

are included in staple products), \$2,762,941 ; animal products, \$5,398,439. The hay crop is quite largely dependent upon the dairy interest, and the animal products are so largely dependent upon the dairy as to be almost a part of it. The veal product is certainly a dairy product, and most of the veal of the State is grown on the skim-milk of our dairies.

If the killing of tuberculous animals is to go on without compensation to the owners, this most important industry must rapidly decrease, carrying along with this decrease a still greater decrease in the value of much of the farming property of the State. The fine dairy barns that dot the farms of the State will become valueless and the pastures will be allowed to grow up to brush. The State can ill afford a decrease in its agriculture and its agricultural population. If the fight against tuberculosis is for the public good, the public should make part, at least, of the sacrifice deemed necessary. Especially is this proper in view of the fact that many cases of tuberculosis in human subjects do not terminate fatally and many apparently recover. I quote from "Tuberculosis in Relation to Animal Industry and Public Health," by Dr. James Law. "Dr. Biggs tells us . . . that in the Charity Hospital of the city [New York], 30 per cent. of all deaths show old lesions of tuberculosis now becoming stationary. He quotes a Vienna hospital pathologist to the effect that he finds similar old stationary lesions in 85 per cent. of all post mortem examinations. This leaves but 15 per cent. who have not

suffered from tuberculosis." It is not too much to claim that a like proportion of bovines slightly affected with tuberculosis would never be apparently injured by it. Such cases should be paid for in full, if sacrificed for the public good. But it would be difficult for the officials to discriminate in the matter of allowance for cattle killed; and so it would probably be better to fix upon a portion of the value of the animal in health as the amount that should be paid to the owner of an animal condemned to destruction because infected with tuberculosis. I believe the owners of neat cattle as a class are unwilling to bear all the burden. They believe that if the public takes arbitrary possession of their property and destroys it, that an equitable portion of its value should be returned to them. In view of all that we know of tuberculosis, it cannot be determined what an equitable proportion is, and the manner must be decided by granting an arbitrary part of the original value.

The value of the animal condemned is but a part of the loss to the owner. His business is broken into; his herd is discredited; his customers are afraid of his product; and if permanent future immunity is to be gained by him, he must be to a large expense in disinfecting his barns and stables. This disinfecting is out of his line, but is as necessary to the public health as the slaughter of infected animals. The State should see that it is properly done; and it could be done cheaper and more certainly by agents of the State than by the numerous private owners. Why should not the State provide for this