

DESERET EVENING NEWS

Organ of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.
LORENZO SNOW, TRUSTEE-IN-TRUST.

PUBLISHED EVERY EVENING.
PRINTED BY THE DESERET NEWS.
111 E. Temple Street, Salt Lake City, Utah.

Charles W. Penrose, Editor.
George G. Whitney, Business Manager.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICES
Per Year, \$3.00
Six Months, \$1.50
Three Months, .75
One Month, .25
One Week, .05
Saturday edition, per year, \$2.00
Five-Year, \$12.00

EDITORIAL OFFICE
154-156 Times Building, New York City. In charge of B. F. Cummings, Manager Foreign Advertising, from our Home Office.

Correspondence and other reading matter for publication should be addressed to the EDITOR.
Address all business communications to THE DESERET NEWS, Salt Lake City, Utah.

SALT LAKE CITY, JAN. 24, 1901.

THE TOPIC OF THE HOUR.

A supreme effort is being made by the physicians of the State, to force vaccination upon all the children of school age. A bill has been introduced for the purpose of opening the schools to healthy children who have not been exposed to contagion. It is now under consideration by the committees on health, of the Senate and of the House. This is the text, as presented by Mr. McMillan of Salt Lake, on January 18:

A BILL.
For an Act to Prevent Compulsory Vaccination in the Public Schools of the State of Utah.

Section 1. That hereafter it shall be unlawful for any board of health, board of education, or any other public board, acting in this State under police regulations or otherwise, to compel by resolution, order or proceedings of any kind the vaccination of any child, or person of any age; or making vaccination a condition precedent to the attendance of any public or private school in the State of Utah, either as pupil or teacher.

The doctors have had their innings. They have used all the stock arguments in favor of vaccination, with which readers on the subject are familiar. They have explained, in the usual manner of the faculty for nearly a century, the reason why some vaccinated persons contract and die of smallpox; that is, the vaccination did not "take," or was "imperfect" or "not successful." They took up most of the time before the joint committee in asserting and proclaiming their sincerity—which no one questions, their belief in the virtues of vaccination, arising from their medical training, and they lauded the celebrated Jenner as the greatest benefactor of the race—and who, by the by, claimed for vaccination what none of them now admit, and practiced the operation in a manner that they all now discard—and they talked round the subject which was before the committee, without touching it except in the most gingerly fashion.

The gentlemen present to speak in favor of the bill had little opportunity at the morning session to present their side of the question. But one speaker drew attention to the real question, namely, the exclusion of healthy children from the public schools. We presume they will have a hearing by the time the "News" goes to press.

The virtues or evils of vaccination are not at present the subject of contention by the supporters of the bill. All they want is to remove the absurd restrictions which shut out healthy children, unexposed to contagious disease, from the schools supported by taxation, and to which they have a rational and lawful right of entry.

Queries have arisen in the discussion which have not been satisfactorily answered. One is, if vaccination renders the subject immune, what danger is there to the vaccinated from the unvaccinated? Another is, why has Switzerland abolished the compulsory law, and why has England, after a century of trial, so modified the compulsory law that no one who has conscientious scruples against it and will say so, can be prosecuted for violating the law? Still another is, why are healthy children, too feeble to be vaccinated and therefore more liable than others to be infected, permitted to go to school on a doctor's certificate, while perfectly healthy children but who have not been vaccinated are denied admission? The efforts to flounder around these questions were truly ludicrous.

Now the great majority of the people of Utah are perfectly willing for the advocates of vaccination to set forth their strong reasons, to advise, persuade, and induce people to have their children vaccinated and be vaccinated themselves. No one is fighting that kind of procedure. It is the policy of force which arouses the indignation of the great bulk of the citizens of the State and against which they are raising a mighty protest.

There is not a line of law that justifies it. True, on the admission of certain alleged facts, which were not really facts, but for legal purposes were not denied, two justices of the Supreme court supported the city board of education and the city board of health, in excluding an unvaccinated child from a public school. Observe, the authority of the State board was not passed upon, nor even called in question. The other justice supported the decision of the District Judge and denounced the act as an attempt to effect by indirection what could not be done under the law directly. Thus two judges ruled against compulsory vaccination in any form, and two supported it simply because certain alleged facts were agreed to by both sides, in order to bring one point to the front.

