

SEEK TO PREVENT DOG VIVISECTION

Lovers of Animals Make
Strong Appeal.

Physicians Oppose Bill at State
House Hearing.

Lovers of dogs made a strong appeal to members of the Legislative Committee on Legal Affairs at the State House this morning to report a bill to prevent experiments of any character on living dogs, with or without the use of anesthetics. A large group of prominent physicians, against whom the provisions of the bill are aimed, opposed the measure, stating that it is a question of whether the lower animal should not be used for these purposes in order to save mankind.

Edward H. Clement, president of the New England Anti-Vivisection Society, said that the European war would not be today as terrible, as it is, if it were not for the brutalizing effect of vivisection.

H. C. Mervin, president of the Work Horse Relief Association, did not believe mankind had a right to torture dumb animals "on a chance that some piece of knowledge valuable to mankind" might come from it.

Hon Samuel L. Powers said he had always supported woman suffrage and antivivisection, two measures that had not yet become laws. He expected soon to see women enjoying their full political rights and to witness the enactment of a law against vivisection.

Mr Powers argued that no special class like surgeons had a right to ask a privilege that is denied other people. He pointed out that doctors disagree as to the value of vivisection.

Hon Samuel J. Elder spoke for the bill, saying he had long been an opponent of this form of cruelty to animals.

A letter was read from Hon Asa P. French, who was prevented from attending by court engagements and who said he would write the committee his reasons for favoring the bill.

Mrs Jessica L. C. Henderson, secretary of the New England Anti-Vivisection Society, said the reason the bill did not include other animals was because the majority of experiments were made on dogs. She read the record from a medical journal of an experiment made at the Harvard Medical School on a female dog, which was allowed to suffer for four hours and a half.

A large number were recorded in favor of the bill, including Mrs Edward Dane, Rev J. M. Foster and Representative William O. Souther Jr of Cohasset.

Opposition to the bill was conducted by Dr William B. Cannon of Harvard. He said the number of animals on which experiments may be made is limited; that the dog is the largest and is omnivorous. It is nearer man. He believed the lower animal should be used to save the lives of human beings.

Dr Theobald Smith of Harvard said he used very few dogs in experiments, but that in crucial experiments it is necessary to use them. He said that in order to study the diseases of dogs vivisection is necessary. He characterized as "gross exaggeration" some of the statements made by those in favor of the bill.

Others who opposed the bill were Dr Langdon Frothingham, Dr Reid Hunt, Dr David Edsall, Dr Elliot Joslin and Dr Harvey Cushing. The hearing was continued until tomorrow.

WOULD UPLIFT MANKIND