

Buffalo." The reply in each case was, "Unless you have been vaccinated, you cannot cross the line."

"A few years ago officers of the law went to the residence of a prominent citizen of Philadelphia and informed him that they were ordered to convey his wife to the pest-house because she was afflicted with smallpox. He did not consent, claiming that he had made ample provision for her care and the prevention of any public hazard on account of her disease. Regardless of his resistance his wife was taken to the pest-hospital. The husband followed the ambulance to the door of the hospital and asked to be admitted that he might be with his wife in her sickness, but he was refused. That man's wife died—he never knew when, and was buried—he never knew where. If there is any right among men more sacred than all others, it is to be with and care for our own families in time of sickness, to stand by them in the hour of death, and to bury them in a place selected by us for that purpose, where the last resting-place may be marked and visited. Yet that most sacred of all rights has not a feather's weight when it comes in conflict with the law of public necessity."

"There is no such thing, and never was, as an absolute individual right to do any particular thing, or to eat or drink any particular thing, or to enjoy the associations and bliss of one's own family, or to live, in conflict with the law of public necessity." "Someone may say that if these propositions of law are correct, then civil government at best is legalized tyranny. Let us not misapprehend the effect of these propositions; let us bear in mind that the government must seek to promote the public welfare."

"I have presented the rigid rules and extreme requirements of the law of public necessity to meet the prating on personal liberty and individual rights so common in the mouths of American citizens with foreign ideas, and of political demagogues for personal ends. It is remarkable . . . that these classes of persons have had such influence as to secure large acquiescence in their claims, and such hesitancy in exposing their fallacies. . . . It may be a great restraint sometimes on personal liberty