The State board, or rather one member of it, has assumed the right to formulate rules and enforce them upon local boards. There is not a line of law for the exercise of any such authority. The utmost that can be legally claimed

for the State board is, "co-ordinate powers" with the local boards in school matters, and that is not definitely given as to the schools. The question is, shall that board, which is like the fifth wheel to a coach—the local boards making the essential number—dominate this State or shall the majority of the people rule?

As a matter of fact, the State board has dwindled or swelled—as you please—to the autonomy of one individual, inflated with self-importance, who sends out his edicts, and actually employs agents, to carry them forth, with threats of their enforcement by prosecution, and there is not a line of statutory law that bestows such tyrannical power. The citizens of this State are manning against this usurpation. They call on us, and on the Legislature to help put it down.

The bill now before the joint committee will settle the question as to the schools. There is not a shadow of logical or legal argument to shut out healthy, unexposed children from the schools. To stop further trouble and contention and litigation, let the bill now pending be passed without delay. That will settle this part of the tumult.

Then let vaccination be argued on its merits, if necessary. Let the truth prevail. No one wants to stop the doctors from their work upon willing subjects, nor their reasoning and persuasion on its merits. Go ahead! Vaccinate all you can, without compulsion. But keep your hands off those whom you have no right to force to submit to a surgical operation, which however much you may believe in, is still a matter of medical dispute, and in any event must not be violently thrust upon free American citizens.

"SOMEWHAT BIASED."

The Medical Record, in a thoughtful editorial on the physician as an expert witness, comments on the well known fact that expert medical evidence both in civil and criminal cases, is invariably looked upon as "a very unsatisfactory kind of testimony." There have been cases in which men in the vanguard of the medical profession have testified in direct opposition to each other, says the Record. The explanation offered by that reputable journal is this, that "the medical profession is assuredly in the bulk honest and honorable, but when, by tending certain testimony, one's own patient and one's own pocket are likely to benefit, one is unconsciously inclined to be somewhat biased." The truth of this, we think, no one will call in question. And that is one reason why thinking people are slow to form conclusions on medical testimony, whether presented in the form of statements of alleged facts, scientific conclusions, or partial figures.

TROUBLE AT STANFORD.

There is trouble at the Stanford university, and it is of a nature to cause widespread concern.

It dates back to last November, when Dr. Edward A. Ross was discharged, for the alleged reason that "Mrs. Stanford had lost confidence in his judgment." The specific reason was said to be that he, in a public address, had advocated laws for the restriction of coolie labor, although he knew that the late Senator Stanford had employed such labor in railroad construction.

This dismissal aroused both the faculty and the students. Professor George E. Harvard denounced the dismissal as an outrage, and then his resignation was demanded. Later other resignations followed, and now the question is whether it is for the best interests of American education, that benefactors of institutes of learning assume the power of dismissing from the service all instructors who differ with them in views, no matter how competent they may be otherwise.

On this question there are now two factions. One holds that liberty of speech is no longer one of the privileges enjoyed by teachers in universities, but that, as one contemporary has it, ready-made thoughts go with the land and buildings. The other claims that the professor's first duty is to teach the truth, as he sees it, and that if in doing so, he feels it necessary to criticize existing conditions, he should not be thrown out on that account. Mrs. Stanford seems to have taken the stand that the professors are merely her hired servants, whom she can dismiss when they, for one reason or another, become the objects of her personal dislike. That this is an error will be admitted by most persons. Unless the instructors are the servants of truth, their mission is a failure. And unless institutes of learning are endowed for the purpose of enabling the occupants of the various chairs to serve better the cause of truth, the munificence of the endower is worse than wasted.

