2- 9. Medicine.
2- 9. Dermatology.
5- –. Blind.
6- 8. Deaf Mutes.
6- 8. Anti-Slavery.
6- 9. Housing.
——. Red Cross.
6-11. Colonial.
6-11. Mathematics.
6-11. Physics.
6-11. Technical and Industrial Education.
8-14. Dentistry.
9-15. Stenography.
9-11. Educational Press.
10-17. Hygiene and Demography.
10-18. Bibliography.
12-14. Alpinists.
12-15. Hypnotism.
16-28. Geology.
18-25. Electricity.
20-25. Anthropology and Prehistoric Archæology.
22-25. Psychology.
25-Sept. 1. Ethnography.
27-31. Economic and Commercial Geography.
29-Sept. 1. Teaching of Art.
29-Sept. 1. Teaching of Design.
29-Sept. 1. Teaching of Drawing.
30-Sept. 6. Physical Education.

September. Gold and Silver.
2-8. Ethnographical Sciences.
3-5. Basque Studies.
3-8. History of Religions.
5-8. Women's Rights.
6-9. Social Education.
10-12. Apiculture
10-12. Fruit Culture.
10-12. Folklore.
10-13. Popular Education.
14-19. Aquiculture and Fishery.
15-23. Railroads.
17-21. Americanists.
24-29. Fisheries.
25-28. Sunday Rest.
29-6. Peace.

October. 1-3. Maritime Law.
1-7. Botany.
Fireman (officers).
Medical Press.
Thread Numbering (textile).
Tramways (street railways).

ANTI-VIVISECTION LEGISLATION.

THE following letter from President Eliot of Harvard University to the Hon. James McMillan, Chairman of the Senate Committee of the District of Columbia, is printed in the medical journals:

HARVARD UNIVERSITY,
CAMBRIDGE, March 19, 1900.

Dear Sir:—I observe that a new bill on the subject of vivisection has been introduced into the Senate, Bill No. 34. This bill is a slight improvement on its predecessor, but is still very objectionable. I beg leave to state very briefly the objection to all such legislation.

1. To interfere with or retard the progress of medical discovery is an inhuman thing. Within fifteen years medical research has made rapid progress, almost exclusively through the use of the lower animals, and what such research has done for the diagnosis and treatment of diphtheria it can probably do in time for tuberculosis, erysipelas, cerebro-spinal meningitis, and cancer, to name only four horrible scourges of mankind, which are known to be of germ origin.

2. The human race makes use of animals without the smallest compunctions as articles of food and as laborers. It kills them, confines them, gelds them, and interferes in all manner of ways with their natural lives. The liberty we take with the animal creation in using utterly insignificant members of them for scientific researches is infinitesimal compared with the other liberties we take with animals, and it is that use of animals from which the human race has most to hope.

3. The few medical investigators can not, probably, be supervised or inspected or controlled by any of the ordinary processes of Government supervision. Neither can they properly be licensed, because there is no competent supervising or licensing body. The Government may properly license a plumber, because it can provide the proper examination boards for plumbers; it can properly license young men to practice medicine, because it can provide the proper examination boards for that profession, and these boards can testify to the fitness of candidates, but the Government can

not provide any board of officials competent to testify to the fitness of the medical investigator.

4. The advocates of anti-vivisection laws consider themselves more humane and merciful than the opponents of such laws. To my thinking these unthinking advocates are really cruel to their own race. How many cats or guinea pigs would you or I sacrifice to save the life of our child or to win a chance of saving the life of our child? The diphtheria-antitoxin has already saved the lives of many thousands of human beings, yet it is produced through a moderate amount of inconvenience and suffering inflicted on horses and through the sacrifice of a moderate number of guinea pigs. Who are the merciful people—the few physicians who superintend the making of the antitoxin and make sure of its quality, or the people who cry out against the infliction of any suffering on animals on behalf of mankind?

It is, of course, possible to legislate against an improper use of vivisection. For instance, it should not be allowed in secondary schools or before college classes for purposes of demonstration only; but any attempt to interfere with the necessary processes of medical investigation is, in my judgment, in the highest degree inexpedient, and is fundamentally inhuman.

Yours very truly,

C. W. ELIOT.

HON. JAMES MCMILLAN.

A NATIONAL REPOSITORY FOR SCIENCE AND ART.

A LECTURE was delivered at the Society of Arts on May 18th by Professor Flinders Petrie on 'A National Repository for Science and Art.' Professor Petrie, as reported in the London *Times*, said that the preservation of material for study had become an urgent question. Many of the sciences rested on proofs and bases which were partly or entirely vanishing. Looking at our present needs, and first of all those which he knew of personally, he asked where was the possibility of preserving all the new world of prehistoric man that had opened before us in the last 30 years. There was scarcely a single burial preserved intact in any museum, though they might see long rows of objects from such tombs, divorced from all else that belonged to them. We had nothing yet but stray examples of the prehistoric ages of other countries. In Egypt alone the prehistoric pottery extends to 900 varieties; when he made an offer to the British Museum he was asked to send as few as possible. To get ten square yards more in English museums was a problem. The bulk of the Greek and Latin inscriptions that we possessed was stored in cellars of the British Museum in the worst of lights. When the earliest Greek tools were offered to the British Museum they were declined as being too ugly; and they were lost beyond recall. The subject of casts was a national scandal. As to the last 1500 years the prospect was far worse. Of our own architecture there was no collection, except a small one belonging to the Institute of British Architects. There was no home for any remains of the innumerable buildings that were wiped away by modern changes. Every year the tribes of our Empire were dwindling, becoming extinct, or merging with their rulers. Our civilization had wiped out races at a greater rate in this century than in any other of the world's history. Yet there was no place where the remains of these peoples and of their civilizations could be preserved. The study of variations were only just beginning, and was the key to the great question of species. Yet series of hundreds or thousands of the same objects, however needful, however irreplaceable, could not be kept in existing museums. The larger geological specimens were scarcely ever preserved. Most of the remains of man were irreplaceable, and to suppose that the remains of all the past civilizations of the whole world were to be compressed into one square furlong at Bloomsbury was manifestly absurd. At the beginning of the century the British Museum was begun in an airy suburb. At the end it was in the midst of square miles of houses, with land of high value around it. It is hopeless to suppose that such a site could be fit for the expansion of historical material. To say that nothing should be preserved that was not worth many pounds for each square foot was to destroy all hopes of progress. Yet we virtually did so by saying "The price of preservation is £5 or £10 per square foot; perish all that is not worth so much." Two very