

13

RACE CONSERVATION—THE CONSERVATION OF HUMAN
LIFE AND EFFICIENCY—THE DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH AND THE SO-CALLED LEAGUE
OF MEDICAL FREEDOM

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT L. OWEN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE

SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

FRIDAY, JUNE 23, 1911



WASHINGTON

1911

101698—10132

REGISTRATION - THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS
OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM
WASHINGTON, D. C.



WASHINGTON
1913

1913 - 1913

SPEECH
OF
HON. ROBERT L. OWEN.

The Senate having under consideration the bill H. R. 4412—

Mr. OWEN said:

Mr. PRESIDENT: For many years various efforts have been made to establish a department of health of the United States, and during the last year both Houses of Congress have been considering this question, and the most overwhelming evidence has been submitted in the Senate and House hearings justifying the establishment of such department. There has arisen in opposition to the department of health an organized movement resisting the establishment of the department, under a so-called League of Medical Freedom, on the alleged ground that it would promote one school of medicine over another school of medicine and invade the rights of the States and of individual citizens.

I introduced at the beginning of the present session Senate bill No. 1, providing for the establishment of a department of health, which did not place the head of that department in the Cabinet, but which expressly provided against any possible invasion of State or of individual rights and against any discrimination for or against any so-called system or school of medicine.

Mr. President, I am entirely opposed to promoting one school of medicine over another school of medicine. My purpose in urging a department of public health has been to establish a department of human conservation—educational rather than regulative—which should deal with the matter from an educational standpoint, so as to make effective and efficient the knowledge which we are slowly acquiring with regard to the preservation of human life.

And the preservation of human life does not deal primarily with the curing of a man after he is desperately sick. It should not be regarded as a science devoted to the cure of bubonic plague after bubonic plague has been established in the human organism. It should not deal with the question of tuberculosis after it has been contracted, but it should deal with this terrible disease by preventive means. The important point is to prevent it—not to merely cure it. These diseases are easy to prevent, but almost impossible to cure.

A department of human conservation—called, for convenience, a department of health—would naturally deal with instructing the people of the United States in well-ascertained facts with regard to sanitary engineering, sanitary construction of streets, alleys, houses, sewerage, water supply, milk supply, and food supplies generally; proper care of the markets, the control of insect life, which is so frequently the cause of disease, as in the

cases of the malaria and yellow-fever mosquito; the extermination of the house fly, with its typhoid-fever germ; and the education of the people, through circulars, authoritative publications, through the schools, and through special instructors on the rules of right living.

The instruction of the people as to the value of fresh air, clean air, clean bodies, the proper use of the bath and hot and cold water, and the proper precautions to guard against infectious diseases. It would disseminate full and complete knowledge relative to diseases of sex now prevalent throughout the United States and throughout the world by reason of the gross ignorance of young people arriving at the age of puberty with no knowledge whatever upon this vital topic and thus exposed by gross ignorance to the most dangerous maladies.

These things, and much other interesting information, which, under proper guidance, could be made the common knowledge and the common property of the people of the United States, operating through the municipal, State, and Federal agencies, within their strict constitutional limitations, are of vital importance to the people of the United States, to their health and longevity and to their happiness; to their physical, mental, and moral well-being. Our insane asylums are full of syphilitics. Our blind institutions are filled in like manner through venereal diseases. Our cities are filled with tuberculosis victims carrying disease of the most malignant character into the houses of the rich and the poor, especially the poor.

I desire the country to understand that the purpose of the department of health is in reality that of race conservation, the preservation of human life and of human energy, and that there is great need for the cooperation of all classes of men, including the Christian Scientists, who have undoubtedly been of genuine public service in teaching people better methods of self-control. This is also true with regard to the school of osteopathy, as well as other so-called schools of medicine, chief of which are the so-called regular physicians, sometimes called allopaths and homeopaths.

We need prevention more than cure, however. We have not so much the need for the regular physician, as his function is generally understood—that is, as a man who will give medicine to cure a sick patient, as we have need for his services, and for the services of all schools of medicine, in their far more important aspect of preventing diseases by instructing patients, whether sick or well, in the rules of right living.

This, indeed, is the great work which has been done by the regular physician, and which has been done likewise by other schools of medicine not known as regulars and by men who were not physicians at all. The great Pasteur was a chemist, not a physician. Dr. Wylie is a food expert, not a medical practitioner. It seems to me that all good men who desire the welfare of the human race should be favorable to the establishment of a department of public health, which shall not give special preferment to any school of medicine or system of medicine, but which shall devote itself to the conservation of the human race, and which shall study with care and with patience all claims of all schools of men engaged in the art of healing, in the more important art of preventing disease and ill health. This will include osteopaths, Christian Scientists, physical culturists, and a great variety of students of human health.

I have drawn Senate bill No. 1 in such a way that the proposed department is not permitted to discriminate in favor of any school or system of medicine; so that it shall not invade any function of any State; so that it shall not enter the house of any individual without his free consent and invitation.

The real function of a department of public health is to prevent disease. The cure of diseases should not comprise one-twentieth part of the activities of such a department. What we want is to prevent people being made sick, not merely to attempt to cure them when they are ready for the grave.