Some censorship, we presume, there must be over the teachings of universities. How far this must go is difficult to determine. Charlatany and obvious heresies cannot be tolerated in our institutes of learning, where the youthful character is moulded for future duties as American citizens. On the other hand, responsible devotees of the sciences should not be curtailed in their investigations or their liberty of utterance. Perhaps the public itself can be best trusted to exercise the correct censorship. For it is certain that the soundness of doctrine and ability of imparting instruction are well indicated by the patronage of such institutions. The students will come from the other end of the world, in order to reap the benefits of the teachings of some professor famous for ability in a particular line. At the same time the falling off in attendance at schools, where undue influence is exercised, is equally indicative of the correctness of popular judgment. The loss of prestige of the Chicago university at the time that Prof. Bonis was obliged to give up his chair because he was not permitted to give free utterance to his investigations in the sphere of political economy, and especially in the department of trusts, is an illustration of this. Unless the endowers of universities, who very often are but little competent to do more for them than give them pecuniary support, give up the idea of personal control, they will

find that their munificence is thrown away, as regards any real public benefit to be derived from their benevolence.

EDWARD THE KING.

The cheers with which the crowds greeted Edward VII, King of Great Britain and Emperor of India, indicate the change of popular sentiment toward him during the last few years. The Prince of Wales, twenty years ago, was not enshrined in the hearts of the people. Very often he caused his mother much anxiety, and merited severe censure. But of late years he has grown in favor with the people, and he ascends the throne, followed by the best wishes of his subjects.

That the event will bring about any immediate or radical change in the policy of the government, is highly improbable. The Prince of Wales has for years represented the Queen at the more laborious functions of state. He has been prominent at the laying of cornerstones of public buildings and the entertainment of foreign diplomats. Very often he has been consulted by the cabinet ministers. In this way he has become familiar with the duties that devolve upon the sovereign of the British empire, and he will, undoubtedly, fulfill them in the spirit of true democracy.

Perhaps as a matter of curiosity it can be mentioned that astrologers, about a year ago, predicted that the death of the Queen would be followed by a prolonged and horrible war in South Africa. A Nevada prognosticator on the 4th of March last year, published a statement to that effect. He added that England was to meet with success and reverse alternately, and that when she was most sure of victory, she would meet with "a most crushing defeat," and be compelled to yield to the Afrikaners. Nobody with common intelligence believes in the guesses of astrologers, but the change in the British government at this time reminds us of that prognostication. Certain it is, that one of the first questions suggested by the recent events in Great Britain is this, What effect, if any, will they have upon the country's South African policy? When the Afrikaner delegation arrives in London, that question will be answered.

BACK TO THE FARM.

A contributor to the January number of World's Work writes thoughtfully about the advantages of farm life, as compared to "city life." He has investigated the subject closely, and his conclusion is that anyone with a little capital, preference for farm work, average intelligence, industry and good health, can, in five years, be better off even on a small farm than he would be as a common laborer in the cities.

Most of the farmers here say have an abundance of wholesome food and a little account in the savings bank. They feel secure against the great changes in the economic world, caused by strikes, panics and fluctuating prices. What they formerly spent on "appearances" and amusements, they put into their establishment and every improvement furnishes them an additional sense of pleasure. But what impresses the writer most is the development of character in the industrious farmer, and the achievement of the qualities of "ladyship" by the wife, notwithstanding the supposed drudgery of the work. The subject is one often emphasized in these columns. For the acquisition of independence and comfort, there is no surer road, to a great number of the young men of a community, than that offered in agricultural pursuits. The writer in the World's Work speaks of the conditions in the East, but what he says is equally, if not more, applicable to the West. Back to the farm, is generally speaking, good advice.

Omaha police are still craning their necks to see which way the Crowe flies.

Col. Roosevelt is just slaying mountain lions in Colorado, Woe to the British lion if he ever hunts it.

An exchange says there is no partisanship in corruption. Perhaps not, but there is a great deal of division.

A fight on cigarettes is being made in the Michigan legislature. It may or it may not end in smoke.

Mme. Sara Bernhardt is said to be somewhat stouter than of yore. It would be truer to say that she is "less thinner" than in days of old.

Chicago is again imitating New York. A vigilance committee has been formed there. What is the matter with Chicago that she follows instead of leading? Is she losing her "zip"?

Hello! What does this mean? The New York Phonograph company has sued Thomas A. Edison for a quarter of a million. Evidently somebody's wires are crossed.

Much is being said of the Victoria age. It has been a great one, in some respects the greatest England has known. But the great age of English literature is still the Elizabethan.

Grover Cleveland crystallized a terrible indictment of two great powers when he said England and the United States were both killing natives in order to possess their lands," says the Troy Press. Truly there is a literary gem of the first water.

