

animals, and the general progress of the public weal. (Cheers.)

Sir LYON PLAYFAIR, M.P., said that experiments on living animals had been sanctioned by Parliament, which had intrusted the Home Secretary to make suitable restrictions for the carrying out of the operations. The proposed Institute was promoted differently from those in foreign countries, which were being founded by the State, and the deputation only asked to be allowed to associate for a purpose recognised by Parliament, and with such restrictions as Sir Michael Hicks-Beach or the Home Secretary thought proper to impose.

Professor DEWAR spoke of the importance of the proposed Institute from a chemical point of view, and Professor RAY LANKESTER and Sir JAMES CRICHTON BROWNE also spoke.

Sir M. HICKS-BEACH, in reply, said—I hope that it is not through any fault of mine that those who have arranged for this deputation have not come to me in the ordinary numbers of a deputation, but have thought it necessary for their object to summon from different parts of the country so very large a number of gentlemen who are very actively engaged, and whose time must be very valuable, not only to themselves, but also to the public. I am not disposed to be influenced in any matter by the mere numbers of a deputation. It would be perfectly possible for you, and for those who differ from you on the other side, to fill a very much larger room than this. I think the deputations should be weighed rather than counted, and if half-a-dozen of those who are now present had come to me saying what has been said to-day, and authorised to speak on behalf of all of you, I can assure you that I should have attached as much weight to their arguments as I can do now. But, of course, I accept your presence here as a strong testimony to the great interest that you feel in this subject. I am sorry to confess to have differed from so many gentlemen of such eminence as those who have supported this movement, and to have found myself unable to grant the application of the British Institute of Preventive Medicine for permission to register the Association without the addition of the word "limited." It is only due to you that I should explain as shortly as I can the reasons which induce me to arrive at that decision. Now, the section of the Act of 1867 under which you ask me to act lays down two preliminary requirements which must be proved to the satisfaction of the Board of

Trade—first, that the Association shall be formed for one of several purposes, such as for instance, that of promoting science or some other useful object; secondly, that the profits or income will be applied to promote the objects of the Association, and that the payment of dividends will be prohibited. Now, I will assume that you have complied with both these requirements; I say nothing to the contrary. But the proof of such compliance does not, in my opinion, compel the Board of Trade to act on the section. Something has been said to-day to the effect that you have obtained counsel's opinion that it does compel the Board of Trade so to act. I have taken another view—I admit without legal advice. If you will place before me the opinion upon which your view is based, of course I shall very carefully consider it, and myself obtain legal advice upon that point, because I view it as an important point as you will see from what I am going to say. I have considered, as I said, that the section of the Act only empowers the Board of Trade to act, and leaves it to the Board of Trade to decide whether the licence shall be granted or not; and if granted whether any conditions or regulations should be imposed and inserted in the memorandum and articles of association. It therefore seems to me that the Board of Trade could hardly grant such a licence without expressing approval, by the mere fact of the grant, of the Association to which it is granted. In your case I think I have no right to express such an approval, because if I rightly interpret Clause 3a of your memorandum I understand—and I also gather from what has been said to-day—"that experiments on living animals calculated to give pain," to quote the words of the Act of Parliament, are included among your objects—in one word, that vivisection would be part of your work. Now, this is a subject which the Legislature by the Cruelty to Animals Act, 1876, has placed under the control, not of the Board of Trade, but of the Home Office. By that Act, as you know, vivisection is made illegal except by licence from the Home Office, and under the most stringent regulations, including inspection by inspectors of the Home Office. I assume that when you had established this Institution, supposing my licence were granted, an application would be made to the Home Office for a licence or licences for vivisection on the premises of the Institute for some one or more of its members. It seems to me that the Home Secretary would have fair

Loefflund's Mustard Leaves (prepared specially for Sinapisms from the finest seed only. The most efficacious and reliable form of mustard-plaster. Clean, quick, portable. Tins of 10, 1s. 6d. Special quotations for larger sizes, containing 50, 100, and 200 leaves each. R. Baelz and Co., 14-20, St. Mary Axe, E.C.

NOTICE.—Messrs. Baelz and Co. respectfully invite correspondence from the members of the Nursing profession, to whom they will be happy to forward full particulars of Messrs. Loefflund and Co.'s products, and quote special terms in such cases as may be found conducive to a thorough and practical test of these "excellent preparations." 14-20, St. Mary Axe, E.C.

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)