

June 30, 1906.]

THE SPECTATOR.

1037

which, thanks to King Edward and to a section of our Press, was believed to have been shaken off for ever. Were such a fatuous policy to be followed, and were England to acknowledge the supremacy of Juggernaut, then good-bye to our *entente* with France and to the peace of Europe. Perfidious Albion would become our well-merited sobriquet.—I am, Sir, &c.,

EX-DIPLOMATIST.

IRELAND AS A TOURIST RESORT.

[TO THE EDITOR OF THE "SPECTATOR."]

SIR,—Once more I venture to draw the attention of your readers to the steady progress that is being made every year in throwing Ireland open to the British tourist.

The new service inaugurated last year between Heysham, in Lancashire, and Belfast can now boast of four steamers. Two of these, the 'Antrim' and the 'Donegal,' are twin-screws, whilst the other two, the 'Londonderry' and the 'Manxman,' are worked by turbines, and attain a speed varying from twenty-two to twenty-three knots an hour. The outward service leaves St. Pancras at 5.30, Portrush at 9.5, and Londonderry at 9.45 the following morning; whilst the return service leaves Londonderry at 5.35, Portrush at 6.5, and Belfast at 9 in the evening, arriving at Heysham at 4.25 and at St. Pancras at 10.40 the next day. A new service has also been opened between Heysham and the North Wall, Dublin.

When we reach Ireland itself we are able to record important improvements on the Great Northern Railway. The extension of the line from Banbridge to Ballyronney on to Castlewellan and its connexion with Newcastle throws open one of the loveliest districts in Ireland to the tourist. Trains are run now from Belfast direct to Newcastle, whilst the railway journey from Dublin to Newcastle is shortened by sixty miles, or three and a half hours. The Mourne Mountains have also been rendered still more accessible by a motor-car service which runs along the coast *via* Killybegs, and so unites Newcastle with Warrenpoint. A motor-rail service has been established between Belfast and Lisburn, and this taken in conjunction with the ordinary trains makes the service a half-hourly one. If we go still further afield, we find Lord Leitrim has enlarged his golfing hotel at Rosapenna, on the shores of Sheephaven, in the neighbourhood of some of the best links and finest coast scenery in North-West Donegal. It now accommodates a hundred visitors, and will be further enlarged this winter.

The new Great Western service to Ireland by Fishguard and Rosslare will shortly be opened, and it will be then possible to leave Paddington at 8.45, arriving at Waterford at 6.30 and at Cork at 9.15 by the day or night services. Admirable arrangements are also being made for dealing with the coal and cattle traffic at Fishguard, where the Great Western Railway have furthermore opened the Wynclyffe Hotel. As Fishguard is only fifty-four nautical miles from Rosslare, the twenty-two-and-a-half-knot turbine steamers will be able to cover the distance in much less than three hours. I need hardly add that the London and North-Western Railway, and the City of Dublin Steam Packet Company, continue to maintain their admirable services between Holyhead, Dublin, and Kingstown.

—I am, Sir, &c.,

V. HUSSEY WALSH.

Athenæum Club, Pall Mall, S.W.

CAN ANIMALS "SUFFER"?

[TO THE EDITOR OF THE "SPECTATOR."]

SIR,—In the comments contained in your issue of June 23rd on the first chapter of Mr. Robinson's book, the writer apparently assents to the author's dictum that animals do not suffer pain, since they do not know that they suffer. Experience shows that they do dread pain, often connecting it with certain causes which they ingeniously avoid. It also shows that they not only feel pain as human beings do, but are less able to endure it, not seeing beyond it. I have, however, in mind an instance in which a dog of ours quietly submitted to a cutting operation which it evidently felt would lead to immediate relief, which was the case. Mr. Robinson's argument applies equally to an infant who does not *know* when a pin has been allowed to run into him, but loudly proclaims the fact.—I am, Sir, &c.,

M. OR N.

[TO THE EDITOR OF THE "SPECTATOR."]