In this connection I call attention to a very important department established by the Equitable Life Assurance Society of New York, a description of which appears in the New York Commercial. William A. Day, president of the Equitable Life Assurance Society, has just announced the organization of a "conservation department," with Elmer E. Rittenhouse, former president of the Provident Savings Life Assurance Society, at its head. It proposes to circularize the millions of men who hold policies in that assurance society on the gentle art of self-care as a means of the preservation of their own health, the care of the health of their families, their households, and they expect to use this system as a practical money-making proposition, because, having assured the life of their policy holders, they want to prolong their lives as much as possible.

The New York Commercial, of June 17, 1911, makes the following announcement:

[New York Commercial, June 17, 1911.]

"EQUITABLE ESTABLISHES CONSERVATION DEPARTMENT—ELMER E. RITTENHOUSE TO BE COMMISSIONER IN CHARGE—PURPOSE OF NEW BUREAU WILL BE TO CONSERVE HEALTH AND LIVES OF POLICY HOLDERS AND PREVENT LAPSES—EDUCATIONAL AND SANITARY CAMPAIGN PLANNED.

"William A. Day, president of the Equitable Life Assurance Society, yesterday announced the inauguration of a 'conservation department,' with Elmer E. Rittenhouse, former president of the Provident Savings Life Assurance Society, at its head. Mr. Rittenhouse will be known as the 'conservation commissioner.'

"The purpose of the new department is to carry into effect one of the new ideas in life insurance, that of conserving the health and lives of present policy holders and preventing lapses. Mr. Rittenhouse attracted wide attention in his former connection by instituting a campaign of medical assistance for policy holders, and recently the Association of Life Insurance Presidents started a health conservation bureau.

"At a meeting this week of the association one of the members reported the results of an inspection he had made of the sanitary conditions of 32 cities of the country, and he suggested the organization of local sanitary clubs.

"The Equitable, however has gone into the matter more extensively. The announcement setting forth the news of the new appointment says:

"All life insurance companies suffer from two sources of waste or loss, which have been given much study and which continue to cost the policy holders large sums annually. One is the annual loss of life from preventable or postponable cause. The other is the loss due to the costly American habit of lapsing policies.

"The life companies of the country lost from this source last year over \$700,000,000 of insurance already on their books, which cost the policy holders of the United States over \$20,000,000 to put on the books.

101698—10132

Over 26,000,000 policy holders are therefore personally and financially interested in the reduction of the loss from both these causes.

"The society will assist its members by educational and perhaps other methods to reduce life waste. It will also extend such help as it legally may to the public-health authorities of the country in their efforts to improve sanitary and general health conditions. It will give its moral support to the general life-conservation movement which has reached nation-wide proportions and already accomplished much in favorably affecting the mortality rate of the country.

"This phase of the 'efficiency problem' will be given especial attention and the measures adopted to favorably affect it will be made known as the work develops.

"It is believed that before the end of another five years every life insurance company of consequence will have a department designed not only to conserve business, but to lower mortality. The Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., of this city, has had great success in its industrial field with its nursing service and the wide distribution of literature setting forth measures to prevent tuberculosis.

"The Equitable, however, will go further than this, according to present plans. It will use its agents and medical men all over the country to cooperate with the local health boards for the purpose of improving sanitary conditions, and it will use the 'conservation department' for the purpose of getting into close touch with individual policy holders."

I respectfully submit an answer to President Huntington, of the Connecticut General Insurance Co., by Prof. Irving Fisher, of Yale University, president of the Committee of One Hundred on National Health, on the more obvious benefits a department of health would have over the present Marine-Hospital Bureau;

460 PROSPECT STREET, April 21, 1911.

President ROBERT W. HUNTINGTON, Jr.,

Connecticut General Life Insurance Co., Hartford, Conn.

DEAR SIR: Senator OWEN has written me that you have inquired of him as to the functions which a new national department of health could profitably assume which are not already sufficiently covered by the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service and the other bureaus of the United States Government.

I think one of the best arguments in favor of such a department is contained in the speech of Senator OWEN himself, which I am therefore sending you under a separate cover. You will notice that his argument shows the utter inadequacy in times of stress of a bureau like the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service under a department the head of which usually does not know and does not care in regard to public health and whose interests, even, are sometimes directly opposed. Except in the life insurance business and some others there is, at least as my studies have led me to believe, a very common conflict between commercial interests and public-health interests. It was for this reason that the yellow fever was systematically concealed in Southern States for fear that its presence would interfere with trade, and it was only as the States there finally appealed to the United States Government to take over the quarantine stations that the intolerable situation by which each locality denied the existence of yellow fever, while accusing the neighboring States of having it, was done away with.

The San Francisco episode is one which Senator OWEN emphasizes. He does not overdraw the situation in the least, as I know by information direct from Dr. John S. Fulton and Dr.

101698—10132

J. J. Kinyoun, who were directly concerned, and the former of whom made a special investigation. A number of representatives of San Francisco commercial interests were sent to Washington to prevent the knowledge of the bubonic plague's existence in San Francisco from being spread by the United States Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service, and they would have succeeded had it not been for the fact that Dr. Fulton, then secretary of the board of health of Maryland, had a suit case of documents containing facts on the subject, with which he was able to confront the lies which the delegation from California were trying to spread, simply for the benefit of a few merchants in San Francisco and to the prejudice and danger of the health of the entire country.

