

country, just now emerging into an era of expected prosperity, stands in jeopardy of being driven to the wall. We speak advisedly when we say the situation is extremely grave, and if the Government is well advised they will avert the danger brought about through drifting into an untenable position, and one which, while serving no good purpose, either to human beings or animals, has already wrought very great damage.

This is not the occasion for regrets or recriminations, nor technicalities regarding official consistency, but, as Hon. John Dryden elsewhere clearly and forcibly points out, the time for decisive action has come for doing now what is right and just, and the sooner steps are taken by

experience with the disease, that the test is no criterion whatever of the seriousness of the disease or otherwise, even if any be indicated.

Another objection to the test is that, in the purchase and sale of animals, it is necessary to apply it under all kinds of circumstances—when the animals are naturally unfitted to receive the test, and at such times as no experienced and skillful veterinary surgeon would desire to apply it. It can be of service only when employed properly by a competent man, and when the cattle are tested at appropriate seasons. Much harm is reported from various quarters to pregnant cows and also to young bulls. A valuable yearling bull sold by me last summer was impotent for some four months after, but is now all right. At the same time a yearling heifer was sold in calf, and a short time after aborted.

Under all the circumstances, therefore, my mind is clear that the test, as applied, affords no real protection whatever, and is a considerable source of embarrassment and annoyance to those who are seeking to build up the cattle interests of this country.

None of us can quite understand why those who are investing large sums of money in superior cattle should be thus hindered and tormented, while those who deal in comparatively worthless or inferior animals are not molested in any particular.

I have no hesitation in saying that it is the duty of the Dominion Government to at once cancel the regulation requiring this test on imported animals. The Canadian Government was the first to institute it, and for years after the arrangement had

been made with the United States Government for the imposition of the same test on cattle coming into that country the regulation was not enforced against cattle from Great Britain, as was the case in Canada. As our Government was the first to institute it and to request a conference with the United States authorities leading to a similar regulation in that country, I am strongly of the opinion that they ought to be the first to acknowledge the utter futility of the test as at present being applied in both countries. If such a course were taken, I have no doubt that it would serve as a strong incentive towards a similar course being adopted in the United States. Recent issues of English periodicals show that the same state of feeling and objection to the test exists in that country as elsewhere.

JOHN DRYDEN.

Shall Tuberculin Hinder Live Stock Improvement?

To the Editor FARMER'S ADVOCATE:

SIR,—It is not necessary to discuss the question

whether the imposition of the test does or does not hinder live-stock improvement, because, owing to the fact that such a test imposed on importers produces in them a fear of consequences, which may mean financial hurt, is evidence enough that the continuance of the test for imported stock will undoubtedly hinder live-stock progress, such progress being dependent to a large degree on the influx of fresh blood from Great Britain. The agitation for and against the test has no doubt forced otherwise reasonable people to go to extremes in their statements, and from which they cannot be entirely excused. The stockman has undoubtedly a grievance, whether he exaggerates or not in stating his grievance. If it is necessary and advisable to test imported cattle, why is it not just as necessary to test with mallein all horses used for breeding purposes imported from other countries? Such a procedure would be far more reasonable, because glanders is undoubtedly capable of being transmitted from horse to man; in fact, more logic would be shown in enforcing a test with mallein, because glanders in man is practically only got from diseased (glandered) horses or mules. The motion of Arthur Johnston and Alex. Smith, at the Guelph meeting, is eminently fair and correct in its statements. Among other things, they draw attention to the fallibility of the tuberculin test.

