

treatment." This is that notorious leaflet, *M. Pasteur's Hecatomb*. I do not know what the *Hecatomb* was like in 1887, when one of the witnesses before the Lords' Committee said he believed it was accurate; but I know what that witness would say about it now. It is sheer nonsense, not worth the paper it is printed on. It includes:

(a) Cases accepted on the authority of *Le Petit Journal*, *L'Intransigeant*, *L'Ami du Peuple*, *La Croix*, and *Le Petit Parisien*.

(b) Cases giving neither the name of the patient, nor the date of the bite, nor the date of the treatment, nor the date of the death.

(c) Cases that died while the treatment was going on.

It conceals the fact that all cases at the Pasteur Institute are divided into classes (A, B, and C). And, worst of all, it gives the date of the first inoculation, not of the last inoculation; thus escaping the question whether a fortnight elapsed between the end of the treatment and the outbreak of the disease.—I am, etc.,

April 6th.

STEPHEN PAGET.

THE FRIENDS ON VIVISECTION.

SIR,—I was interested by your reviewer's dealing with the Friends' Antivivisection Association. As this Association appears to be a product of this locality you may care to hear of my success in combating it.

I find opponents are nearly always kind-hearted people who simply object to useless and unnecessary infliction of pain; so it is my custom to deny that physiologists ever do such "grievous torture," and to challenge proofs. Then it is easy to show in the instances adduced that if any suffering at all was caused, in which they are usually mistaken, at least it was neither useless nor unnecessary. But, sir, though I have induced the Chairman of this Friends' Association to withdraw or qualify nearly the whole of their offensive pamphlet, I have been unable to wring from him references to any single experiment. Hence I wrote, turning his phrase against the author: If the Chairman of the Physiologists' Anti-Quakerism Association wrote a pamphlet to the clergy, saying:—

"It is not right to deliberately torture our weaker fellow creatures—the little children in our power—however much spiritual satisfaction it may give. It lowers the moral tone, hardens the heart, and is essentially degrading. We earnestly invite your help in the strong conviction that Quakerism is causing grievous torture to myriads of unoffending little children."

And when challenged to prove these statements wrote:

"I have no objection to Quakerism, except in so far as it teaches us to torture children. Unaware of the extent to which Quakerism may involve grievous torture—I should be glad to be assured that 20,000 is below the mark—but that ethical belief must from its nature be degrading, for its practice involves in a high degree a disregard for the suffering of unconsenting victims, etc."

Then, I think, a Friend would feel that he had a grievance against the Chairman of the Anti-Quakerism Association if he had to write to him five times and then could not get him to mention a particle of so-called evidence in support of his charges, nor yet to own that they were unwarrantable.

This analogy touched my opponent so keenly that I regret to relate the worthy Friend closed the controversy as being too "personal."—I am, etc.,

Croydon, April 2nd.

T. ARCHIBALD DUKES.

We have received for publication the following letter which Dr. Raven has addressed to the officers of the Friends' Antivivisection Society, in compliance with an intimation in a pamphlet recently circulated by that Society:

Broadstairs, March 26th, 1900.

GENTLEMEN,—I recognise in the appeal which you have addressed to the medical profession a tone very strongly in contrast with the raucous mendacity and abuse with which some leaders of medical science have often been assailed by antivivisectionists. No imputations have been too gross, and no abuse too violent, to shower upon men who have given, and are giving, their most strenuous energies for the relief of human suffering, and the prolongation of human life.

But I also recognise the usual tendency—arising, doubtless in your case from imperfect information—to exaggerate the painful aspect, and to minimise the beneficial side of vivisection. It seems to me that the phrases "deliberately tortured," and "intensity of torture to myriads of unoffending creatures" are as unjustifiably exaggerated as the terms "current laboratory theories" and "some relief to human suffering" are utterly inadequate to indicate the achievements of medical science brought about through the agency of experiments upon animals. On these vital points I would venture to recommend you to thoroughly

acquaint yourselves with the facts which may be found in Mr. Stephen Paget's work *Experiments on Animals*, recently published by Fisher Unwin. In the meantime it appears that what would gain your sympathy would be a lazy acquiescence in the fatal tendency of those diseases which can be remedied only through the agency of vivisection. Such an attitude would scarcely strengthen "such national qualities as compassion, justice, manliness, and sympathy with weakness"—to use your own language—nor would it cultivate in the doctor "chivalrous tenderness towards creatures weaker than himself," for such are his patients. English doctors have not yet learned in the face of difficulties to shrug their shoulders and to ejaculate "*Kismet*," like the Turk of whom we have heard so much.