I believe that the theme of commercial versus hygienic interests has not been exhausted in Senator OWEN's speech, and that many other instances, equally important, could be given, some of which I am not free to mention, as they have come to me in a more or less confidential manner. Some of these concern the administration of the Bureau of Chemistry in the Department of Agriculture and the Bureau of Animal Industry in regard to meat inspection. With a Department of Agriculture, the main object of which is to improve the prosperity of farmers, including cattle raisers, it is not surprising that the inspection of meats and foods should often be aborted in the interests of the producers, for whom a Department of Agriculture largely exists, but against the much more important interests of the consumers who suffer from the ingestion of deleterious products. I do not believe that those who have not looked into this subject have the faintest conception of the extent to which the public is injured in this matter.

Dr. Wiley, who, in spite of accusations of going to extremes, is certainly a friend of the public interests, is very enthusiastic over the project of having a department of health, and one of his chief arguments is that such a department would afford the only good soil in which bureaus concerned with public health can really grow and flourish. Such bureaus, as long as they are subject to ministers of finance, agriculture, labor, commerce, etc., can never work untrammelled for the public good whenever a conflict of interests exists between the public good and that of the special interests of finance, agriculture, commerce, labor, etc. But the instant we have a department of health, with a secretary whose sworn duty it is to improve the health of the people, that instant we shall have the conditions for the untrammelled exercise of health protection by existing as well as newly created bureaus concerned in public health.

Another great advantage comes from the assembling together of the bureaus now existing and which sometimes work at cross purposes. There would be cooperation instead of duplication, mutual helpfulness and encouragement, and the growth which comes out of these conditions; in other words, economy and efficiency.

There would, I believe, be no need and no probability of duplication of work, as between the national and the State departments of health, any more than there is now a duplication as between the State departments and the municipal departments. The spheres of work of the two would be very different, not only as required by law but also because of the cooperation

which would necessarily result. As proof of this we have a precedent in the Department of Agriculture, which has, I believe, never been accused of duplicating the work of the State agricultural experiment stations and colleges, but of helping them. In fact, there are other analogies, as between the United States Army organization and the State militia, which is a relation of mutual helpfulness. This aspect has been formerly considered by Dr. William C. Woodward, health officer of the city of Washington, who could give you more and better instances than occur to me offhand. Suffice it to say that the project for a department of health has been indorsed by the conference of State and Territorial boards of health and by a large number of individual municipal health officers. In fact, I do not know of any local health officers who have opposed a national department of health as duplicating their work. These people are, in general, the most enthusiastic of all for a national department of health, realizing that such a department would give an impetus to the interest in public health which would increase their own power and influence at one bound.

The Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service, in its laboratory, has done great work in investigations, and I believe this is self-evidence of how much more could be accomplished if a larger sphere could be given to such investigations. Hookworm and pellagra, though important, are very trifling examples as compared with the results which we might hope for with a larger sphere. The greatest hygienic advances which the world has seen have come out of such department laboratories abroad, particularly the French work of Pasteur, which is the foundation of modern bacteriology, and the German work of Koch, which has done so much for tuberculosis. Proof of what can be done comes from the example of the Department of Agriculture, which has solved the many problems of animal and plant disease by putting experts to work to direct their energies to these specific objects. Some of the best work for public health has been an incidental result, as, for instance, the work of the Bureau of Entomology, under Dr. Howard, which has shown the influence of the typhoid fly, as he calls the common house fly, and as a consequence of which there is a country-wide antily and antimosquito crusade.

After a number of years of study of the possibilities of investigation, I am satisfied that there is no subject with which I am at all familiar in which there are so many unexploited possibilities as in public health. For instance, in spite of all the work for improved ventilation and the crusade for outdoor living in connection with the fight against tuberculosis, we do not yet know what are the specific qualities of good as distinct from bad air. The old theory of carbon dioxide has been almost completely exploded, and we have now simply a great mass of conflicting working hypotheses; as, for instance, that it is the coolness, dryness, humidity, motion, electrification, ionization, ozone condition, freedom from organic impurities, freedom from bacteria, etc., which explains good air as distinct from bad. The instant this problem is solved, the question can be solved with it, and we shall know whether the proper means is to use an ozone machine, humidifier, an electric fan, or some other device.

I do not for a moment doubt that the establishment of a national department of health would lengthen human life very materially, also rapidly, for, besides the above-mentioned advantages, would come a general education of the public. This would take place through bulletins and the use of the public press and in other ways, such as visual exhibits, etc., in a manner similar to the way in which the Department of Agriculture has educated the farmer. A department can do this where a bureau can not, not only because the head would be more sympathetic with such work, but also because a department would have so much more prestige and would attract more attention. The great problem of education of the public consists, I believe, as newspaper men affirm, in getting the ear of the public. It is the large headlines which do the work of molding public opinion, and on the same principle it is a large department rather than a small bureau which will get the public ear. The Department of Agriculture when it was an independent bureau did not have a tittle of the influence which it now possesses.

