

sor Schiff of Geneva, one of the best known of continental vivisectioners, has never found it necessary to practice on a feeling animal.

Dr. Pye-Smith, in his address before the British Association in 1879, laid down the lines on which anti-vivisection legislation is at all permissible. "The only restriction which Christian morality imposes upon such practices is that no more pain shall be inflicted than is necessary for the object in view. Any one who would inflict a single pang beyond what is necessary for a scientific object, or would by carelessness fail to take due care of the animals he has to deal with, would be justly liable to public reprobation." This means that the physiological laboratories should be licensed like dissecting rooms under the Anatomy Act in England, and licenses given only to persons of adequate knowledge and known character, and that then the experts should be left to follow their own methods.

Upon the question of the restriction of vivisection, Professor Dalton says, categorically: "I think investigators and teachers should be the sole judges as to what is necessary in their investigations and teachings." Dr. L. S. Pitcher believes it only necessary that "the public should be informed of the truth relating to vivisection in order that there should be secured to science every advantage and privilege which its advancement may need." Professor Wesley Mills, the leading physiologist in Canada, declares openly that a scientist can be the only judge of the rights and obligations of his own profession. Dr. Osler, his predecessor, later of Johns Hopkins, was of a similar mind.

In Dr. Yeo's table it is admitted that only one experiment in a hundred is painful. Legislation aims to deal with this one case, and in doing so suppresses the other ninety-nine as well. The way to insure that not more than one case in a hundred shall be painful and yet science go untrammelled is not by legislative enactments based on sentiment and insufficient knowledge, but as Frances Power Cobbe, its most ardent opponent admits, "by an ethical and moral agitation," by a more refined morality on the part of the operators and the community in which they live, brought about by the methods of ethics and religion. The action of the Societies for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, by countenancing the extremists who would suppress vivisection, has alienated the support of physicians whose position and relations would be invaluable in furthering the general aims of the Societies. The medical journals are no longer shy of the practice. Under the influence of public opinion at one time they spoke of vivisection apologetically and with caution; in recent years they adopt no line of excuse, and treat the objections of the opponents with aggressive