; and if *they* suffer, what wonder that the poor are called upon to suffer, and that their prayers and entreaties go up in vain to the magistrates, who, sitting on the bench, and having the power “if they think fit,” think fit to the extent of crushing the poor men, and allowing them, in many instances, to be sold up, because they resist this inhuman law! (Hear, hear.)

I think the notice taken of this question may be useful to the medical profession. I don't disdain outside criticisms in my own profession. We have had to submit to them many a time, and I am sure we have benefitted by them. The same may be said of the military profession. Anti-vaccinators have been called fanatics, but they are only defending their

hearths and their homes and their innocents. (Hear, hear.) It has been said that they tell untruths. How many untruths have been told on the other side? I can name a medical gentleman, living near Birmingham, who states that where a child dies from erysipelas caused by vaccination the fact may be suppressed, because it may give rise to an unjust feeling against vaccination? The same thing was done in the Norwich case recently. Now those hon. gentlemen who called "Name, name," when my hon. friend was speaking will please to take that fact, and I will give them any reference they choose. (Hear, hear.) Our poorer brethren stated loudly that they suffered from disease owing to this practice of vaccination, and the medical profession to a man rose up and denied it. But what happened? Why, before the Committee of the House of Commons, Mr. Simon, the head of the department of which Dr. Buchanan is now the head, denied it, and jeered at it. But in a few days it transpired that Mr. Jonathan Hutchinson, one of the greatest authorities on syphilis, could give evidence on the subject. He came before the same committee, and stated as his opinion that it was impossible to tell in all cases whether the child from whom lymph was to be taken was or was not syphilitic. A member of this House described to me the results of re-vaccination upon himself. He was urged to be re-vaccinated some three years ago, and at last, on the persuasion of his doctor, he gave way. What was the result? The doctor said, "I have found a good subject—a most beautiful child—I know all its history—from which to procure the vaccine. The child is a perfect picture of health." My friend was vaccinated from that child, and in a fortnight or three weeks he broke out with a most loathsome eruption, extending from head to foot. There was nothing to justify or account for it but the vaccination. The disease would not yield to treatment, and my friend was sent to Harrogate to take the waters. There he put himself under another physician, who informed him that he had been vaccinated with impure lymph. Here was a member of this House, possessing every security that wealth could give him, and able to obtain the highest medical services. Then take the case of a poor man compelled to bring his child

to the public vaccinator, and who cannot help himself. A police magistrate for London told me that more than once he had a child brought to him who was one mass of sores. The mother said, "The child was well till it was vaccinated," and the magistrate believed it. This is testimony as to suffering which is still going on. (Hear, hear.) Now, this is what the anti-vaccinators protest against, and it is what the whole medical profession has denied. Even Mr. Simon, who has denied the possibility, admitted that among the replies from some 500 to 600 medical men, two or three of them had mentioned similar facts to him. The famous French surgeon, referred to already by my hon. friend, gave his testimony that it was so.

I should like, as my hon. friend has done, to call attention to what vaccination really is ; and I hope the House will not surrender itself entirely to medical opinion, but that it will consider for itself. Let us see what certain medical men say as to this horrible poisoning. Many are shocked at this practice already, and if not, I believe they will be as soon as they are fortified by inquiry into the matter. The famous John Hunter no doubt may be said to be old-fashioned, but perhaps the medical profession regards him still as one of the greatest physiologists. He did for himself what Dr. Cory has done, inoculated himself to test scientific results, and Hunter's opinion seems to be that "any extraneous substance introduced into the blood modifies the vitalized or "living fluid." He adds : "The introduction by inoculation of "mineral or vegetable poisons into the blood is hazardous, and in "certain quantities may be destructive ; but the introduction of "animal products from any living body, be it a man, a cow, or even "an ass"—(laughter from Mr. Warton)—I emphasised that "for my hon. friend—"Hear, hear," and much laughter)—"is infinitely more pernicious because, like it, it is vitalised." That will be recognised as being true in the future. Many of the medical profession are opposed to that opinion, because they believe that such stuff as this is a preventive of a disease of which they exaggerate the proportions, and in regard to which they distrust their own powers of treatment.



A medical staff officer in the Prussian army, referring to the effects of vaccination on disease, says:—"I myself have been vaccinated, and twice successfully re-vaccinated, and yet in the exercise of my official medical duties during the late outbreak in Prussia, I have been attacked with smallpox in the most virulent and confluent form." Those who have been congratulating themselves on being re-vaccinated will perhaps take that piece of evidence, and discuss it in relation to their own case. (Hear, hear.)

