

# MAINE STATE LEGISLATURE

The following document is provided by the  
**LAW AND LEGISLATIVE DIGITAL LIBRARY**  
at the Maine State Law and Legislative Reference Library  
<http://legislature.maine.gov/lawlib>



Reproduced from scanned originals with text recognition applied  
(searchable text may contain some errors and/or omissions)

PUBLIC DOCUMENTS OF MAINE

BEING THE

ANNUAL REPORTS

OF THE VARIOUS

Public Officers <sup>and</sup> Institutions

FOR THE YEAR

1891.

---

VOLUME I.

---

AUGUSTA:

BURLEIGH & FLYNT, PRINTERS TO THE STATE.

1892.

REPORT OF COMMISSIONERS

ON

# Contagious Diseases of Animals.

---

Under the Law of 1887, Chapter 138, of Public  
Laws of Maine.

---

F. O. BEAL, *President.*

W. W. HARRIS, *Treasurer.*

GEO. H. BAILEY, *State Veterinarian.*

---

AUGUSTA:

BURLEIGH & FLYNT, PRINTERS TO THE STATE.

1891.



# REPORT.

---

*To His Excellency, the Governor of Maine:*

In presenting our biennial report for 1889, we take this occasion to congratulate the stock owners and farmers of Maine, upon the remarkable freedom from disease among all our native bred cattle and horses within the year just closed.

A summary of the whole number of cases reported to the Commission in 1890 is found to be seventy-nine. Forty-eight herds of cattle were inspected, and thirty-one stables. Twelve head of cattle were condemned and destroyed, at an appraisal of \$593, and eighteen horses were also condemned and destroyed at an appraisal of \$1,215. The number of horses destroyed has increased from last season, over double in number, and but a single one of them was found to have been bred in Maine. It would seem from this fact that we have no contagious disease among our home bred horses, and that the supply should be much more equal to the demand than at present, for a class of horses that are needed to carry on the business of our mercantile and farming communities, every way better adapted to the work, and sounder and more useful animals than any we import.

The expenditures of the year will overrun the appropriation by about fifty dollars, and although the work has been carried on for three years previous without exceeding this amount, we believe the work of the Commission could be broadened and made more effective by a larger appropriation, as is well known that should any serious outbreak occur in many of the private herds of Maine, at all approximating the one at

Orono, it would absorb the entire amount of money to adjust the appraisal. There are cases brought to our attention quite often, where the owners feel they should receive more attention and consideration at our hands, than we are able to afford them and keep the necessary expenditures of our Commission within the annual appropriation. There has been quite a number of cases reported this season of "hog cholera" or swine plague, which the owners have thought it was our duty to attend, relying upon certain sections of the law of 1887, as in section one (for extirpating all insidious, infectious and contagious diseases, now or that may be, among cattle *and other live stock.*)

Section 2 also provides, (that it shall be the duties of said commissioners to cause investigation to be made as to the existence of tuberculosis, pleuro-pneumonia, foot and mouth disease, *and any other infectious or contagious disease.*)

There are other sections that have been quoted and relied upon in the making of applications for attendance upon such cases, and we believe the law should be made more explicit as to just what classes of animals are to be entitled to inspection and appraisal, as according to the understanding of our board, "sheep and swine," are excluded from the list of contagious diseases, by the action of the Legislature of 1887, under the amended law of that year, chapter 138, of Public Laws of Maine.

"The articles upon the latest discovery of Prof. Koch which are published from day to day in the German papers, and transmitted to America by telegraphic despatches, are giving rise to a great deal of admiration and enthusiasm, as well as anxiety, among scientific and medical men; and while nothing very positive is as yet known concerning the new discovery of the learned German, every one is anxiously and attentively watching for the description of the details of the method which is announced, and for the results which may follow the treatment to which many sufferers from tuberculosis are now being subjected. To the public at large, for the physician, for all, in fact, the new treatment as now indicated will be

welcome, and the name of its discoverer will deservedly pass to posterity as having made one of the greatest, if not the greatest discovery of this century. And yet there is one point which we think, deserves careful consideration, viz., the application of Koch's treatment to the relief of the many animals which are suffering with the disease, and which by it from valuable are metamorphosed into dangerous animals, and which in so many instances prove one of the most common means of transmitting the disease. Let us all hope that the subcutaneous injections of "paratoid" will prove as applicable and beneficial in the lower class of phthisic patients as it is promised it will prove in the higher class, the human family."

The first notice and inspection of the year just closed was on January 1st at Limerick, where a horse owned by J. F. Littlefield, stage proprietor, was found badly affected with glanders, and was condemned and destroyed. Appraised \$100.

January 2d. An inspection was ordered upon the farm of Chauncy Bangs, West Farmington, in a herd of dairy cattle, but no contagious disease was found to exist.

January 13th. The cattle of J. S. Knight of Windham Center were inspected and a cow found affected with emphysema. No case.

January 17th. Inspected the cattle belonging to E. W. Allen of Canton, but found no contagious disease.

January 28th. Inspected the Jersey herd of L. F. Jones of Andover but no contagious disease was found to exist, the whole herd being in fine condition.

February 4th. Inspected the cattle of Orville Knights, at Waterboro' Center, but no disease was discovered.

February 5th. Inspected the herd of Sumner and Adna Foss at Mechanic Falls, but found no case.

February 7th. Inspected the herd of Mr. Hinckley at Livermore Falls, and found no case.

February 12th. Inspected the herd of James Eastman at Hill Side, but found only a case of emphysema.

February 14th. Inspected the herd of Alfred B. Nichols of Abbot village, but found no trouble.

February 15th. Inspected the cattle of T. C. Woodbury of Lincoln Center, and found a cow affected with tuberculosis. Appraisal \$30.

February 18th. Inspected a reported case of glanders in a horse belonging to Joseph Marcott of Lewiston, but found no case.

March 2d. Inspected a horse belonging to Abner French of Glenburn, reported to have glanders, but found no case.

March 11th. Inspected the herd of cattle belonging to James Pinkham of Lincoln, and found two cows and a calf affected with tuberculosis. They were condemned and destroyed. Appraisal \$60.

March 12th. Inspected the herd of N. N. Knights of Winthrop, and found a single case of emphysema.

March 15th. Inspected the herd of George E. Libbey of North Warren, but found no case.

March 18th. The cattle of W. L. Seymore, of Livermore Falls, were inspected, but no disease was discovered.

March 20th. Inspected a case of glanders at Glenburn, belonging to Abner T. French. The horse was condemned and appraised at \$50.

March 31st. Inspected the cattle of James Plummer of South Dover, but found no case.

April 3d. Inspected the cattle owned by Benjamin Day of Sanford, and found an old cow affected with tuberculosis. She was condemned and appraised at \$18.

April 5th. Inspected the cattle of C. H. Records of East Auburn, and found a case of emphysema.

April 11th. Inspected the cattle of Lewis B. Davis of West Auburn, but found no case.

April 14th and 15th. Inspected the cattle of Elmer Carter, and the horse of Frank Brown of Etna, but found no contagious disease upon either premises.

April 17th. Inspected the herd of Hereford cattle,



belonging to Gilbert Underwood of Fayette, but discovered no contagious disease.

May 2d. Inspected a case of suspected glanders, belonging to Joseph La Chapel of Lewiston, but found no case.

May 3d. Inspected a horse belonging to James A. Brooks of West Paris, and found a bad case of glanders and farcy. The horse was condemned and appraised at \$100.

May 10th. Inspected the cattle of A. Higgins and M. Blanchard at Scarboro', but found no disease on either farm.

May 14th. Inspected the cattle of Jason Rackley of Leeds, but found no case.

May 16th. Inspected the cattle of Alphonzo Blanchard of Kingfield, but found no case.

May 19th. Inspected the cattle of William H. Keene of Waterford, and found a case of tuberculosis in a grade Jersey cow. She was condemned and appraised at \$30.

May 26th. A case of suspected glanders was reported by the selectmen of Norway, but the horse was found to be suffering from catarrh.

May 30th. Inspected the herd of Joseph H. Lovell of Yarmouth, but found only an ox affected with emphysema.

May 31st. Inspected the cattle of Amaziah W. Davis, of Dayton, but found no case.

June 7th. Inspected the cattle belonging to A. C. Libby of Locke's Mills, but no disease was discovered.

June 14th. Inspected a case of suspected glanders, belonging to Mr. McKenney of Lewiston, but found only a case of catarrh.

June 17th. Inspected a horse, reported by the selectmen to have glanders, and belonging to Mrs. Lura Hamilton of North Yarmouth, but no case was found to exist.

June 27th. Inspected a horse belonging to Mr. Savage of Lagrange, suspected to be a case of glanders, but none was found.

June 28th. Inspected the cattle of William E. Irish of Turner but found no disease.

July 1st. Inspected the cattle of T. L. Spaulding of Lewiston, but found no disease.

July 7th. Inspected the horses belonging to Charles C. Davis of Oxford, and found two work horses (Canadians) badly affected with glanders and farcy. Both horses were condemned and destroyed. Appraisal \$200.

July 7th. Same day as above, inspected a horse belonging to Abe Lincoln Chaplin of Welchville, and found a case of glanders. The horse was destroyed and appraised at \$80.

July 8th. Inspected a two-year-old colt at Kent's Hill, belonging to B. W. Harriman. Colt found badly affected with farcy, and was destroyed. Appraisal \$50.

July 10th. Inspected the cattle of C. G. Sawyer of Wilton, but found no case.

July 19th. Inspected the cattle of Swett Bros. of Buxton Center, but found no case.

July 21st. Inspected the cattle of James Blazo at Parsonsfield, but found no case.

August 2d. Inspected the team horses of Dudley Gilman of Bath, and found two horses affected with glanders in an advanced condition. Both horses were condemned and appraised at \$150.

August 9th. Inspected a horse belonging to a Mr. Pearson of East Corinth, but it proved to be a case of chronic catarrh.

August 15th. Inspected the herd of Jersey cattle belonging to Wallace K. Oaks, M. D., of Auburn, but found them all right.

August 16th. Inspected a case of suspected glanders in a Canadian horse belonging to W. A. Crocker of Topsham. A bad case of glanders was found to exist and the horse condemned, but as he had been brought into the State within a year, no appraisal was held.

August 27th. Inspected a reported case of glanders at Springfield, belonging to M. L. Scribner, and found a bad case of glanders. The horse was condemned and appraised at \$100.

September 1st. Inspected the herd of George H. McKechnie of Alton, but no cattle were condemned.

September 7th. Inspected the herd of cattle belonging to B. R. Blackstone of East Perham, (Aroostook county), but no contagion was identified in the herd.

September 7th. Same day Messrs. Harris and Bailey of the Commission inspected the Jersey Bull, by "Ginx of Cream Brook" out of Juno 2d. This bull having originally been purchased from the State College Farm at Orono, on May 14th, 1885. This bull was found in the possession of Edward M. Bennett of Limestone, and was destroyed having been appraised at \$40. Full particulars of this case will be found in this report.

September 16th. Inspection was ordered on the premises of R. B. Hassard of Bangor, in a herd of milch cows, but no disease was discovered.

September 22d. Inspection was ordered on the premises of Albert E. Jennings of Farmington, but no cattle were found diseased.

September 27th. Inspected the cattle of Mrs. Mary Polard of Skowhegan, and a four-year-old Jersey heifer found afflicted with tuberculosis. Condemned and appraised at \$20.

October 10th. Inspected the cattle of Nathaniel Ladd at Abbot, but found no case.

October 13th. A case of suspected glanders was reported at "Edes Falls," in the possession of C. M. Barton, but no case was found.

October 14th. Inspected the herd of cattle belonging to M. H. Hubbard of Fayette Corner, and a Jersey cow was condemned and appraised at \$25.

October 22d. A case of glanders was reported by the selectmen of Turner, at the stable of Peter Gouther. The horse was found diseased and condemned. Appraisal \$50.

October 25th. Inspected a horse suspected of glanders, and owned by A. C. Dow of Chase's Mills. No case was found.

November 11th. Inspected the herd of cattle at the "State College Farm," and discovered an advanced case of tuberculosis in a Guernsey cow, purchased by the farm committee last season in Massachusetts. The cow was condemned and destroyed. Appraisal \$200. Fuller particulars of the above case will be found on pages 12 to 14 inclusive, of this report.

November 12th. Inspected a suspected case of glanders in the stable of Orlando Hall at Newcastle, which proved to be catarrh.

November 15th. Went to Forest Station to inspect a case of glanders reported by the Board of Health as belonging to Abram A. Cox. No case was found.

November 20th. Inspected a reported case of glanders belonging to G. W. Baden of Bangor. Horse condemned and appraised at \$35.

November 24th. Notice was given by the State Board of Health at Augusta, of a supposed case of glanders at Egypt, near Bar Harbor in the possession of E. G. Burnham. The horse was found badly affected with the disease and destroyed, but as he had been brought from Massachusetts into this State within a year, no appraisal was held. Full particulars of this case will be found in this report.

November 29th. Inspected a herd of cattle at East Baldwin, and found a Registered Jersey cow affected with tuberculosis. The cow was destroyed and appraised at \$150.

December 2d. Inspected a reported case of glanders at the stables of John J. Sturgis of New Gloucester, but found a case of chronic catarrh.

December 4th. Inspected at Portland an old cow belonging to Catherine McCarthy, and condemned and destroyed her. Appraisal \$20.

December 6th. Inspected a reported case of glanders at Orono, at the stables of Mr. Oliver, which proved to be chronic catarrh.

December 10th. Inspected a reported case of glanders at Kingman, belonging to James C. Tracy of Springfield. No disease was found to exist.

December 15th. Inspected the stables of Dudley Gilman of Bath, and found a case of glanders in a Canada horse, and had him destroyed and appraised at \$100. These are the same premises in which two other horses were found affected with the same disease last August and destroyed.

December 15th. Same day as above, inspected a horse in the stables of Fred Burgess at Bath, and found him affected with glanders and farcy. The horse was destroyed and appraised at \$100.

December 17th. Inspected the cattle belonging to Thomas Simmons of Brewer, but found no contagious disease.

December 19th. Inspected the horses belonging to W. H. Bacon at Sebago lake, and found a bad case of glanders and farcy in a Canadian horse. He was condemned and appraised at \$100.

December 22d. Inspected the cattle of E. C. Morrill of Glenburn, but found no contagious disease.

December 26th. Inspected a reported case of tuberculosis at Pittsfield, owned by B. S. Barton. The cow had emphysema.

December 27th. Examined a reported case of glanders in the possession of H. W. Smith of Lewiston, but found no case.

By a vote of the Trustees of the Maine State College it was decided in the spring of 1889, to restock the farm with a new herd of cattle, to replace the one destroyed by order of the Cattle Commissioners in 1889, and among the cattle to be purchased it had been decided to introduce some Guernseys and Holsteins into the herd, and with them to continue the business of experimental dairying upon the farm. With this purpose in view the farm committee visited Massachusetts, and finally purchased from Wm. P. Perkins of Wayland, in Middlesex county, five head of Guernsey heifers, and from other parties four head of Holsteins. Other pur-

chases since that time have been made in this State so that the herd now aggregates about thirty head all told ; and while we believe the committee acted in perfect good faith, in making the selections which they did, it is but fair towards ourselves to say that the purchases were made against the earnest protest and advice of our Commission, as we had the best of reasons for entertaining a very wholesome fear of all Massachusetts cattle, as our reports for the past four years will show. Upon July 12th we received the following letter from one of the farm committee :

“WATERVILLE, ME., July 12th, 1889.

*Dr. G. H. Bailey, Portland, Maine :*

At a meeting of the Trustees of the Maine State College, held June 25th, it was voted ‘That the clerk write to Dr. Bailey, and request him to visit and examine the College herd of cattle at the College farm, and that he should be paid for the same all reasonable charges.’ As all the cattle which we have at the farm are those recently purchased in Massachusetts, you will understand what this means. Dr. Russell thinks the cattle all right, but as this is a State matter, and knowing your great experience as a veterinary surgeon we thought it advisable to have you see the herd. We do not wish to subject ourselves or the State to any further criticism on the subject of College cattle than justly belongs to us. If we take the judgment of men who know all about such things, we do all we can to protect the State’s interests, and it will be a great favor to the State if you will give them the examination. Dr. Russell will undoubtedly meet you there, but I think you had better write him a few days before, as it is vacation and he may be away for a time.

Yours truly,

WILLIAM T. HAINES.”

Upon July 29th, in company with Mr. F. O. Beal, President of the Commission, Dr. Bailey visited Orono and inspected the newly purchased cattle, and found them all maintaining an elevated temperature, ranging from 102 2-5 degrees to 103 degrees, and by an agreement between Professor Balentine and Doctor Bailey it was agreed that Doctor Russell, V. S., of the experimental station, should from time

to time retake the temperature of the animals and report to the Commissioners the condition of the herd, but not until November 29th, four months afterward, did Doctor Bailey receive the report embodied in the following letter :

“ORONO, ME., NOV. 29, 1889.

DEAR DOCTOR:—Prof. Balentine tells me that he met you on the train and told you of the temperatures of the Guernseys. I had intended to write you before but neglected it. At two different times that I have examined them their temperatures ranged from 102 degrees to 103 2-10 degrees, but within the past week I have examined them twice and at neither time have I got a temperature above 101 degrees. They seem perfectly well in every way, so I regard it of slight importance that I happened to find their temperature elevated. Have never heard any of them cough.

Very truly,

F. S. RUSSELL.”

We then wrote to Mr. Haines that the cattle appeared to have resumed a normal temperature, and from anything we could then discover they were entitled to a “bill of health.” We did not see the cattle again after July, 1889, until in answer to the following letter from Prof. Balentine :

“ORONO, November 1st, 1890.

*Dr. George H. Bailey,*

DEAR SIR:—I notify you in your capacity of Veterinary Surgeon to the Cattle Commission, that we have killed a Guernsey heifer to-day whose lungs were badly used up with *tuberculosis*. We desire to have the Cattle Commission examine the remainder of the herd at their earliest convenience. There will be a regular meeting of the Trustees of the College on Thursday of next week. I would like to have the examination take place before that time if possible.

