

The
Farmer's Advocate
and Home Magazine.

"PERSEVERE AND SUCCEED."

ESTABLISHED 1866.

REGISTERED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE COPYRIGHT ACT OF 1875.

VOL. XXXVI.

LONDON, ONT., AND WINNIPEG, MAN., JULY 1, 1901.

No. 529

EDITORIAL.

The Tuberculin Crusade and the Cattle Breeders.

It is to be feared that a very large number of our cattle-owners have not yet realized the real significance of the tuberculin-test crusade. Its dangers have not been fully discerned. The original conception seems to have been that by its use animals with tubercles in their bodies could be entirely eliminated from the country. An elaborate treatise on this subject issued from an American experiment station a while ago disclosed the nature of the design, in the writer's mind, to be the enforcement of tuberculin testing on every farm, and the quarantining of cattle showing a rise in temperature. In a recent annual report, Dr. D. McEachran, head of the Canadian Live Stock Inspection Department, asserts that "with a moderate expenditure to enable us to at once get rid of all those showing symptoms and so presumably infective, fattening the others and quarantining them for life, this disease can be completely eradicated." Cannot the farmer and stockman perceive the true character of the system which a little clique of officials would fasten upon them for the benefit of themselves and the manufacturers of tuberculin? How would the breeder and farmer relish the prospect of supporting a lot of salaried officials whose duty would be to periodically give their cattle hypodermic injections, or, as one writer graphically puts it, "pump poison into them?" Even supposing there were no risks of abortion in pregnant animals, or other subsequent injurious effects, it would be very much cheaper and better for the country to simply pension off these officials at once. For the general farmer and dairyman the system is optional now, but how long will it remain so? The evident, logical design is

TO MAKE IT GENERAL AND COMPULSORY,

as it is upon the breeders who desire to import or to export pure-bred animals to the United States. Grades and scrubs go there without a test! But when an enterprising American comes along wanting first-class cattle, and who does not want them tested, he cannot get them without a dose.

A MISLEADING TEST.

As a scientific test, what reliance is to be placed upon a tuberculin injection? The Dublin experiments showed that it both condemned the innocent and let off the guilty, the extent of error amounting to 17½ per cent. Even Nocard, of France, does not claim that reacting animals are always tuberculous. The investigations conducted by the Royal Agricultural Society of England showed error to the extent of 17.64 per cent. It is not contended that an injection of tuberculin, which is a fluid lymph prepared from the tubercle bacillus itself, passing through the animal system will not by its effects on the tissues or cells cause the temperature of the animal to rise; in other words, occasion what is called a "reaction." It is said that a tubercle the size of a millet seed anywhere in the system would occasion that effect, but should that condemn the animal? Speaking of human tubercles, Prof. Wm. Osler, of the Johns Hopkins University, one of the most eminent medical practitioners and pathologists in the world to-day, states that "a very large proportion of all persons at the age of forty have, somewhere in their bodies, tuberculous lesions. This was discovered by large numbers of post-mortem examinations of persons dying of other ailments or accidents, or probably of old age. The variation of animal temperatures under ordinary conditions, and without any injection of tuberculin,

is remarkable. Our attention has been called to a very careful test made with a Canadian stable full of cattle, of which from five to ten per cent. of their number gave a reaction, without any injections, of from two to three degrees, and all evidently in perfect health and on regular feed. And yet the veterinary branch of the Dominion Department of Agriculture presumes to condemn and throw upon the hands of the breeder animals whose temperature rises two degrees or more under the tuberculin test during the 48-hour period! And this, too, in the name of science! One cannot wonder that indignant breeders look upon this as

A COMBINATION OF HUMBUG AND OUTRAGE.

As every well-informed stockman knows, there are many reasons that will cause a sudden rise in animal temperature, such as indigestion, slight cold, or anything causing a feverish condition. Floyd S. Barlow, of Cornell University, whose letter we republish elsewhere, states that "after the tuberculin has been injected into a cow, some change in the regular current of her life may take place; for example, a rise in the temperature of the air, exertion on the part of the animal, privation of water at the usual time, retention of milk at the usual milking period, coming in heat; in fact, anything that tends to excite the animal may cause a rise of temperature above the normal." What an easy matter it is, then, for officials who are looking for reactions, and whose occupation, like Othello's, would be gone without them, to secure an occasional rise in temperature with perfectly healthy animals. With all these chances against him, and stringent orders, with heavy penalties, requiring quarantining from the rest of the herd for the remainder of its life, or else slaughter of every animal that reacts, how long can any breeder continue a trade in breeding stock with the States without getting loaded up with valuable but condemned cattle? The Government could hardly have devised a more