Dr. Buchanan has taken upon himself to deal very strongly with the reputation of a brother medical man, Dr. Guy, the vaccinator in the Norwich disasters, in regard to this matter. Dr. Guy has in his time been rewarded and complimented, but Dr. Buchanan admits, apart from the malpractice he ascribes to Dr. Guy in the use of ivory points, an inferior sort of ivory, unknown to the operator, might possibly retain that which would infect the vaccine. See how that points in the direction we are indicating—that there are many possible chances in this operation to communicate disease. There may be neglect on the part of the vaccinator, for whom it is to be said that he has to get through a large number of cases in a short time. And yet you ask us to accept vaccination by compulsion when you have not taken the commonest precautions of science to ascertain whether the operation may be safely performed! You are forcing this upon our population, when you have no right to do it. (Hear, hear.)

Dr. Buchanan wrote a memorandum some time ago, in which he demonstrated the extraordinary benefits of vaccination. He said, "Of course, the vaccinated and the unvaccinated live under the same conditions." He ought to have known that there are a large number of persons who cannot safely be vaccinated, either from ill health, or from proneness to inflammatory disease, and who are more likely than any others to catch the smallpox and die of it. The unvaccinated class consists of those who cannot be vaccinated because it is dangerous—children and others. But it consists also of all your nomad population, of your Arabs, tramps, and poor people, who live under the conditions most opposed to

health, and most likely to render them liable to this disease. Now, what do you think of the reasoning laid before the British public by the head of the Medical Department of the Local Government Board? It is that, from a medical and statistical point of view, the unvaccinated and the vaccinated live under exactly the same conditions. I hope before we have gone on long we may begin to use our own judgment on eminent medical men. (Hear, hear.)

MR. HOPWOOD then referred to the case of vaccinating a woman within 24 hours of her confinement, and asked if the department would stop that most inhuman practice. (Cheers.) He said he did not believe that the medical profession, as a body, approved of the practice, and stigmatised it as monstrous that poor waifs and strays in such circumstances should be subjected to vaccination when admitted to a work-house. Referring to the general question further, Mr. Hopwood said: You will be surprised to hear that smallpox is 72nd in the order of diseases and fatality last year. Our opponents infer from a heavy mortality in some epidemic year in last century that the usual rate of mortality from smallpox in London was during that period 4,000 per million. Therefore, these vaccinators now say that the deaths before vaccination was introduced into London, were 4,000 per million. It is quite as unfair as if I took the years before 1871, and said how many thousands had died under vaccination, and had given the average per million. The House may be surprised to learn that in 1881 there were 57,000 deaths from bronchitis, 48,000 from phthisis, 33,000 from heart disease, 17,000 from scarlet fever, 13,000 from whooping cough, and 13,000 from cancer. I will not mention such causes as drowning by accident, but pleurisy caused from 1,200 to 1,300 deaths, and boils 1,066. I come on to dysentery, and then to smallpox, the deaths from which are given at 648. (Ironical cheers.) Will the hon. gentleman tell me why in 1871-72 there died 44,000 of smallpox? Then the population had been vaccinated, for vaccination had been brought into perfect play in 1857, and the population was enjoying its unrestricted advantages. Now I first want to point out the increase of the deaths from infantile diseases in one

year, owing to vaccination. The argument on the one side is, smallpox once very rife: now very greatly reduced. The catechism founded upon that is this: What is the cause that scarlet fever is so rife? The answer is, "Nature." What is the cause when it diminishes? "Nature." What is the cause when cholera increases? The reply is "Nature." What is the cause when smallpox is abundant? "Nature." What is the cause when smallpox is scarce and rare? "Vaccination." ("Hear, hear," and a laugh.)

It is a question of statistics founded upon very doubtful evidence. How do you find out the unvaccinated? You have their names in the hospital, but in confluent smallpox you can't find the marks if there has been vaccination. People have been admitted with 16 or 17 marks, but how do you tell? They may ask the poor patient when he is nearly dying. It may be poor Joe, from 'Tom-all-alone's, and the medical man naturally says, "Put it down." But people will say to you, "Do you accuse the whole of a respectable profession of being "in league and falsifying all the statements?" I don't say wilfully falsifying, but they have something else to think about than investigating these matters, and if a thing is doubtful they will, to avoid trouble, put it down this way or that way. ("No, no.") It is all very well for hon. gentlemen to say "No, no," but will they put themselves in the position of those who are collecting these facts? Do they imagine that a medical man whose time is busily occupied will go searching the arm of a poor dead patient? Why he would do it at risk to himself. Even in the last year or two a surgeon has fallen a victim, though he was vaccinated; and nurses after nurses have died of smallpox.

