

CASE GOES TO SUPREME COURT

Fight Being Made Against the Compulsory Vaccination Law.

In view of the opposition there is in this city to the compulsory vaccination law, it will be of interest to know that the matter has been brought before the United States Supreme court by George Fred Williams as attorney for Henning Jacobson of Cambridge. This case may settle the compulsory vaccination laws all over the country. Mr. Williams sets forth that compulsory vaccination is in violation of the 14th amendment to the constitution of the United States.

Henning Jacobson, a man of 50, is a minister of the Swedish Lutheran church in Cambridge. He was born in Sweden and until he was vaccinated in infancy was in excellent health. Six days after the vaccination he was troubled with a hot burning rash which continued for years. He needed constant and efficient care, such as being wrapped in hot wet sheets, etc.

Three years ago during the smallpox scare his 18-yr.-old son was ordered by the arm for which he worked to get vaccinated. His father told him he would rather he would give up his job. Finally it came to a question of leaving his position or getting vaccinated, and he chose the latter. For six months he carried his arm in a sling.

When the Cambridge board of health ordered Rev. Mr. Jacobson's 6-yr.-old daughter to be vaccinated he took the child to Dr. Abbott of the Massachusetts board of health and told of the result to himself and son.

He said that he wanted a signed statement from Dr. Abbott that he (Abbott) would be responsible for any injury resulting from the vaccination of his child. Dr. Abbott finally granted a permit of exemption in the child.

When the authorities demanded that Mr. Jacobson be re-vaccinated, he thought of the woes of his infancy and the injury to his son and flatly refused. He was arrested and fined \$5 but appealed.

Aided by the Anti-Compulsory Vaccination society, who furnished the funds, he has fought the case up through the successive courts and is now about to test the constitutionality of the law. Should the case go against him he has no method of escape other than a permit of exemption or moving to some other state.