Very truly,

WALTER BALENTINE.”

We visited the farm upon November 3d, and discovered an advanced case of tuberculosis in one of the Guernseys, and she was promptly quarantined until November 10th, when the Commissioners again visited Orono, and

slaughtered the cow in question, and carefully inspected the entire herd; and while we cannot regard the balance of the Guernseys as entirely above suspicion, we believe that all the cattle now upon the farm and purchased in this State, are entitled to a clean "bill of health," and that the present outbreak will prove to have been confined entirely to the cattle purchased in Massachusetts, although it is to be much regretted that the disease has again made its appearance upon the farm. The post-mortem of the cow killed on November 10th revealed tubercular deposit in all stages of degeneration. The lungs were voluminous, and completely adherent on either side, and on cross-section proved to contain large cavities filled with a muco-purulent mass, and we are of the opinion that none of the Massachusetts purchases should be retained upon the farm, either to propagate their kind, or for dairy purposes, for in addition to the Guernseys already killed, it is a most significant fact that the Holstein cows were out of the same herd and purchased from the same party, William A. Russell of North Andover, Mass., as was the bull King Ruiter, recently killed at Falmouth, the post-mortem showing extensive lesions of tuberculosis.

In the December number of the "American Veterinary Review", edited by Professor A. Liautard, Dean of the American Veterinary College of New York, he has published an editorial on the "Reappearance of Tuberculosis in Maine", as follows:

"The State of Maine has suffered largely from the prevalence of tuberculosis amongst her cattle, and it is but a few years since that Dr. Bailey, the veterinarian of the State Cattle Commission, condemned a large number of cows as suffering from the disease, and condemned the entire herd to destruction. It was then hoped and expected that by careful watching it would be possible to escape further loss and damage from the disease, but the necessary vigilance, and the wise suggestions of the doctor were not sufficiently heeded, and with the introduction of a new supply of cows, together



with that of seven cattle bought in Massachusetts, the disease has reappeared, and once again the State may be made to suffer from the widely diffused malady.

In procuring them from Massachusetts, they were procured from a State which, according to the doctor, is "full of the disease," infested to such an extent, indeed, that he "believes that from thirty-five to fifty per cent of her cattle population are infected."

The large experience with tuberculosis acquired by Doctor Bailey renders this estimate every way reliable, and strongly corroborates our own opinion, already repeatedly expressed on other occasions in columns of the Review. Our statements have been attacked by persons who have had but scant opportunities for the substantiation of their criticisms, and as a partial answer to their strictures, we again refer these friends to the words of the State Veterinarian of Maine, which we have just quoted. No doubt we could obtain more and additional support for our views, if we felt inclined to inquire, not only from almost every state in the Union, but even from Massachusetts itself, from whence came the undeserved criticisms of our statement to the Fifth International Veterinary Congress. We stated then that it was not an uncommon thing to find herds in which tuberculosis was present to the extent of fifty per cent. Dr. Bailey states that in Massachusetts, "the cattle are filled with tuberculosis," and he believes "that from thirty-five to fifty per cent of the cattle in that state are infected."

In a letter to me under date of December 5th, my esteemed friend Dr. Williamson Bryden of Boston, a gentleman of conspicuous literary and professional ability, and "Live Stock Inspector for the British Steamships," takes exception to the article in the Review, and asks me to state "what in my opinion is the present per centage of tuberculous cattle in the State of Maine, also the number of cattle of all kinds exported annually from Massachusetts to Maine, and the per centage of them I have found tuberculous."

Taking the whole number of cattle in this State, [Census of 1890,] as three hundred and five thousand, and the whole number of cattle found affected with tuberculosis for the past four years as forty-eight, the average of all the cattle so condemned will be only twelve for each consecutive year. This will be found to be a percentage of less than four one-hundredths of one per cent, and while we have no means of knowing the exact number of cattle brought into this State from Massachusetts each year, we know that what do come here are a constant menace to our live stock interests, and that of the whole number of twelve cattle killed by order of our Commission the past year, four of them came here out of Massachusetts herds, and this would be an exact average of thirty-three per cent. But not wishing our Massachusetts friends to be bound by their percentage in this State, we quote from higher and undisputed authority as follows: From testimony of Dr. J. W. Winchester, late "State Veterinary Surgeon of Massachusetts" given before the Investigating Committee at Augusta, in 1887.

"I reside in Lawrence, Mass., and am a veterinary surgeon and one of the Board of Cattle Commissioners of Massachusetts. I have had a little experience with the disease pleuro-pneumonia and considerable experience with the disease called tuberculosis.

Q. How long has it existed in Massachusetts?

A. Well, Mr. Cheever has told you that it was at Amherst twelve years ago. I do not know. My idea is it has existed for about thirteen years.

Q. Whether you find it often at the slaughter-houses in Massachusetts where they are slaughtering cattle for beef?

A. I saw a letter written by a gentleman who had been at a hearing at the State House on this subject, and he made a strong statement,—that of these old cows, "skates" I believe he called them, there was hardly one that did not have some evidences of the disease. He was not a professional man, and I do not know what right he had to make that statement.

He said he did not think there was a herd of twenty cows in all Massachusetts but what had it.

I also have a letter written by Dr. Winchester previous to 1886, in which he says "that in his opinion there was not a sound herd of cattle within ten or twenty miles of Lawrence, Massachusetts, the city where he lives."

A. W. Cheever, another of the Cattle Commissioners of Massachusetts, testified before the Investigating Committee as follows :

TESTIMONY OF A. W. CHEEVER.

I am a farmer by education, now connected with a newspaper and on the Cattle Commission of Massachusetts for a year and a little over. Before coming here I inquired of Professor Stockbridge, who has been on the Commission nearly since its organization—20 years, more or less—in regard to the disease as it has developed itself at the College farm in Massachusetts, and that is about all I know of the disease practically. It was introduced on the College farm there in some Shorthorn cattle, I think, about 11 years ago. There were, Professor Stockbridge tells me, at different times about sixty Shorthorn cattle on the farm, and some four or half a dozen of the whole number, at one time, exhibited evidences of the disease. At one time two or three Ayrshire cattle gave evidences of the disease, whether taking it from the Shorthorns or bringing it there themselves originally, I do not know. Two or three sales or disposals were made from this farm, Shorthorns and Ayrshires, and afterwards a few were found to be diseased. One, supposed to be all right, except that she refused to breed, was sent to the butcher and killed, and was found to have the disease in the internal organs. Two Ayrshires were sold off the premises, and soon after, or at some time after, developed the disease ; and they were destroyed or killed.

Q. Would you go to the herds which had among them the progeny of any of these diseased cattle, and kill them, down to the second, third or fourth generation ?

A. I do not feel familiar enough with the workings of this disease to lay down the rule of action. Think we have had it in Massachusetts 11 years to my knowledge. On general principles, with a willing state to back it up, I would say weed out every imperfection in all animals and vegetables, and everything the farm raises; but with public sentiment not educated up to that point, the question comes in, where is the money coming from? I should not feel that at the present time in our state we would dare to recommend killing and destroying everything that had been exposed to what we supposed is that disease. I consider the disease, according to my reading, contagious—something as glanders is. It would be a very cheap experiment, and worth the trial, to select four of the most suspicious animals that have gone out from this College herd and slaughter them. If they were all found to be diseased I would begin to examine their progeny if I could find them. The disease is known as a hereditary and contagious one, and a dangerous one among cattle. That is what a part of the authorities say.

Q. You heard read to your associate the condition in which the mother of a certain bull was found when killed—lungs loaded with deposits, etc. What would you recommend to be done with a bull dropped by that cow?

A. I would recommend the killing of him.

Q. What would you recommend as to the eleven other bulls dropped by other members of the herd there, from diseased mothers?

A. I do not see why we should not treat them all alike. I think I should recommend the killing of those eleven. Very likely that would be the wisest and cheapest course for the State to take. It would be liable to save a great expense to the people of the State in the future.

Q. Supposing the bulls were calved from a year and a half to four years before any knowledge of disease among those cows was had by anybody in attendance, any one connected with the animals; would you recommend their destruction?

A. I should recommend examining and killing some of them, as the State is able to do it.

Q. Have you known of any commission that has recommended or practiced that system of killing apparently sound animals?

A. No, sir. I do not know of any laws this side of Germany looking to that extreme action. We have never had a case in Massachusetts that I know of anywhere approaching the rankness of the case at Orono.

Q. Don't you think it would be dangerous to have those eleven bulls scattered over this State, with the pre-disposition to tuberculosis in them which they must have?

A. There is certainly a possibility. There is more probability that they will be dangerous than that they will not be. If I found in a herd of cattle of mine one case of tuberculosis I do not think I should immediately go at work and destroy the whole herd. Think I should kill none but the diseased ones. Speaking as a farmer, and supposing under certain conditions that the meat would be wholesome, I should try to get the most out of the diseased one that I could. If he was fit for beef I should kill him, and if not fit I would kill him anyhow.

Mr. Cheever's testimony was given four years ago, but the *Boston Herald* of December 29th, has recently published an interview with the gentleman in which Mr. Cheever stated that according to custom his board had received a communication from Gov. Russell in regard to the matter, but it was impossible for him to state in advance, with a due regard to official courtesy, as to what the Cattle Commissioners would reply.

“It is asked if the Cattle Commissioners have the power to eradicate the disease from the State, and without hesitation I should say not without building a fence around it high enough and strong enough to keep all living beings subject to the disease, including man himself, out of it till the job was finished.

Very few now living could hope to see the fence removed, and unless equally vigorous measures were adopted outside, the first opening would introduce germs to restock the State. When you can assure us that the public is ready to eradicate tuberculosis I will assure you that the Cattle Commissioners will be ready to do their part or to resign.

As to Dr. Austin Peters of Boston, I consider that his opinion as to a cow being tuberculous would be as likely to be correct as that of any veterinarian with whom I am acquainted. Dr. Peters has for some years past been making a specialty of the study of tuberculosis, and has probably seen as much of it as any one in the State. He has seen enough to know that the most competent veterinarians may make mistakes and form incorrect opinions regarding cases examined previous to post-mortem.

Every candid, intelligent veterinarian will admit that in its early stages it is very difficult or impossible of detection, even by the most expert examination.

The Commissioners aim to be consistent in their action and to treat owners of animals by a uniform method. They do not destroy a horse for glanders because it is old or worthless, or because the owner is abusive or neglectful of its comfort, but simply because it has the glanders and is a public danger.

The Commissioners are given great powers over the destiny of animals, and it becomes them to use their powers with due caution and discretion. Thus far, in the treatment of tuberculosis in cattle, the Commissioners have been trying to gain information regarding the disease and its importance, and so far as possible to diffuse such information among both producers and consumers of cattle products rather than to exert their powers in merely killing a few animals suspected of having the disease.

No special legislation has as yet been recommended by the Commissioners for the extermination of tuberculous cattle. The Massachusetts Society for Promoting Agriculture two years ago asked permission of the Commissioners to establish

within the state an experiment station expressly to investigate this disease. The request was granted and the undertaking commenced. A partial report has been published, which has been read with much interest by milk producers and consumers of cattle products.

Until the work undertaken at this experiment station is completed the Commissioners do not design to ask any additional legislation."

Now that Dr. Peters has received this high endorsement from Mr. Cheever, (and one that I heartily concur in) let us see what Dr. Peters has to say about tuberculosis in his own state.

Dr. Austin Peters of Boston, Mass., in a letter to me dated August 23, 1889, "reports that at the experimental farm at Mattapan, Mass., where, in connection with Dr. Ernst, he has been making some interesting observations, they have had in all eighteen tuberculous cows from ten different herds, representing eight towns, all within a radius of twenty-five miles from Boston, except in one instance where a cow came from Newport, R. I. He has killed thirteen calves and seven pigs which have been fed upon the milk of these cows for a period of from three to six months. Two pigs and six calves were tuberculous. *Nine of the eighteen cows have been killed and all proved by post-mortem examination to be tuberculous.* Tubercle bacilli were found in the milk of six of these cows. He says further, that he has found the bacillus in three other cows that were never in his possession. He has also visited several herds in the state and has found the disease existing in from one to one hundred per cent. of the animals."

On January 10, 1891, Dr. Peters in a very able and exhaustive address upon the subject of tuberculosis, at a Farmers Meeting in Boston, said :

Cattle in the dairies in the neighborhood of large towns and cities are much more the victims of tuberculosis than those kept out on the farms ; therefore while perhaps from ten to twenty-five per cent of the milch cows in eastern

Massachusetts are tuberculous, it is much more rare in the western part of the state, although I do not mean by this to say that it does not exist there. In the neighborhood of our large cities infection from diseased to healthy cows plays an important part in its spread, there being a constant buying and selling among milkmen, and once it obtains a foothold in a herd it is very difficult to eradicate it.

It is not uncommon in southern New Hampshire, as here there is a constant trade back and forth with Boston and its outlying cities. Cows that have contracted tuberculosis in or around Boston are sold to New Hampshire farmers when farrow and replaced by new milch ones which are taken back to the city dairies. If a farmer is so unfortunate as to buy one of these consumptives, it is not long before he has a tuberculous herd, as I know of no instance where the saying that "a little leaven, leavens the whole lump" applies so well or so truly as it does here.

Some of Massachusetts' public spirited citizens seem to be alive to the importance of eradicating this terrible disease from their milch herds, and Mr. Francis Blake a wealthy citizen of Auburndale, has recently related his experience before the "Thursday Club," in a valuable paper, extracts from which I copy.

#### "GERMS OF DEATH IN MILK."

My purpose to make a few remarks this evening on the subject of "Tuberculosis in Milch Cows," originated in a most disagreeable occurrence in my stable a few weeks ago. A veterinarian having been called in to prescribe for an ailing cow, reported his suspicion of tuberculosis and asked permission to arrange with a confrere for a thorough joint inspection of the herd. A few days thereafter the inspection was made and *six of the ten animals in the stable were declared to be afflicted with tuberculosis*, and within the next twenty-four hours were killed. Careful autopsies fully confirmed the diagnosis in each case.



Before proceeding, let me say that up to the time of inspection I had supposed myself possessed of as fine and healthy a lot of animals as could be found in the state. None of them to the layman's eye had any outward symptoms of disease—in fact, a skilled veterinary surgeon who had been familiar with the stable for years had not suspected trouble until a few days before. The autopsies had disclosed a state of physical rottenness most alarming to me, in view of the fact that the milk from two of the worst afflicted cows had been used in my household up to the day of the inspection.

From what I hear, my opinion is that it is hard to find a herd of cattle kept for sale of milk in which there are not cases of tuberculosis. If this is so it seems to me there should be a strong movement toward securing legislation in the interest of the consumer.

My experience is not, or rather ought not to be, an exceptional one. A neighbor, attracted by it, has within the month had his herd examined and *three out of seven* animals killed; and within the last two weeks my attention has been called to newspaper accounts of tuberculosis in cattle at Waltham, Mass., and Dover, N. H.

One stands appalled at the immensity of this evil, covering as it does, the entire country, threatening at every step the health of the community, and crying loudly for redress. A single case of cholera, yellow fever or small-pox, or even a harmless cucumber taste to the water supply in a large city is considered good cause for excited editorials in the newspapers, and for extraordinary efforts on the parts of boards of health, while every day from January to December scores are perishing unnecessarily from the more insidious and far more deadly tuberculosis.

In the proceedings of the twenty-sixth annual meeting of the United States Medical Veterinary Association, held September 17, 1889, the report of the Committee on Contagious Diseases says:

“According to these reports the deaths in the human family from tuberculosis during the past year were, in the state of

Rhode Island 750; in the state of New Hampshire about 1,000. Massachusetts reports for 1886, 5,897."

Dr. F. I. Smith, V. S., of Rochester, N. H., who has largely had charge of the extensive outbreak of tuberculosis in that state, and who is one of the most expert examiners in this disease I know of, writes me under date of November 7, 1890, "I see by the papers you have a new outbreak of tuberculosis at the State College Farm, caused by the introduction of some Massachusetts cattle. The people of Rochester are well aware that Massachusetts cattle are thoroughly infected with this disease; and I have seen it ably proved in my examinations at Hillsboro', Weare, Antrim and Henniker; and I have no doubt the primary cause of the outbreak at Manchester can be traced to Newbury and thence to Massachusetts.

"The worse cases I have had this season are where they carry on an exchange with Massachusetts in milch cows; dealers bring them here and turn to pasture and sell among the farmers those they buy in the vicinity of Boston, so you can readily see it is wide spread and no one knows where it will end."

Having been called by the state authorities several times to New Hampshire within a year, to assist in inspecting cattle in that state, I can vouch for Dr. Smith's accuracy in these matters, and the nearest approach I have ever known to the great outbreak at Orono in 1886, was the recent destruction of the fine herd of high-bred cattle at the State Industrial School at Manchester, where I assisted in condemning thirty-nine head of Jersey and Shorthorn cattle, every one of which proved to have been affected.

Dr. Alford H. Rose, D. V. S., United States Inspector at the Quarantine Station, Littleton, Mass., has lately told me "that Suffolk and Middlesex counties in Massachusetts, were literally overrun with the disease, and that 25 per cent. in that state would be a light estimate."

Dr. Wm. Rose, D. V. S., United States Inspector of the Agricultural Bureau, at Washington, D. C., who was sent to

Massachusetts three years ago, to assist in looking up some supposed cases of pleuro-pneumonia in that state, told me at the close of his examination, "that he had been into over two hundred herds, and while he had not found a single case of pleuro-pneumonia, he had not been into a herd in which he could not identify over twenty-five per cent. of tuberculous cattle."

A Massachusetts stock raiser, who for a long time has kept a large stock of dairy cattle, has also written us "that he has lost eighteen milch cows with tuberculosis, out of a herd of twenty-four, and proposes to come to Maine, to restock his farm, where he can buy sound cows."

