

earnest desire to rid the country of it at all hazards, it would be laudable. But it is not really the disease which is dreaded, so much as the knowledge on the part of our customers of the presence of the plague in our midst. The plague itself! why that is an exceedingly small matter. I know that that existed in Massachusetts in 1858 and 1860, and was killed out by the energetic action of that State, at a cost of \$68,060. I know that since that time it has been repeatedly carried from New York City into Connecticut, where it has been again extirpated by the action of the State Commissioners. I know that the Massachusetts Board of Cattle Commissioners visited the Skillman stable Brooklyn, in 1862, and "found some sick with the acute disease"; and killed one in the last stage of the illness, the examination of which "showed a typical case of the same malady which existed in Massachusetts." I know that the Commissioners reported that:

"If New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania would adopt similar measures to those in this State (Massachusetts), it would be one of the most effective modes of securing the whole community against this disease, which, if allowed to remain, would endanger the best stock in the country, and greatly deteriorate the most substantial food of the people."

I know that the importation of the plague into Massachusetts in 1858 was made in the persons of the Holstein cows imported by Mr. Chenery, of Belmont. I know, further, that the first importation into Brooklyn, in 1843, was by a Dutch cow landed near South Ferry and taken into a stable near the foot of Joralemon Street. Many still live who can relate all the circumstances of the boasted milking qualities of the imported cow; of her early death; of the infection of the herd with which she had stood; of the extension of the disease to a distillery stable across the street, and thence, by the sale of cows, all over Brooklyn. From that time to the present, it has prevailed constantly in Brooklyn, having been kept up by the continual changes among dairy stock, and by the mingling of different herds in summer, on the open commons around the city. The ancestry of this disease, in Brooklyn, can be as satisfactorily traced as that of any family in the English peerage, or that of any crowned house of Europe. The Yankee is no more surely the descendant of the original Puritan than is the lung plague of Brooklyn the descendant of the *Lungenseuche* of Germany.

But this is not what troubles us. The pestilence may devastate the stables of the New York and Long Island dairies at its own sweet will; it may spread over the State of New Jersey until the inspectors allege that in many counties no less than 20 per cent. are infected; it may ravage Eastern Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, and Virginia, and may invade the District of Columbia itself—all this and much more may befall us; we may remain month after month, and year after year in the most imminent danger of having the affection carried out to our Western plains, whence we could never eradicate it—this concerns us but little; but that England should for a moment suppose that we harbor such a disease, is a scandal and an outrage, and must be repudiated and denied with all possible vehemence. Our own veterinarians, who have studied the disease both here and in Europe, and who have acquainted themselves with its history on both continents, are to be silenced, that we may listen complacently to those who sit composedly at a respectful distance—at Toronto (Canada) and Edinburgh (Scotland)—and without personal examination of history, progress, symptoms, or lesions, pronounce oracularly that we "are not dealing with the contagious pleuro-pneumonia of Europe." This action is altogether too much like that of the hunted ostrich, which buries her head in the sand in the vain hope of warding off her fast-advancing fate.

I still cling to the hope that this plague has not penetrated

the West—a hope supported by the entire absence of any contagious lung disease in Western cattle stopped fifty miles west of New-York, as also by their constant soundness on their arrival at our Eastern stock yards, and until they have been long enough there to develop the disease. But I do not contradict the conclusions of Professors Brown and Deguid, and of the Principals of the Edinburgh and Glasgow Veterinary Colleges, when they state that they found contagious pleuro pneumonia among imported American stock. It is time enough to pronounce upon a disease when one has personally investigated it. Any reasonable man will admit that it is not impossible that there may be one or several centres of the lung plague in our Western States, or in Canada, whence some of the exported cattle were drawn. With the disease existing on our Eastern seaboard for thirty-six years, and affecting at different times, to my certain knowledge, high class herds from which cattle were likely to be drafted for transport westward, it seems almost miraculous that it should not sooner have gained the Western States and spread widely. But besides this there are various ways by which the "Ontario" cattle may have been infected. We have no assurance that this disease does not exist in Canada. A few years ago the *aphous fever*, incomparably less insidious and less dangerous than the lung plague, was exported from Great Britain to Canada, whence it spread widely over New York and New England. The importation and secret existence of the lung fever is a thousand-fold more probable.

But these are not the only possible channels for infection of the exported cattle. Who can assure us that infected cattle never entered the stock yards at Portland, Me.? Since the commencement of our work in New York, we have had cattle sent to Maine under *permut*. Did such an occurrence never take place before, and without any professional vigilance and control? Again, who can assure us that the "Ontario" never on any previous occasion carried cattle from any other port which infection was likely to reach? Who can demonstrate that the barge that carried the cattle to the Ontario had not become similarly infected? Who can certify that neither of these vessels ever carried infected hides or other animal products to or from England or elsewhere? Who can tell whether the cars used for the transport of the cattle had ever carried infected cattle or hides? Who can deny that the attendants on these cattle in transit may have carried infection in their clothes?

Many American writers seem to lose sight of the fact that if it were established that the cattle on board the Ontario and Brazilian suffered from lung fever, it is far from being proved that this disease exists in our Western States. It would be ample ground, it is true, for a searching investigation through our Western herds, but no proof at all that these herds were really infected. But to return to the infected districts in the East. Any one who will consider for a moment, must see that the opinions of Professors Williams and Smith, as to the nature of a disease they have never seen, and the descriptions of which have come to them only through newspaper paragraphs, are not worth the paper they are written upon. It must be evident to all that men who will found their opinions on such a slender basis are very unfit objects of public confidence. Seeing Prof. Smith is no further off than Toronto, and that he is so deeply interested in this disease, why did he not come to New York in person and satisfy himself as to the true nature of the malady, rather than hug his ignorance and publish an implied censure on the veterinary authority of New York, whose ability I do not for a moment believe that he doubts. By paying attention to what has been already published by the New York authorities, he could have ascertained the truth; but he has chosen to persistently shut his eyes and call for an experimental