VICIOUS MOVE AGAINST THE INTERESTS OF THE BREEDERS

of Canada. It will prevent new men from going into breeding improved cattle, and tend to stop those who have started increasing their pure-bred herds. Not only so, but it has come to our hearing that in some way or other those who are manipulating the Washington end of the tuberculin-test business are becoming posted as to the results of the testing of some of our zealous inspectors, so that if they need any excuse to shut out Canadian cattle absolutely, they can soon get it. Within their own borders the test is not allowed to worry the U. S. breeders, but for the sake of this fad the Canadian authorities are being used as a cat's-paw. Thus far, the tuberculin policy of the Canadian Government has done little but damage. The contention that it is imposed as a protection to our breeders is an insult to their intelligence.

A word with regard to the compulsory quarantining on the farm for life of reacting animals. A gentleman who has had an extended experience with the tuberculin test, stated at the Ottawa conference on tuberculosis, in February last, as a result of his investigation, that he did not agree as to the necessity of isolating reacting animals; also stating that his reacting cattle had not failed or become emaciated; in fact, they seemed just as sleek and good conditioned as the others. Four years ago a herd of 29 Jersey cattle were tested by a veterinarian, acting for the Dominion Department of Agriculture, and 16 reacted. They are all alive and well yet, and no better looking herd is to be seen, and not under quarantine, either. Dominion officers report 1,200 reactions, chiefly in suspected

dairy herds, during three years past, but, so far as we can learn, the quarantining of them has been in name only. Why, then, impose it upon breeders?

The test system is on a par with the costly 90-day quarantine imposed on breeding cattle imported from Britain,

THE ABOMINABLE CONDITION

of which some time ago was exposed in our issue of May 1st last, one breeder reporting that his animals had got both foul in the foot and vermin while confined there. The idea is to prevent cattle disease from getting into Canada, and yet animals, after spending three months there, were tramped down and out the identical lane through which fresh arrivals had come in!

What, then, is to be done with this useless and injurious tuberculin-test system? We are of opinion that so long as the Canadian Government maintains it against Britain and the United States, just so long will the States be enabled to keep it up against Canada. There is no doubt that Hon. John Dryden hit the nail squarely on the head when he wrote the *FARMER'S ADVOCATE*, on February 1st last, that the original adoption of the test was a blunder, and the sensible and proper course for the Dominion Government, that first imposed the regulation, should be

AT ONCE TO REMOVE IT.

That is what Hon. Mr. Fisher should do now, and, fortunately, it can be done without reference to Washington. That was the stand taken at the big cattle-breeders' meeting in Guelph at the last winter show, on the motion of Mr. Arthur Johnston, seconded by Mr. Alex. Smith. At a subsequent meeting, in February, the breeders were assured, on behalf of the Government, that relief would be speedily forthcoming, so they refrained from going in a body to Ottawa. How has the promise been kept? The staff of regular departmental officers to do testing has been increased in Canada, with Dr. Rutherford appointed for Great Britain, and there is to be a more stringent enforcement of regulations. They asked for bread, and they are getting a stone.

Canadian Manufacturers Abroad.

Mr. D. Thom, head of the well-known Watford (Ontario) Implement Works, recently called at the *FARMER'S ADVOCATE* office on his return from Great Britain. The agriculturists of Scotland, whom he had the opportunity of visiting, he found, as a rule, prospering; in fact, making money. He noticed a good demand for live stock, ordinary farm dairy cows selling readily at two and three times the prices prevailing in Ontario. Speaking of the International Exhibition at Glasgow, which is proving a great success, Mr. Thom was much surprised at the absence of the Scottish manufacturers of agricultural implements, and upon communicating with them, drew from one of their number the frank confession that the reason was, that in view of the complete exhibit and the superior character and finish of the Canadian machinery shown, the comparison would not be favorable to the Old Country makers, so they deemed it prudent to refrain entirely from attempting to make any exhibit.

No Better Published.

GENTLEMEN,—I received yesterday, in good order, the book, "First Principles of Agriculture" (Voorhees), ordered of you. I will take this opportunity of saying that I do not think there is a better farm paper published than the *FARMER'S ADVOCATE*. Thanking you for your promptness in sending the book,
MIDDLESEX CO., ONT.
CHAS. H. FOSTER.