Dr. Joseph H. Stickney, M. D. V. S., one of the most conservative and experienced veterinarians in the old Bay State, has recently said in a discussion upon the subject "that he had but little cow practice but had seen a good deal of bovine tuberculosis. It is not to be wondered at that tuberculosis should exist in many of our well-bred dairy herds, as it has been propagated there for years."

Dr. Madson Bunker, D. V. S., of Newton, Mass., who, I believe, in company with Dr. Winchester, attended the cases of Mr. Francis Blake, owns up, I believe, to *fifty per cent.*, while Doctors Hitchings, Penniman, Colburn and other well informed and prominent veterinary surgeons in that state, acknowledge all the way from twenty-five per cent. up far enough to substantiate the statement of which Dr. Bryden complains. Other states are no better off, if we are to accept the statement made by ex-Cattle Commissioner Wilson, (one of the brightest men in Illinois) at the National Conference of State Veterinarians, which I attended, held December 18th and 19th, 1889, at Springfield, Ill., "that he had every reason to believe that fifty per cent. of the high-bred cattle of the great state of Illinois were affected with tuberculosis;" and in the report furnished me by Dr. Geo. C. Faville, Chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry for Maryland, "it appears that 169 cows, coming within a radius of six miles from the City Hall in Baltimore, were proven to be

ter of meat from infected cattle ; he had condemned only such as seemed the worst, and that, although he found a considerable percentage of tuberculosis among eastern cows, he was convinced that the disease does not prevail to anything like the extent that some members of the association had reported. He had examined 880 cows, of which 810 were eastern. Of the whole number, 28 were found affected, all being eastern cattle. The whole number of cattle killed was 15,506 and the per cent. of affected animals was .17. Of the eastern cows the per cent. affected was 3.60.

He said the abattoir does not get all the animals killed for cheap beef, and his figures should not be accepted as representing the entire state. He thinks the disease less prevalent among eastern cattle than in the populous centres of most European countries, while at the West it has almost no existence.

Dr. Burr also gave statistics of dead cattle brought to the fertilizer factory, of which 7.5 per cent. were found affected.

The paper was fully discussed, there being a wide difference of opinion among the experts present as to the prevalence of the disease, several holding that Dr. Burr's figures were far too low.

Dr. Austin Peters, who has given the subject as much attention as any veterinarian in this State, and who is an accepted authority, is of opinion that Dr. Burr's figures are not exaggerations ; that, when it is considered that his figures simply apply to the dead cows sent to the abattoir, the estimate is more likely to be too small than too large. Several other parties in the suburbs of Boston dispose of similar animals, of which no statistics are known. There are dealers in cheap cows, who attend the local markets, who know what a tuberculous cow is, although they may not know the scientific terms. They call the cows "coughers," and they would be naturally shy of taking a "cougher" to the abattoir, where they know an inspector would probably condemn the carcass. They, therefore, sell to cheap dealers and bologna sausage makers, whose slaughter houses are outside the jurisdiction of the Boston Board of Health.

On November 13th, we received the following letter:—

*Dr. Geo. H. Bailey, State Veterinarian, Portland, Me.*

DEAR SIR:—I enclose herewith a copy of a letter which I have just received, which will perhaps, be of interest to you and which you may think of sufficient importance to investigate. It seems to me that there is considerable danger that Mr. and Mrs. Burnham, one or both, are already infected with glanders. If you investigate the case, I should regard it as a favor if you would let me know what you find. I am writing to Mr. Burnham that I have notified you.

Yours truly,

A. G. YOUNG, *Secretary, by B.*

On November 24th, I went to Mr. Burnham's farm, two miles from "Franklin Road Station" on the branch of the Maine Central running from Bangor to Mt. Desert, and condemned the horse and obtained a statement from Mr. Burnham, "that the horse was brought into this State on or about the eleventh of July, from Cambridge, Mass., to Bucksport, by boat, and probably had glanders at the time of purchase. He was sold to the man from whom I purchased him for about sixteen dollars being sold with the knowledge that he was sick. Before selling him Mr. J. W. Bowden asked the selectmen of the town of Hancock to send to the State Veterinary Surgeon, for him to come and kill the horse but they did not for reasons unknown to me. I also found out by a man who treated the horse that he told Mr. Bowden the horse had glanders, and from that time refused to treat him for the disease. I have been twice to Hancock to see Mr. Bowden, but have so far failed to see him. As I am not used to such matters I would be pleased to have you give me instructions how to proceed in this case, and if I can get anything from these men or the State."

We immediately wrote to Mr. Bowden, and received from him the following letter and bill of sale:—

HANCOCK, ME., 11, 25, 1890.

*Mr. George H. Bailey.*

DEAR SIR:—Yours of the 24th at hand and in reply would say, the horse in question I bought of one, P. H. Dardis of Cambridge,

Mass., in the forenoon of July, the 11th, 1890, and did not see the horse again until I saw him on the boat bound for Bucksport, Me. I see then and there on the boat, that the horse had as I supposed a bad cold, I got the horse home and kept him a month and doctored him. He got some better and I sold him for a sick horse. This is all I know about him. I enclose Mr. Dardis' card also my receipt from him July 11th.

Very respectfully yours,

J. E. BOWDEN.

BOSTON, July 11, 1890.

P. Mere and J. Bowdwin Bought of P. H. Dardis (1) one Black Horse Seven Years old. Amount paid one hundred and thirty-five dollars. Received payment.

P. H. DARDIS.

We also wrote to M. Harvey from whom Mr. Burnham purchased the horse, and received from him the following letter :—

FRANKLIN, November 25, 1890.

*Mr. Bailey* :—Yours at hand and in regard to the horse you wrote me about I do not know much about him. I got him about the middle of September, had him but one day. Mr. Burnham came to my place, I told him the horse had been sick, had not got well quite ; he said he would take all chances, so we exchanged. He gave \$1.50 between them to pay for shoeing. Dr. Phillips of Ellsworth looked at him and gave him medicine and called it the bronchitis. He said he would cure him. He helped him until Burnham left him out and he caught cold, and as near as I can learn he grew worse. This is all I know about the matter. I got the horse of a man by the name of Bowden, he got him in Boston out of a sale stable some time the first of the summer. We told him and thought he had the horse ail. This is all the information I can give you.

Yours respectfully,

W. A. HARVEY.

The peculiar hardship to Mr. Burnham aside from great risk that his wife and himself have already been subjected, by exposure, to a typical case of glanders in a chronic form, is the fact that under the present law we cannot pay him anything for his horse, and he has thus far failed to obtain any redress from the party who let him have the horse.

Section 2, chapter 177, "of the act to extirpate contagious diseases among animals" reads: "And also to cause the appraisal of the animal or animals affected with the said disease, in accordance with such rules and regulations by them as hereinafter authorized and provided, and also to cause the same to be destroyed, and to pay the owner or owners thereof one-half of their value, as determined upon the basis of health before infection, out of any moneys appropriated by the legislature for that purpose; provided, however, that no appraised value shall be more than two hundred dollars for an animal with pedigree recorded or recordable in the recognized herdbooks of the breed in which the animal destroyed may belong, nor more than one hundred dollars for an animal which has no recordable pedigree; provided, further, that in no case shall compensation be allowed for an animal destroyed under the provisions of this act, which may have contracted or been exposed to such disease in a foreign country, or on the high seas, or that may have been brought into this State within one year previous to such animal's showing evidence of such disease."

But one other case of glanders has occurred in this State, under the amended law, that we could prove had been brought into this State within the prescribed time to exempt them from appraisal; the other being the case of W. A. Crocker of Topsham, last August, the horse then destroyed having come here from Canada within a year, and it is worthy of note that this horse was sold by a dealer in Canada horses from whose sale stable the State has this season alone condemned and paid for four other horses badly affected with glanders. As soon as I had destroyed the horse at Egypt, I reported the facts to Dr. Young, as to the condition of Mr. and Mrs. Burnham, as the treatment of their cases belonged to his department, and since then have learned that Mrs. Burnham had been to Ellsworth to consult some physicians there, and is now under treatment and advice from them. It is earnestly to be hoped that Mr. Burnham and his wife, who are both young and worthy people, may escape the terrible

disease to which they have been thoroughly exposed ; and we recommend that additional safeguards shall in the future be thrown about all our citizens, and the great risk to which they have been subjected, be materially lessened by prompt and wise legislation, for it is an appalling fact that of the eighteen cases of glanders and farcy disposed of this year in Maine, but one of this large number was bred in this State ; that while practically we have no glanders among our native stock we are constantly exposed to such cases, by the unrestricted traffic allowing dealers to bring them here by the car-load and distribute them all over this State, involving the payment of large sums of money to pay for foreign stock. It is not clear to our minds just what the true remedy will prove to be for we are satisfied from past experience that if the time is extended in which they shall be owned in Maine, to entitle them to an appraisal, the proof will be always forthcoming that they have complied with the law.

The neighboring state of Vermont is closing her ports against Canadian cattle and the same quarantine may yet be necessary in this State against Canadian horses. The Secretary of Agriculture has made an order closing all the ports, except St. Albans, in the collection district of Vermont against the importation of cattle, sheep and other ruminants and swine, and requiring that all such animals imported through this collection district must enter at the port of St. Albans, where they must be inspected by a veterinary inspector of the Department of Agriculture. Railroad companies carrying animals imported into the United States are required to provide the necessary pens, and to unload such animals, so that they may be properly inspected.

The secretary says this is done as a protection against the introduction into this country from Canada of any contagious disease affecting these classes of animals.

Such inspection is provided for by the act of August 30, 1890, and in view of the fact the English veterinary authorities at Dundee, Scotland, have only recently seized Canadian



cattle when landed there, declaring them to be affected with contagious pleuro-pneumonia.

With the destruction of the Jersey bull at Limestone, the Commissioners have every reason to believe there has disappeared the last member of that vagabond band of College bulls, that had been sold from the farm, between October 24, 1882, and November 27, 1885, when the records show the last of the fourteen bulls was disposed of "to improve the stock of Maine." The circumstances that led to the discovery and destruction of this bull, and about which considerable criticism (?) has been indulged in, are in brief as follows: Upon August 11th of the present year, Dr. Bailey, Veterinarian of the Board, received a letter from Mr. B. R. Blackstone of East Perham, "Aroostook county", in which he writes, "I bought from the State Farm at Orono, a Jersey bull and have owned him to the present spring when he was sold and went away. But I have a herd of cows that are coughing some, they are in fair condition and do not appear to be sick, but cough frequently. One has had a little cough for three years but not much: now for about three or four weeks nearly all cough. The animal lifts its belly and throws out its tongue in coughing with a sound like blowing out wind. Please write me in regard to them, and what is the best course to pursue; if they need an examination, I should like to know it." Address. B. R. Blackstone, East Perham, Aroostook County, Me.

Mr. Blackstone's letter was replied to promptly, and on August 15th a second letter was received from him, in which he writes, "I will say in reply, that the bull from the Orono herd was the calf of Juno 2d. The cough of my cows resembles that made by a calf or other animal when tied by a rope, and the rope is drawn tight to choke it. I do not think the animals are any thinner in flesh than would naturally be the case, and do not notice any signs of sickness except the cough; but they cough considerably, nearly all of them. I lost a yearling the summer that I got the bull, the animal

running down after being out on grass and dying in the fall, but appearing like a person in consumption. My nearest station is Caribou." B. R. Blackstone. This letter was also replied to, inquiring where the bull was then owned, and on August 22d, Mr. Blackstone wrote his third and last letter, saying "That bull is in Limestone, owned by a Mr. Bennett. I do not know his first name but I think he lives near Limestone village. I am ten miles from Caribou. Those calves are wrong I am satisfied, and I should have answered your letter before, but was away when it came." B. R. Blackstone.

A consultation of the full Board of Cattle Commissioners was held, and it was decided that Mr. Harris and Dr. Bailey should go to the Aroostook, and inspect the cattle of Mr. Blackstone, and also endeavor to discover the location of the bull in question. We arrived at Caribou September 6th, and the next day visited Mr. Blackstone's herd, and had his cows driven to the barn and examined, his younger stock being away to pasture. The cow that he claimed coughed the most, (that was the produce of the College bull) had evidence of considerable emphysema, that would account for her cough in a large degree, and after examining other animals it was agreed between Mr. Blackstone and the Commissioners, that the heifer should be fed off for beef and slaughtered for a test case, her lungs to be sent to Portland for examination and decision, but up to the present time they have not been received, and no final disposition of this animal has been reached. Mr. Blackstone informed us that "he had become suspicious of his bull, and had sold him for twenty dollars, a price less than he would have brought for beef." After leaving East Perham, the Commissioners went the same day to Limestone, about ten miles east of Caribou, and found the bull in the possession of Mr. Edward M. Bennett, who had recently purchased him of Mr. Blackstone, and upon making known our errand, we inspected the animal and promptly came to an agreement with the owner, that his own interests and that of the community would best be served by having the bull slaughtered, (he to receive what he

had paid for him \$20.00) and if the lungs proved sound when examined, he could sell the beef, if unsound, the beef should be destroyed. The lungs of the bull were received by express on Saturday, September 13th, and upon examination the parenchyma of the lung was found to be invaded with millary tubercle; and while fairer upon the surface than had been some of its kindred viscera, within it was "like a whited sepulchre full of dead men's bones". Our Treasurer, Mr. Harris, then sent Mr. Bennett a check for twenty dollars in full for all demands, and up to the time of his correspondence with Gilbert, he had been perfectly satisfied to have the bull destroyed. Mr. Bennett was immediately notified as to the true condition of the bull, and instructed not to sell the beef, as it was not fit for human food. Mr. Bennett made no reply to this notice, and on October 23d there appeared in the editorial column of the "Maine Farmer" the following paragraph:

#### TUBERCULOSIS AGAIN.

"The paragraph recently floating the rounds of the papers to the effect that a bull bred from the College herd, and which has been kept for service by Mr. E. M. Bennett of Limestone, Aroostook county, has been sought out by the Cattle Commissioners and slaughtered, and was found rotten with tuberculosis, was wholly false, it turns out, in so far as disease is concerned. Mr. Bennett has written to the Secretary of the State Board of Agriculture correcting the misrepresentation and giving the full account of the case. He writes: 'There were five responsible men present when the bull was dressed, who had killed many cattle, and we all pronounced the bull in perfect health and his lungs perfect.' In justice to Mr. Bennett and his stock, we are glad to correct the false report."

The Commissioners wish to state right here that they have possession of the lungs of this bull and they are *thoroughly diseased* and as this is the first opportunity the present Board

of Cattle Commissioners has ever had of making any official reply or report, which could embrace the final disposition and destruction of these College bulls, a resume and summary of these important cases seem to be demanded at this time, inasmuch that so long time has elapsed since the orders were first received to have these bulls all inspected and disposed of, that the facts concerning them have about passed out of the public mind. It will be recollected, however, that on April 22d and 23d, 1886, the entire herd of fifty-one thoroughbred cattle, belonging to the "State College Farm" at Orono, were destroyed by order of the Cattle Commissioners of Maine, the full Board at that time consisting of Wm. B. Ferguson of Monroe, Samuel Bell of Deering, and Geo. H. Bailey of Portland, with Z. A. Gilbert, *ex-officio* member of the Board. Mr. Gilbert was also by virtue of his office of "Secretary of the Board of Agriculture," *ex-officio* member of the Board of Trustees of the State College Farm, and of the Experiment Station, and also one of the farm committee at Orono, from all of which positions he has since then been deposed by especial act of the legislature. Webster's unabridged gives the definition of deposed as "the act of deposing or divesting of office."

"Thus when the State one Edward did depose,  
A greater Edward in his room arose."

DRYDEN.

After the destruction of the Orono herd, the fact was developed that among the produce of the cows then slaughtered fourteen young bulls had been sold and distributed among the farmers of Maine, as Mr. Gowell the farm superintendent himself says, "to benefit the farmers by selling low 'farmers' prices' our motto." And it became a serious question for consideration what action should be taken in regard to them, and what recommendation should be made to the Governor and Council in their forthcoming annual report.

Up to time of the meeting of the legislature in January, 1887, no report had been agreed upon, owing to a marked disagreement among the Commissioners what disposition

should be made of the produce of the College herd, and a joint special committee was finally appointed to investigate the cause of the outbreak of disease among the cattle at the State College Farm, who after an exhaustive inquiry, returned the following report :

“The undersigned, a majority of the committee appointed by a joint order of the two Houses of the legislature to investigate the cause or causes of the late outbreak of disease among the cattle at the State College Farm, the loss of other cattle at said farm prior to that time, the disposal of the cattle therefrom, and the doings and correspondence of the Commissioners on Contagious Diseases Among Cattle and in relation to the same, have attended to that duty and after several hearings and an exhaustive examination of the facts, beg leave to report, that the disease from which the herd of cattle at the State College Farm was suffering in March and April, 1886, was tuberculosis, a disease identical with consumption in the human family ; that said disease, according to the evidence introduced before us, which is made a part of this report is contagious, and readily communicated by reason of the constant intermingling of the different animals of a herd together, and is transmittable from either parent to its offspring.

The date and source of the first introduction of the disease into the College herd is unknown, but the evidence tends to disclose that it had existed there for some years, and that it had caused the death of several cattle on said farm before the slaughter of the herd in April, 1886.

The outbreak of said disease there in the winter and spring of 1886 was the most malignant on record, and seems to have been caused by the collecting and intermingling of so many cattle, some of which, at least, were diseased in close and well finished stables and by the thorough impregnation of said stables with contagious virus from those and former diseased animals. Little out-door exercise and concentrated and stimulating food were also potent factors in the rapid extension and progress of the disease.

This herd, which appears to have been thoroughly inbred, which fact caused the disease to develop in an unusually severe form.

The disposal of the cattle from said farm for several years past is shown by the evidence introduced before us and is referred to.

The doings and correspondence of the Commissioners on contagious diseases among the cattle on said farm, are also herewith submitted in the evidence introduced. The facts seem to fully justify the destruction of the entire College herd.