The report of the Registrar-General, who is not a medical man, contains pages of reasoning facts in favour of vaccination. They are all possessed with a belief in vaccination and they stand by it. Now, there are seven or eight diseases especially inoculable by vaccination, and all or most of these have increased the number of deaths of children under one year of age, as shown by a return moved for by me (No. 433), 1877. Among them syphilis. Another disease is cancer,

which has greatly increased in the population of all ages. It has increased 70 per cent. Now, the House would like to pause, and turn to the medical gentlemen and ask them can they guarantee us against the possibility of this fearful disease being propagated by vaccination. The study of this question by medical men is yet in its infancy. They are fiddling about with microscopes, saying that certain diseases can only be conveyed if there is a speck of blood in the vaccine. They really know little about the subject yet, and until they have amply satisfied us that they are agreed among themselves, we ought not to approve of these compulsory laws. (Hear, hear.) Diseases of the mesenteric glands, or internal scrofula, have increased 30 per cent., and it is highly probable that that may have been caused through vaccination, until the contrary is ascertained. Twenty-fourth in order of fatality on the list of diseases comes scrofula, which has maintained its previous rate. The next is the disease of syphilis; this has increased 127 per cent., and has multiplied four-fold in proportion to the births, as compared with the rate in 1847, when the statistics were first taken. The 61st cause of death is one of phlegmon, or boils; this has just doubled. This heading formerly included pyæmia, or blood poisoning, now separated; and we can easily see that boils are the sort of disease that could be easily conveyed by vaccination.

In these circumstances, is it to be wondered at that the law is evaded and prosecutions take place? I hope this House, as the guardian of public liberty, will set itself with determination to have these prosecutions stopped. They have amounted to thousands. Poor men have had their beds sold from under them, both here and in Ireland, and have been forced to endure cruel poverty, because, in their own simple language, they had seen so-and-so's child dying, or little Mary suffering dreadful pains in consequence of vaccination. And yet the magistrates are called upon to perform these duties under a law so little supported by scientific knowledge, and so discredited by competent persons. I believe it is tottering to its downfall, and I hope this House will not be the last of the legislative assemblies—I hope it will be among the first—to take off this iron grip

from a suffering population, and say that no man shall, against his will, incur the dangers to his offspring which this practice offers. (Cheers.)

Sir Lyon Playfair, Dr. Cameron, and Sir Charles Dilke having spoken in opposition to the motion :—

Mr. TAYLOR, replying upon debate, said: We have had a very ingenious speech from my right hon. friend, the member for the University of Edinburgh, and as the right hon. gentleman, the President of the Local Government Board, said, it is one of his excellences that he knows well how to deal with figures in an interesting and seductive manner. In regard to the statements he made, it is of course impossible for me to enter upon them at this hour, and I am quite prepared to leave the matter to the House and the country. I only wish to show that he has largely dealt with mere assertion, and with the recognition of a foregone conclusion. The right hon. gentleman referred to the terms of an amendment which I had moved in the committee of 1871, recognizing the safety of the practice of vaccination, observing that after such an observation from me it was unnecessary for him to say a further word upon that subject. But the right hon. gentleman forgot to note that I have many times since read my recantation and expressed my regret at the error into which I, with the great mass of my countrymen fell, through yielding too much faith to the traditions of the medical profession. It was not fair, therefore, in this manner to quote me as an authority against myself while at the same time he passed unnoticed the real authorities which I had quoted on the other side, viz., such men as Dr. Ballard and Dr. Cameron and Mr. Brudenell Carter. Again the right hon. gentleman repeated the well-known fact that smallpox had greatly decreased within the last century, and he begged the question of the efficacy of vaccination by assuming the fact that smallpox had diminished just as vaccination had increased. It would really be as logical to declare that so great was the power of vaccination, directly and indirectly, that while it had stamped out smallpox directly, it had indirectly stopped the plague, seeing that no case of it had occurred since the practice of compulsory vaccination. The right hon. gentleman

likewise took no notice whatever of the fact which I proved upon the highest medical authority—the late Dr. Farr—viz., that the diminution in smallpox had commenced before vaccination was heard of, probably from the combined influences of the diminution of inoculation and a gradually improving sanitation. I quoted high medical authorities for the opinion that in sanitation lay our only hope of stamping out smallpox and all other zymotic fevers. This, too, the right hon. gentleman calmly passes by, although the authorities I quoted must rank higher than that of the right hon. gentleman himself, seeing, as he has just informed us, he is not a member of the medical profession. The right hon. gentleman draws a distinction between the meaning which he and I apply to the phrase “stamping out a disease.” He says that by vaccination we can stamp out smallpox, but we cannot keep it out. To ordinary minds it would, I think, appear that to stamp out a disease would mean that people should no longer die of it. If persons who are protected by vaccination continue to die of it, because, as the right hon. gentleman says, we cannot keep it out, where is the advantage of protection? And this, in fact, is precisely what does occur. There is only one other matter which I wish to refer to—the story, the bogus story, which the right hon. gentleman brought forward and repeated from Dr. W. B. Carpenter, the story of the mortality of the French and German armies respectively during the Franco-Prussian war.

Sir LYON PLAYFAIR: I got it from the Physician-General of the French army.