It is a fact that life has been prolonged or death rates decreased fastest and best where there have been good departments of health. Statistics show that the country of most rapid advance in recent years is Germany, the only country which really has a true department of health. In this country the cities which have good departments of health show the result by a lower death rate, as witness New York, Chicago, and Washington, all of which places have remarkably good health officers. In New York the death rate responded at once to the cleaner streets of Col. Waring, to the improved milk crusade, to the tuberculosis notification law, etc., just as so many cities have responded at once to the introduction of water plants. By the way, Mr. Calvin W. Hendrick, who is putting in a several million dollar new sewerage system in Baltimore, is an enthusiastic advocate of a national department of health in order that it may supply models for municipal sanitation in respect to sewerage systems, etc., believing that in this manner such improvements as he is making in Baltimore could be communicated with great rapidity to other municipalities, which will probably not get these improvements otherwise within a generation. The average "city father" is conservative and will not run to Baltimore or any other city for information when he would take it as a matter of course from a department of health.

As I see it, the situation, in brief, is: First, that there is a great field for hygienic investigation unexploited; second, that the present scientific knowledge is a full generation in advance of its practical application; third, that in order both that knowledge shall increase and that present knowledge shall be applied we need a mechanism like a department of health which, like the Department of Agriculture, will perform the needed investigations and spread the existing knowledge.

I fear I am worrying you. There are many other things I would like to say. I take the liberty of sending with this a copy of my address before the Association of Life Insurance Presidents on the subject of the prolongation of human life, and a copy of a more recent address before the International Association of Accident Underwriters on the same subject. Various

insurance associations and companies, including the International Association of Accident Underwriters, have passed resolutions favoring a department of health.

If you have not seen my report to President Roosevelt on National Vitality, and would care to look it over, I should be much pleased to have the opportunity of sending you a copy. Life insurance men are showing a great interest in the subject at present, as you doubtless know. Mr. Messenger, actuary of the Travelers' Life Insurance Co., is one of the Hartford men most interested. President Holcombe, President Dunham, Vice President Lunger, and others are also interested.

If I can be of any service to you at any time, I should be very much pleased.

Yours, very sincerely,

Great and organized opposition to the establishment of a department of health has been carried on by a so-called League for Medical Freedom. This league has many good people in it who are misled—Christian Scientists who deny disease, and some good citizens who have been falsely led to believe their liberty will be invaded—some people who do not think, and some people who have an evil purpose, a sinister commercial purpose, who are engaged in promoting patent medicine. There is a description in Collier's on May 6 and June 3 of this League of Medical Freedom, which is of sufficient interest to justify its being read to the Senate, but without objection I will, Mr. President, insert it in the Record without reading.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I shall have to object to the request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is made.

Mr. OWEN. I will then proceed to read into the Record this extract. It is as follows:

[From Collier's, May 6, 1911.]

"A BAD BUNCH.

"An octopus which we don't like is the League for Medical Freedom. It is doing a tremendous amount of damage by its opposition to needed medical legislation along all lines relating to the public health throughout the United States. In the excellent California Legislature, for instance, this year, efforts for better sanitary laws were largely blocked by this organization, thoroughly equipped with ready money, and extensive in its hold upon the imaginative minds of many citizens. These gophers have worked underground, since the league came into existence, to counteract the pure food and drugs act of 1906. The membership is composed for the most part of those who were hit hard by the act. Expensive lobbies are maintained at Washington, and in many State capitals, for the purpose of defeating health legislation. In 1909-1911 important bills relating to the health of the Nation were held up in Congress at the instigation of the league. It is alleged that \$25,000 per week was spent by the league lobby. There is probably no accurate way of computing the amounts that have been spent in Washington or at the various State capitals. One method of attack consists in sending showers of telegrams of protest to the Senators and Representatives from all parts of the Union, and

101698—10132

especially from the home districts of the lawmakers. These protests are invariably misrepresentations of the real purpose of the proposed legislation. Organizations have been formed in every State of the Union, and attorneys employed to represent the league before conventions, legislative committees, and municipal meetings of all kinds. Another plan of procedure is to send circular letters to delegates of conventions requesting them, in the name of "liberty and fraternity," to vote against any medical resolution that might be introduced. It has always been difficult to get appropriations for health purposes, and if this league continues to fight the health authorities we must expect an increase in the death rate in all States in the next year or two. In Chicago, where the league is strongest, in 1908 the death rate was 14.08 per 1,000 per annum; in 1910 it was 15.21 per 1,000."

I remind the Senate that the chairman of the Committee on Public Health had a thousand telegrams put in his hands on one day, coming through the agents of this so-called League of Medical Freedom, opposing the department of health, although the department of health proposed nothing in the world except the coordination of Federal activities that we already have and putting them together under one intelligent management.

Many citizens telegraphed who thought they would be subjected to compulsory vaccination, who thought their domiciles would be invaded. Many engaged in the art of healing and preventing disease protested under the false assurance that a department of race conservation and of human health meant that they would be denied a license to practice osteopathy, and so forth.

Many protested under the erroneous advice that a department of human conservation of the United States would invade State rights and interfere with local authority. These manufactured telegrams and protests had no genuine foundation of fear. They were manufactured wholesale by sinister commercial forces, that had an unlimited treasury of money, able to organize at once these patent-medicine leagues of medical freedom in many States and flood the press with half-page advertisements in box-car letters.

