

been impregnated with vile blood disorders, by the filthy practice of putting animal corruption into their veins. Numerous instances are cited to prove this. It is also claimed that the practice of taking pus from one vaccinated child to inoculate another, often communicates disease hereditary in the family to which the first belongs.

There have been cases in this Territory which seem to bear out these objections. And if it can be demonstrated that the decline in the fatality and spread of smallpox is due to other causes than vaccination, there will be a revulsion of public sentiment on the question, and people will become as repugnant to the practice as they are now eager to sustain it by law and by custom.

Compulsory vaccination, which obtains in England and some other countries, has always been resisted by a portion of the people, and parents are willing to pay repeatedly the fine imposed for neglect of the regulation, rather than infuse into their children's blood diseased matter from an animal or from the arm of a child who may possibly be of diseased ancestors.

This opposition has become so strong of late as to open the question of the value of vaccination, once considered settled by the faculty. A commission has been appointed under Act of Parliament in England, to investigate thoroughly the whole subject and make a full report. The result of these inquiries will be looked for with interest, not only by practising physicians, but by all who desire the health and welfare of the human family.

### PROHIBITION.

The prohibitionists are increasing in numbers in this country; it is a question whether or not they are increasing in influence. In New Hampshire and Massachusetts they have failed to obtain amendments to the State Constitutions, and it is not unlikely that in Rhode Island, where prohibition has been established for nearly three years, the measure will be repealed.

There are more people than ever in the United States who believe it would be better for the country if no intoxicants were manufactured, and that the evils of alcohol very far outweigh the benefits that come from its use for any purpose. But most of them hesitate to vote for legislation that is so restrictive of the rights of individuals as that involved in the prohibition movement.

Temperance is the great desideratum. A well-balanced person is temperate in all things. But temperance does not always mean total abstinence. It means moderation, and this implies use. As to intoxicants, the term temperance must not be applied when the view is taken that they are always harmful. But this is yet an open question. The most intelligent and conscientious people, however, are agreed, we think, on the proposition that anything which intoxicates ought not to be indulged in as a beverage or used commonly at all. In some cases of sickness, it is believed they may be prudently resorted to with benefit. But even this is disputed by people with extreme views, or whose aversion to alcohol in any form has become intense because of the mischief it has wrought in all classes of society.

Alcohol is used in the arts for many purposes, and it is difficult to see how its place could be supplied if its manufacture were entirely cut off. It is claimed that it exists in nature, and, indeed, to some extent in everything that is consumed by mankind. But, on the other hand, it is shown that it is born only of death, produced only by decomposition, and so does not come to us naturally. The temperate in thought and judgment will recognize its use, while they condemn its abuse; that which may be proper in mechanics may be very improper as a drink.

It is undeniable that all nations, in all ages, have exhibited an appetite for fluids containing more or less alcohol. Wine or strong drink of some kind has been manufactured from time immemorial. And whatever may be claimed as to its moderate or occasional use in exceptional cases, it cannot be truthfully denied that its history is disfigured with monstrous evils, and that mankind, wherever it has been introduced, has been demoralized by its influence, and frightfully degraded when made slaves to its insidious power.

It is all very well to talk of moderate drinking and draw a parallel to it with moderate eating. But the facts are that the two appetites cannot be fairly compared. Strong drink obtains a mastery over most people, when indulged in frequently, that rarely loses its hold. And its moral effects are so terrible and so baneful both upon the individual and upon society, that no just comparison can be made between drunkenness and gluttony.

It is in view of the weakness of mortality and the inability of most people to resist the advances of the appetite for intoxicants when it once is fairly formed, that their use has been declared by the Great Author of the universe to be unwise in His people. In a community of Latter-day Saints it ought to be perfectly practicable to establish prohibition. So in any community of total abstinens. But in a mixed society, republican in its form of government, prohibition does not appear to be feasible or consistent. While it is perfectly right for the common good that drunkenness should be prohibited and made penal, it may not be right to deprive people who think it no harm to partake sparingly of the liberty to eat and drink such things as they choose when they do not infringe upon the rights and liberties of other people.

And yet the public drinking saloon has been demonstrated to be an evil, difficult to control and almost impossible to suppress without exceedingly stringent legislation. High license seems now to be the favorite method of regulating that which has been found so hard to put down. How long this method will prevail remains to be seen. It may be that when this proves not to arrest the tide of intemperance, a wave of public indignation will sweep over the land and prohibition will be tried with a determination to prohibit.

Wherever the preponderance of public sentiment is honestly in its favor, and those who are entrusted with its execution are faithful to their official obligations, prohibition will be found to work nearly, at least, as well as other laws, and the evil effects of dram-drinking will be wonderfully lessened if they are not destroyed.

It is no argument against prohibition that liquor is sold in places where it is established by law. There are murders where killing is a capital offense. Stealing is committed where the penalties against it are severe. Crimes against the person are perpetrated in spite of enactments to prevent them. No one with brains will ridicule the existence of the laws because they do not effectually prohibit the offenses which they were designed to suppress.

There is, no doubt, much truth in the statement that in some places where it has been tried, prohibition has been to a great extent a farce. But is not this because it was not