Allusions to the *morale* of the medical profession, "the lowering of its moral tone and the hardening of its heart," we are never spared and well accustomed to, and it is enough to say in reply that the medical profession has as high a sense of its moral obligations as any society for the prevention of knowledge can have; perhaps higher, for we are consistent in our aims, while the antivivisection societies take no notice of the crimping of live skates and the boiling of living lobsters. Their members consume the flesh of "myriads" of unoffending creatures' slain to promote their "well being." A very eminent statesman, a co-religionist with the members of the Friends' Antivivisection Society, was an enthusiastic fisherman, but I have never heard that he was remonstrated with on account of the "deliberate torture" inflicted with the hook upon the salmon or the mangling of its body with the gaff, nor has any notice been taken of the numberless wounded birds that escape from the sportsman to slowly die in starvation and agony. And yet it might have been supposed that no really useful end being in view your Society might have begun with an effort to stop field sports rather than to interfere with work which has for its object the saving of life and the relief of suffering.

But the matter does not end here. If human interests should be subordinated to those of the lower animals, the liberties of mankind would be very greatly restricted. I do not understand how a consistent member of your society could reconcile it with his conscience to "deliberately" take a woodland walk, for in the course of a few miles he would crush the life out of a number of unoffending insects—ants, beetles, and such-like. Even on a high road this coachman might destroy many harmless worms, and in the dark there is no knowing what harm might be done. Spiders, rats, mice, cockroaches, fleas, etc., might be treated with less circumspection, but another generation may see a society formed for their protection also. In fact, if pursued to its logical conclusion, your proposition would end in a *reductio ad absurdum*. Chaos—at least, social chaos—would come again, and the earth would be overrun by those animals which, either by the greatest power of reproduction—as rabbits—or by superior physical force—as the carnivora—would obtain predominance.

I am a member merely of the rank and file of the profession, and have neither time, opportunity, nor talent for physiological experiment, but I should consider myself utterly unworthy of the trust reposed in me if I did not to the best of my power utilise the wonderful discoveries that have been made by vivisectionists for the good of those "little brothers"—to employ your own quotation—who come under my care. And, to take but two instances. I should be guilty of grave breach of duty were I to allow little children to die of diphtheria when I might save them with antitoxin, or to let them run the risk of small-pox by failing to vaccinate them; and neither could diphtheria have been successfully combated nor small-pox effectually prevented had it not been for experiments upon animals.

All scientific truth I regard as being just as surely God's truth as that which is found in Hely Writ, and I hold it as wrong to neglect the one when it comes in the path of duty as to ignore the other.

For my part, I should not have brought in the name of our Saviour, but as you have chosen to introduce the "example and precepts of Christ," I must remind you of the Gospel narrative in which we are told that, in effecting the cure of a man possessed with devils, a large herd of swine was sacrificed by Christ himself.

As you have invited replies to your communication, I make no apology for addressing to you this rejoinder, which, however expressed, is courteously intended.

I am, yours faithfully,

THOS. F. RAVEN

CONTRACT MEDICAL PRACTICE.

CHARGES FOR A TEMPORARY INFECTIOUS HOSPITAL.

HOSPITAL writes: A. B. is surgeon to a company which pays him a retaining fee, but his regular payments come from the workmen. An epidemic breaks out among the children, for whom he is not paid, and the surgeon's advice being taken, a house is set aside as an isolation hospital, and is carried on for three months. Is A. B. entitled to charge the company for attendance on the children at the hospital (the workmen object to pay because the children have been removed from their homes)? If so, at what rate? The company undertook all expenses of hospital nurses, food, etc.