In relation to those cattle sold from the College farm for several years past, if we are allowed by the terms of the order for investigation to make a recommendation, we must certainly recommend a most careful examination of those animals, and especially the bulls recently sold therefrom, by a competent Board of Cattle Commissioners, to the end that every vestige of said disease, wherever found, may be stamped out and destroyed. As a committee of this legislature, we take no part in any controversy arising out of this matter. Yet we cannot help coming to the conclusion that the Cattle Commissioners have not given such attention to this case as exigency required, and we respectfully suggest that the existing condition of things may have grown out of the fact that one of the members of said Commission seems to have held several official positions, the duties of which were incompatible with each other.

We make the majority report of the Cattle Commission, signed by Dr. Bailey and Messrs. Bell and Ferguson, a part of the evidence in this investigation, and, as a consequence, a part of our report, and we respectfully call attention to the testimony given in said investigation by Dr. J. F. Winchester of Lawrence, Massachusetts, a member of the Cattle Commission of Massachusetts, and A. W. Cheever of Dedham, Massachusetts, also a member of said Board, and others.

The above report is signed by I. C. Libby, who differs from the other members of the Committee in the recommenda-

tion of the examination at the State's expense of any apparently well animals and also any reflection on any member of the Cattle Commission."

SAMUEL H. ALLEN, } *Committee on the part*  
ALFRED W. RICH, } *of the Senate.*

S. J. WALTON, } *Committee on the part*  
ENOCH ADAMS, } *of the House.*  
I. C. LIBBY, }

Governor Bodwell promptly issued an order for Doctor Geo. H. Bailey, then as now, State Veterinarian, "to follow up these cases, until every bull had been inspected and destroyed *pro bono publico*." In March Doctor Bailey accompanied by Mr. Bell went to Bangor, and the very first animal examined was the bull owned by Washington Hall & Son at Brewer, the animal having been purchased from the College Farm May 13th, 1885, as a yearling, and by a singular coincidence was sired by the same bull, "Ginx of Cream Brook," as was the last bull recently killed, and purchased by Mr. Blackstone May 14th, 1885, as shown by the following table:

## History of Males Sold from Maine State College Farm.

38

CATTLE COMMISSIONERS' REPORT.

Date of Sale.	Purchaser	Residence	Date of Birth	Sire.	Dam	Price.
Oct. 24, 1882..	W. G. Chamberlain [for other party]	West Lebanon	Aug. 5, 1882	Reed's Bull, No —, M S J. H.	Butter Girl, No 502, M. S. J. H.	\$15 00
Feb. 16, 1883...	Bangor City—Farm	Bangor	Feb. 3, 1883	Samuel, No —, M S J. H.	Helen Hart, No. 22460, R J C C	6 00
May 22, 1883..	Mr. Morrill	Alton	May 15, 1883	Whip 2d, No. 350, M. S. J. H.	Juno, No. 688, M. S. J. H.	6 00
Aug. 20, 1883..	Mr. Atkins	Exeter	July 13, 1883	Regulus, No. 69465, A. S. H. H. B.	Princess	15 00
March 6, 1884..	J. C. Green	Bangor	Feb 25, 1884	Silver Blanket, No 13196, A J. C. C.	Helen Hart, No. 22460, A. J C. C.	10 00
April 30, 1884..	Mr. Comins	Eddington	April 27, 1884	Regulus (see above)	Pet	3 00
Aug. 6, 1884...	M D. Barnes	Lee	Dec 29, 1884	Silver Blanket, No. 13196, A J. C. C.	Tinney, No 18015, A. J. C. C.	35 00
Sept. 24, 1884..	E. C. Mallet	Topsham	Sept. 6, 1884	Silver Blanket, No 13196, A. J. C. C.	Highland Belle 2d, No. 683, M S. J. H.	10 00
Oct. 24, 1884...	E. G. Brimmer	No. Mariaville	June 3, 1883	Regulus (see above)	Tulip 4th, Vol 15, A. S. H. H. Book	65 00
Dec. 6, 1884...	N. P. Haskell	Orono	(Bred by Blanchard Brothers, Cumberland, Me)			100 00
May 13, 1885..	W. Hale & Son	Brewer	June 18, 1884	Ginx of Cream Brook, No. 6415, A. J. C. C.	Mildred, No 969, M. S. J. H.	35 00
May 14, 1885..	R. R. Blackstone	Alton(?)	March 30, 1885	Ginx of Cream Brook, No 6415, A. J. C. C.	Juno, No. 688, M. S. J. H.	15 00.
Sept. 4, 1885...	S. N. Kent	Bucksport	May 11, 1885	Ginx of Cream Brook, No 6415, A. J. C. C.	Princess Alba, No 596, M. S. J H	20 00
Nov. 27, 1885..	A. B. Sutton	Orono	April 8, 1885	Syringa's Lenox, No 5499, A J. C. C.	Belle of West Meadows, No. 4927. A. J. C. C.	30 00
						\$365 00



The dam of the latter bull was Juno 2d, a cow that had been owned upon the farm, where she had bred three calves, but had been sold to a Mrs. Stetson before the slaughter of the herd in April, 1886. This cow we have never seen, but we offer the testimony of Hon. S. C. Hatch. "I was a member of Governor's Council in March, 1886, and visited the Orono State College farm. The cattle coughed and were rather thin. Went again in April to the farm, when we decided to have all the cattle slaughtered. Mrs. Stetson wanted the College to pay her back the money she paid them for her cow and take back the cow. We told her we could do nothing for her and the College would not for fear of other calls of the same kind. I should have advised the College to buy up the cattle sold. There were no funds and we did not feel free to do it. The Kent bull was brought to the notice of the Governor. Dr. Bailey has since bought and killed him." The produce of Juno 2d was Susie, (No. 31) one of the animals destroyed, and both her lungs were found diseased, and her very next calf was the bull recently owned by Mr. Bennett of Limestone, that Gilbert now says was perfectly sound.

The bull then owned by Mr. Hall was kept in a large herd of dairy cows, and was found to be in an advanced stage of tuberculosis, was condemned and destroyed, and when his lungs were brought to Augusta and exhibited in the office of the Maine Farmer, Dr. Wm. B. Lapham, its former editor, who was present, pronounced them "the worst specimens of tubercular disease he had ever seen." The lungs were then returned to Orono by express for the faculty of the "State College Farm" to see for themselves "just how sound and clean they were." They were rotten to the core, but notwithstanding this fact Secretary Gilbert had published an editorial in the "Farmer" of the week before, "that Doctor Bailey had been East examining these College bulls, and found them sound and clean, as the owners all the time knew they were," and he has never to this day retracted that statement, but has recently made another in regard to the case at Lime-

stone, which is almost its exact counterpart for truth and veracity. The dam of Mr. Hall's bull was "Mildred" (No. 2) of the post-mortem report, both her lungs badly affected with adhesions to the costal pleura. Her dam was "Pansy" (No. 1) who had a cyst in centre of left lung, and right filled with miliary tubercles, and besides Mildred, she produced Hyacinthe (No. 3) with both lungs affected, and a bull calf that was affected and coughed when but three days old. From that time to the present, all the bulls have been inspected and destroyed, there being *scarcely one of them that failed to show evidence of disease*, and while we believe that but very few of their produce is in existence, the Commissioners earnestly advise that if there are any such, they shall not be kept for stock or dairy purposes, as they will always be regarded as suspects, and a constant menace to other animals, and we take this occasion to say that it is our candid opinion, if these bulls had been allowed to remain undisturbed upon the farms where they were found and kept for stock purposes, "the woods would now have been full" of tuberculous cattle, and our percentage instead of being less than four one-hundredths of one per cent, as it has for the last four years, would have out-rivalled any other New England state.

It has become the settled policy of the State, to follow up the progeny of diseased cows, and have them disposed of whether they show evidence of disease at the time or not, for it is a well recognized fact that in the largest percentage of tuberculous animals, the disease cannot be identified until they are past five years of age; and it is in a large measure due to this vigorous policy, that we attribute the remarkable freedom from contagious diseases among the "flocks and herds" in Maine, as it is now universally admitted that we "lead the way" in the almost absolute health of our live stock, and the purity of our dairy products.

According to Walley, "Hereditary tendency may be divided into direct and indirect; the former when it is transmitted by a sire or dam to its immediate progeny, the latter when only transmitted to the second or third generation—

constituting atavism. No predisposing cause with which we are acquainted exercises such a potent influence in the production of tubercle as this: from sire to son, from dam to offspring, from generation to generation—often an unbroken succession—the fatal tendency is transmitted; the more consanguinity is multiplied, the more the tendency is increased, and the greater the virulence of the resulting products. No animal whose history is tainted, even in the slightest degree, or in whose system there exists the least suspicion of tubercle, should be used for breeding purposes.”

Previous to the appointment of the joint special committee, the ownership of but a single bull sold from the College Farm, had become known, and he was found in the possession of S. H. Kent of Bucksport, Me., and as this case seems to have furnished the key that unlocks all the motives of the former Commissioners in recommending or resisting the destruction of these bulls, we quote briefly from their evidence given at the investigation.

#### TESTIMONY OF Z. A. GILBERT.

Q. Coming now to the Kent bull, what was the first information you had as to him?

A. I had a letter from Mr. Kent inquiring of me something in regard to a bull that he bought from the College herd.

Q. When was that?

A. I cannot tell you. It was sometime along in the spring or summer, but I haven't the date of it. It was not an official matter, and consequently I did not make any official record of it.

Q. Why was it not an official letter?

A. Because it did not call upon me as one of the Cattle Commissioners.

Q. How did he happen to write to you?

A. I do not know anything about that.

Q. Didn't you suppose he wrote to you as a member of the Board of Commissioners?

A. He didn't address me as one of the Cattle Commissioners.

Q. Does a man have to address you in a matter of that kind as a member of that Board before you take any action upon the matter?

A. I do not know whether that would be the case or not.

Q. If a man writes to you addressing you as "Z. A. Gilbert," or "Hon. Z. A. Gilbert," without putting on "Member" or "Chairman of the Board of Cattle Commissioners," and informs you of a suspicion of diseased animals in his herd, do you take no notice of the letter?

A. I do take notice of the letter.

Q. Why didn't you take notice of that letter?

A. I did.

Q. But not officially?

A. I did not officially.

Q. Do you take notice of the others officially?

A. He did not inform me of a diseased animal.

Q. Do you take notice of the others officially?

A. I do when I am informed of diseased animals.

Q. Have you that letter in your possession?

A. I have not. It was a private letter and I do not keep them on file. All my official letters are kept on file.

Q. How do you tell whether a letter comes to you in your private or official capacity?

A. If it was a letter in regard to a diseased bull I should suppose it was in an official capacity.

Q. This was not?

A. It was not.

Q. Was it not in regard to a bull he had suspicion about having the disease?

A. In this letter he told me the bull was not diseased.

Q. Why did he write to you then?

A. He addressed me as a brother Patron and asked my advice.

Q. About using a bull that was not diseased?

A. About using a bull which was purchased at the College farm prior to the outbreak of disease there.

Q. Did he at that time state to you anything about whether he had suspicion of the disease?

A. He stated to me that the animal was well, that he ate well, looked well and appeared well, and that he was well.

Q. And you haven't taken pains to preserve that letter, but are simply stating the contents of it now from memory?

A. I am stating it from memory; I did not preserve it.

Q. At the time you received that letter had any of the cattle at the State farm been killed?

A. They had all been killed.

Q. Did you take any pains to answer him to ascertain the parentage of that bull?

A. I did not at all.

Q. Not the slightest?

A. Not at all.

Q. Didn't try to find out whether the mother of the bull was one of the worst diseased cattle of the herd?

A. I have answered that question.

Q. Did you or not?

A. I say I did not.

Q. Did you take any pains to inform yourself as to the condition of the bull before replying?

A. No.

Q. And this letter you received was immediately after the killing, was it not?

A. No sir; I cannot state when it was. My impression is that it was immediately after the killing.

Q. On what days were the cattle killed there?

A. I think it was the 22d and 23d of April. (Letter marked "B" shown witness.)

Q. Is that the letter which you sent to Mr. Kent in reply to his?

A. It is.

Q. What is the date of that?

A. April 30th.

Q. Then prior to April 30th, you had received from him his letter?

A. I presume so.

Q. Then it must have been immediately after the killing. It seems that you received his letter when the matter was entirely fresh in your mind?

A. Of course it must have been fresh in my mind at that time.

(Mr. Cornish reads in evidence the letter marked "B", which is as follows:)

"B"

STATE OF MAINE.

BOARD OF AGRICULTURE. }  
North Greene, April 30, 1886. }

Mr. S. N. KENT:—Your letter is at hand. If I were in your place I should retain and use the bull. As long as he has shown no cough and no other signs of disease it is safe to conclude he is well. If he is well it is safe and proper to use him.

Resp'y yours,

(Signed)

Z. A. GILBERT.

Q. You have heard the physicians testify, have you not, that an animal might have that disease and have no cough?

A. Yes, might have a cough and no disease.

Q. But he might have that disease and yet have no cough?

A. Yes.

Q. So that the cough is not the only symptom?

A. No.

Q. And not a necessary incident to the disease?

A. No, but a usual accompaniment of it.

Q. But still, not a necessary one?

A. Not always.

Q. Do you know when the stiff-necked one was killed, in March, 1885? Were you made acquainted with the fact that two stiff-necked ones were killed, in March, 1885?

A. No.

Q. And did you know that one of those was half sister to this very Kent bull?

A. No, sir, I didn't know anything about the breed, records or parentage, or anything about it; nothing at all.

Q. After your correspondence with Mr. Kent, what was your next correspondence in regard to the Kent bull?

A. I have no recollection of any further correspondence with Mr. Kent in regard to the bull.

Q. Well, with any member of your Commission?

A. I do not know as I could state that correctly. I had some correspondence with some members of the Commission in regard to that bull.

Q. Did you have a letter from Dr. Bailey inclosing Mr. McAlister's notice the latter part of July or the first part of August as to this bull?

A. I believe I received such a letter including Mr. McAlister's notice.

Q. And the document which I produce is the notice which was included?

A. I could not swear to the notice at all. It was returned by request to Dr. Bailey. I could not state whether this was the notice or not.

Q. Did you reply to Dr. Bailey on that matter?

A. I presume I did; I usually replied to his letters, all of them.

(Letter dated August 10th, 1886, and marked "C" shown witness.)

Q. Is that the letter which you sent to Dr. Bailey in reply?

A. I think that is the reply.

(The letter was read in evidence by Mr. Cornish, and is as follows:)

"C"

## STATE OF MAINE.

BOARD OF AGRICULTURE, }  
North Greene, Aug. 10, 1886. }

Dr. BAILEY,

*Dear Sir:*—Your letter with Doc's at hand. I do not think case warranted a visit from you, and they probably took the course they did to get an examination of the animal at State's expense. I knew all about the case.

In regard to my advice to use the bull; it is the only position we can take. The bull was sound, so stated, "and we have no evidence that he came from any other than sound parentage." The only thing to say is that he is all right. If he doesn't feel easy about it, it is none of our business; then he must sell him, that's all.

Yours,

(Signed)

Z. A. GILBERT.

Q. Was not there evidence to you, as a member of the Board of Trustees of the College, or as a member of the Cattle Commissioners present at the killing in all your capacities, that he did come of unsound parentage?

A. There was a possibility, nothing further.

Q. You knew his mother was one of the worst cases, did you not?

A. I did not at that time.

Q. Could not you by the slightest work have obtained that information?

A. I probably could if I had sought it.

Q. But you didn't try to, did you?

A. I did not. I will make a word of explanation here, with the permission of the Chairman, with reference to why I stated (in the letter), that he should not have visited the bull. The requirements of the law are that there should be diseased animals in order to warrant a notice; that that notice shall come from the municipal officers to the Commissioners. I had had this bull under my charge. The notice to me was that he was a well bull, and all right in every respect. There



was only a possibility, a suspicion against him; but the statement was that he was all right, and, therefore, that was not a matter for legal notice to the Commissioners, and hence my statement.

Q. You say you had had the bull under your charge?

A. Under my notice.

Q. Under your charge as one of the members of the Cattle Commission, do you mean?

A. No, sir, under my notice; under my notice would have been a better word, because I had had the bull under consideration.

Q. Under your notice as a Cattle Commissioner?

A. No, sir, as an individual.

Q. You make that distinction all the way through, do you?

A. I make it now.

Q. Were you acting in respect to the Kent bull as a private citizen, or as one of the Board of Cattle Commissioners?

A. In that letter to Dr. Bailey I was acting as a Commissioner.

Q. And in your letter to Mr. Kent how were you acting?

A. As a private individual, as I was addressed by him.

Q. Then the way in which you act always depends upon the method by which you are addressed by those who write you letters?

A. I do not know about that.

Q. It did in this case?

A. I stated in each case how I acted.

Q. In the letter to Dr. Bailey you said of the Kent bull it was "none of our business?"

A. None of our business as Cattle Commissioners.

Q. Do you think the Cattle Commissioners have no "summary powers" in such matters?

Q. What do you mean by "summary powers"?

Q. What does the statute mean when it uses the word?

A. I do not know. I ask for information.

Q. What is your construction of it?

A. I could not say. I could not tell what in law is understood by "summary".

Q. Haven't any idea what "summary powers" means?

A. No, not definite.

Q. Do you mean to say you think the Cattle Commissioners had no power to act in any case of diseased cattle unless the municipal officers should call upon them so to do?

A. Repeat that question.

Q. Do you think that the Board of Cattle Commissioners had no power to deal with diseased animals in any way, or those suspected of disease, unless notified by municipal officers of the town?

A. The only exception that I would make to that is a herd of stock belonging to the State.

Q. Otherwise they had no power?

A. Otherwise, in a town or municipality where the stock belonged to a private individual, the Cattle Commissioners have no power whatever to act in cases of disease unless called upon by municipal officers.

Q. You are very positive in that position?

A. I am.

By Mr WALTON :

Q. Did I understand you that this letter (letter marked "B") was written by you as a private individual to Mr. Kent?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you understand that he wrote to you as a private individual asking your advice in regard to it?