Collier's answers some of the victimized members of this league who protested against the first editorial, as follows:

[From Collier's, June 3, 1911.]

"LIBERTY.

"Protests from readers have greeted our criticism of the League for Medical Freedom. Also a protest is telegraphed from the California branch of the league. In the minds of most of those who protest the principal objections are to the following positions taken by us: 1. That the league contains the kind of men who opposed the pure-food act. 2. That the activities of the league are against public welfare and frequently surreptitious. Our answer follows:

"1. B. O. Flower, one of the nine founders of the league, and now in his second term as president of it, was president of 'The R. C. Flower Medicine Co.' from 1885 to 1899. R. C. Flower is the notorious quack and general humbug whose latest arrest was as late as 1908. B. O. Flower wrote the league's pamphlets on Bubonic Plague and The Compulsory Medical

101698—10132

Inspection of School Children. His views on patent medicine are often expressed. For instance:

"I believe that a great majority of the proprietary medicines are infinitely less dangerous to the public than the majority of regular doctors' prescriptions.

"2. C. W. Miller, second vice president of the league, was also one of the founders. In his newspaper, which publishes patent medicine advertising, he has constantly fought the medical profession. Last year one of his addresses against what he calls a 'doctors' trust' was delivered to the Dairy Association in Baltimore. We may say in passing that Collier's does not believe in freedom to sell tuberculous milk any more than it does in freedom to sell tuberculous meat.

"3. Mrs. Diana Belais, a director and also a founder, has appeared before in this paper as president of an antiexperiment society, a well-meaning, ignorant, reckless, and muddle-headed agitator. We are officially informed by the chairman of the 'committee on publicity and education' of the league that Mrs. Belais was made a director 'because of her courageous efforts to secure a higher law in New York State than the doctors' cruel theories and professional arrogance.' Here's to antiexperiment, meningitis, diphtheria, and freedom!

"4. Dr. C. S. Carr, who is on the advisory boards, edits a pseudo-medical sheet. Collier's long ago printed a letter signed 'The Peruna Drug Co., per Carr.' As editor of Medical Talk for the Home he carried advertisements of many of the medicines exposed in Collier's in our series on 'The great American fraud.' He is now editor of the Columbus Medical Journal, which he at once turned from an ethical sheet into a sheer fraud. Look at the issue of May, 1909. On the front cover is a picture of Carr himself writing, 'All drugs are poison. All druggists are poisoners.' On the reverse side is an advertisement beginning, 'Prescribe Antikamnia and Codein tablets in la grippe, headaches, etc.' Hurrah for freedom and Peruna!

"5. George P. Englehard, who is on the advisory board, has for a long time in his journal defended the patent-medicine interests.

"6. Charles Huhn, also a member of the board, is a prominent officer in a cooperative patent-medicine concern.

"7. Another founder was a member of the advertising agency which is now spending for the league the money which it puts into its advertising campaigns.

"The league says it did not oppose any 'sanitary or quarantine laws.' This statement requires some hardihood, as the hearings of the Senate Committee on Health, and more especially of the House Committee on Foreign and Interstate Commerce, show. It would interest us to know whether the league can point out a single health bill introduced in Congress which it has not opposed. When the leaders wish to oppose a sanitary or quarantine law they do it on the ground that such a law would indirectly 'lead to compulsory and discriminatory legislation.'

"The league was nominally born recently, but those who make it up had already as individuals, and even as organizations (such as the Colorado League for Medical Liberty), opposed State and national legislation. A pamphlet published by the Colorado branch singles out Collier's for attack, and was written by a notorious quack doctor. In California, which was the

special theme of our former editorial, if the league should prevail, the next threat of bubonic plague would be carried out, instead of being suppressed like the last; smallpox might again become a serious epidemic; school children would bear their ills as best they might. A bill was introduced ordering that the board of health be composed of 2 'allopaths' (a school which does not exist, but is a hostile term for regular physicians), 2 homeopaths, 2 'eclectics,' 2 osteopaths. It did not pass."

"Some leading homeopathists and osteopathists, be it said, are in favor of a national health bureau and strongly against the agitations of the league. Dr. Francis B. Kellogg, president of the California State Homeopathic Society, in an address recently said:

"* * * In my opinion there is an effort being made to exploit the homeopathic profession by influences and interests which are indirectly but radically opposed to the welfare not only of practitioners of medicine in general, but to that of humanity itself. I refer to the effort to enlist homeopathic support for the so-called National League for Medical Freedom.

"Plato complained that in his day doctors made too sharp a distinction between the body and the mind. In our day the best class of physicians frequently recommend faith cure and Christian Science, and the Emmanuel movement is an indication that it is possible for science and religion to work together in healing. Few mere observers rate the benefits that Christian Science has brought to the community more highly than we do. A belief which so frequently brings about an actual improvement in character, disposition, bodily health, and mental atmosphere deserves the most serious recognition, even by those who regret its hostility to the progressive science of medicine. It is possible at times for clever designers to use members of any faith for disastrous purposes. When R. C. Flower was at the height of his career, in 1907, as manufacturer of diamonds, vender of fake mining stock, wearer of most ingenious disguises, traveler under assumed names, and general artist in gold bricks, he conceived the idea of playing for profit upon the earnest beliefs of the followers of Mrs. Eddy. One of his accomplices, a woman, who also used an assumed name, worked the game with him, and when Dr. Flower, alias Mr. Cortland, took up the cudgels in defense of Christian Science, without being requested to do so, he said:

"Not that I am one of its disciples, but I like to see everyone free to practice medicine as he wishes.

