tricts in Illinois and Indiana. The reception of either mineral or vegetable poison into the system would not give rise to such a disease, neither could it give an infectious character to disease. Besides, as incontestable evidence shows, those Texan cattle which come from the northern part of the state, where there is no *live oak*, present the disease in all its malignancy, and have the same power of infection. The cattle brought by way of Abilene, and those brought by Southern routes, are equally affected by the plague, and are equally potent as media of contamination.

Another theory, is that the disease is due to the long journey from Texas; that the cattle become foot-sore, and that, as in the case of foot-and-mouth disease, the virus oozing from the feet of the animals affected, contaminates others. No doubt, many animals, which come overland from Texas, become lame; but, unfortunately for this theory, native cattle, affected by this plague, show no disease in their feet; neither are their mouths affected as in the case of cattle having foot and mouth disease. Besides, cattle which come by way of New Orleans are as much diseased as those which come overland.

The remaining theory is that the plague is caused by the ticks or parasites which infest many of the Texas cattle. It is said by the advocates of this theory that when the ticks have attained their full growth, they drop from the cattle and re-produce their species in large numbers on the grass with which they are taken into the stomachs of the cattle and form an acrid poison. This theory is so absurd and so generally discredited that it is unnecessary to comment on it.

Your committee are of opinion that the disease is one peculiar to the Gulf States and to Georgia and Forida. They think that it is a species of low typhoid fever, somewhat analogous to yellow fever in the human subject, and that it is due, in great measure, to climatic influence, having its origin in a climate near the tropics and extending its infection northward, as it may be conveyed there by natives of that climate, only during the hot season of the year, which is not only specially favourable to its extension, but is essential to its existence; because it is well known that this disease never appears in cold and frosty weather, even when there are large importations of Texan cattle.

Your committee discredit the idea that Texan cattle are not themselves affected by the plague—large numbers of them are diseased and die of the disease both in Texas and in the north. Your committee had plain evidence of this; and in a recent report by Dr. Rauch, of Chicago, presented to the Board of Health of that city, on the 1st September, Dr. Rauch states: "That during the past week it has "been satisfactorily demonstrated that Texas and Cherokee cattle suffer from this "disease, but not to the same extent as native cattle. The same structural lesions "have been found and three carcases have been condemned as unfit for food." It is quite possible that in many Texan cattle the disease may have assumed a form not sufficiently active to destroy them speedily, but, like some of the natives of India, having enlarged spleens, not very sick, yet sufficiently diseased to contaminate others. It is well known to medical men that such men are moving pest-houses, and army surgeons are careful to exclude them from the camp. Such may be thousands of Texas cattle. The idea that a perfectly sound and healthy animal has the power of imparting a disease of a highly infectious and virulent character, is contrary to correct pathological principles. In conjunction with this extraordinary notion, it is contended that diseased native animals cannot contaminate others. Thus we are asked to believe two statements entirely opposed to each other, and equally opposed to pathological science. First, we are asked to believe that perfectly healthy animals can impart a malignant and highly infectious disease, and then that the animals which have become diseased have not the power of infecting others.