* * It is no part of A. B.'s duties under such circumstances to attend the children without payment. He must make his own terms with the company, and he is himself the best judge as to what his charge should be; the rate should depend on the time and labour required.

THE NATIONAL DEPOSIT FRIENDLY SOCIETY.

DR. W. B. WINSTON, New Southgate, N., Honorary Secretary of the Wood Green and District Medical Society, informs us that at a special general meeting of the Society, held on April 4th, 1900, the following resolutions were unanimously adopted:

1. That the Wood Green and District Medical Society, having carefully considered the present and proposed new rules of the National Deposit Friendly Society, Limited, consider that, to make that Society one that

it can recommend to the profession, it shall alter its rules as regards medical pay as follows:

(a) That each "intermediate visit in dangerous cases" shall be paid for at 2s. 6d. per visit.

(b) That the removal of cancerous or other tumours of magnitude shall be paid for at the rate of £5 instead of £3.

(c) That there shall be a minimum fee for attendance in midwifery cases as follows:

(i) For patients drawing up to 3s. per day sick pay, ordinary labour £1 1s.; instrumental labour or cases of version, £1 11s. 6d. (major operations excepted). Where anæsthetic is used, 10s. 6d. extra to above fees.

(ii) For patients drawing from 3s. to 5s. per day, 10s. 6d. extra to above fees.

(iii) For patients drawing over 5s. per day, £1 1s. extra to above fees.

Also that such fees shall be paid direct by the Society to the medical attendant and deducted from the patient's "sick pay" or "deposit" if sick pay be insufficient.

(d) That the fee to be paid by all candidates for admission shall be at least 2s. 6d. for their medical examination for entry.

2. That there is no reason why "medical officers" should be appointed for districts, inasmuch as all registered medical practitioners are eligible to attend members and sign all certificates, and that by appointing a particular medical man as "medical officer," he is given an undue preference over other practitioners, as evidenced by proposed new rules (Rule IV, Section VI; Rule XVI, Section XIV).

3. That the certificate of health of candidates for admission shall be sent direct to the district secretary, and not returned to the candidate.

4. That the patient may obtain the advice of a consulting surgeon upon the same terms as proposed in the new rule (XVI, Section XIV, Subsection V) *re* consulting physician.

5. That no member shall be eligible for medical pay at above rates (Rule XVI, Section XIV, Subsections I, II, III, IV, V) whose average income exceeds £5 per week.

6. That copies of the above resolutions be sent to the medical press, the Ilford Medical Society, and the East Suburban Medical Protection and Medico-Ethical Society, Limited.

THE MIDWIVES BILL.

A MEETING of the West Kent Medico-Chirurgical Society was held at the Royal Kent Dispensary on Friday, April 6th. The PRESIDENT, Dr. C. J. Parke, occupied the chair.

Dr. F. S. TOOGOOD introduced the discussion, and moved the following resolution:

That this meeting of the West Kent Medico-Chirurgical Society, whilst cordially welcoming fully-qualified lady doctors, protests against the proposed Midwives Registration Bill as tending to create an inferior order of midwifery practitioners, and as being contrary to the spirit of the Medical Acts, which were designed to protect the public in general and the poor in particular. That this meeting thanks the Council of the Society for co-operating in convening the meeting to resist the registration of midwives, and will support the Council (pecuniarily or otherwise) in carrying on that resistance as resolved by the South-East London meeting.

The resolution was seconded by Dr. CHISHOLM WILLIAMS, and strongly supported by the PRESIDENT, Drs. BARNETT, HART, HERSHELL, ANDERSON, WEEKES, KEAY, and HENRY.

It was carried unanimously, and ordered to be forwarded to members of Parliament and the press.

THE CANNON STREET HOTEL MEETING.

We have received from Dr. Glover (with a request for its publication) the following letter in reply to the resolution passed at the meeting in Cannon Street Hotel, reported in the BRITISH MEDICAL JOURNAL of April 7th:

GENTLEMEN,—
25, Highbury Place,
April 6th, 1900.