A London dispatch says that Edward VII has less patronage at his disposal than the average commissioner in the New York city government. That is easily explained. The former is a constitutional monarch while the latter is an autocratic ruler.

Mr. Bryan's "Commoner" has made its appearance. It is said that an enthusiastic admirer offered ten thousand dollars for the first number. This is the price that a Brooklyn lady a few years ago, gave for a perfect copy of "Caxton's Sir Thomas Malory's 'Morte Darthur'." The Brooklyn lady's money was better spent than was the enthusiastic admirer's.

The idea that anybody is "placed on trial" because a venomous adversary charges him in a vague, general and vicious manner with undertaking for a money consideration a political job, is

one of the curiosities of journalistic reasoning. Why, the charge itself, coming from such a source, is more of a compliment than anything else. Approval from that quarter would be something to be avoided as a disaster. "On trial," forsooth, what next?

Prince Ching thinks that the powers should take into consideration the value of the loot secured by the allied troops when the question of indemnity to be paid comes up. The suggestion is a very proper one, one that should be entertained and is logical. Looting is against the laws of modern war and is withal a most barbaric practice. Perhaps the suggestion comes from the wrong source to have any weight, no matter how meritorious itself.

What a great State California is. In the United States it is a commonly accepted belief, is a prime article of faith in governmental theory, that the truest and best foundation of the commonwealth is education. In the matter of higher education California beats the country, having one college student to every 419 of population. In the matter of expenditure for high schools only three States—New York, Ohio and Massachusetts—exceed her in proportion to population. Only two States—Massachusetts and Nevada—spend more per capita of population on their common schools than California.

In the pantries and corridors in the private part of Windsor Castle are a set of printed rules for the observance of the servants which are said to have been penned by her majesty's own hand. They are neatly printed and framed, and hang where they are constantly before the eyes of those for whom they are intended. They are:

"Profane no divine ordinances."
"Touch not state matters."
"Urgo no heulies."
"Pick no quarrels."
"Maintain no ill opinions."
"Encourage no vice."
"Repeat no grievances."
"Reveal no secrets."
"Make no comparisons."
"Keep no bad company."
"Make no long meals."
"Lay no wagers."

Splendid rules, rules fit for Utopia or Paradise. But only the power of an empress-queen could enforce them against cooks and scullions.

TROUBLE AT STANFORD.

Kansas City Star.
The fact that four other professors are leaving Leland Stanford University as a sequel to the dismissal of Prof. E. A. Ross last November, indicates a revolt against Mrs. Stanford's policy that is tantamount to a condemnation of it in the public mind. Prof. Ross was asked to resign because his speeches expressed views on Chinese immigration and municipal ownership of public utilities different from those held by Mrs. Stanford. Prof. G. E. Howard took occasion to criticize the action of Mrs. Stanford in an intemperate address before his class. As he refused to apologize, his resignation was called for. Prof. W. H. Hudson of the English department and Prof. C. O. Little, head teacher in mathematics, resigned out of sympathy with Mr. Howard, and Prof. B. Brown of the art department has announced his intention of leaving.

Chicago News.
Three more (making five in all) Stanford University professors have resigned as a consequence of economic criticisms disagreeable to Mrs. Stanford. The professors, instead of bringing their heads about street car problems of San Francisco and other matters in which Mrs. Stanford is financially interested, should have compared her, a la Trikes, to the Sappho of the Leucadian steep. Mrs. Brownings or Pevens Nightingale. Then they could have retained their professorships at increased salaries expressive of their discrimination and appreciation.

Chicago Times-Herald.
Outside the clashing factions of the campus there are those who have the temerity to assert that intellectual activity is one of the principal objects of a university. They may even dissent from Prof. Ross' plan against the importation of Chinese labor and still believe that that plea is not a profane intrusion because Mrs. Stanford happens to employ Chinese labor on her farms. They will assert, indeed, that it is really grotesque to hamper any university discussion of questions of general public interest by the warning that it will be considered personal out on the ranch.

