

mnskets, their unanimity on that point is all the more remarkable."

Mr. Gladstone has offered his successor all the aid he may see fit to ask, but it is more than likely that the new premier has already laid out a line of policy of his own, and that his premiership marks an epoch in the history of the nation. The present position has always been the goal of his ambition.

What Gladstone still has to say to the liberal party will be listened to with keen interest. A party council will probably be summoned before long, and the voice of the "grand old man" will once more be heard, indicating the course to follow. Then it will probably be made more clear what part the retiring premier proposes to take in the struggle that is still pending.

THE MEDICAL BILL.

No one subject of legislation pending in the present Assembly has attracted the personal attention and excited the personal interest of as many citizens of the Territory as has the question of a medical law. An avalanche of petitions relative to it have poured in upon the Assembly and the number of signatures attached to them aggregate many thousands. By far the greater number of the signers have asked the repeal of the present law and protested against the enactment of any similar legislation. Ever since the people of the Territory generally have realized the character of the medical law that was passed at the last session of the Legislature their indignation and resentment have steadily increased. Thousands of intelligent, solid, conservative citizens of the Territory, who are not easily swayed by any passing political breeze or subject of popular discontent, sincerely feel that the last Assembly, by passing the present medical law, committed an invasion of their rights. This sentiment has no doubt been increased by the efforts of individuals who, for personal reasons, justifiable or otherwise, have antagonized the law and exaggerated its objectionable features.

But making all just allowance for the results that have attended the efforts of interested individuals to arouse public antagonism towards the law, the statute is hostile to what has always been the prevailing public sentiment in the Territory ever since the first settlers located in it. A very large proportion of its inhabitants have always regarded with more or less distrust the teachings of schools of medicine, and the alleged skill and ability of physicians to successfully combat disease. It is not the purpose here to discuss the question whether or not such distrust is proper or justifiable. It exists as a marked public sentiment, and always has, and there ought not to be any allegation from any source that the people have not a perfect right to entertain it. Hence the objection of the people to the action of the last Assembly.

It is a matter of history that with almost unflinching regularity a coterie of physicians, at succeeding sessions of the Legislature, sought the passage of a medical law, more or less nearly in line with the existing one; but the

Assembly always resisted the proposition until 1892, when success at last attended the efforts of the doctors. It is notoriously true that it has always been the doctors and not the people who have wanted a medical law, and to the legislators the question has been whether the people or the doctors should rule. At the session of 1892 a physician who had repeatedly labored for a medical law was made chairman of the public health committee in the House, and this circumstance goes far towards explaining how the law came to be passed.

There has been a general anticipation that the present Assembly would either repeal in toto the medical law, or pass another that would remove its objectionable features. Probably a dozen bills have been introduced with the latter object in view, but nearly all of them have been killed. The House committee on public health has reported adversely on most of them, but a waiting public waited in vain for it, or its Council counterpart, to offer a bill that either could support, until the 50th day of the session, when a measure was introduced in the House and after amendment has now passed that body.

The bill is quite a disappointment in every respect, and though it is amendatory of the act of two years ago in some particulars, it is essentially a reproduction of it. Unfortunately the very features of the old law that have been the cause of so much unpopularity remain largely unchanged. Two forms of certificates are provided for, but their difference is not well-defined. There is a reduction in the license fee, which was formerly deemed too high; but the same authority is left with the board to determine what is a "respectable medical college." Under one of the sections a non-graduate, who secures the endorsement of twenty-five legal voters of the "city or precinct" in which he resides, is permitted to practice medicine in such city or precinct; thus a practitioner may lawfully prescribe for a patient on one side of a precinct or corporate boundary line, but if he do the same act of benefit or mercy on the other side of that line, he is a criminal! This is a proposition that is not contained in the present law, and in this respect the bill is worse than the statute. There is room for some ambiguity as to the meaning of the term "immoral or dishonorable conduct," and for a good deal of uncertainty as to the proceedings against one charged with such conduct. Faulty and absurd construction must also be charged as to the "administration of family remedies," which is exempted from the operations of the bill. What are "family remedies?" What is the difference between "family remedies" and "drug store remedies?" In general? How is it to be determined whether a practitioner, prosecuted for violating the law, did or did not confine his prescriptions for the sick to "family remedies?" A person might innocently suppose he was using a "family remedy" while the medical board might try to prove that it was some other kind of remedy. A remedy administered to a whole family would certainly be a "family remedy" under the ordinary meaning of words; but does the

language of this bill imply that the dose to cure one must be given to the whole family?

It would be easy to go on and multiply instances of carelessness in preparation, and of objections in principle, but lack of space forbids. The measure evidently intends to make it easier for a non-graduate to get a license, but there appears to be a clash between sections on this point, and the result is uncertain. The worst feature is the failure to define or restrict the powers of the board in respect to the examinations it may require applicants for "certificates" to pass. It provides, in effect, that those examinations shall be such as the board may see fit to prescribe, and the result is that the board is given absolute and autocratic power to exclude any applicant, on the ground that the result of his examination was not satisfactory. When it is remembered that this examination includes the moral conduct and character of the applicant, as well as his professional qualifications, the inquisitorial character of such a law is apparent; it virtually places an applicant for the privilege of practicing medicine, on trial before a jury that may be avowedly hostile to him, and with no law to govern them in making up their verdict except their own sweet will.

The News thinks that if nothing better can be offered in the Legislature, that body would do well to simply repeal the law of 1892. For nearly half a century the Territory flourished without a medical law, and the overwhelming majority of its voters remain unconvinced to the belief that they need one; though this is not saying that the right kind of a medical law would not be a good thing in Utah.

ROSEBERRY'S VISIT TO BRIGHAM YOUNG.

"Bernard," a very good friend of the News living in Salt Lake City, calls to our notice, in connection with the elevation of Lord Roseberry to the English premiership, the fact of his having visited this city many years ago. During his visit to America in the summer of 1873, Lord Roseberry stopped off here several days while on his way west. At the time he arrived here, President Brigham Young, with most of the other prominent brethren, was absent on a visit to Provo. The Utah Southern railroad was completed only as far as Pleasant Grove, teams being used from that point south. Roseberry, who has achieved since—what he was then quite entitled to—a well-earned reputation for energy and pluck, came to Salt Lake City chiefly to see and converse with the man he had heard so much about; and when he learned that President Young was absent, he took train at once in pursuit, determined not to lose the object of his visit. On arriving at Pleasant Grove, no conveyance met the train to take him the remaining 12 miles to Provo. He immediately "hustled around" until he found a man with an ordinary lumber wagon, or as Roseberry called it, a "cart," who agreed to take him over to Provo, and in that way he got there.

Arriving at Provo he called upon