

paper before this society I thought that it might not be without some interest to briefly review the facts which led up to this general belief in the possibility of primary infection through the intestinal tract by the bacilli in milk, hoping that in the discussion which might follow, the position to be taken by us as a medical profession at the present, might be more clearly defined.

In 1865 Villemin¹ excited the interest of the medical world by his statement that tuberculosis is a specific affection, the cause is an inoculable agent, inoculation of tuberculosis material into the rabbit producing tuberculosis. Chauveau,² following him, found that such material may be also effectively introduced into the body through the alimentary canal, and that calves might be rendered tubercular by feeding them with the milk, sputum, or flesh of an infected animal, a fact verified later by Gerlach,³ Klebs, Orth and Bollinger.⁴

A few years afterwards experiments made by Baumgarten⁵ showed that a few ounces of milk to which a quantity of phthysical sputum had been added, were sufficient to produce characteristic tubercular lesions in the intestine of the rabbit with considerable precision and certainty.

Wescner⁶ found that when sputum was given with the food of rabbits, the mesenteric glands alone became infected, but when sputum was injected directly into the intestine, intestinal lesions of a virulent character ensued. This difference in the results Wescner attributed to the germicidal power of the gastric juice.

It was in 1882 that Koch discovered the tubercle bacillus and announced to the world that tuberculosis, whether human or bovine, was one disease and dependent in all cases upon the one specific micro-organism; a view questioned by Virchow and others who recognized even then that the contagium of bovine tuberculosis was much more virulent for experimental animals than that met with in human tuberculosis. Koch now maintains that human tuberculosis differs from bovine and cannot be transmitted to cattle, and adds that if one studies the older literature of the subject and collates the reports of the numerous experiments that were made in former times by Chauveau, Gunther, Bollinger, and others, who fed calves, swine, and goats with tuberculous material, one finds that the animals that were fed with the milk and pieces of the lungs of tuberculous cattle, always fell ill of tuberculosis, whereas those fed with human material did not.

Opposed to this view thus absolutely stated let me quote the following: In 1888, Crookshank⁷ reported to the Board of Agriculture in England that he had inoculated an animal with sputum from a case of advanced phthisis, which evidently had contained besides tubercle bacilli suppurative micro-organisms, and stated that he had been able