"Here we have the very words themselves from old Doc Flower. Up with freedom!

"Everybody who believes in 'freedom' in medicine is within his natural and political rights in supporting this league. Collier's, not believing in this species of 'freedom,' is also within its rights in treating the league as a menace, the make-up, bias, and purpose of which ought to be fully understood."

I have a few more editorials from the American Medical Association Journal, which I shall read into the RECORD for the benefit of the Senate.

Mr. President, the membership of this so-called league, in my judgment, have been deliberately misled by sinister interests, and the membership which has been thus added to these alleged

rolls of membership has no means of expressing itself. The expression comes through its officers. Those officers are described by Collier's, and I think it would be well for the membership of that organization to look to the directors and see who they are and understand what is at the bottom of this movement. That is the purpose of my reading into the RECORD the history of this so-called organization. I shall now read some editorials from the Journal of the American Medical Association:

SOME EDITORIALS FROM THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION—THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION CALLED A TRUST.

“‘Trust’ is a good word to juggle with nowadays, for to most people it conjures up visions of extortion, robbery, and general oppression. When, therefore, any organization is to be attacked and there are no tangible charges to be preferred against it, it is dubbed a ‘trust,’ and by that very token is damned in the premises.”

I want to say right here that in my State half-page advertisements in huge letters were spread all over that State by this so-called League for Medical Freedom, practically denouncing the medical profession of this country as being a “medical trust,” desirous of depriving citizens of their rights to employ any physician they pleased, to use any medicine they pleased, and giving it to be understood that the purpose of a department of health was the invasion of the private home of the citizen and the invasion of the constitutional rights of the State. The members of the so-called League for Medical Freedom have been grossly imposed upon and have been grossly misrepresented as to what they truly stand for. I know what many of their members stand for perfectly well, and I am in accord with them cordially and sincerely. I know what the Christian Scientists stand for, and I sympathize with them; I understand what the osteopaths stand for, too, and I think they serve a good and useful purpose. They have been misled by the agents of the patent medicine association in this country, that are actively engaged in promoting the drug habit in our citizens, and this declaration on the part of the so-called League for Medical Freedom against the American Medical Association is not only unjust and unfair, but it is disgraceful and utterly untrustworthy.

The article continues:

“In this manner the American Medical Association becomes the ‘doctors’ trust,’ according to the ‘National League for Medical Freedom’ and other organizations with equally high-sounding and misleading names, fathered by the ‘patent-medicine’ interests. Not that the term originated with this widely advertised ‘league,’ although some 15 or 16 years ago the president of this ‘league’ attacked the medical profession in a magazine article on ‘Medical monopoly.’ The representatives and mouthpieces of the proprietary interests have long employed it; notably Strong, through his two journals, the National Druggist and the Medical Brief, and Engelhard, through his journals, the Western Druggist and the Medical Standard. As the proprietors of these publications are found among the personnel of the ‘league’ it is natural that this latest ‘patent-medicine’ organization should have appropriated a figure of speech possessing such magnificent potentialities.

101698—10132

"To the proprietary men the American Medical Association is a trust because, they allege, it has attempted to dictate to physicians what medicinal preparations they shall and shall not use; or, to put it more baldly, because the fraudulency and worthlessness of various proprietary products have been made clear in the Journal. Others have accused the association of being a trust because it has attempted to raise the standard of medical education and thereby to 'control the output of medical students.' But the reason advanced by the 'league' is a brand-new one, invented, no doubt, in the hope that it will reach the public's heart through its most direct route—the purse. The American Medical Association is a trust, we are told, because it has established a schedule of prices by which all its members are bound. The president of the 'league' is reported as saying:

"The [American Medical] Association now fixes the prices charged by physicians in America.

"More specifically the 'league's' vice president puts it:

"The American Medical Association has secured the adoption of its scale of prices throughout the country. * * *

"To such a charge there is but one answer; and that an all-sufficient one, viz, that it is a falsehood, and a stupid one at that. Every physician and every layman who has ever investigated the matter knows that as a matter of fact the American Medical Association has never even suggested that the 'price' of medical service be 'fixed,' but on the contrary has positively discouraged such a proposition. The recommendation in the Principles of Medical Ethics that individual physicians in any locality should adopt some general rules 'relative to the minimum pecuniary acknowledgment from their patients,' has been taken and an attempt made to read into it a meaning never intended and certainly never accepted. What the attitude of the association is on this point is well set forth in the standard Constitution and By-laws for County Societies, prepared by a committee of the American Medical Association and recommended and very generally adopted by various county societies:

"Sec. 3. Agreements and schedules of fees shall not be made by this society. * * *

"And yet the falsehood is blazoned forth, with a prodigal disregard for the expense entailed, by means of display advertisements and 'interviews,' that the American Medical Association 'fixes the price' of medical service. Of course, the 'league' had to have some shibboleth, and the accusation that the American Medical Association is a 'trust' is an untruth that may be counted on to arouse the interest of the unthinking and to give a more or less plausible excuse for the 'league's' existence. How absurdly mendacious the accusation is the medical profession already knows and the public will not be long in learning.

