I do not consider the above to be an 'important fact,' neither do I consider the observation of Mr. Greene to be fraught with importance of the slightest magnitude, so far as proving the disease to be non-contagious or non-infectious is concerned. On the contrary, I consider that, if it proves anything, it will be found to be evidence rather in favour of, than against, the contagious and infectious theories; for although no other horse had been near the island from the date of the arrival of the horse in question, still, the infection would be able to reach the island in many ways. Might it not have been conveyed to the island by birds? or by the owner or attendant of the animal, whom it is to be presumed would visit the animal occasionally? or may not the poison have been present in the animal's system even before being taken to the island? Again, horses and cattle are very frequently pastured together. There may have been a number of cattle, sheep, or other animals on this island that were removed there from an infected district. The horse may have acquired the disease from them. Yet even supposing that none of the above causes operated to convey the disease to the horse—supposing that no other animals were pastured there, that no man, bird, or other living thing visited the island during all this time, and that the horse was free from taint of any disease at the time of leaving St. John's—I say, even supposing all the above to be the case, is the fact that the animal contracted the disease under these apparently unfavourable circumstances for its development, sufficient evidence to cause any man, who cares to look beneath the surface, to change his belief for disbelief in the contagion and infection of influenza? I think not; for microscopic particles of the contagious principle or virus might yet find their way to the island through the media of the air, and being taken into the air-passages of the horse, in due course, produce their peculiar effects.