Mr. TAYLOR: I think you will find that no one believes that 23,000 of the French army *died* from smallpox. Dr. Bayard states that this was the number of *cases*, not of deaths. Again, when it is asserted that the whole French army was re-vaccinated immediately before the war, Dr. Carpenter replies—“Yes, the original French army, but the recruits taken “afterwards were not all re-vaccinated.” Then I have the authority of Dr. Oidtmanu for saying that the mortality of the original army, who were all re-vaccinated, was greater than that of the new recruits, many of whom it is supposed escaped

the operation. I understand the right hon. gentleman to say, that the numbers of civilians who died in Paris of smallpox in that year (1870) was 1,600. The right hon. gentleman does not appear to have studied the history of the epidemic, for more than that number on the average died in each of the three last months of 1870. The history of that epidemic in Paris is one of the most remarkable recorded in history, and one of the most fatal to the pretensions of protection by vaccination. In January of that year a panic set in against a supposed approaching epidemic of smallpox, and with it such a demand for vaccination as probably before had never existed. I am quoting from an interesting essay on *Variola* by Dr. Spinzig. The Municipal Council of Paris voted 10,000 francs for the organization of a system of gratuitous vaccination. The inhabitants availed themselves of the opportunity to a great extent. On one morning as many as 2,000 persons presented themselves for vaccination at one *Mairie* alone. My hon. friend, the member for Glasgow, will be interested to learn that his doubts about humanized lymph prevailed also in Paris, and that the cry was all for lymph direct from the calf. And with what result? That those thus vaccinated contracted smallpox in the same way as all others who were differently or not at all vaccinated; and that month after month the mortality increased to so terrible an extent that the *Conseil de l'Hygiene* finally rejected it altogether before the close of the year, when within three months, viz., in March, 1871, the mortality assumed a more normal condition, leaving this astounding record for the year 1870, viz., that in that year when Paris was vaccinated and re-vaccinated as it had never been before, the mortality from smallpox was double what it had been in the *aggregate* of the previous ten years.

## ANALYSIS OF VOTES ON Mr. P. A. TAYLOR'S MOTION.

NOES.

	Members.	Constituencies.
L	Acland, C. T. Dyke . . . . .	East Cornwall
L	Acland, Sir T. Dyke, Bart. . . . .	North Devon.
L	Ainsworth, David . . . . .	West Cumberland
L	Amory, Sir John Heathcot . . . . .	Tiverton
L	Asher, Alexander, Solicitor-General for Scotland	Elgin, &c.
L	Baldwin, Enoch . . . . .	Bewdley
L	Balfour, Right Hon. John B., Lord Advo- cate	Clackmannan
C	Balfour, Arthur J. . . . .	Hertford Borough
C	Barttelot, Sir Walter B. . . . .	Sussex, W.
L	Bass, Sir Arthur . . . . .	Staffordshire, E.
L	Bass, Hamar . . . . .	Tamworth
C	Beach, Right Hon. Sir M. Hicks . . . . .	Gloucestershire, E.
C	Beach, W. W. Bramston . . . . .	Hants, N.
HR	Bellingham, Alan Henry . . . . .	Louth
C	Bentinck, Right Hon. G. A. C. . . . .	Whitehaven
L	Biddulph, Michael . . . . .	Herefordshire
C	Blackburne, Col. John I. . . . .	Lancashire, S.W.
HR	Blake, John Aloysius . . . . .	Waterford Co.
L	Bolton, Joseph Cheney . . . . .	Stirling
L	Brand, Henry R., Surveyor-General of Ordnance	Stroud
L	Brassey, Henry A. . . . .	Sandwich
L	Brassey, Sir Thomas, K.C.B., Lord of the Admiralty	Hastings
L	Brett, Reginald Balliol . . . . .	Penryn, &c,
L	Brinton, John . . . . .	Kidderminster
C	Brise, Col. S. Ruggles . . . . .	Essex, E.
C	Broadley, W. H. Harrison . . . . .	York, E. Riding
C	Brooke, Lord. . . . .	Somersetshire, E.
C	Brooks, W. Cunliffe . . . . .	Cheshire, E.
L	Bruce, Right Hon. Lord Charles . . . . .	Marlborough
C	Bruce, Sir H. Hervey . . . . .	Coleraine
L	Bruce, Hon. R. Preston . . . . .	Fifeshire
C	Bruce, Hon. Thomas . . . . .	Portsmouth
L	Bryce, James . . . . .	Tower Hamlets
L	Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn . . . . .	Edinburgh
C	Burghley, Lord . . . . .	Northamptonshire, N.
L	Buszard, Marston Clarke . . . . .	Stamford
L	Caine, William Sproston . . . . .	Scarborough
L	Cameron, Charles . . . . .	Glasgow
C	Campbell, James A. . . . .	Glasgow University
L	Cartwright, William C. . . . .	Oxfordshire
L	Causton, Richard Knight . . . . .	Colchester
C	Cecil, Lord Eustace . . . . .	Essex, W.
C	Chaine, James . . . . .	Antrim Co.
L	Cheetham, John Frederick . . . . .	Derbyshire, N.