"Again we say: The publicity which the 'patent-medicine' interests are giving to the American Medical Association through this 'league' is welcomed. The more the people know about the association and the work it is doing, the keener the investigation made of its methods and aims, the better it will be not only for the American Medical Association and the medical profession of the country, but also, more important than all, for the public itself." (Editorial, Journal American Medical Association.)

Mr. President, the American Medical Association has published at great length scientific and careful analyses of most of the nostrums and patent-medicine frauds of this country. They have given wide publicity to it, and in that way they have excited the violent animosity and hostility of the patent-medicine people, so that the declaration is made by them that the medical profession comprises a trust. In point of fact, if the American Medical Society form a trust and if they are concerned in establishing a department of health with a view to preventing sickness, which would be the purpose of a department of health, they would be engaged in tearing down their own business; they would be engaged in depriving themselves of their patients from whom they make their living. It would be the only trust in existence which is concerned in diminishing its own revenues and destroying its own financial foundation. Such a trust as that is a very novel trust and one that deserves encouragement.

Now, Mr. President, without further objection, I will submit for printing in the RECORD the concluding editorials.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GALLINGER in the chair). Without objection, permission is granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

A NEW COMBINATION AGAINST THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION.

"Within the past few days the newspapers of the chief cities of the country have carried large advertisements headed, 'Do you want the "Doctors' Trust" to be able to force its opinions on you?' These advertisements paint in vivid colors—'yellow' predominating—the disaster and general destruction that will follow the formation of a Federal department of health. They emanate from, or, to be more correct, are signed by, an organization calling itself the 'National League for Medical Freedom.' In addition to the regular display advertisements the press agent is supplying matter for the reading pages, and there is every evidence that the propaganda is not lacking financial support. Of course, the American Medical Association is the *bête noire* the 'league' seeks to kill; it is the 'Medical Trust' referred to. Members of the association will be surprised to learn that if a national department of health is created it will result in 'denying to the people the right to determine for themselves the kind of medical treatment they shall employ.' For this reason, and so far as the advertisements state, for this reason only, the National League for Medical Freedom has been brought into being. As a slogan, under which the real reasons for organizing may be carefully concealed, it may serve its purpose. Most people prefer to have their thinking done for them, and this alone will prevent the absurdity of such a proposition as that on which the 'league' is ostensibly founded becoming apparent. Yet every person with the most elemental knowledge of our Government knows that the regulation of the practice of medicine and the licensing of physicians is a function of the State, and that any law attempting to confer such power on a department of the Federal Government would be unconstitutional. The proposed department of health would have just as much authority to determine what 'kind of medical treatment' the people should employ as the Department of Agriculture has to dictate to the farmer regarding the implement company he

101698—10132

shall buy his plows of. Yet we are asked to believe, apparently, that a national department of health would mean that the free-born American citizen who wanted to have a purulent appendix cured by the 'spinal adjustment' route would have to patronize a surgeon, even though he were a 'conscientious objector' to surgery. It would mean, it seems, that the individual suffering from malaria who wished to be freed from this 'moral error' by 'absent treatment' would be ignominiously dragged to the internist and dosed with quinine. It would mean that the optimist who would cure his rheumatism by wearing a 'guaranteed magnetic ring' would have to endure the administration of the salicylates. It would mean—but why pursue these harrowing predictions further?

"Seriously, though, there must be something wrong with the mental make-up of the individuals composing this 'league' who expect—even by such potent means as the lavish distribution of printer's ink—to persuade a reasonably sane people that any law might, could, or would be enacted that would curtail the rights of the public as they have suggested. Of course, the fact is that the moving spirits behind the organization of the 'league' have neither an overwhelming solicitude for the public welfare nor any strenuous objection to the formation of a national department of health. The 'league's' actual, and fairly evident, *raison d'être* is opposition to and antagonism against the American Medical Association. To disclose the source of this opposition it is only necessary to call attention to some of the members of the 'advisory board'—high-sounding title—as reported in the newspapers, to make reasonably clear to the members of the American Medical Association the 'power behind' the 'league.' The publisher of the *Medical Standard* and *Western Druggist*, for instance, has long been known as a defender of, and mouthpiece for the 'patent medicine' and proprietary interests. His presence on the 'advisory board' is fitting, and the only surprising thing about it is that he should have been guilty of such a tactical blunder as getting into the fierce light of publicity.

"That the president of the American Druggists' Syndicate should be on the 'board' was to be looked for, and being looked for, is found. And there are others! Among the lesser satellites in this distinguished galaxy are those who very naturally might be expected to enter enthusiastically into such a campaign—the president of an antivivisection society, some 'mental healers' and one or two journalists of varying degrees of obscurity. Of the latter, one has for years been strongly opposed to medical organization and more recently has taken up that mental vagary known as 'new thought.' Taking into consideration both the objects of the 'league' and the personnel of its 'board' one feels that the *New York Journal* expressed only a half truth when it said:

"The druggists and the proprietary medicine interests throughout the country are said to be chiefly concerned in defeating the Owen bill.

