

live lobster, the swallowing of a live oyster, or the gentle art of angling, would be devilish beyond description.

But beyond balking the physiologist the anti-vivisection party do not seem to have much interest in the lower animals. No protest seems to be raised when they suffer in the interest of sport. One prominent member of the society excuses sport because there is courage and danger in it, and the animals "die game."

When two vagrants were brought before a magistrate not long since for grossly ill-treating a performing bear, they had to be discharged because the bear was not a domestic animal, and was entitled to no protection save from the physiologist.

Give ear, then, Bill Sykes and Co.; it was lawful for you to flay, burn, or boil wild animals at your pleasure *as long as you did it to gratify your devilish instincts*, but you, O humane and educated savant! make but one unlicensed injection into a frog and there is a society at hand to see fine or imprisonment inflicted upon you for the sin of trying to benefit your fellows.

From this branding of the physiologist as a more cruel and debased character than the common-place ruffian, one would expect to find that vivisection in England had reached the highest point of cruelty. Yet what are the facts! Taking the average of experiments on animals year by year, 75 per cent. of these are painless, 20 per cent. involve no greater suffering than the prick of a needle, whilst only one per cent. entail as much suffering as would ensue from the performance of any ordinary surgical operation upon the animal.

Operations, and painful operations, such as castration, are daily performed on the brute creation without chloroform, and for far less weighty reasons than those which sway the physiologist, and yet who cries shame?

The aim of the anti-vivisection party is to suppress this species of scientific research in *Great Britain*, yet in all the long, wearisome tirades that I have heard or read, I have failed to find one instance where any authentic charge of barbarity has been brought against any British investigator. In a furious blast against vivisection delivered not long since by the Hon. Bernard Coleridge in the House of Commons, the honorable member, after denouncing the abominable cruelties practised in this country, has to go as far as Strasburg to find a scapegoat in the person of Goltz. The Secretary of State, in reply, said: "The honorable and learned member has suppressed entirely the fact that under the Vivisection Act the things he mentions are *impossible in this country*." That the Hon. Henry Matthews is no mere partizan is evidenced by another remark of his: "I am not myself enamoured of this system of physical research." (Hansard, cccxxv., 878-887). If the orators of the Total Abolition party had the honesty to tell

their hearers that vivisection in this country must be performed under a license from the Secretary of State; that its object must be to save life, alleviate suffering, or teach important lessons in physiology; that all experiments must be conducted in licensed rooms and not in secret; that no public exhibitions are allowed; that all experiments must be open to the Government inspector, and that a report of all such experiments is laid before the authorities—then I imagine the public would be apt to inquire of them what all their fuss was about.

The justice of the crusade against vivisection can be further estimated by statements of some of the crusaders. One of these, the Rev. Noble Scott, writes me as follows: "I agree with you that our British medical men are, with very few exceptions, true gentlemen. . . . Even those who have vivisected have mostly done so in the humanest manner possible."

In his evidence before the Royal Commission in 1876, Mr. Colam said he did not know a single instance of wanton cruelty on the part of British scientists, that he believed anaesthetics were used wherever possible, and that any cases of inhuman conduct were exceptional and rare, and not chargeable upon the profession at large.

Many others of the more liberal minded of the party have not hesitated to testify in the same way, and have not been backward in condemning the extravagant language of the more violent partizans.

The gross untruths and insults hurled about by these latter do not form a very wholesome atmosphere for the Anti-Vivisection Society to exist in, and yet in the clearer air of plain truths and undeniable facts the anti-vivisectionist exhibits more of the ridiculous than of the sublime, more of Don Quixote than of King Arthur.

With some of the ultra-orthodox members of the party, dogmatism and not humanity may be the leading string. Physiology has of late brought strange facts to light that smell of heresy. Physiology must be gagged if possible. A pamphlet by some of these weak-kneed enthusiasts sets forth the fact that as sin and death arose in the beginning by eating of the tree of knowledge, so the continued nibbling at it will be productive of greater sin, and the moral is, abolish vivisection.

There is one test by which our opponents can show their sincerity and heroism. If vivisection and its results be accursed let them refuse to avail themselves in time of sickness of the remedies worked out by experiments on animals. I have suggested this on one or two occasions, but it has made no converts.

To the members of the Anti-Vivisection Society, therefore, I commend the principles of honest Davie Deans—"If he didna satisfy me that he had a right sense of the right hand and left hand deflections of the day, not a goutte of his physic should gang through my father's son."—*Hosp. Gaz.*