	Members.	Constituencies.
C	Christie, William Langham . . . . .	Lewes
C	Churchill, Lord Randolph . . . . .	Woodstock
C	Clarke, Edward . . . . .	Plymouth
C	Clive, Col. Hon. G. Windsor . . . . .	Ludlow
C	Coddington, William . . . . .	Blackburn
L	Colebrooke, Sir Thomas Edward . . . . .	Lanarkshire, N.
C	Collins, Thomas . . . . .	Knaresborough
HR	Commins, Andrew . . . . .	Roscommon
C	Compton, Francis . . . . .	Hants, S.
C	Coope, Octavius E. . . . .	Middlesex
C	Corry, James Porter . . . . .	Belfast
L	Cotes, Charles Cecil, Lord of the Treasury	Shrewsbury
L	Courtney, Leonard H., Secretary to the Treasury	Liskeard
L	Cowper, Hon. Henry F. . . . .	Herts
L	Creyke, Ralph . . . . .	York
C	Crichton, Viscount . . . . .	Fermanagh
L	Cropper, James . . . . .	Kendal
L	Cross, J. Kynaston, Under Secretary for India	Bolton
C	Cross, Rt. Hon. Sir R. A. . . . .	Lancashire, S.W.
L	Crum, Alexander . . . . .	Renfrew
L	Cunliffe, Sir Robert Alfred . . . . .	Denbigh, &c.
C	Curzon, Major Hon. Montagu . . . . .	Leicestershire, N.
C	Dalrymple, Charles . . . . .	Bute
C	Davenport, H. T. . . . .	Staffordshire, N.
C	Davenport, W. B. . . . .	Warwickshire, N.
L	Davey, Horace . . . . .	Christchurch
L	Davies, Richard . . . . .	Anglesey
C	Dawnay, Hon. G. C. . . . .	York, N. Riding
C	De Worms, Baron H. . . . .	Greenwich
L	Dilke, Right Hon. Sir C., President of Local Government Board	Chelsea
L	Dillwyn, Lewis Llewellyn . . . . .	Swansea
L	Dodson, Right Hon. J. G., Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster	Scarborough
C	Donaldson-Hudson, C. . . . .	Newcastle-under- Lyme
C	Douglas, A. A. . . . .	Kent, E.
L	Duckham, Thomas . . . . .	Herefordshire
L	Duff, R. W., Lord of the Treasury . . . . .	Banffshire
L	Dundas, Hon. J. C. . . . .	Richmond
C	Dyke, Right Hon. Sir W. H. . . . .	Kent, Mid
L	Earp, Thomas . . . . .	Newark
C	Eaton, Henry William . . . . .	Coventry
C	Ecroyd, William Farrer . . . . .	Preston
L	Edwards, Henry . . . . .	Weymouth
C	Egerton, Hon. A. de T. . . . .	Cheshire, Mid
C	Egerton, Hon. A. F. . . . .	Wigan
L	Egerton, Admiral Hon. F. . . . .	Derbyshire, E.
C	Elcho, Lord . . . . .	Haddingtonshire
C	Elliot, George W. . . . .	Northallerton