In this connection, readers of the live-stock papers will doubtless have noticed the results of investigations by the Royal Agricultural Society of England—not a body of extremists, by any means. The results obtained by them are as follows: In a test of 34 head, 18 failed to react, three (3) of which were tuberculous, an error of 16.4 per cent.; of the 16 reacting, 3 were found not to be tuberculous, an error of 18.7 per cent., a total error of 17.64 per cent. A cow can now be seen at the dairy barn of the Wisconsin Experiment Station, twice tested and twice said to react, by the student bacteriologists conducting the test. Three subsequent tests, by the animal husbandry staff, at intervals of six months or more, showed her to be a non-reactor, and tests of her neighbors show that they also are free. Marshall (Michigan), writing of the management of tuberculosis, says: "When we consider the generality of tuberculosis, testing of imported animals seems to be of questionable utility. The wisdom is only seen in the rare possibility of some imported tuberculous animal getting into a herd free from tuberculosis, and this we maintain is something which each individual stockman should be held responsible for. I wish to repeat right here, however, that repeated tests may show an animal to be all right!"—an instance of which is mentioned above, in the W. E. S. herd, and which Dr. Marshall says he has shown in previous statistics. Many cases when slaughtered show the intestinal lymphatic nodes only to be affected, the animal often being in good flesh, etc., the chances of infection from such cases being at the time practically nil. As to veterinary authorities, we cite the most recent, and the text-book used as an authority in the veterinary colleges of Canada, United States, Great Britain, France and Germany, namely, the work of Freidberger and Frohner. They state that the making of a positive diagnosis during life (*intra vitam*) is impossible, and that slaughter of all cattle affected would demand very extraordinary sacrifices. The same authorities also state that they venture to doubt the wisdom of veterinary police regulations, of which the enforced use of the tuberculin test is one form, against tuberculosis. As to the infection of man from animals, five such cases are reported, cited by Scherming; of Copenhagen; Pfeiffer (Weimar), Law, Rich and Ravenel (Phila.), all such being the result of wound infections got at post-mortems. As a result, one might lean to the opinion that the bovine germ would cause the disease in the human being. Let us, however, review the statistics: Tuberculosis in all its forms in England and Wales has decreased 39.1 per cent. in thirty-five years. At the same time, intestinal tuberculosis in children under one year has been said to have increased 27 per cent., due, as some would have us believe, to the use of milk from tuberculous cows. Autopsy statistics with regard to the above show those lesions (intestinal) to be secondary, the primary lesions being in the lungs, thus weakening the case against milk. With regard to the danger from milk and udders, let us consult the report of the medical officer of Manchester, Eng. Six hundred and three (603) city cows were examined, only twelve udders being affected, and only one (1) of which was tuberculous. Of the other five hundred and fifty-five (555) cows examined outside the city, only thirty-nine (39) udders were affected, two (2) only being tuberculous, and eight were indurated. Going further, seven hundred and twenty-nine cows, on twenty-nine farms, were examined. Thirty-three (33) showed udder affections, three



DALE AND DOLLY 5TH.

Champion Herefords at the International Live Stock Show, Chicago, December, 1900.

the Minister of Agriculture to relieve the tension, in so far as he has authority, the sooner may we hope for reciprocal action on the part of the United States Government and a removal of the barriers to business which are at present exasperating the stock breeders of both countries.

STOCK.

Hon. John Dryden on the Tuberculin Test.

To the Editor FARMER'S ADVOCATE:

In answer to your request for a statement of my views on the question of the desirability or otherwise of the continuance of the tuberculin test on imported cattle, I have to say that my opinions are so decided and clear to my own mind that I have no objection to give them to you for publication over my own signature, if it is thought desirable.

It is my opinion that a mistake was made when, by order of the Department of Agriculture, this test was first instituted many years ago. Whoever was responsible for its conception no doubt had before his mind the possibility, by the employment of the test and the butcher's knife supplemented by a grant from the Government of several thousand dollars, of ridding the country entirely of bovine tuberculosis. This being accomplished, the testing of cattle coming into the country would, in his opinion, prevent its introduction.

Since that time no attempt has ever been made to entirely destroy the diseased cattle at present existing in the country, and I assume none ever can be made. Such a scheme would provoke a rebellion among those whose interests would be affected, and, in addition, it would be undertaking an impossibility.

This being the case, the application of the test to imported cattle is of no real service. There is no more reason why animals purchased in countries outside of our own territory should be tested than those that are purchased within our own borders. No man can satisfactorily tell me why I am permitted to buy an animal, say in Manitoba, without notice or hindrance, and yet am not allowed to buy a similar animal in Scotland without the interference of governmental authority, as I am as likely to buy disease in one country as the other.

It is now admitted and is perfectly clear that the test as ordinarily applied is not authentic. Even the best authorities in Europe will not say that it is *always* reliable. It may frequently prevent the purchase and reception of a very valuable animal which would undoubtedly live to old age without the possibility of communicating the disease to any other member of the herd, while at the same time it permits an animal to pass unnoticed which may be diseased in such organs as would make it possible for the disease to be communicated.

It is also admitted by those who have had some



LINCOLN YEARLING WETHERS.

Winners of first prize and silver cup as best pen of Longwools at the Smithfield Club Show, 1900.

only of which were tuberculous. The final examination had to do with the milk of 2,000 cows, out of which only twelve cows were shown to have udders affected with tubercular trouble and capable of conveying the disease. On twelve farms visited, only five cows were found with tuberculous udders. Freidberger and Frohner state that in post-mortems many cases are termed tuberculous when they are not, and they also state that a positive diagnosis cannot be made, unless backed up by a microscopical examination. Yet, how many cases post-mortemed ever reach the stage of a microscope? The list of diseases apt to be mistaken for tuberculosis need not be recapitulated here. Some time ago, in company with a bacteriologist, the