

The Canada Lancet

VOL. XLVI.

TORONTO, MAY, 1913

No. 9

EDITORIAL

THE ANTIVIVISECTIONISTS.

The extremes to which this class will go has no apparent limit. These people have attacked scientific medical research in the most virulent manner, and given out to the public literature and statements of the most misleading character. This is usually the case when sentiment takes the place of knowledge and reason. It is an old saying containing much truth in it that as judgment is weak prejudice is strong. These people are governed by prejudice and sentiment founded upon ignorance.

They contend that experiments on the lower animals cause pain and suffering, and that this is not justifiable. They also claim that medicine has not made any real progress as the result of these experiments, and they deny the value of the statistical proofs regarding the cure of disease by the products obtained in this way. They cannot see any merit in such a potent agent for the cure of disease as antidiphtheria serum. Seriously they will assert that vaccination is of no value; indeed, that it is worse than useless, that it is only introducing into the system diseased matter.

Recently the British public has been treated to a dose of anti-vivisection views over a suit for libel against William Waldorf Astor, of the *Pall Mall Gazette*, J. L. Garvin, the chief editor, and H. Cabel W. Saleeby, on account of an article that had appeared in that publication. Some of the adherents of the antivivisection school of thought asserted their firm conviction of the truth of their position. One went so far as to state that he believed that the death of the late King Edward was due to blood poisoning caused by the use of some vaccine.

At the time of the death of King Edward VIII., a leaflet to this effect was issued, and withdrawn only because the request of the Queen objected to it. On that occasion Queen Alexandra made the statement