	Members.	Constituencies.
L	Elliot, Hon. A. R. . . . .	Roxburghshire
C	Emlyn, Viscount . . . . .	Carmarthenshire
HR	Errington, George . . . . .	Longford, Co.
C	Estcourt, George S. . . . .	Wilts, N.
L	Evans, Thomas William . . . . .	Derbyshire, S.
L	Farquharson, Dr. R. . . . .	Aberdeenshire, W
C	Fielden, Lieut.-General . . . . .	Lancashire, N.
C	Filmer, Sir Edmund . . . . .	Kent, Mid
C	Finch, George H. . . . .	Rutland
L	Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmd., Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs	Calne
L	Fitzwilliam, Hon. C. W. . . . .	Malton
C	Fletcher, Sir Henry . . . . .	Horsham
C	Floyer, John . . . . .	Dorsetshire
C	Folkestone, Viscount . . . . .	Wilts, S.
C	Forester, Cecil T. W. . . . .	Wenlock
L	Forster, Right Hon. W. E. . . . .	Bradford
C	Foster, William H. . . . .	Bridgnorth
L	Fowler, Henry H. . . . .	Wolverhampton
C	Fowler, Robert Nicholas . . . . .	London
L	Fowler, William . . . . .	Cambridge
C	Fremantle, Hon. T. F. . . . .	Bucks
C	French-Brewster, R. A. B. . . . .	Portarlington
L	Fry, Lewis . . . . .	Bristol
L	Fry, Theodore . . . . .	Darlington
C	Galway, Viscount . . . . .	Nottingham, N.
C	Garnier, John Carpenter . . . . .	Devon, S.
C	Giffard, Sir Hardinge S. . . . .	Launceston
C	Giles, Alfred . . . . .	Southampton
L	Gladstone, Herbert J., Lord of the Treasury	Leeds
L	Gladstone, William H. . . . .	Worcester, E.
L	Goschen, Right Hon. G. J. . . . .	Ripon
L	Grafton, Frederick W. . . . .	Lancashire, N.E.
L	Grant, Sir G. M. . . . .	Elgin and Nairn
C	Grantham, William . . . . .	Surrey, E.
C	Gregory, George B. . . . .	Sussex, E.
L	Grey, Albert H. G. . . . .	Northumberland, S.
L	Grosvenor, Right Hon. Lord R., Secretary to the Treasury (Teller)	Flintshire
C	Halsey, Thomas F. . . . .	Herts
C	Hamilton, Lord Claud J. . . . .	Liverpool
C	Hamilton, Right Hon. Lord G. . . . .	Middlesex
C	Harcourt, Edw. Wm. . . . .	Oxford Co.
L	Harcourt, Right Hon. Sir W., Home Secretary	Derby
L	Hartington, Right Hon. Marquis of, Secre- tary of State for War	Lancashire, N.E.
L	Hastings, George W. . . . .	Worcestershire, E.
C	Hay, Right Hon. Admiral Sir J. C. D. . . . .	Wigton
L	Hayter, Sir Arthur Divett, Fin. Sec. War Office	Bath
L	Henderson, Frank . . . . .	Dundee

	Members.	Constituencies.
C	Herbert, Hon. Sidney . . . . .	Wilton
L	Herschell, Sir Farrer, Solicitor-General . . . . .	Durham
L	Hibbert, John Tomlinson, Under-Secretary for the Home Department	Oldham
C	Hildyard, T. B. Thoroton . . . . .	Notts, S.
C	Hill, Alex. Staveley . . . . .	Staffordshire, W.
C	Holland, Sir H. T. . . . .	Midhurst
L	Holmes, John, Secretary Board of Trade . . . . .	Hackney
C	Home, Lt.-Col. D. Milne . . . . .	Berwick-on-Tweed
C	Hope, Right Hon. Alex. Beresford . . . . .	Cambridge University
L	Howard, E. Stafford . . . . .	Cumberland, E.
L	Howard, Geo. Jas. . . . .	Cumberland, E.
L	Illingworth, Alfred . . . . .	Bradford
L	Inderwick, Fred. Andrew . . . . .	Rye
L	James, Charles H. . . . .	Merthyr Tydfil
L	Jardine, Robert . . . . .	Dumfriesshire
L	Jenkins, David James . . . . .	Penryn, &c.
L	Jenkins, Sir John J. . . . .	Carmarthen
L	Jerningham, H. E. H. . . . .	Berwick-on-Tweed
L	Jones-Parry, Love . . . . .	Carnarvon
C	Kennard, Colonel . . . . .	Lymington
C	Kennard, Coleridge J. . . . .	Salisbury
C	Kennaway, Sir John H. . . . .	Devon, E.
HR	Kenny, Matthew Joseph . . . . .	Ennis
L	Kensington, Right Hon. Lord, Comptroller of Household (Teller)	Haverfordwest
L	Kingscote, Colonel . . . . .	Gloucestershire, W.
L	Kinnear, John . . . . .	Donegal
C	Knight, Frederick Winn . . . . .	Worcestershire, W.
L	Lambton, Hon. Fred. W. . . . .	Durham, S.
C	Lawrence, Sir Trevor . . . . .	Surrey, Mid
L	Lawrence, William . . . . .	London
L	Lea, Thomas . . . . .	Donegal
L	Leatham, W. H. . . . .	York, W. R., S. Div.
L	Leeman, Joseph Johnson . . . . .	York
L	Lefevre, Right Hon. G. J. Shaw, First Commissioner of Works	Reading
L	Leigh, Hon. Gilbert H. C. . . . .	Warwickshire, S.
C	Leigh, Roger . . . . .	Rochester
C	Leighton, Stanley . . . . .	Shropshire, N.
C	Lennox, Lord Henry G. . . . .	Chichester
C	Levett, Theophilus John . . . . .	Lichfield
C	Lewisham, Viscount . . . . .	Kent, W.
L	Lubbock, Sir John . . . . .	London University
C	Macnaghten, Edward . . . . .	Antrim
HR	M'Carthy, Justin . . . . .	Longford
L	M'Lagan, Peter . . . . .	Linlithgow
C	Makins, Colonel . . . . .	Essex, S.
L	Majoribanks, Edward . . . . .	Berwickshire
L	Marriott, William Thackeray . . . . .	Brighton
HR	Martin, Patrick . . . . .	Kilkenny Co.