Worcester Gazette.
Coercive measures, so destructive to the growth and integrity of individuals, have been singularly absent so far in our educational life, and the tendency has been more and more toward a recognition of the sacredness of the principle of freedom, so that the recent incident, comes with a sense of shock. There is every reason to hope, however, that the difficulty will not be a permanent one, and that the proper influences will be exerted upon Mrs. Stanford to reconsider her decisions, and restore prestige to a university that has hitherto stood out with peculiar distinctness as a model of all that is good and influential in American life.

Boston Herald.
More will be known about these matters some time. There is no call for hasty judgment. The freedom of instruction in an institution of liberal education is of the first importance. This may be said without denying that there are rational limits to such freedom. We do not imagine that Stanford University, with all its money, can afford to teach that all the methods and motives of the men who built the Central Pacific railroad were exemplary. It is a waste of money to establish a university to inculcate such morals and economies.

Los Angeles Times.
If Mrs. Stanford is possessed of the idea that she is "the whole thing," she will do well to disabuse herself of that idea. Insistence upon it will surely destroy the usefulness of the institution which bears the Stanford name. It is a matter of wide conviction among citizens of the State that not one dollar of the money that went to build and equip the Stanford University belonged of right to those who obtained possession and control of the vast railway interests built up at the expense of the people of California. Legally and technically the Stanford millions were private property. In a moral sense they belonged to the people, from whom they were obtained by notorious methods, which need not here be discussed.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

The February number of McClure's Magazine opens with a story by Josephine Dodge, "Heart of a Child," beautifully told. Another article deals with Richard Croker. This is by William Allen White. Among other articles of interest are "Some Recollections of John Wilkes Booth," by Clara Morris, and "The Problem of Problems of Chemistry," by Professor Ira Remsen, LL.D. of Johns Hopkins University. The fiction of this number is especially good, among the authors being Rudyard Kipling, Sarah Orne Jewett, Robert Barr and Edwin Leverett. Illustrations are contributed by Kenyon

SPECIAL SALE of KNIT UNDERWEAR

Week Commencing Monday, Jan. 21.

OUR ENTIRE STOCK, Comprising the Leading Makes of the Country,

To be Sold Without Reserve for One Week Only, at a Reduction of

25%

POSITIVELY NO SALE GOODS EXCHANGED.

Z. C. M. I. T. G. WEBBER, Supt

Cox, Edwin Lord Weeks, Lockwood Kipling, Edmund J. Sullivan and others.—The S. S. McClure Co., New York.

CLEARANCE SALE

We will close out Men's Suits that we have been selling at \$5, \$6 and \$6.50 for—

\$3.50 A SUIT.

Young Men's Suits that we have been selling from \$5 to \$6 a suit at—

\$3.25.

Overcoats, boys' \$1.00, Men's \$4.50, \$5.00, that are half price, to make room for our big spring stock.
L. D. S. Knit Garments for Ladies and Gentlemen \$1.00, \$1.25, \$1.50, \$2.00, \$2.25. Big bargains in Ladies', Misses', and Children's Knit Underwear.

CUTLER BROS. CO.,

36 MAIN STREET, SALT LAKE CITY.

"KEEP MONEY AT HOME"

By insuring with the

HOME FIRE "UTAH"

"INSURE TODAY TOMORROW MAY BE TOO LATE."

DONT CARRY YOUR OWN RISK!

HEBER J. GRANT & CO.,

General Agents.

TRUNK FACTORY.

OLIVER R. MEREDITH,

Dealer in and Repairer of Bicycles and Trunks.

29 E. First South Street.

SALT LAKE THEATRE,

GEO. D. PYPER, Manager.

SPECIAL!

Manager Pyper Announces the OPENING TOMORROW (Friday)

At 10 a. m. of the

SALE OF SEATS

FOR THE ENGAGEMENT OF THE WORLD'S GREATEST CONTRALTO,

COLLAMARINI

—ASSISTED BY—
RUSSO AND ALESSANDRONI
AND THE

BOSTON LYRIC OPERA CO.

50—PEOPLE—50

SALT LAKE CITY'S GREATEST MUSICAL FESTIVAL.

Prices: Collamarini Nights, \$1.00, \$1.50, 75c, 50c, and 25c.
Comic Opera Nights, \$1.00, 75c, 50c, and 25c.
Matinee, 75c, 50c, and 25c.

Next Week, Lord Chumley.