

## "PREVENTION IS BETTER THAN CURE."

Acting upon the above well-known proverb, and in the belief that much suffering is endured by poor dumb animals from thoughtless and unintentional acts of cruelty, a member of the Ladies' Auxiliary of the S. P. C. A. has offered small prizes in a school in the suburbs of Halifax for the two best essays upon the subject of Cruelty to Animals, and for this purpose has circulated in the school some papers issued by the "Royal" Society in England, of which the Queen is the honored head.

The JOURNAL of the S. P. C. A. now issued monthly, in Halifax, will be a means, if so circulated, of promoting the same object by giving to the children matter for reflection, as well as matter for their essays.

It is hoped that at the next meeting of the Ladies' Auxiliary, the plan of offering prizes in other schools will be discussed, so as get the Society as soon as possible into working order.

It is also hoped that the members will attend the meeting, and so help out the good work. To lead, not drive, is the special work of the Ladies' Auxiliary, and the sooner the young are so led the better and more easily the work of the Society will be accomplished.

## A BRANCH ORGANIZED IN TRURO.

A number of gentlemen met at Truro, Oct. 28th, to consider the advisability of organizing a Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. Mr. Israel Longworth, Mayor of Truro, and a Vice President of the parent society of Nova Scotia, occupied the chair, and Hugh McKenzie was appointed Secretary *pro tem*.

Addresses were delivered by the Chairman Revd. Mr. Burroughs, and Mr. Naylor, in reference to the objects of the Society and its working. It was moved by Dr. D. H. Muir, seconded by S. D. McLellan, and passed, that "in the opinion of this meeting it is expedient to organize a Branch of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals in Truro."

The following gentlemen were then elected officers of the society for the ensuing year:

*President*—Israel Longworth, Mayor.

*Vice Presidents*—Dr. D. H. Muir, J. F. Blanchard, Dr. Peppard, Great Village; Robert Forham, Acadian Mines; James D. Putman, Brookfield; John Yuill, Clifton; David McGill Johnston, Upper Stewiacke; Col. W. M. Blair, M. P. P., North River; David A. Campbell, Tatamagouche; Thomas Parker, Lower Stewiacke.

*Executive Committee*—Rev. Mr. Burrows, (Chairman), J. K. Blair, Wm. Cummings, Richard Craig, Robert McConnell, Dr. A. C. Page, Rev. John McMillan.

*Honorary Counsel*—Messrs. Mackenzie and McLellan.

*Secretary and Treasurer*—Dr. W. S. Muir.

The thanks of the meeting were tendered to Messrs. Naylor and W. H. Harrington, to which a reply was made by Mr. Harrington.

A list was opened, and the roll of membership signed, after which the meeting adjourned.

## VIVISECTION.

SIR WM. FERGUSSON, the eminent English surgeon, said, "Nothing has ever yet been attained by vivisection towards mitigating pain and suffering in the human race. The whole system while undergoing the torture of vivisection is in a condition so entirely different from the normal, that no reliable results can be gained in that way. Dr. Hoggan bears similar testimony. Dr. Pritchard, lecturer on Pathology, says it is impossible in the case of a horse or a dog to safely use chloroform to alleviate or stop the pain of vivisection—that, when applied to the dog, the primary effect is uncertain, and death the consequence. Dr. Walker and Dr. Paget say nearly the same, though Dr. Paget adds that he has an intense objection to the use of anaesthetics, for he is satisfied from thirty to forty persons die every year from their effects. Dr. Robert and Dr. Martin were of the same opinion as Dr. Pritchard, and I could give you a list of twenty others, men who stand high in their profession that no one could doubt what they assest to be the case.

A case of vivisection occurs to me which I feel impelled to relate, as showing that vivisection is sometimes practised from no other motive than that of downright cruelty. A vivisector crucified a dog and kept it without food or water, till, at the end of eleven days, death put a close to its sufferings. For what purpose was this done? The operator himself said he had no purpose in view but to see how long a dog could support life under that torture. What possible knowledge of real value could they lead to? I stigmatise the act as positively infernal.

