

A Word to The Wise!

Do not be misled—attorneys of repute nail misrepresentations circulated against the proposed Anti-Compulsory Vaccination Amendment on the Ballot. Be sure and vote 312 X YES. If you vote NO you are voting for Compulsory Vaccination.

PORTLAND, Oct. 22.—(To the Editor Oregonian.)—A letter has appeared in your columns signed by H. D. McInturff, secretary of the Oregon committee for the protection of public health, who is also an employe of the Oregon state board of health, calling upon me to explain my position as one of the sponsors of the anti-compulsory vaccination amendment.

In reply to Mr. McInturff's assertion permit me to say that the committee for the preservation of public health has been and is basing its entire fight against the measure on false and misleading statements and accusations. For example, his statement to the effect that all other life insurance companies are fighting this amendment is untrue, as I have before me a copy of the Pacific Echo, the official organ of the Neighbors of Woodcraft, which contains the amendment, together with the affirmative argument for the amendment as found in the voters' manual. The editor further comments as follows: "It seems to the Pacific Echo that the amendment should be approved by the voters of Oregon. We have altogether too much legal invasion of the purely private and personal right to attend to our own business these days, anyway."

As a matter of fact, I have no knowledge of any life insurance company except the Metropolitan that is fighting this measure. It stands to reason that the examining physicians for other companies may be, as all allopathic physicians have a personal and financial interest at stake, and as it appears that the opposition to this measure is being conducted chiefly by allopathic physicians and those interested in the manufacture of vaccines. The homely phrase of Sam Jones seems appropriate: "It is the hit dog that yelps."

It may be enlightening to the public to know that the medical examinations required of all life insurance companies are required by the state.

After having several years' experience as a druggist, I will agree with friend McInturff that I have no confidence in the recommendations of the medical fraternity.

The dogmatic charge that I have allowed myself to be guided by "ignorant prejudice" and that I have "allied" myself with "quacks" and "misguided proponents," the "product of mental abnormality," is typical of the attitude of the allopathic medical profession in general, whose whole assumption is that none but a medical man's word is worth listening to, and that the representatives of the American Medical association should do the thinking for everybody. In other words, the attack on this measure assumes the attitude of let none who is not an allopathic doctor be considered worthy of being allowed to think or to speak. It is a clear revival of the same quality of thought as that which carried on the inquisition.

The proponents of compulsory medicine take much credit to themselves in quoting from health reports as to what was accomplished in the army, but they signally leave out such facts as the following, which are taken from the United States public health reports: During the influenza epidemic of 1918, for a period of ten weeks running from September 20 to November 29, among the 1,500,000 soldiers in camps in this country, the flower of American manhood, medically inspected, seruminized, vaccinated and under absolute control of allopathic doctors in sanitary camps, there was a death rate of 14.66 a thousand, while among the entire civil population, including many rejects, city slums, the ailing and the aged, fully one-third not having regular medical treatment, the death rate during the same ten weeks was only 3.18 a thousand. In other words, among the medicated soldiers the death rate was about four and one-half times as great as among the non-medicated civilians.

It is not conclusive to say that the reduction of smallpox and other diseases in the army during the world war as compared to other wars was all due to vaccination or inoculation. Thinking people everywhere believe that better sanitary conditions played a most important part.

Quinine and pills did not remove the yellow fever from the canal zone or

our southern states, but draining and filling swamps and ridding the country of mosquitos did.

In reply to the allegation that the passage of this measure will endanger the health of the people of the state, I submit the following statement, signed by many reputable practicing attorneys:

"We, the undersigned, have examined the above anti-compulsory vaccination amendment, and in our opinion—

- "1. This amendment does not abolish public health laws.
- "2. This does not abolish quarantine.
- "3. It does not permit food handlers to refuse examination.
- "4. It does not allow persons infected with smallpox, leprosy, syphilis and other diseases to go upon our streets, in hotels, theatres, churches, schools or trains.
- "5. This amendment does not prevent vaccination, inoculation or other serum treatments to those who desire them, but it does prevent one from being compelled to submit to these forms of treatment.

(Signed)

"MAURICE A. SEITZ,
"W. T. VAUGHN,
"JUNIOUS V. OHMART,
"LOYAL H. MCCARTHY,
"W. O. SIMS,
"F. C. McDOUGALL,
"GEO. D. YOUNG,
"JOHN A. JEFFREY,
"HAMILTON JOHNSTONE,
"RALPH A. COAN,
"E. B. BIRKENBEUEL,
"J. O. STEARNS,
"ASHBY C. DICKSON,
"WILSON T. HUME,
"CLARENCE H. GILBERT,
"E. J. MENDENHALL,
"W. H. SHIVELY,
"R. K. WALTON."

(The above are well known Portland attorneys.)

North Dakota, Montana and Utah have had similar laws in force for years and no serious results have followed.

In reply to your small measure of advice, permit me to ask you, in the spirit of justice and humanity, to vote 312 yes, and you may still be vaccinated.
C. L. McKENNA.

Hillsboro, Oregon, Oct. 26, 1920.

Having noted the criticisms of the anti-compulsory vaccination amendment, have examined the proposed measure and fail to see wherein it would in any way interfere with any existing quarantine laws or regulations, or prevent the detention of any person afflicted with any disease, contagious or otherwise. If adopted it would prevent the exclusion of any person from any school, or other places, because such person had not been vaccinated. The result would be to leave the question of vaccination optional with each individual, without any compulsion or discrimination on the part of the authorities.

BENTON BOWMAN, Attorney at Law,
M. B. BUMP, Attorney at Law.

Anti-Compulsory Vaccination Committee

DR. E. T. HELMS, Chairman

(Paid Advs.)