"It would have been nearer the facts if for 'defeating the Owen bill' were substituted the clause 'attempting to disrupt the American Medical Association.' A dozen years ago the public might not have been able to see the animus prompting this attack; to-day it is wiser.

"As to the publicity which this sensational and costly campaign will give to the American Medical Association, the medical profession may welcome it. One thing that has long been needed is that of directing the attention of the laity to the aims and accomplishments of the American Medical Association. It welcomes investigation; the more the public learns about the work the association is doing the better for the association. It has nothing to be ashamed of, but it has a great deal to be proud of; its work in the interests of both public welfare and scientific medicine is and always has been open and aboveboard. The association needs no defense; it is not only well able to stand on its record, but is proud of that record." (Editorial, Journal American Medical Association.)

"NATIONAL CONSERVATION CONGRESS AND A DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH.

"The National Conservation Congress, recently in session in St. Paul adopted a platform setting forth the views of the delegates as to the duty of the Federal and State Governments in conserving the natural and vital resources of the Nation. One of the planks, unanimously adopted by the committee on resolutions and later by the convention itself, indorsed in no uncertain terms the establishment of a department of health. This plank read: 'We also recommend that in order to make better provision for preserving the health of the Nation a department of public health be established by the National Government.' This declaration was adopted in spite of a large amount of carefully stimulated (and simulated) opposition. The plank was introduced before the committee on resolutions by a delegate from Pennsylvania. As soon as it was known that there was likelihood of its adoption telegrams from all over the country began to pour in on the members of the committee on resolutions, requesting, urging, and demanding that no action be taken on this subject. On Thursday morning, when the delegates assembled in the auditorium, there was found on each seat a marked copy of the Pioneer Press containing a full-length, two-column 'appeal' (otherwise known as advertising matter) from the National League for Medical Freedom, reiterating previously made statements regarding 'political doctors,' 'medical trust,' 'interference with liberty,' and other stock bugbears. But, as a reporter for the Pioneer Press said, 'the delegates smiled.' The men composing the convention, who had been sent to St. Paul to represent the interests of the people and not the people of the interests, who had been able to detect the cloven hoof of monopoly under the specious plea for 'State rights' which had been made in the opening days of the convention, were not slow to understand who and what were the influences back of the objections to governmental action for the saving of life. 'The delegates smiled' when they received the telegrams, when they adopted the resolution of the committee and when the unanimous vote of the convention approved the platform. It was the sound judgment and common sense of the average American citizen which led the delegates to realize that health and life are important and that the only men who oppose any means by which life can be saved are those who have a selfish and mercenary interest in perpetuating present conditions." (Editorial, Journal American Medical Association.)

"WHO PAYS THE BILLS?"

"Newspaper men are not easily misled as to motives, neither are they slow to recognize the real forces behind an effort to influence public sentiment. An editorial in a recent number of the Baltimore Evening Sun shows how the better class of newspaper editors regard the strenuous and well-nigh hysterical efforts now being made to simulate a popular uprising against the awful iniquity of national health legislation.

"As the Sun well says, the mere statement of the arguments of the National League for Medical Freedom is all the answer that is necessary. But the attack on the Owen bill is only a pretext. The American Medical Association is the real target. The forces behind this movement are endeavoring to take advantage of the popular feeling against trusts and monopolies by branding the American Medical Association as a 'doctors' trust,' a designation, by the way, which originated with certain so-called medical journals which derived their support from nostrum vendors.

"Evidently, the manufacturers of 'baby killers,' sophisticated and adulterated foodstuffs, cheap and bad whiskies under the guise of 'family remedies,' and fakirs and swindlers doing business under the guise of physicians, hope that the American public and press will accept this designation without asking for proof or evidence, and that by such methods the American Medical Association and its work can be discredited in the public estimation. 'The delegates smiled' when the members of the committee on resolutions, at the Conservation Congress at St. Paul, were overwhelmed with a flood of telegrams carefully arranged for beforehand, protesting against the indorsement of a national department of health. Truly, newspaper editors and managers must smile with equal persistency when 'copy' is received for half-page advertisements at a daily cost of \$25,000, denouncing the national organization of the medical profession as a 'doctors' trust.' Newspaper men know the cost of a general advertising campaign. They also know that only those who are financially and mercenarily interested in blocking the work which the American Medical Association is doing, and who fear to have any further light thrown on their nefarious doings, would furnish the money for such an extensive and expensive advertising campaign. The National League for Medical Freedom asks no dues of its 'members,' yet it has used large quantities of the most expensive newspaper advertising space. Who pays the bills, and whence comes all the money?

"Certainly it does not come from the few homeopaths who have joined the league, nor from the few eclectics, nor from the small number of osteopaths; and surely the Christian scientists are not shouldering this enormous burden. The obvious conclusion is that the money comes from those exploiters of human weakness and credulity whose fraudulent practices have been exposed by the American Medical Association, and whose pocketbooks have been injured in consequence." (Editorial, Journal American Medical Association.)