A. I did. He addressed me as a brother Patron, that is, a brother Granger.

Q. You wrote this upon one of your blanks as Secretary of the Board of Agriculture?

A. Yes, sir, I was using that paper in all my correspondence, private and official, in various official directions. I have Experiment Station headings to some of my paper, and I sometimes use that. We have no official paper for the Cattle Commission.

Q. Yes, but this is official paper for the Board of Agriculture, is it not?

A. Yes, sir; but not the Cattle Commission.

Q. Certainly, but it is all the official paper you have?

A. No, sir; I have some other official paper.

Q. And in connection with the Board of Agriculture?

A. No, sir, in connection with the Experiment Station.

By Mr. ADAMS :

Q. Does not your office in the Board of Agriculture make you an officer also of this Commission?

A. I so understand it, yes, sir. This office as Commissioner is an *ex-officio* office.

Q. So that would be sufficient for official paper in that capacity?

A. Perhaps so, but it was not so designed. It was designed as an individual.

By Mr. CORNISH :

Q. Have you any official paper of the Board of Cattle Commissioners?

A. I have not.

Q. Has not all your official correspondence as a member of that Board been upon this same paper upon which you wrote to Mr. Kent?

A. I presume it has. I use that in nearly all of my private correspondence, private and official.

Q. In writing to other men do you make the same distinction? and when you write to them and sign simply your own name and without the word "Commissioner" under it, do you understand that to be a private correspondence?

A. Not necessarily so. Sometimes I sign officially and sometimes I do not; depends upon whom I am writing to.

Q. Then at the other end of the route, when the man receives that letter with that letter-head and your signature, he has no means of knowing whether you are writing to him as a Patron or as a member of the Board, has he?

A. I do not know anything about what means he has ; he has only the letter of course.

Q. So far as that goes, have you in any of your correspondence in regard to this Kent bull ever signed your name as "Commissioner on Contagious Diseases?"

A. I do not know. I may and may not.

Q. Now after this matter was brought to the attention of your Board by this notice from the selectmen of Bucksport, did you then think that the Cattle Commissioners of this State ought to take hold of that matter?

A. I did not.

Q. Why?

A. Because that bull was a well bull.

Q. What information had you as to that?

A. I had the information from the owner of the bull.

Q. Do you take the information of the letter which you have described here giving the outward appearance of the bull, written to you, as you say, a brother Patron, in place of the official notice given to you in July as a member of the Board of Cattle Commissioners?

A. Official notice was given to Dr. Bailey.

Q. He was one of the Board?

A. Yes, sir ; and he went to visit them in accordance with that notice.

Q. Then would you let that letter which you received the previous April, as you say a private individual, supersede the official notice which came to your Board?

A. My knowledge of that animal was that he was a well animal. I had no other knowledge in regard to that animal, and consequently that was my position.

Q. Did you have any other knowledge except what was contained in that first letter written to you by Mr. Kent?

A. When?

Q. In April previous.

A. At the time the letter was written, do you mean?

Q. When this letter came to your Board from Mr. McAlister, selectman of the town of Bucksport, did you at

that time have any notice of the real condition of that bull other than what was contained in the letter from Mr. Kent of the previous April?

A. I do not know that I had.

Q. And that letter, you say, was written to you not officially, but as a member of the Patrons?

A. I say so.

Q. And you allowed that letter to supersede this official notice given to you as a member of the Board? Is that so?

A. No, I do not understand it so.

Q. Didn't you take what you say were the statements in that letter in preference to what was contained in this notice?

A. I do not recollect what was in the notice.

Q. Did you ever visit the bull?

A. Never. I never visited the bull because I never was notified he was diseased.

Q. Did you concur in your associate's visiting that bull?

A. The letter says I did not.

Q. You did not approve of his course then?

A. Yes, I did approve of it. I think I wrote to him saying that under the notice to him he was justified in visiting the bull. But the notice was—I do not know how to express it, but I should say it was a sort of spring, one of those springs that have been attempted a good many times on the Commission to get an official diagnosis of a disease at the expense of the State in an individual case.

Q. And you were very glad to have that suspicion in this case, were you not?

A. I do not know.

Q. The only information you had was from the previous letter written to you as a Patron?

A. That is all I recollect now.

Q. Still, you neglected to take any part in the investigation of the Kent bull case as an officer?

A. No, sir. Dr. Bailey went down there and visited professionally, the same as in all cases of disease.

Q. At your request?

A. On his own responsibility, as he frequently did.

Q. Did you approve of his action after he did it?

A. I was a good deal —

Q. Did you approve of his action after he did it?

A. I did.

. And thought that he had a perfect right to go there?

A. I thought under the call he received that it was his duty to answer that call.

Q. Did you tell Mr. Ferguson in the State House this winter that he had no business to go there?

A. I do not think I did. At least, I do not know why I should, because I think I had previously written to Bailey that he was justified in visiting the bull under the notice he received. I do not recollect that I told Mr. Ferguson that. I would swear that I have no recollection of telling him so.

By Mr. CORNISH :

Q. Do you know whether or not Dr. Bailey corresponded with Mr. Gowell after that as to the lineage of this animal?

A. He said he did.

Q. Did Dr. Bailey write a letter inclosing that reply from Gowell?

A. Dr. Bailey informed me that he had corresponded with Gowell and found that the bull was calved by one of the cows killed at the College, one of the diseased cows.

(Letter marked "F" shown witness.)

Q. Is that the letter you received inclosed, do you think?

A. I can tell by reading it through. Dr. Bailey informed me to that effect.

Q. Didn't he inclose a letter from Mr. Gowell?

A. I cannot tell you. He informed me of the fact.

(Mr. Cornish read in evidence letter marked "F," as follows :)

"F"

ORONO, Aug. 9, 1886.

*Dear Doctor* :—The dam of the young bull was Princess Alba, one of the two cows we slaughtered in the field near the stable, and whose lungs and glands you brought into the stable. She was one

of the worst cases. You doubtless remember her condition now. Lungs and glands badly off.

I am confined to the house by sickness and am writing to you with extreme difficulty. Most truly,

(Signed)

G. M. GOWELL.

*Mr. Gilbert*.:—"Princess Alba" was the dam of the "Kent bull," whose lungs I refer to, sent to the American Vet. College.

G. H. B.

(Letter marked "G" shown witness.)

Q. Is that your handwriting?

A. It is.

(Mr. Cornish read in evidence letter marked "G," as follows:)

"G"

STATE OF MAINE.

BOARD OF AGRICULTURE. }  
North Greene, Aug. 13, 1886. }

Dr. BAILEY :

*Dear Sir*.:—We haven't the ghost of a law that will authorize us to interfere with that animal. If Mr. K. don't think the animal safe to use, it is his business, not ours. Besides, "a decision that the animal was unsound when bought binds the College to refund."

Remember, the College cattle were the State's property and we did not apply the law at all.

We can't do anything but let the animal alone just where he is, and not complicate ourselves with it. It is our only way.

Yours,

(Signed)

GILBERT.

Q. You were a trustee of the College, were you not?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And one of the farm committee of the College?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And had been instrumental in purchasing this whole herd?

A. Directly and indirectly.

Q. Largely so, had you not?

A. No, sir.

Q. You and Gowell together?

A. We made one purchase together.

Q. Did you make any alone?

A. No, sir.

Q. Advise as to purchases?

A. I presume so, as we had a perfect understanding with each other in regard to all these matters.

Q. Did you have another letter from Dr. Bailey on the 22d of October?

A. I presume so; I had a good many from him.

Q. Can you find that as readily as you found the last one you produced?

A. I do not know. I may have it here and I may not. Here is one dated October 23d.

Q. Yes, sir. Will you read that to the committee?

(Witness reads letter dated October 23, 1886, and marked "H", as follows:)

"H."

PORTLAND, October 23, 1886.

TO Z. A. GILBERT:

*Dear Sir:*—I am in receipt of two letters this morning, one from Danforth, that satisfies me that they have no "contagious disease" among their horses, and I do not propose to go. So, knowing no business East, I will go to Orono almost any day that I can be of service there. The other letter is from Mr. McAlister, Bucksport, in answer to my enquiry if Mr. Kent would consent to have his bull killed, without the intervention of the Cattle Commissioners, and he replied by saying: "If the State will give \$25.00, the bull shall be disposed of and I will pay the rest of the bills myself. I make this proposition that the future of the community may be safe."

Please answer at once what you have to say to this proposition, as the Governor has said to me lately, "Consult Gilbert". I have to request of you that you will return to me three letters, which I recently enclosed to you; one from Mr. Scribner, the rest from Mr. Gowell, in answer to my enquiry regarding the cow "Princess Alba,"



and last the postal from Mr. Chase in regard to the sale of cattle at Scribner's.

Mr. Ferguson called on me the next morning after our meeting, and told me he had seen Governor Robie in relation to his serving out the remainder of the year, (or until after the report of the Commissioners was made up) and that the Governor had "promised him he should be continued in office, and would forward him papers to that effect". As far as I am concerned all this "backing and filling" has ceased to interest me, and I have no further objections to offer. Please let me know when you write if the appraisal and settlement at Scribner's is satisfactory to you, and if you are to be at home the coming week.

I am very truly yours,

(Signed) GEORGE H. BAILEY, V. S.

(Mr. Cornish proposed to read the McAlister letter inclosed in the letter of October 23d, but Mr. Gilbert raised the point that it had not been identified. The letter was then identified by Dr. Bailey and it was read in evidence by Mr. Cornish, being marked "I" as follows:)

"I"

BUCKSPORT, October 22, 1886.

TO DR. GEO. H. BAILEY:

*My Dear Sir:*—Yours of the 21st inst., received, and contents noted. I fully appreciate your position in the case of Mr. Kent of this town and will co-operate with you and have the bull killed. Now if the State will give \$25 the bull shall be disposed of and I will pay the rest of the bills myself. I make this proposition that the future of the community may be safe.

Respectfully yours,

(Signed) G. W. McALISTER.

P. S. Mr. Kent wishes to get rid of the bull at once as he is to a great deal of trouble keeping the animal up.

McALISTER.

Q. Did you reply to Dr. Bailey, and have you your reply?

A. I have a letter here dated October 27th, which I think is a reply to that letter.

Q. May I look at it?

A. No.

Q. You refuse to allow me to look at that letter?

A. I do until I read it. (Witness reading letter to himself.)

Q. Do you refuse to allow me to look at that letter?

A. I do. I am dealing with the committee and not you?

Q. And you refuse to allow me to look at the letter?

A. Yes, sir. The letter is mine, written by me and I will read it.

(Witness reads letter dated October 27, 1886, and marked "J", as follows:)

"J"

STATE OF MAINE.

BOARD OF AGRICULTURE, }  
North Greene, October 27, 1886. }

DR. BAILEY:—I supposed Mr. Bell would consult you on that unfinished business after you had heard from the parties again.

I am still where I have been in the matter, and being there, know of no compromise ground I wish to take. If you and Mr. Bell decide differently from my views I must yield to the majority, but not convinced.

In view of the fact that the public will not use his bull, will not Mr. Kent, with your advice, feed him off for beef?

The settlement with Scribner was satisfactory all around.

Yours,

(Signed) GILBERT.

I had also previously received from Mr. McAlister the following letter:

BUCKSPORT, September 18, 1886.

Z. A. GILBERT, Esq.:

*Dear Sir:*—Mr. Kent of this town has a bull he purchased at the State College farm and he has been kept away from his other cattle for some time since last March. Dr. Bailey was in the town and looked the bull over and was to have the matter settled, what was to be done with the bull. As Mr. Kent is keeping the animal up at

some considerable expense I hope the case will be disposed of one way or the other.

The people in this section feel that the bull ought not to be used owing to the fact that all of the cattle on the farm at the State College were killed, and as this creature was raised from one of the cows that were killed, and also the bull, and the Commissioners made such a report after giving the subject careful consideration, it seems but justice that the bull sold to Mr. Kent by the State ought to be treated the same and killed and not wait until the disease is transmitted to other cattle and then have him and the whole herd killed. I presume you have had the matter carefully considered, and will you please advise as to the result.

Respectfully yours,

G. W. McALISTER, *Chair. Selectmen.*

TESTIMONY OF GEORGE H. BAILEY, D. V. S.

By Mr. WALTON :

Q. I believe you made a report in full of what you found there in regard to the disease of those cattle didn't you?

A. Yes, sir; too full, some of them think, I believe. I endeavored to make a full and fair report of that trouble at Orono.

Q. How about that Kent bull?

A. That Kent bull was out of Princess Alba, and she was one of the very worst cases at Orono. We killed her in March, and she dropped the bull Kent had the previous June. And with the great amount of deposit she had in her lungs when we killed her—Gilbert said I was crazy to kill her—I do not think any sane man would advise even unofficially the use of that bull. His lungs percussed clear, but he had a staring coat that I didn't like the looks of; it stood out pretty well on him. When I saw him in July I do not think anybody would have discovered any apparent disease about him; but when I found he was out of Princess Alba I did not think it was possible that he was fit to serve.

At the time of my second visit to the College farm, March 12th, from among ten or twelve cows I had previously ordered

isolated from the others, I selected two Jersey cows, Princess Albee, No. 44, P. M., and Princess Alba, dam of the Kent bull, No. 27, P. M., (the latter I then regarded as a typical case,) and had them destroyed for post-mortem examination. Princess Alba had a temperature of  $103\ 3-5^{\circ}$ , marked emaciation, and dullness on percussion over the right lung, while auscultation clearly disclosed humid crackling or gurgling rales. The autopsy revealed an extraordinary amount of disease. The lung, pericardial and pleural membranes, were loaded with deposit, which hung like bunches of grapes, exhibiting a perfect case of what is known as "angle berries." In some parts there was scarcely a remnant of proper lung structure detectable, while others contained large tubercles filled with caseous material and also cavities connecting with bronchia, whose contents had been expectorated or absorbed. The glands in this case had attained enormous dimensions, the mediastinal weighing several pounds, and altogether the lesions were as extensive and varied as in any subsequent autopsy. Jersey Lilly (No. 28,) and Crummie, (No. 29,) page 102, were also out of Princess Alba.

That Kent bull was in bad condition enough, beyond any doubt on earth, to have transmitted it to his offspring, at the time he was killed, but I do not think an expert could have made out enough disease in that bull at the time I first saw him to condemn him. If I had examined that bull and found no trouble except in the lung, I should still say that he could have transmitted the disease to his offspring. He had enough in the lungs to transmit it. A bull can do a great deal more mischief in a year than a cow.

By Mr. ALLEN :

Q. Would you advise the killing of those other bulls that went out from the College farm if they could be found.

A. I would advise just as I always have. I would have them all inspected and killed if necessary. I would kill every one that showed the disease. I would not use one of them or advise any one else to do so under any circumstances,

because I know they were all out of thoroughly diseased dams and I do not think it is right and proper to use them for stock purposes.

By Mr. CORNISH :

Q. Tell the committee in your own way what took place between the Commissioners in regard to the Kent bull.

A. I was notified July 27th by an official notice from Mr. McAlister as chairman of the selectmen of Bucksport to come to Bucksport and see a bull bought from the College herd. I went and saw the Kent herd, and as I say to you, and stated to Gilbert on my return, the bull appeared well, and I put Kent off by saying I would go and consult Gilbert and see what could be done. I did not know what cow that bull was out of, and I immediately communicated with Gowell and found he was out of one of the worst cases there. I wrote to Gilbert and he thought the business didn't deserve a call from me ; he knew all about it before and said we had no proof that the animal was from diseased parentage. I sent Gowell's letter to Gilbert, that the calf was from one of the worst cases, supposing he might modify his view. He did not, however, and said a decision from me that the bull was diseased would bind the College to refund, and if Kent didn't want to use him he could sell him. I was taken sick in August and had a severe attack of sickness, confined to the house some six weeks, and in the meantime nothing was done about it. Finally I saw Gilbert, and Kent had written to me about it. Gilbert said he would speak to the Governor and Council about it and see what could be done. Nothing was done about it. Finally Kent sent me a letter, which I have here, with a request from Mr. McAlister that I would present that communication to the Governor and Council, which was on October 9th.

(Witness read letter from McAlister dated October 9th ; also letter dated October 8th ; as follows :)

BUCKSPORT, OCTOBER 9, 1886.

*Dear Sir:*—I enclose Mr. Kent's letter to you. I trust the matter will be disposed of at the next session of Governor and Council, that Mr. Kent may know what to do.

Respectfully yours,

G. W. McALISTER.

BUCKSPORT, October 8, 1886.

DR. BAILEY:

*Dear Sir:*—I have been informed that the Governor and Council meet the 14th of this month, and as nothing has been done in regard to that animal I bought of Mr. Gowell of the diseased herd of the State farm. I thought I would write you how I feel about the matter. I cannot believe those gentlemen can be so unjust as to try and make me lose that animal or so unwise as to have him kept in this, or any other county in the State. I shall be a great loser at the best. I shall lose one year's service of my own cows and their calves besides what I might have had from the public, for I dare not use him. I am a poor man, my farm is under one thousand dollars mortgage, and I have worked hard for twenty years grading up and buying such animals as I thought come within my reach, until I have a herd of Jerseys I feel proud of, and am not ashamed for any man to see, even Governor Robie and his Council, and to have them all swept away in two or three years by using that bull is more than I could bear; it would ruin me, for I am too old a man to begin again where I did begin twenty years ago, and I have not the means to do any different. If I had had means, I would have killed him long ago, but as it is, I have kept him in strict quarantine ever since the disease broke out on the State farm. He has not been allowed to go with any cattle of any kind, I have hauled water for him half a mile all through the drouth, fed him hay and grain all summer, believing something just and honorable would be done by the State officers.

I bought him in good faith, took the best of care of him, and to get an animal that would bring certain ruin upon myself and herd, according to the report to Governor Robie of the doctors at the State herd, is, I think, decidedly unjust and cruel in the extreme for a poor man without some recompense from some source. I do not know who may be liable, but it does look to me there is some one to back this whole thing and some one to make it good.