I will give but another instance. Dr. Butler had the audacity to assert, and I believe more than once, that having vaccinated a child he placed it in a bed with a case of confluent small-pox. Another child, of similar age and constitution, but not vaccinated, was also placed in the same bed. With what object? To prove that if both took the disease—which I believe they did—the vaccinated one could be completely cured, while the other would certainly be deeply marked, possibly blinded, or, indeed, very probably killed by the cruel malady.

This may be a very fair experiment according to medical ideas, but as a *magistrate*, I should term it manslaughter; as a *Christian*, murder.

But there is a very simple way in which, as I believe, vivisection may be stopped. It is a way which will involve little trouble or expense. It is not the much-resorted-to method of petition. That plan is certainly useless. Petitioning for emancipation was carried on for 14 years without effect. It was not until the Irish people determined to have the Emancipation Bill passed, that the Duke of Wellington said in the House of Lords: "You must either pass the Emancipation Bill or put Ireland under martial law." Now what is needed is just such a determination upon our part. Petitions have been sent in for Women's Rights, but I doubt whether women are more near to the possession of their rights now than before the first petition went in. Now, I would suggest that the Hon. Sec'y. of our Society should issue the form of a Bill which every elector should request his candidate to declare he will do his best to pass, and,

failing a promise to that effect, the elector shall refuse to vote for him. Of the result there could be little doubt. The great majority of the members of the present Parliament have been elected by very small majorities, and such a point they would gladly concede. The Bill I recommend is a very simple one, and one which would not interfere with politics or religion. It would be of this nature, though of course clothed in the usual technical language so difficult for the uninitiated to understand: "Every person who shall practice the healing art under any name or designation whatsoever from this time forth, every physiological lecturer, demonstrator, and veterinary surgeon, is hereby required to take out a license before participating, under certain penalties." Then it should be provided in the Bill that all persons intending to take out licenses should be required to fill up a declaration to this effect: "I (so and so), intending to practice as (so and so), require a license, and I hereby declare that since the passing of the Act (Then would follow the name of the Act which I am proposing.) I have not practised vivisection, nor have I been present at any time when vivisection has been practised; and I further declare that I will not practice vivisection, or be present at any place where it is practised during the time I hold such license."

No trouble should be experienced in obtaining such a license; it should be procured simply by sending that declaration to the office, with a small fee. Now, I think, no one could object to this plan, and I am strongly of the opinion that if all persons wishing to stop vivisection, should decline to vote for any candidate unless he pledged himself to do his best to pass this measure, you would have a very large majority to press it.

I believe, too, the adoption of this Bill would inflict a great blow upon the practice of vivisection, both in France and Germany. In these countries there are a great many students from this kingdom, because the fees are so much smaller there, and these students would, if this Bill were passed, be unable to attend classes where such practices were carried on; and this would, I believe, have a very marked effect upon the course of studies pursued there.

I would further suggest that every person wishing to stop vivisection should refuse to subscribe to the Hospital Sunday Fund, unless those who have the distribution of that fund declare that they will not give any portion of it to any Hospital, unless the authorities state that vivisections are forbidden. There are two hospitals which it might perhaps, not affect—the Westminster Hospital and St. Bartholomew's. The former is, I believe, supported almost entirely by the Duke of Westminster, who is, I understand, decidedly opposed to vivisection, and I believe vivisection is not practised at that hospital. As to St. Bartholomew's, they have an income of £65,000 a year, and of course they care very little about Hospital Sunday. Yet even the authorities of that hospital would be greatly influenced by the passing of the Act to which I have referred, for then, if the practice of vivisection was carried on there, none of their students could practise; and I earnestly appeal to you all to do your utmost to obtain the passing of such a measure."