

herd has been followed in a short time by symptoms of the disease in old members of the herd. Most of us see very little of its results. The learned professor quoted from slaughter-house statistics, taken from Prof. Conn, showing the increase of tuberculosis in European countries within the last ten years, those from Leipsic being especially important on account of the marked increase reported there. In 1885 the rate was 11 per cent., and in 1895 it had risen to 33.3 per cent. and is still increasing. At this rate of going, in a few years there will be no breeding-herds left unaffected. We can thoroughly rely upon the tuberculin test. In Germany they have come to the conclusion that the amount of tuberculosis is over 50 per cent. of the animals in the land. Stringent regulations should be carried out by the Government. The animal should be seen before being permitted to enter Canada. If once an animal has been inoculated with tuberculin you will not get a secondary reaction until a month has elapsed. Nor even in the Eastern States of America is the condition more satisfactory. In Massachusetts the disease has been found very common. The cattle imports for that state show in several large herds as high as 100 per cent. What are the results and dangers from this extreme prevalence of the disease elsewhere? First, the effects upon the animal itself, milk, breeding, etc.; sooner or later the disease progresses. Second, there is danger to the community in employing the milk and meat of such an animal. In 1893 Professor Wright estimated that tubercle in cattle caused an annual loss of \$2,000,000, *i.e.*, loss in milk and butter. In regard to his second question, "If infectious from animal to animal, is it infectious from animal to man?" we generally give an affirmative answer to this. The amount of reliable evidence of direct transmission from animal to man is very slight. It would be easy to determine this if we could make a direct experiment, but we cannot do that; we cannot inoculate man from the diseased meat. We can do the other though, *i.e.*, inoculate cattle from the sputum, and we find that they are slightly susceptible to human tubercle. That obtained from man, however, tends to be localized, and leads to transient results. We have distinct evidence that the bacilli obtained from fowls differ more widely in properties from those obtained from man, than do the bovine bacilli. Fowls may with impunity be fed with human sputa without becoming infected. Man may be infected from birds; but we cannot legitimately apply that to immunity to bovine tuberculosis except that in the main they resemble each other, and that is about all we can say; they are identical. Even in butchers and children fed upon the meat and milk of tuberculous cattle, there is lack of positive evidence. In them we must exclude every other possible mode of infection, and such exclusion is a matter of extreme difficulty. Thus, to obtain any authentic case is a matter