	Members.	Constituencies.
L	Martin, R. B.	Tewkesbury
HR	Marum, Edward Mulhallen	Kilkenny Co.
L	Maskelyne, H. M. Story	Cricklade
C	Master, Thomas William Chester	Cireneester
C	Maxwell, Sir H. E.	Wigtownshire
C	Miles, Charles William	Malmesbury
L	Monk, Charles James	Gloucester
HR	Moore, Arthur	Clonmel
L	Moreton, Lord	Gloucestershire, W.
C	Morgan, Hon. Frederick	Monmouthshire
L	Morgan, Right Hon. G. O., Judge- Advocate General	Denbighshire
L	Morley, Samuel	Bristol
C	Moss, Richard	Winchester
L	Nicholson, William	Petersfield
C	Nicholson, W. Newzam	Newark
L	Noel, Ernest	Dumfries, &c.
HR	O'Shea, William Henry	Clare Co.
C	Paget, Richard Horner	Somerset, Mid-
L	Paget, Thomas Tertius	Leicestershire, S.
L	Parker, Charles Stuart	Perth
L	Pease, Arthur	Whitby
L	Pease, Sir Joseph W.	Durham, S.
L	Peel, Arthur Wellesley	Warwick
C	Pell, Albert	Leicestershire, S.
L	Pender, John	Wick
C	Perey, Earl	Northumberland, N.
C	Percy, Lord Algernon.	Westminster
L	Philips, R. Needham	Bury
C	Phipps, Charles N. P.	Westbury
C	Phipps, Pickering	Northampton, S.
L	Playfair, Right Hon. Sir L.	Edinburgh University
C	Plunket, Right Hon. David R.	Dublin University
L	Porter, Right Hon. A. M., Attorney- General for Ireland	Londonderry Co.
L	Powell, W. Riee H.	Carmarthenshire
HR	Power, Richard	Waterford
L	Pugh, Lewis Pugh	Cardiganshire
L	Pulley, Joseph	Hereford
C	Raikes, Right Hon. Henry Cecil	Cambridge University
L	Ralli, Pandelli	Wallingford
L	Rendel, Stuart	Montgomeryshire
L	Richard, Henry	Merthyr Tidfil
L	Richardson, J. N.	Armagh Co.
L	Richardson, Thomas	Hartlepool
C	Ridley, Sir Matthew W.	Northumberland, N.
C	Ritchie, Charles Thomas	Tower Hamlets
L	Roberts, John	Flint
C	Ross, Alexandra Henry	Maidstone
C	Ross, Charles Campbell	St. Ives
L	Rothschild, Sir Nath. M. de	Aylesbury
C	Round, James	Essex, E.

	Members.	Constituencies.
L	Roundell, Charles Savile . . . . .	Grantham
L	Russell, George W. E., Secretary, Local Government Board	Aylesbury
L	Russell, Lord Arthur . . . . .	Tavistock
L	St. Aubyn, Sir John . . . . .	Cornwall, W
C	St. Aubyn, Walter M. . . . .	Helston
L	Samuelson, Henry . . . . .	Frome
C	Slater-Booth, Right Hon. G. . . . .	Hants, N.
C	Scott, Lord Henry . . . . .	Hants, S.
C	Scott, Montague D. . . . .	Sussex, E.
L	Seeley, Charles . . . . .	Nottingham
C	Severne, John Edmund . . . . .	Shropshire, S
HR	Sheil, Edward . . . . .	Meath
L	Shield, Hugh . . . . .	Cambridge
L	Smith, Eustace . . . . .	Tynemouth
L	Smith, Lieut-Col. G. . . . .	Wyeombe
L	Smith, Samuel . . . . .	Liverpool
C	Smith, Right Hon. W. H. . . . .	Westminster
L	Stanley, Hon. E. Lyulph . . . . .	Oldham
C	Stanley, Edward James . . . . .	Somerset, W.
L	Stanton, Walter John . . . . .	Stroud
C	Talbot, John Gilbert . . . . .	Oxford University
L	Tavistock, Marquis of . . . . .	Bedfordshire
L	Tennant, Charles . . . . .	Peeblesshire
L	Thomasson, John P. . . . .	Bolton
L	Thompson, Thomas C. . . . .	Durham City
C	Thornhill, Thomas . . . . .	Suffolk, W.
C	Tollemache, H. J. . . . .	Cheshire, W.
C	Tollemache, Hon. W. F. . . . .	Cheshire, W.
C	Tomlinson, Wm. E. M. . . . .	Preston
C	Tottenham, Arthur Loftus . . . . .	Leitrim
L	Vivian, Arthur P. . . . .	Cornwall, W.
L	Vivian, Sir Henry H. . . . .	Glamorganshire
C	Wallace, Sir Richard . . . . .	Lisburn
L	Walter, John . . . . .	Berks
C	Warburton, Piers, Egerton . . . . .	Cheshire, Mid.
C	Warton, Charles Nicholas . . . . .	Bridport
L	Waugh, Edward . . . . .	Cockermouth
L	Webster, John . . . . .	Aberdeen
L	Whitbread, Samuel . . . . .	Bedfordshire
C	Whitley, Edward . . . . .	Liverpool
L	Whitworth, Benjamin . . . . .	Drogheda
L	Wiggin, Henry . . . . .	Staffordshire, E.
L	Williamson, Stephen . . . . .	St. Andrews
C	Wilmot, Sir Henry . . . . .	Derbyshire, S.
L	Wilson, Charles Henry . . . . .	Kingston-on-Hull
L	Wilson, Isaac . . . . .	Middlesbrough
C	Winn, Rowland . . . . .	Lineoln, N.
L	Wodehouse, Edmond R. . . . .	Bath
C	Wolf, Sir H. Drummond . . . . .	Portsmouth
C	Wortley, Chas. B. Stuart . . . . .	Sheffield
C	Wyndham, Hon. Percy . . . . .	Cumberland, W.