Brother Gilbert, Z. A., for such I will call him, for we both belong to the order of P. of H., advised me to keep him and use him; Mr. Gowell of the State farm did the same. Wonder if Mr. Gilbert would buy him for his own herd or for the College farm when they stock up again; if so, I will keep him for them. I do not know what the gentleman can be thinking about. It would be no worse to have another herd exterminated on the farm than to have two or three towns in Hancock county have this contagious disease and cost the State the same amount of money. There is too much risk in using him in any community, private or publicly, and he must be got out of the way some way or other (unless the State officers take the responsibility upon themselves).

I think it is a shame and imposition to advise the use of such an animal. We can scarcely take up a paper but we see something of this terrible scourge in some parts of our country, and thousands upon thousands of dollars is lost by its fatality, and shall we let it spread in our own beloved State when so small a sum (for I only ask for fifty dollars) and a little caution will put an end to the whole thing?

I think I have had great patience, for I have waited something like six months to know what disposition would be made with my case by the officers of the State, and it is but just and right for them to say what they will do or if they intend to try to throw the loss upon me. I want to know, when the Governor and Council meets, what they will do, that I may know how to act on my part.

The correspondence with the State officers has been done mostly by Mr. McAlister and Mr. Cunningham, our town officers; they have taken great interest in this matter that the disease should not spread in this community.

I have great respect for your gentlemanly visit at our place and I shall hold you in great esteem as a true and faithful officer of the State.

Hoping that this matter will be justly and honorably disposed of immediately, I will remain,

Very truly yours,

S. H. KENT.

Dr. BAILEY :

I presented Mr. Kent's letter to the Governor and Council and asked them for their advice about the matter, but they could only act as advisory to us, and the matter was finally

left to Mr. Hatch, as I understood it. Nothing was done about it until I received a letter from Mr. McAlister saying if the State would pay \$25 he would have the bull killed. I made that proposition to Gilbert and he would have nothing to do with it, and said he had no compromise to make. I told McAlister if he would take \$20 I would pay it myself for the privilege of seeing the lungs of the animal. He accepted my offer and sent the lungs to me by express. I sent a part of them to New York and kept a part of them myself until I could make use of them. I made a section and found some miliary deposits, and found tubercles in the lung. I sent the upper lobe of the lung to Dr. Michener. I have the letter stating what he found. I have more than one letter from him. I consulted him when my attention was first called to the bull and asked his opinion about it, and I received this letter in reply to it. (Witness reads letter.)

Dr. BAILEY, D. V. S.:

*Dear Sir:*—Your letter of 14th is received. I do not see how any one can advise the keeping of said bull for service.

It must be remembered that tuberculosis is held to be hereditary by all best authorities, both human and veterinary. If this be true, and I believe it to be so unquestionably, then this particular animal is certainly an unsafe sire, or to put it differently, is a sire almost certain to propagate the disease. He should be killed.

Mrs. M., is at present out of the city and my work for the Bureau of Agricultural Industry will, I fear, keep me from getting down to Maine this summer.

With kindest regards to all, I am,

Sincerely yours,

(Signed)

CH. B. MICHENER.

He also wrote me on November 19th. (Witness reads letter of that date.)

*My Dear Doctor:*—Your letter received. I do not remember what L. & L. was made to refer to, but most likely “lungs and lymphatic glands involved.” In some cases I used L. L., (without the &) to mean left lung. O. K. means all right, but I do not



remember now of any grown animals that were entirely free. Those two cases are probably an error then.

I am glad you wrote me concerning this, as it gives me an opportunity to say that by chance I saw a portion of lung left by you at the Am. Vet. College, said to be from the "Kent bull" (Dr. Liautard told me), a calf of one of the cows of Orono herd. These lungs show unmistakable lesions of tuberculosis. Why don't you hunt up all such bulls and have them destroyed? There can be but little doubt that they will all sooner or later develop this disease. They will serve to extend it in many herds when their services are required. The Com's and the State Veterinarian more than all will be, I think, directly responsible for every case of such extension. In the eyes of all veterinarians you will deserve censure if you fail to follow up each animal. They may yet be used as beef. Probably your hands are tied. I think this the case, for I know you well enough to judge that you are not one to avoid a duty, no matter how unpleasant.

With regards to all, I am,

Sincerely yours,

(Signed)

CH. B. MICHENER.

Dr. Michener was present at the College and acted with me when the herd was slaughtered. There were also two heifers out of Princess Alba that had been killed, Jersey Lily and Crummie, 28 and 29 of my post-mortem list. They were killed by Mr. Gowell previous to my knowing anything about the herd, in '85 some time, one in March, I think, and one later. Those are the two stiff-neck heifers, a symptom which they connected with a high trough. A wry neck is a symptom of tuberculosis. The glands in the neck become affected and it makes them carry their necks awry. I heard Gowell testify as to the stiff-neck heifers. I think they were suffering from tuberculosis, and their being out of Princess Alba more than confirms me in that opinion. I first knew where these other bulls were when Mr. Gowell gave the list to the committee the other evening. I had not known anything about them before that time. I had talked with Mr. Gilbert about it at my house, and had endeavored to have him tell me where they were if he knew; I do not know whether he knew or

not. I never asked him directly whether he knew where they were. I told him if he would show me the bulls I would agree to show tubercles in some of them, and eat them if I did not.

Q. State what took place at the meeting of the Board October 20th, at your house.

A. The three Commissioners came to my house. I had been sick, and we had quite a discussion over the subject of what should be done with those bulls. And I was very urgent that they should be inspected and something done about them, and Gilbert was just as urgent that nothing should be done about them, for which he gave two reasons; one was that we had no law that would enable us to have anything to do with them, and if we did we had no proof, only a suspicion that they were diseased. Those are the two positions he took. I told him I thought we had abundant proof after seeing the lungs of the dam he came from, and knowing that other animals from the same dam were thoroughly diseased, and I could not see it in any other light. We could not agree about it. The other two agreed with me, and there it hung. I told Gilbert in regard to the report that if he remained of that opinion I did not see how we could sign any report, knowing that he would not sign any I could make, and I could not sign any he would make; and the matter was left there, and nothing was said about it for some time afterwards. I offered to give him access to all my correspondence and authorities and let him and Bell make any report they liked and I would have nothing to do with it, or make a report of our whole proceedings, if he would sign my recommendation for the destruction of those bulls.

I also wrote Mr. Gilbert the following letters :

PORTLAND, September 12, 1886.

TO Z. A. GILBERT :

*Dear Sir:*—I am in receipt of your letter of the 18th, probably written before you received my second letter written yesterday, or you certainly would not say to me as you do that “we have no evi-

dence that this bull came from any other than sound parentage," as I enclose you Mr. Gowell's letter in reply to mine asking what cow was the dam of the young bull at Bucksport. After reading my letter of the 11th, if you still adhere to the same opinion, I shall abide by it for the present, but I know it will not satisfy the selectmen of Bucksport, of whom Mr. McAlister seems to be a very intelligent man, and fully disposed to press this case to a satisfactory conclusion. As to their call on me to attend this case, if "you do not think it warranted a visit from me," how am I to distinguish between what I ought to attend and those I had not? For I have never received a call apparently more in earnest than this one, and one in which I felt myself it was my duty to attend when I came to know the calf was from the herd at Orono.

His dam now proves to have been "Princess Alba," one of the worst, if not the very worst case at Orono, and her lungs presented all the lesions possible for tuberculosis to assume. This was the case Balentine told you I called a "beautiful case." I think now it is important that we agree upon some action to be taken, although if you still adhere to your present position, I cannot now see my way clear to do so, but I am willing to allow the matter to lie for the present or lay it before the Council for their opinion if you think well of so doing

We have so far encountered no criticism in our management of the Commission we cannot successfully defend, and as my term of office will probably expire with Governor Robie's "term of office" I would not like to make a mistake now.

I am yours sincerely,

GEO. H. BAILEY.

PORTLAND, October 29, 1886.

TO Z. A. GILBERT,

*Dear Sir:*—I am in receipt of yours of the 27th, containing four letters, three of which were from Etna and one from Kennebunkport, neither of which were sent for by me as they relate to matters which have been long since settled. If you will refer to my letter again you will notice that I specified three letters, the first from Scribner (which you asked to keep a little longer) the next from Mr. Gowell in relation to Kent's bull, and a postal from Mr. Chase. These are a part of my records, and may be of service to me. Mr.

Bell did call on me on Tuesday, and I showed him McAlister's letter, and while he fully agreed with me that the proposition was a liberal one on Mr. Kent's part, and ought to be settled, we were not at all sure we had a "quorum of the Board" as, if Mr. Ferguson is a member as he says he is (Governor Robie having continued his commission), we could not be certain whether he would concur with your views or ours, upon a final vote, although he said to me informally he thought every one of the young bulls should be killed or castrated. Consequently no action was taken officially, but another letter from Mr. Kent, requesting immediate action on his case, precipitated action upon my part, and rather than have any more disagreement or vexation about this case (and you still opposing any compromise whatever), I concluded to offer to Mr. McAlister to settle the matter upon my own private account, and am just in receipt of his letter of acceptance of my offer, and the bull will be killed at once. This action upon my part will in no way compromise the Commissioners, or commit them to any future action in regard to other cases that may arise similar to Mr. Kent's, after I am no longer a Commissioner. The cost of settling the matter as I have I shall regard of no consequence to me, compared to the result that will be attained, and I shall feel that I have discharged my duty, in the only case connected with the College farm that I have been allowed to know anything about. I can see no good to be accomplished by going over the ground, as regards our difference of opinion upon these particular cases, for they are so far apart that there is no probability that either of us could draw up a report that both of us would sign. Besides if Ferguson is still a member, you will have the legal and proper number (three) still upon the Board to make up a majority report. As for my own action about these cases, I am perfectly willing to await what develops and results, as the only vindication I shall need, either at the hands of the College or the State.

As soon as I can go to Orono to inspect the buildings, I will make you my final report of what I find, as Mr. Gowell writes me the dressing will all be moved from the cellar within a few days.

I am yours truly,

GEO. H. BAILEY, V. S.

PORTLAND, November 15, 1886.

TO Z. A. GILBERT :

*My Dear Sir:*—Your letter of Oct. 30th, was received during my absence from home, and since then I had learned you had gone East, so delayed writing you until after I had inspected the College buildings, which I have now done, returning home on Saturday. I believe every detail of recommendations, from both Dr. Micherner and myself, have been faithfully and honestly complied with, and that the stables are in safe condition as they can be made through the agency of disinfection to receive stock. In your letter of Oct. 30th, you say “you regret my decision very much, for you believe I am doing wrong.” As that is far from my intention, I wish you would write me wherein I am doing wrong.

Is it in settling the Bucksport case upon my own private account (after consulting with Mr. Bell, in which he fully concurred with me that some settlement ought to be made,) or in urging the settlement of all similar College cases upon the best terms possible? If the former, I have in no way compromised the State or the Commissioners, Mr. McAlister and myself each having agreed to pay the amount, to have the case disposed of; and if the latter, having your decision, both verbal and in writing (Oct. 20th,) that it is none of our business to hunt up such cases, and that (Oct. 27th,) “you know of no compromise ground you wish to take, and if you should yield to the majority you would still be unconvinced.” I have decided to take no farther action as Commissioner, and step aside, at a time when I can leave every case that has so far been called directly to the attention of our Board fully disposed of. In taking this step, I certainly hope I do not misunderstand you, Mr. Gilbert, upon any matters connected with the Commission, for while, personally, I have none other than the kindest feelings towards you, professionally, there is no earthly prospect of my being able to agree with you, and I cannot consent to remain upon the Board, to be regarded as a “disturber of the peace,” or as interfering with the College cases, either complicating their present embarrassments or their future prosperity. Having no desire to appear in such a role, “I had rather be right and retire, than be wrong and remain.” and I shall always believe my duties to the State to have been conscientiously and faithfully performed, after entering my earnest and official protest against keep-

ing for service any of the bulls that have been sold (within the last two years, from the College farm, whose dams we killed at Orono, and now known by us to have been thoroughly diseased, as the hereditary tendency of such animals would render them almost certain to propagate the disease. Not relying upon the theory of heredity, that appears capable of propagation from parent to progeny, by which we do not mean that actual diseased condition is necessarily propagated,) but more often is a diseased condition under trifling influences, to develop the disease or one like it. I am willing to abide by what has developed in the only case I have been allowed to see, what I advised before the animal was killed, as well as what has developed since the post-mortem of the bull at Bucksport, and which Mr. Gowell now tells me is the one he expected would first show lesions of the disease, as his dam was one of the worst cases at Orono. I believed it to be as much the duty of the Cattle Commissioners to prevent disease (when possible to do) as to stamp it out after it has made its appearance, and, in my opinion, it would be a god-send to the College, if all the outstanding cases could be settled upon as liberal terms as the one at Bucksport.

I return the letter you ask for (that of Oct. 27th) and if there are any others you have written me you would like to have I will return them, while I am willing to abide by any opinions or statements I have made to you as the only vindication I shall ever need for any act of mine while Commissioner of Maine.

G. H. BAILEY, D. V. S.

#### TESTIMONY OF SAMUEL BELL.

I reside in Deering. Have no business at present. Have been in the retail shoe business some thirty-nine years. I have carried on a farm some twenty-five years and had a stock of cattle during that time.

About the 18th of last October I received a notice from Mr. Gilbert that the Commission was to have a meeting on October 20th, in the evening, at Portland. I have it here and it is as follows :

## STATE OF MAINE.

BOARD OF AGRICULTURE. }  
 North Greene, October 15, 1886. }

Mr. BELL:—You are requested to meet the Board of Cattle Commissioners at City Hotel, Portland, Wednesday evening, October 20th, at seven o'clock.

Yours,

(Signed) Z. A. GILBERT, *President*.

I went there at the time appointed and found Messrs. Gilbert and Ferguson there, the commission of the latter having run out at that time. After being there a few minutes Mr. Gilbert said to me and Mr. Ferguson that he would like to have us go up into his room a few minutes. We went up, and when we were fairly seated in the room he said he wanted to prepare our minds for what was coming before us. It was the first intimation that I had but that the meeting was to be there. It seemed by his remark that it was not, but was to be somewhere else. He commenced by saying, in substance, that we were to meet at Dr. Bailey's and he wanted to prepare our minds before we went there for what we should probably hear when we got there, from Dr. Bailey, with reference to the bulls that had gone out from the College farm. He said Dr. Bailey was somewhat crazy on the subject, to have those bulls slaughtered; and he commenced by saying the bulls were well so far as he knew; that there was no reason why they should be slaughtered; there was no evidence that the dams were diseased when the calves were dropped, and, in fact, if they were, we had nothing to do with that; that there was no law that would give us authority to have anything to do with them, and he thought the best way was to let them alone. He talked until he expressed his mind fully bearing upon this point. Perhaps we were there half an hour. We then went to Dr. Bailey's house. Of course I had heard nothing before about the matter. It was news to me. After a few preliminary remarks at Dr. Bailey's, with reference to our meeting, the matter at once came up. Dr. Bailey asked Mr. Gilbert

what was going to be done with the bulls that had gone out from the College herd. Mr. Gilbert said, nothing; he did not know anything that could be done with them; that there was no evidence that the bulls were diseased. After talking a time in general terms with reference to them all, Dr. Bailey spoke of the Kent bull. He had been to see him. Mr. Gilbert told him that he had since understood that the Kent bull was sound and had been sound, and he didn't see as we had anything to do with him at all. Dr. Bailey made some further statements with reference to hearing from either Mr. Kent or Mr. McAlister, one of the selectmen of Bucksport—I think it was Mr. Kent—and after considerable talk between the two, it was finally brought down to the point, by Dr. Bailey, as to what was going to be done eventually with reference to the report, as the time was drawing near when the report was to be made. Dr. Bailey said: "If you take the ground you do, why, I cannot agree with you, for I certainly never could sign a report without advising that those bulls should be examined, and if found diseased they should be put out of the way." Mr. Gilbert said there was no occasion for that at all that he could see; that we had nothing to do with them; that the State did not call upon us to tell them what we had not done, but simply what we had done, and he saw no reason why we should refer to them at all. Dr. Bailey told him his conscience never would be clear to make a report without making reference to them. He thought it was absolutely necessary. He thought the disease could be scattered all through the country if they were allowed to be used for stock purposes while they came from such diseased parents as many of them did. He finally made a proposition to Mr. Gilbert. He said: "I will make a report and make these recommendations, which we can all sign, perhaps, or you may have my minutes and make a report to suit yourselves, and if Mr. Bell or Mr. Ferguson are disposed to sign it, all right." So the matter, so far as the bulls were concerned, closed. There was a great



deal more said there than I repeated, but it amounts to this, as I understand it. It closed up with the proposition of Dr. Bailey, which Mr. Gilbert neither accepted nor rejected, as I know of—that is, he did not propose to make any such report as Dr. Bailey desired, and he did not say he would make such a report as Dr. Bailey recommended him to make by taking his minutes.

