

of the Act of 1876, expressed the belief that the chief protection which animals had was the desire of experimenters to exercise all possible humanity, a feeling which he was sure was in the mind of every experimenter. The public opinion of the other men working in the laboratory, another witness said, was adequate safeguard.

The violence of these agitators has wrought evil to all humanitarian effort. They take their stand upon what they call "moral ground" and endeavor to reinforce their position by publications which they are forced to withdraw, untruths which they are obliged to correct, and slanders for which they are induced to apologize. Thus all ethical questions are brought into disrepute. Many of these persons are consistent and will not employ animals for food; but the sum of their contribution to human knowledge is that a vegetarian diet does not conduce to truthfulness or sweetness of temper. Such self-abnegation is worthy of all respect if it proceeds from a spirit of humaneness and not from recalcitration.

This violent conduct is peculiar to England, where a large section of the public is always sacrificing itself; the males going to gaol rather than pay taxes, and the females because they want to vote. Such extremists find it difficult to be moderate in speech. They are easily led away from the truth, and they do not seem to see the distinction between what is true and what is not true. This makes us sorry, for they are in other respects good people.

It will be useful to set down a few examples of their unwisdom, so that humane persons who retain their sanity may be induced to remonstrate with them. There is a peculiarly flagrant case in the London *Daily Mirror*, November 6, 1906, in which it is stated that deeds which are alleged by a nameless writer to have been done in France seventy years ago are done in England to-day. In the London *Tribune*, November 8, 1906, a story of horrible cruelty to a cat was published as part of the evidence given before the Commission now sitting. The following day the paper acknowledged that it "had been victimized" and apologized "very frankly." Yet the fabrication was repeated in *The Christian*, April 4, 1907, although it was characterized formally before the Commission as "absolutely false," Q. 3673. Three newspapers in London habitually publish untruths about the Commission. They say it is conducting its enquiry behind closed doors, and that the revelations are "too terrible to mention."

(To be continued.)