SIR,—I understand the argument of Mr. E. Kay Robinson's "Religion of Nature," as summed up in your last issue (June 23rd, p. 979), to enforce the conclusion, "Man alone can 'suffer.'" By putting "suffer" in quotation marks the reviewer means, I suppose, suffer in the full sense of the word; he does not, however, make clear to me the secondary sense in which he considers it applicable to animals. "Animals feel pain, but are not conscious that they feel it." In whatever sense that may be true of animals, it is surely true of many human beings. Would your reviewer say that idiots or babies cannot "suffer"? Or would he say that

they "have the power of thinking about their feelings," as he says animals have not? We can as little recall the sensations of some disorder before our first birthday as discover those of a vivisected dog; but the manifestations of suffering tell the same story in both cases. Mrs. Besant has informed us that it was the anguish of watching the sufferings of her sick baby which destroyed her faith in God. One can imagine many arguments directed to her state of mind. But no one, I think, would include in them the suggestion that as the baby could not think about its own feelings, it did not suffer. It was the sensation, not any thoughts about it, from which she desired to deliver her child. What makes me hope that you will insert this letter is the conviction that about half the cruelty of the world is due to a vague belief that others do not suffer in the same sense as we and those we care for do. Humanity begins when a man or woman puts himself or herself in the place of the sufferer. To teach that this endeavour is inapplicable in the case of the majority of the sentient inhabitants of this planet is to seal the springs of pity against those who have least power to open them, and to harden the average heart where it is already most callous.—I am, Sir, &c.,

JULIA WEDGWOOD.

[The phrase was Mr. Kay Robinson's, not ours; but we admit that it is liable to be misunderstood. We, at any rate—we can, of course, only speak for ourselves—meant that animals cannot be said to suffer in the same sense that human beings suffer,—for there is in the soul of man that which differentiates him from all other sentient creatures. If not, men would not feel as they feel about cannibalism. The most cruel of men would not lightly kill a human being to stay their hunger. The kindest of men allow the gentlest of animals to be killed to satisfy their appetites when those appetites can easily be satisfied in other ways. We recognise, however, the very great danger of encouraging men to think that animals do not suffer in the same way as men. Nor do we wish to suggest that the sin of cruelty to animals—for sin it certainly is—consists only in the injury done to the man who treats animals cruelly. We hold that men should recognise rights in the animal world, though we admit that it is difficult—we do not say impossible—to reconcile those rights with the cruelty of the slaughter-house, a cruelty unfortunately inseparable from the use of animal food. In any case, our partial adoption of Mr. Kay Robinson's argument does not and cannot involve in the slightest degree any defence of cruelty to animals. The point upon which we desired to insist was that the Divine Providence cannot be arraigned on the ground of the intense sufferings of animals in a state of Nature. Their agonies, though great, are not strictly comparable to the agonies of conscious beings like men and women. That seems to us a proposition which must be admitted by those who hold, as we most certainly do, that there is a difference in kind, and not merely in degree, between man and the lower animals.—Ed. *Spectator*.]

SAVE US FROM OUR FRIENDS.

[TO THE EDITOR OF THE "SPECTATOR."]

SIR,—Will you permit me to ask if it be fair that thousands of women householders, landowners, and law-abiding citizens should be jumbled up under the leadership of such persons as Miss Billington and her friends? Yet this is your comment upon the woman suffrage question in the *Spectator* of June 23rd: "The chances of women obtaining the Parliamentary vote were never very bright, but what little chance there was has now vanished altogether." The *Spectator* has repeatedly told us of late that Churchmen should not be judged by the acts and words of extremists; why, then, should women suffragists be judged by their extremists? We repudiate the actions of these silly and unmannerly women; all we ask is that the payment of rent should give us the Parliamentary vote, just as the payment of rates gives us the municipal vote. This seems to most of us mere justice, for our responsibilities are equal to men's; indeed, many a woman has far more responsibility than her gardener or her coachman. Why, then, should she be denied the vote which is allowed to her serving-men?—I am, Sir, &c.,

ONE OF THE FIRST MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE.

[We publish this protest, but cannot open our columns to a discussion of the franchise question.—Ed. *Spectator*.]