I have received from you a letter covering the following resolution, moved by Dr. Lorimer Hart and seconded by Mr. Joseph Smith, at a meeting presided over by Mr. George Brown, and in its later and attenuated stage by Dr. Toogood:

That whereas the General Medical Council and others who support the registration of midwives on the mistaken expectation of "influencing important details" have signally failed to amend the worst provisions of the Bill before Parliament, it is time that honestly mistaken supporters of such registration should cease to trifle with a public danger, and in view of the *plebiscite* recently taken by the *Lancet* indicating the sense of a great proportion of his electors, this meeting, regretting Dr. Glover's

attitude of indifference to these considerations, invites him, by resigning his seat and seeking re-election, to afford to his constituents a just opportunity of reconsidering their relations to him.

It is pleasant to have the assurance conveyed in your covering letter that no personal unfriendliness is meant by such a resolution. I accept the assurance, though it is very difficult to construe the procedure of the gentlemen concerned in this matter as either reasonable or courteous. The impression produced on others affected by your views and methods may perhaps be gathered from the fact that two only of a large number of members of Parliament whom you invited attended, and that the great profession to which we belong was in the end, with its 23,000 members, represented by seventeen persons, who thought it seemly to ask a direct representative to resign because of a disagreement with him as to the best means of dealing with the question of midwives.

I am sure nothing would more effectually surprise you, or lower me in the esteem of the great body of the profession, than that I should take such a resolution seriously. I shall only remind my constituents generally that as a matter of fact my vote in the *Lancet* ballot was given against this Bill, and will still be given so until I am satisfied that the midwives to be licensed shall be required in all unusual cases to appeal for help to the medical profession.

It is only fair to the General Medical Council to say that it has in most important ways influenced the details of this Bill. Even as the Bill stands at present the Council has secured a control over licensed midwives which would probably not have been conceded if Parliament had thought that the profession was represented by the seventeen modest gentlemen who ask me to resign a trust which was given me, for the third time, by thousands of practitioners, on the explicit understanding that I would support such legislation on conditions.

Believe me, Gentlemen,

Yours very truly,

J. G. GLOVER.

F. S. Toogood, Esq., M.D. Lond., etc.
John P. Henry, Esq., M.D. Dub., etc.

MEDICAL SICKNESS AND ACCIDENT SOCIETY.

The usual monthly meeting of the Executive Committee of the Medical Sickness, Annuity, and Life Assurance Society was held at 429, Strand, London, W.C., on March 30th. There were present: Dr. DE HAVILLAND HALL (in the Chair), Dr. J. B. Ball, Dr. G. E. Herman, Mr. J. Brindley James, Dr. J. W. Hunt, Mr. F. S. Edwards, Dr. M. Greenwood, Mr. Frederick Wallace, Dr. F. J. Allan, Dr. Alfred Gubb, Dr. Walter Smith, and Dr. W. Knowsley Sibley.

The list of current sickness claims presented to the Committee was, as is usual in the spring, rather heavy, but compares well with the experience of the Society at the same season last year. The influenza epidemic appears to have nearly exhausted itself, the sickness claims arising from this cause being less both in number and duration than in the earlier part of the year.

A considerable number of claims are received during the first three months of each year arising from bronchial affections and similar ailments. General practitioners in the provinces are naturally more liable to these than medical men engaged in practice in cities, so that the list of country claims is always long in the past quarter of the year. These claims are, for the most part, of short duration, and do not cause a very heavy draft on the funds. On the other hand, medical men in large towns seem more liable to suffer from the effects of overstrain, and the claims arising from nervous breakdown, although fewer in number, are of much longer duration. Most of the chronic or permanent claims belong to this latter class, and these cost the Society about £40 a week at present, and show no signs of decreasing in the future.

Prospectuses and all particulars on application to Mr. F. Addiscott, Secretary, Medical Sickness and Accident Society, 33, Chancery Lane, London, W.C.

The Pasteur Institute at Antananarivo, the capital of Madagascar, was, we learn from the *Times*, opened on March 30th.