## FOR MR. TAYLOR'S MOTION.

AYES:—

Name.	Constituency.	Popula- tion.	Reg. Electors.	Votes given to Members when elected.	No. of Repre- sentatives.
Arnold, Arthur . . . .	Salford . . . .	176,233	23,928	11,110	2
Barran, John . . . .	Leeds . . . .	309,126	49,414	23,547	3
Blennerhassett, Rowland . . . .	Co. Kerry . . . .	190,784	5,202	No contest.	2
Bright, Jacob . . . .	Manchester . . . .	393,676	58,712	24,789	3
Burt, Thomas . . . .	Morpeth . . . .	33,402	5,749	No contest.	1
Chambers, Sir Thomas . . . .	Marylebone . . . .	498,311	34,687	14,003	2
Cohen, Arthur . . . .	Southwark . . . .	221,866	23,566	9,693	2
Cowen, Joseph . . . .	Newcastle-on-Tyne . . . .	145,228	24,261	11,766	2
Craig, William Young . . . .	Staffordshire, N. . . .	132,634	11,276	4,321	2
Ferguson, Robert . . . .	Carlisle . . . .	35,866	5,504	2,802	2
Holland, J. R. . . .	Brighton . . . .	128,407	12,657	4,913	2
Howard, James . . . .	Bedfordshire . . . .	129,929	7,340	3,143	2
Labouchere, Henry . . . .	Northampton . . . .	57,535	8,185	4,158	2
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid . . . .	Carlisle . . . .	See above		2,691	2
Roe, Thomas . . . .	Derby . . . .	77,636	13,167	No contest.	2
Rogers, J. E. Thorold . . . .	Southwark . . . .	See above		9,591	2
Taylor, P. A. . . .	Leicester . . . .	122,351	18,977	10,675	2
Hopwood, C. H. . . .	Stockport . . . .	59,544	8,158	4,232	2
Total . . . .	....	2,454,814	271,783	141,864	..

It will be seen from the above figures that the eighteen members who voted with Mr. P. A. Taylor, whilst constituting but the thirty-sixth part of the voting power of a House of 652 members, do yet represent nearly one-ninth of the registered electors, and one twelfth of the population of the United Kingdom. The full vote of three constituencies—Carlisle, Southwark, and Morpeth—was given for the abolition of compulsion as exercised against conscientious conviction. In five constituencies—Bedfordshire, Brighton, Derby, Leeds and North Staffordshire—the votes of Mr. Taylor's supporters were neutralised by the votes of the upholders of medical tyranny, the Marquis of Tavistock, Mr. Marriott, Sir W. Harcourt, Mr. Herbert Gladstone, and Mr. H. T. Davenport having gone into the opposite lobby from Mr. James Howard, Mr. Holland, Mr. Roe, Mr. Barran, and Mr. Craig respectively. Probably the electors of Derby may find the enforcement of compulsory vaccination rather too high a price to pay for the honour of being misrepresented by a Cabinet Minister, since they are reported to have told Mr. Roe that 90 per cent. of the population were opposed to the system. The other members for Salford, Manchester, Marylebone, Leicester and Stockport either absented themselves from the House, or abstained from voting in the opposite sense to Mr. Arthur Arnold, Mr. Jacob Bright, Sir Thomas Chambers, Mr. P. A. Taylor, and Mr. Hopwood.

It will be observed that three county members—the representatives of Bedfordshire, North Staffordshire, and Co. Kerry—voted with the minority. One Irish member, Mr. Blennerhassett, ranged himself on the side of the small band of English Radicals who so bravely upheld the rights of conscientious parents against medical tyranny.