I have had since that time at least two or three talks with Mr. Gilbert, and perhaps three or four. I went with him to South Waterboro', I think the next day after the meeting, to settle some matters there connected with a herd, and one or two of them were destroyed afterwards. I was not present at the destruction though, didn't know anything about it. I had a notice from Mr. Gilbert to go up there, but got it too late. But I did go up to settle the business with him, and at that time, in going and coming, we talked more or less with reference to these bulls that were out and other matters pertaining to disagreements between him and Dr. Bailey, and each and every time I talked with him he took one and the same ground—that he was totally opposed to anything being done with reference to the bulls that were out, unless it was under different circumstances than had thus far come before us. I signed the report made by Dr. Bailey. There is, perhaps, one point that I have omitted with reference to that meeting. When I started from the hotel with Mr. Gilbert and Mr. Ferguson I thought that Mr. Gilbert was probably right in his view of the matter; yet I questioned the propriety, for the paltry sum that the bulls were worth, whether or not it would be prudent to leave them scattered round through the country as they were. But I did not decide one way or the other at the hotel. After we got to Dr. Bailey's and I heard the evidence that he produced from his professional standpoint, that the bulls were diseased, I made up my mind then and there that it was not safe to let them remain as they were. After the conversation between Mr. Gilbert and Dr. Bailey, and

the argument between them was wound up by each saying all they wanted to in the matter, they referred the case to Mr. Ferguson and myself, to know what our opinions were. I decided with Dr. Bailey that I thought it was right that the bulls should be slaughtered and put out of the way, because it seemed to me from the evidence of Dr. Bailey, given from his professional standpoint, that they must be diseased, from the parentage from which they came. I never saw these cattle that were at the College farm and had no personal knowledge of them whatever. I do not know that I ever saw any cattle sick with this disease. When I signed this report of Dr. Bailey's I signed it measurably on his knowledge, but I cannot say wholly so, because I have read the disease up and have talked with some other veterinarians, but not to any great extent. Some little time after going to South Waterboro' with Mr. Gilbert I received a letter from Mr. Gilbert inclosing a letter that was sent to him by Dr. Bailey, and from him sent to me for me to read in connection with some remarks in his letter to me. In that he referred to the bulls, with reference to Dr. Bailey's feelings to him; and there were some remarks in the letter with reference to what his views were. The letter is here. (The letter was read by the Chairman and is as follows :)

NORTH GREENE, Oct. 25, 1886.

BRO. BELL:—I inclose letter within from Dr. B. which, after reading his "proposition", you will please return to me. I have to request that you see the Dr. and talk the matter over with him as you think. You need not let him know I have written you, or that you have seen his letter. You may say to him I go to Washington county Wednesday, to return on Saturday. I think there has been about fooling enough over the Bucksport matter and I want it dried up. I never can consent to have anything to do with the matter further than as advisory to Mr. Kent.

Yours truly,

(Signed)

GILBERT.

Mr. BELL :—

After receiving that letter I went to see Dr. Bailey, and the first question he asked me was whether I had heard from Mr. Gilbert, saying that he had written him a letter and had received no answer. I explained it to him by saying he had gone away. He said, "Have you received a letter from him?" I evaded the question at the time, for I did not feel as though I ought to inform him, but was finally obliged to do so or tell an absolute lie, and I told him I had received a letter from Mr. Gilbert, and told him what the letter contained. I immediately wrote to Mr. Gilbert saying I had seen Dr. Bailey and Dr. Bailey had cornered me so I had to explain that I had heard from him (Mr. Gilbert). Some little time after that I received a letter from Mr. Gilbert saying that he wanted me to assist in making up the report, and in substance that the legislature was anxious to have a report from the Commission, and he had written Dr. Bailey and wanted me to meet him at Woodford's Corner and go into the city with him, and then, with Dr. Bailey, to go to Augusta and make out the report of the doings of the Commission. I met Mr. Gilbert at the depot at the appointed time, and he got off the train. I said: "You are not going into the city?" He said, no, it was no use; he had heard from Dr. Bailey and he did not propose to make any report with him, refused to make any report. We went into the depot and had some little talk before the train arrived, and then he got on and came back. In the conversation he asked me if I would go down to Augusta with him. I told him that I did not feel willing to sign such a report as he proposed to make; that I believed Dr. Bailey's suggestion was a proper one, and I could not conscientiously sign a report without referring to these bulls that had gone out from the College herd; I thought they ought to be put out of the way and it seemed to be the duty of the Commissioners to at least recommend it. He said we had nothing to do with it; that it was none of our business; that no evidence of their being diseased was before us, and he

used the same language or similar language to that which he used at our meeting with Dr. Bailey. I said: "Well, there is one thing about it, I never have signed any report that has been made. You have never requested me to do it, and I do not feel as if I could go this one if I would." He told me he did not know what he should do, as nobody but himself felt so about it. As he and I were the only other ones on the Commission he thought it was my duty to go with him and sign the report. I told him I could not do it conscientiously. He said: "There is one thing about it; if you do not do it I think the Commission will be broken up, and my opinion is that they will put the State Board of Health on the Commission." I said, "Very well, I shall accept the situation whatever it may be. I don't propose to do it." He urged me very strongly, and finally he said he wanted me to come down Thursday morning and sign it if I would. If not he would go down and make the report. I told him if I changed my mind I would come, and unless I did, I gave him to understand that I should not. In conversation with him then, in speaking of Dr. Bailey and the bulls that had gone out from the College herd, I said: "You know what was done with the Kent bull, I suppose? You know Dr. Bailey paid twenty dollars out of his own pocket and had that bull killed. I understand, besides, that the lungs of the bull were sent to him and that he found unmistakable evidences of disease, and he was not satisfied with that, or in other words wanted more evidence, and he sent a part of the lungs to New York and has since had testimony from veterinarians there that examined the lung that there were unmistakable traces of tuberculosis in the bull." I don't remember whether Mr. Gilbert said he was aware of the fact or not, but I told him as I understood it from Dr. Bailey. When I told him of the Kent bull I remember that he remarked something like this, that if Dr. Bailey had minded his own business there would have been no trouble with the Kent bull. He felt, as I understand him to say,

that Dr. Bailey had busied himself and had really made trouble unnecessarily; that if he had kept quiet there would have been no trouble about it. I have here the letter which I received dated January 13th. (The letter was read by the Chairman, and is as follows:)

SKOWHEGAN, JAN. 13, 1887.

Br. BELL:—Meet me at station on down Lewiston train on Monday next, and go into Portland station with me. The legislature is in a stew over the fact that we have not made a report. It must be done at once. I have written the doctor to this effect, and have asked him to be at the station and go to Augusta and fix it up.

Write by Saturday mail that I may know what to depend upon.

Yours,

(Signed)

GILBERT.

Mr. BELL:

I met him at the station the following Monday, the 17th, and had the conversation with him which I have stated. I also received from him letter dated February 8, 1887.

(This letter was read in evidence, and is as follows:)

STATE OF MAINE.

BOARD OF AGRICULTURE, }  
North Greene, Feb. 8, 1887. }

Br. BELL:—I was surprised to find you mixed up with the mischief connected with that cattle disease matter. I don't know how to account for it on the estimate I have held of you, and after what you had said to me. I am sadly shocked over it.

I hope to see you at the Farmers' Institute at City Hall next Tuesday. I am now at liberty to reveal a secret bearing on yourself. Hoping to meet you, I am,

Yours,

(Signed)

Z. A. GILBERT.

I remember perfectly in the conversation that evening that Dr. Bailey indirectly asked where the bulls were, or in other words he said: "If you will tell me where those bulls are I can prove to you or show to you that some at least of those

bulls will give evidence of disease." That was the idea that he presented. Mr. Gilbert replied that he had nothing to do with that; he did not, at any rate, tell him where they were. He did not tell Bailey that he had information as to where the bulls were at that time.

#### TESTIMONY OF WILLIAM B. FERGUSON.

I was a member of the Cattle Commission up to September 25th. I reside in Brewer and am a farmer. I received a letter from Mr. Gilbert about the middle of March. I suppose that letter is in Monroe, where I lived before moving to Brewer. He wrote me about the middle of March saying that he supposed I had learned through the papers then that there was difficulty with the herd of cattle at Orono. And he said when I was in Bangor I had better, at my convenience, go up, or he would like to have me go up and look them over. That is the purport of the letter. I went up alone the 18th of March and examined the cattle. I stopped over night and was there a part of two days, the 18th and 19th, and went back to Monroe. I saw the herd. The new barn contained the most of them, and as far as looks went they were in good condition. I noticed a cough about them. I knew enough about cattle to know that that cough was not right. The cough itself would be strange for well animals. I do not think well animals are afflicted with a cough. I had never before noticed creatures with a cough such as I saw there. The cough was all I should have noticed about the cattle in the new barn, and it was evident to me that something wrong produced it. They had a bad cough and were badly emaciated. I had never seen those symptoms in cattle before, that I am aware of, not of that disease. No one was with me except Mr. Gowell. From every appearance upon examination I was satisfied beyond the possibility of a doubt that those in the smaller barn were badly diseased. After I returned from there I wrote to Mr. Gilbert that I had been up and I thought the quicker those isolated cattle were killed

the better. I received a notice from Mr. Gilbert about the time of the slaughter, immediately before, saying that a veterinary, Micherner his name is, was coming there, and he would like to have me there also; that he and Dr. Bailey should be there. I did not get the notice to enable me to be there sooner than the second day of the slaughter, in the morning, the 23d, I think. Probably half of them were killed after I got there. I examined those animals and saw them dissected. I also examined the lungs of several killed the day before. The worst cases were killed the first day, and it was surprising to me that they could live in the condition in which I found their lungs. I said to Mr. Gilbert those cattle better be killed, the sooner the better. The cattle killed the second day showed different degrees of the disease. As far as I know they were all diseased. A few days before the 20th of last October I received a communication from Mr. Gilbert saying he would like to have me meet him the 20th of October in Portland, at a meeting of the Board. I went. After I got there I learned from Dr. Bailey that our commissions had expired, his and mine. They had expired a month before that meeting and there had been no re-appointment at that time. I had understood that Dr. Bailey was unwell and it was desirable to meet at his house. I and Mr. Gilbert and Mr. Bell met at the City Hotel. We had some conversation there principally in regard to the extermination of those bulls that had gone out from the College farm. I had not seen the Commissioners before since April. We went over to Dr. Bailey's house, and Dr. Bailey and Mr. Gilbert had a lively argument about following up those bulls and having them destroyed. Dr. Bailey contended that they should be looked after and destroyed and Mr. Gilbert objected to it, saying that there was no proof that they were diseased, and that the law gave no authority. I always received my notice to meet with the Commissioners for any purpose from Mr. Gilbert. In one or two cases I acted without notice from anybody except the municipal officers. Dr. Bailey was chosen Secretary of the Board, and I understood his duties to be to

keep a record of our doings, the same as the secretary of any other board.

Q. Did you come to any conclusion at Portland as to what was best to do with the stock that was out?

A. I was out myself then by the expiration of my commission, and of course I was not very officious. Mr. Gilbert is a member of the Board *ex-officio* and needs no appointment. Subsequent to our first appointment another was added to the Commission, making four on the Board. When I got to Portland on October 20th I had a consultation in Mr. Gilbert's room at the City Hotel, with Mr. Gilbert and Mr. Bell, before we went to Dr. Bailey's house. Mr. Gilbert invited us to his room. Mr. Gilbert said he wanted to prepare our minds for something that we should get from Dr. Bailey; he wanted to prepare our minds for something that Dr. Bailey was crazy on, to use his phrase. He said he was crazy on those outstanding bulls. We conversed in his rooms thirty minutes in regard to that, then we went to Dr. Bailey's house and talked the matter over there. I was of the opinion that those bulls should have been before taken care of. I agreed with Dr. Bailey in that particular and have signed the report which he has made to the legislature. Mr. Bell, the other Commissioner, also agreed in the propriety of the destruction of the bulls and also signed the report. I saw the Kent bull in Bucksport on October 22d. Dr. Bailey said in Portland that inasmuch as I lived near by I had better go down and see the bull and the party who owned him. Think the matter of that bull was talked over on the 20th of October. I examined that bull the 22d. He was in fair condition as to flesh, but not fleshy enough for beef. He had a staring coat and I did not like the expression of his countenance, things that I should not call just right. I have had considerable to do with cattle and horses and I can judge as quickly of the healthfulness or unhealthfulness by the looks of their eyes as by most anything. I told Kent that I should not use the bull. At our meeting on the 20th of



October, Mr. Gilbert said there was no evidence that the bull was diseased that he knew of. Dr. Bailey stated at that time that the bull was out of one of the worst diseased cows that were killed in the previous April. I understood that Mr. Gilbert was opposed to having anything to do with the Kent bull. I saw Mr. Gilbert here at the opening of the legislature, and I understood him to say that Dr. Bailey had no business to go down to Bucksport when he did to make the examination. I think he disputed my right to fees for going down there on the same errand. I understood him to say that the Board had nothing whatever to do with the Kent bull. I asked him at that time if he was not going to make a report, and I think he said he didn't know. I spoke to him about it here in this room, the first day of the session of the legislature. It was my opinion and advice in Portland that those bulls should be taken in charge and killed; I thought they had better not be propagating their kind.

Q. You thought it was Mr. Gilbert's duty as Cattle Commissioner to gather them up?

A. I haven't said anything about that.

Q. What is your opinion?

A. I think it was more the duty of the Trustees of the College than anybody else's. I knew bulls were sold from the farm, but I knew nothing about them. The first I knew that the bulls had been sold from the farm was when I was in Portland. I agreed in Portland that the bulls had better be called in. Mr. Bell and Mr. Gilbert discussed considerably in Portland the question of whether or not there was a law allowing or providing for calling in the bulls. I might have expressed an opinion that the Commissioners might not have authority to take animals and kill them unless there was some evidence of disease. I do not understand that we have a law authorizing the Cattle Commissioners to go out and destroy an animal after it has been pronounced sound by proper authorities. I understand there is law by which the Trustees could call these cattle in—the law that they them-

selves do business there by. When I saw Kent he was very anxious to get rid of his bull.

Q. Unless there was evidence of disease in these cattle when they were sold, would you consider that the College was under any obligation to buy them back than an individual would be?

A. Yes, I should, those animals, because they sold them.

Q. If you had sold an animal that was sound and you knew of no disease upon him or in the herd, and the disease afterwards developed in the herd and your cattle were destroyed, would you consider you were obliged to go and buy the cattle you had sold in a sound condition and that were still in sound condition?

A. If that disease could be traced back to the breeding animal I should consider I was under both moral and legal obligation to take him back.

Q. But that question as to whether it is traceable back is an open question, isn't it?

A. Perhaps so. I do not understand it is so among experts. I understand by veterinary authorities that it is hereditary.

Q. Do you understand that there is any certainty of how this disease developed in this herd of cattle at Orono?

A. By contagion and by heredity both. I understand there is no other way by which it can be propagated. I understand that these cattle were brought from different herds. Some got it probably by contagion, others by heredity.

Q. Then would you search out the bulls where there was a hereditary tendency and leave those where the dam died from contagion? How would you distinguish there?

A. I should say that the strong probability was that those bulls were unsound and unsafe from hereditary tendencies.

Q. We will say here is a cow brought into the herd at the College; that cow drops a bull one year prior to this contagion; that bull is sold at three months old and goes out. Afterwards that cow takes this contagion from the rest of the

cattle and dies. Do you think the College is under any moral legal obligation to call in that bull?

A. Perhaps not. If there is no suspicion of the bull I do not know any reason why they should take him back. But these bulls bred from cows diseased while they were carrying the calves I should say the College was under obligation to take back.

Q. As matter of fact, is there any certainty that any of these cows were diseased when they carried these calves four years ago?

A. I could not tell that. I understand that the Kent bull was really diseased. Dr. Bailey and Dr. Micherner are my authority.

TESTIMONY OF G. W. MCALISTER, MUNICIPAL OFFICER  
OF BUCKSPORT.

Was called upon by Mr. Kent in regard to his bull. In March, 1886, called on me to write to the Superintendent of College farm about the matter. Thought the bull not fit for breeding purposes. He said he bought it for that purpose. Mr. Gowell advised the keeping and use of the bull. Mr. Gilbert wrote to him to use the bull, but I still advised him not to use him, as it might result in the slaughtering of his herd and perhaps others in town. In July he notified me he had a diseased bull and I at once notified Dr. Bailey. Dr. B. advised Mr. Kent not to use the bull, decidedly.

TESTIMONY OF DR. J. F. WINCHESTER, D. V. S.

Q. If you were called in a case and condemned a cow which unmistakably had this disease, would you recommend to the people of Maine to follow out the progeny of that cow clear down to the second or third generation, whether apparently well or not?

A. That has been my practice in individual cases. Of course, officially we do not do it. That is, we have not done it.

The outbreak in Orono was the most rank of any that I ever knew or read of. What I know of this is gained by reading. It is the most virulent case I have ever known. So far as the milk is concerned, I do not think there is any doubt that the milk contained the germ of tuberculosis if the udders were diseased.

Q. And it was on that basis that you made this recommendation in your last report to the Massachusetts legislature: "The milk and beef of any animals in any stage of this disease should be proscribed, as it is transmittible to man." And those are your sentiments?

A. Yes sir. The largest percentage of these diseased animals are found above five years.

Q. What are the symptoms of disease before that time—from two to four years?

A. You would have a cough,—that is usually the first symptom; you might have a staring look, an unhealthy appearance to the skin, a lameness, or from very careful observation you would find some of the lymphatic glands on the outside enlarged. A cough is not a necessary part of the disease. The disease can exist in other parts of the body without the cough. I deem it wise to crush the disease out as fast as it can be located. I think it a dangerous disease among cattle, and, more or less, the human race. I have heard considerable about the case at Orono and have kept run of it.

Q. There was a herd of fifty-one animals, and over forty were found to have this disease in one stage or another. Would you have deemed it prudent to scatter those animals or any of them among the farmers of this State for use?

A. On general principles I would not. On general principles I do not think it would be a wise thing to do. It is a pretty hard question to answer whether the action of the Commissioners was wise or not in causing the cattle at Orono to be killed as they were, but if I had found a herd at our State College in the same condition I should have made the same recommendation.

Q. Supposing you had a mother of a bull calf killed, and it was found to be in this condition, lungs loaded with deposits of virus, large abscesses in cavities, bronchial glands greatly enlarged, age eight years. Is that, or not, an advanced stage?

A. It is. I would expect a calf dropped by that cow to have the same tendency. There is a predisposition to it, hereditarily. I would not deem it advisable to use that calf for breeding purposes. With my individual clients I have recommended that such calves be killed. The disease can be transmitted from the bull just the same.

Q. If you found that in a herd of forty-nine, forty-seven were found to have this disease, and you learned that eleven bull calves had been sold to various people about the State, coming from this herd, would you, or not, recommend the killing of those bull calves?

A. I think I should. I should deem that a wise and prudent thing, necessary for the safety of the herds of the State.

Q. If four bulls were brought here of the first generation of the cattle that were killed, ranging from two to four years old, and they are slaughtered and no signs of tuberculosis are found in them, does that argue necessarily that the others are not affected?

A. No, sir, it does not.

Q. Well, notwithstanding the fact that it shows itself sometimes in the second generation, you would not take the chances of killing the descendants of those bulls, if you found them in a healthy condition?

A. No, sir.

Q. We understand you that it is not always hereditary?

A. No, sir; there are exceptions.

Q. My point is that, being at the age they are, they might not, if killed now, show symptoms of the disease; and at a later period in life these same animals might exhibit signs of the disease?

A. That is it exactly.

Q. It is impossible to say which one of these bulls will show, and which will not, without a post-mortem examination indications of the disease?

A. You might have some physical examination, but it would be safer to have a post-mortem one.

Q. Could you tell by a physical examination in a mild case?

A. No, sir.

Q. It has been asked here if a bull that came out of a cow from two to four years old might not have been bred from a healthy cow. The facts are these. The mother of these bulls were killed and found diseased, and their off-spring from two to four years killed at the same time and every one found to be diseased.

A. If the off-spring of these cows killed were found to be diseased, and they were older than the bull now living or were at least within six or nine months of his age, I should recommend the destruction of this bull.

#### TESTIMONY OF GILBERT M. GOWELL.

I reside at Orono at the State College farm. Have been on that farm four years last April. I have had the care of the stock in question during that time. Think it was in November, '85, that I first discovered any apparent signs of disease among the herd. Think in all there were forty-six in the herd at that time. Think there were twenty-six cows and two bulls. The rest were young, heifers and bulls, except the steers, too young to come into milk. Sixteen were imported Jerseys and sixteen Maine State Jerseys; eight were Shorthorns.

The money to buy the present herd of cattle did not come from the State by appropriation. The farm committee communicates to me the wishes of the Trustees. No one except Mr. Gilbert has helped me buy cattle. Other moneys besides that I let them have went into purchasing fancy stock. Trustees loaned \$1,000 to buy stock. The College has owed me

\$3,400 or \$3,600. Has been reduced to \$2,600. Should estimate that \$2,500 might now be owed towards the stock.

Don't feel it necessary to have Trustees called on. Dr. Wilde gave no hint of contagious disease. Can't say if any disease existed or has in herds from which we have purchased.

I have looked after the accounts of the farm. Have that \$2,504.25 was paid for cattle bought by myself and Mr. Gilbert by order of the Trustees.

The dams in the herd were reported by Dr. Bailey except in one instance. The Kent bull was sold from the farm to Mr. Kent of Bucksport. Two other bulls sold had the same sire. Had correspondence with Mr. Kent. Advised him to retain and use the bull after the disease at Orono broke out. Princess Alba was bad when killed. None of her offspring in existence.

#### TESTIMONY OF E. E. PARKHURST.

I am a farmer and reside at Presque Isle. I have been one of the Trustees of the State College two or two and one-half years. I have attended every meeting of the Trustees since my appointment except the first. I was at the farm three or four times after my appointment up to the time I was called there when the herd was slaughtered. I was called there this last summer. I was called there and arrived either Tuesday or Wednesday morning, and the cattle were slaughtered the next day, or half of them were. I examined the herd at that time. They were then separate. The herd in the new barn was in good condition, as good as I ever saw it in, I think; but there were six or eight animals that had been separated and taken into the horse stable, that were not looking so well, looking perhaps about as well as our ordinary farm stock does through the country. I heard them cough. The indications at that time did not show any disease I was acquainted with. I probably would not have known they were diseased by looking at them. I noticed that the cattle in the other barn coughed. I was there the day before they

were slaughtered and in the barn three or four times, and I heard them cough every time. From the light I got from examining the cattle I came to the conclusion it was best to slaughter the herd. I was in doubt as to a few of them in which they could not discover the disease. I think they were all killed. I was not there when they were all slaughtered. I examined some after they were slaughtered and saw indications of tuberculosis. Think I looked at the lungs of every animal that was slaughtered that day. I had no acquaintance with that disease before that time. Should say I was notified of the disease about a month before the slaughter. I met Mr. Burleigh there the day of the slaughter. I do not want to state this as a fact, but my impression is that Mr. Burleigh said to me like this: Mr. Parkhurst, I hope this thing will be thoroughly investigated—the cause of this disease and everything connected with it shown up. And I agreed with him in that. I now think it would have been wise to collect and slaughter the eleven bulls that have been mentioned here as having gone out from the farm in the time previous to that. I should not want to breed from them. I do not recollect that Mr. Burleigh said or intimated at that time that he thought there was any provision by which the College could buy in those bulls. I think no one intimated that it was the duty of the College to buy up those bulls. I understood that the Cattle Commissioners had the matter in charge at that time. I did not understand that the Governor and Council had any authority in the matter. Part of the Council was there and I think advising. When I was summoned there I supposed the Trustees would have something to do with it. After arriving there I learned better than that. I found that the whole thing was in the hands of the Cattle Commissioners and that the trustees were powerless. I went home that night and was not there the second day when they finished slaughtering. I understood that the Trustees had no right to interfere after the Cattle Commissioners had taken it in hand. I did not understand that the Trustees had any right to go and purchase back those bulls.



## "POST-MORTEM" NOTES OF COLLEGE HERD.

Pansy, I, (No. 1.) Cyst in centre of left lung. Apex affected, right filled with miliary tubercles. Age eight years. Bred in Bowdoin. Dam, Model. Produce, Mildred, (No. 2, P. M.) Hyacinthe, (No. 3,) and a bull calf that was affected and coughed when but three days old.

Mildred, I, (No. 2.) Adhesions of both lungs to costal pleura, badly affected. Age five years. Bred in Bowdoin. Dam, Pansy, (No. 1.) Produce, "Mildretta of Orono," (No. 4,) and bull sold, now coming three years old, both bred on College farm.

Hyacinthe, I, (No. 3.) Both lungs affected; tubercles in right; age four years; bred in Bowdoin. Dam, Pansy, (No. 1;) produce, "Gray Nose," (No. 47.)

Mildretta of Orono, (No. 4.) Affected with tubercles; age one year. Dam, Mildred, (No. 2;) bred on College farm.

"Helen Hart," (No. 5.) Both lungs and mammary glands affected, so that her milk was tainted; age eight years; bred on College farm. Dam, "Hepsy Hart;" grand-dam, Hebe. Produce, heifer calf, (No. 6,) and two bulls, coming three and four years old, both bred on College farm.

Helen's calf, (No. 6.) Affected with miliary deposits in both lungs; age eight months. Dam, "Helen Hart," (No. 5;) bred on College farm.

"Hesta Hart of Orono," (No. 7.) Affected with tubercles and cough; age one year. Dam, "Hesta Hart;" grand-dam, "Hebe;" bred on College farm. "Hesta Hart" died in giving birth to "Hesta Hart of Orono."

"Hugo Pauline," (No. 8.) Affected with tubercle in right lung size of hen's egg; age seven years; bred on College farm. Dam, "Pride of Lachine;" grand-dam, Hebe. "Hugo Pauline" was sold from the herd when one week old, passed through several hands, and was re-purchased by Mr. Gowell in January, 1885.

Collie, I, (No. 9.) Right lung affected with tubercles; age nine years; bred in Winthrop. Produce, Tinney, (No. 10,) and Collie, 2d, (No. 13.)

Tinney, I, (No. 10.) Both lungs affected with tubercles; age seven years; bred in Winthrop. Dam, Collie, (No. 9.) Produce, Eizeletta (No. 11,) Tinetta, (No. 14,) Tinney's calf, (No. 15,) and bull sold now coming three years old.

Eizeletta, I, (No. 11.) Tubercle (size of hen's egg) in right lung. Left lung affected; age five years; bred in Winthrop. Dam, Tinny, (No. 10.) Produce, Blanch (No. 12) and "bull calf" (No. 16½.)

Blanch, (No. 12.) Both lungs badly affected. "Grapes" (angle berries) and abscess in right lung; age three years; bred on College farm. Dam, Eizeletta, (No. 11.) Produce, (No. 16,) bull calf, affected, coughed badly and debilitated.

"Collie 2d," (No. 13.) Thyroid and maxillary glands affected; age two years; bred on College farm. Dam, Collie, (No. 9.) No produce.

Tinetta, (No. 14.) Glands affected; coughed: age one year; bred on College farm. Dam, Tinney, (No. 10.)

"Tinney's calf," (No. 15.) Parotid glands affected, coughed badly and emaciated; age three month; bred on College farm. Dam, Tinney, (No. 10.)

"Blanch's calf," (No. 16.) Glands affected, stiff neck; age nine months. Dam, Blanch, (No. 12.) Bred on College farm.

"Eizeletta's calf," (No. 16½.) Coughed badly; age ten months. Dam, Eizeletta, (No. 11.) Coughed badly; age ten months. Dam, (11.) Bred on College farm.

Highland Benne, (No. 17.) Badly affected in both lungs and liver. Age six years; bred at Bowdoinham; purchased in 1882. Produce, Edith, (No. 18,) and bull, sold, now coming three years old. Bred on the farm.

Edith, (No. 18.) Both lungs badly affected, and pleural adhesions to ribs; age three years. Dam, Highland Belle, 2d, (No. 17.) Bred on College farm.

“Belle of West Meadows,” I, (No. 19.) Affected with tubercles in both lungs; age eleven years; imported in her dam from the Isle of Jersey. Produce, “Maid of West Meadows,” (No. 20,) and one bull, sold; bred on College farm.

“Maid of West Meadows,” I, (No. 20.) Affected with tubercles; age four years; bred in Rockland.

Dam, “Belle of West Meadows,” (No. 19.) Produce, Flossy, (No. 22.)

“Belle of West Meadows’ calf,” (No. 21.) Glands affected; coughed badly; age eight months. Dam, “Belle of West Meadows,” (No. 19.) Bred on the farm.

Flossy, (No. 22.) Lamé in left shoulder; right lung greatly affected with large abscess, left lung and bronchial glands also much affected; age two years; bred on College farm. Dam, “Maid of West Meadows,” (No. 20.) No produce.

Tulip 4th, I, (No. 23.) Large tubercle in right lung, both affected; age eight years; bred at Old Town. Produce, Tulip’s heifer calf, (No. 24,) Berry, (No. 49,) and one bull, sold, now coming four years old; bred on College farm.

Tulip’s calf, (No. 24.) Glands affected, with cough; age four months. Dam, Tulip 4th, (No. 23.) Bred on College farm.

Thresa, (No. 25.) Tubercular deposits in both lungs; age three years; bred on College farm. Dam, Rose 6th, (No. 48.) Produce, heifer calf, (No. 26.) Rose 8th was killed in 1885.

“Thresa’s calf,” (No. 26.) Miliary deposit in both lungs; age five months. Dam, Thresa, (No. 25;) bred on the College farm.

“Princess Alba,” I, (No. 27.) Lungs loaded with deposit, angle berries, large abscess and cavities, with bronchial glands greatly enlarged; age eight years; purchased in Rockland. Produce, Jersey Lily (No. 28,) Crummie, (No. 29,) and the Kent bull.

“Jersey Lily,” I, (No. 28.) Stiff neck, emaciated and bad cough; age two years and nine months; purchased in Rockland. Dam, “Princess Alba,” (No. 27.) Killed by Mr. Gowell in March, 1885.

Crummie, (No. 29.) Adhesion to costal pleura on left side, both lungs affected; age about two years. Dam, “Princess Alba,” (No. 27;) no produce; bred on College farm.

Juno 2d, I, (No. 30.) Sold to Mrs. Stetson of Bangor. Purchased in Auburn in 1883, when two years old. Dam, Effie. Produce, Susie, (No. 31,) and two bulls, sold, all bred on College farm.

Susie, (No. 31.) Both lungs affected with miliary deposits. Age two years. Dam, Juno, (No. 30.) Bred on College farm.

Julette, I, (No. 32.) Both lungs affected with tubercles, also lymphatic glands. Age seven years. Purchased in Auburn of Briggs and Son. Dam, Pet; produce, Brownie, (No. 33.)

Brownie, (No. 33.) Stiff neck, glands enlarged, both lungs affected; age two years and three months. Dam, Julette, (No. 32.) Bred on College farm; killed by Mr. Gowell in March, 1885.

“Gray Nose,” (No. 34.) Stiff neck, lungs badly affected, emaciation and cough; age two years and six months. Dam, Hyacinthe, (No. 3;) no produce. Bred on College farm; killed by Mr. Gowell in March, 1885.

Betsey, I, (No. 35.) One of the worst cases of tubercular formations and abscess at Orono, both lungs affected. Bought by Mr. Gowell in Augusta, in 1883; killed in January, 1886. Produce, Nan Lizzie, (No. 36.)

“Nan Lizzie,” (No. 36.) Right lung badly affected with tubercles and cavities; age two years. Bred on College farm; no produce.

Clover, I, (No. 37.) Both lungs affected with tubercles; age fourteen years. Bred in Brunswick; produce, Clover's Pet, (No. 38,) and Hattie, sold three years ago when a calf.

“Clover’s Pet,” (No. 38.) Slightly affected in left lung, calcareous deposit in bronchial glands; age two years. Dam, Clover, (No. 37.) Bred on College farm; produce, Clover’s Pet’s calf, (No. 39.)

“Clover’s Pet’s calf,” (No. 29.) Tubercles in both lungs, bad cough; age eight weeks. Dam, Clover’s Pet, (No. 38.) Bred on College farm.

Pet, I, (No. 40.) Large tubercles and abscess, both lungs badly affected; age fourteen years; bred in Bowdoin, and bought by Mr. Gowell in 1882; produce, Old Pet’s calf, (No. 41) and one bull, sold, now coming four years old; killed by Mr. Gowell, Feb. 21st, 1886.

“Old Pet’s calf,” (No. 41.) Lungs affected, bad cough; age nine months. Dam, Old Pet, (No. 40.) Bred on College farm.

Juno, I, (No. 42.) Large abscess in right lung; left generally affected; age eleven years; purchased in Rockland; no produce.

Mollie, I, (No. 43.) Right lung affected with tubercles of the size of a hen’s egg; age six years; bred in Howland; purchased in 1885.

Princess Alice, I, (No. 44.) Lungs studded with miliary tubercles, calcification of bronchial lymphatic glands; age five and one-half years; killed March 11th; bred in Bowdoin.

Bess Pet, I, (No. 45.) Both lungs affected; two years old. Dam, Bess; bred on College farm.

Augusta Boy, I, (No. 46.) Affected with tubercles in both lungs; age four years; bred in Augusta, and placed in the herd September, 1885.

Maggie 3d. (No. 47.) Emaciated and coughed badly; age twelve years; bred on College farm; killed by Mr. Gowell in the autumn of 1884.

Rose 8th, (No. 48.) Shorthorn Herd Book cow; refused to breed, and was sold to a butcher, and her lungs found badly affected; bred at Stark, and bought with her dam when but a few days old; killed by Mr. Gowell; produce, Thresa, (No. 25.)

Berry, (No. 49 ) Thoroughbred Shorthorn steer ; glands affected ; coughed ; age two years. Dam, Tulip 4th, (No. 23 ; ) bred on College farm.

Bright, (No. 50.) Thoroughbred Shorthorn steer ; glands affected, with bad cough ; age nineteen months ; purchased when four days old.

Roan Heifer, (No. 51.) Glands affected, and coughed ; age three months ; purchased when three days old at Old Town.

The dams of eleven of the "bulls sold" from the farm are : "Helen Hart," No. 5, the dam of two ; Collie, No. 9, the dam of one ; Belle of West Meadows, No. 19, the dam of one ; Mildred, No. 2, the dam of one ; Highland Belle, 2d, No. 17, the dam of one ; Tulip, 4th, No. 23, the dam of one ; Old Pet, No. 40, the dam of one ; Princess Alba, No. 27, the dam of the "Kent bull ;" Juno 2d, No. 30, the dam of two.

The post-mortem report I furnish above has been the result of considerable labor to prepare, but I believe it will well repay every one interested, to give it a careful perusal, as bearing directly upon the young bulls that have been sold from the College farm. Take the "Hebe" family as an example : I regard Hebe as a typical case, and the real "skeleton in the closet" of the College cases. "Helen Hart," No. 5, is the dam of two bulls sold from the farm, now coming three and four years old. "Helen Hart" was out of Hepsy Hart and she out of Hebe. "Hesta Hart of Orono," No. 7, was out of "Hesta Hart" and she out of Hebe. "Hugo Pauline," No. 8, was out of "Pride of Lachine," and she out of Hebe. "Helen's calf," No. 6, was out of "Helen Hart," grand-dam Hebe, and Hebe is the old Jersey cow that refused to breed, and which Mr. Rich sold for \$22, she having cost the State a few years before \$250.

Try the "Collie" family by the same test, for Tinney, No. 10, is the dam of one of these bulls, now coming three years old. Tinney was out of the old cow Collie, No. 9, Tinetta, No. 14, was out of Tinney, and she out of Collie. Eizeletta, No. 11, was out of Tinney, and she out of Collie. "Tinney's

calf," No. 15, was out of Tinney, and she out of Collie. Blanch, No. 12, was out of Eizeletta, grandam Tinney. "Blanch's calf," No. 16, was out of Blanch, great-grandam Tinney. "Eizeletta's calf," No. 16½, was out of Eizeletta, great-grandam Collie, and Collie 2d, No. 13, was also out of Collie. Nos. 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 16½ and the bull sold, were all bred upon the College farm. Look over the post-mortem notes opposite each member and see how you like them. Blanch (one of the very worst cases at Orono,) with her dam Eizeletta, her grandam Tinney, and her great-grandam Collie, stood "side by side." Four generations of "Winthrop Jerseys," all splendid animals as far as appearances went, but whose lungs are a "mass of corruption," as were all their produce, together "with their uncles, their cousins and their aunts." Do you wonder, then, that the "warp and woof" of tubercle was woven into the "bone and muscle" of the entire herd, and that they all came honestly by the disease? Take the case of "Belle of West Meadows," No. 19, she is the dam of one bull sold, now coming three years old. "Maid of West Meadows," No. 20, is out of "Belle of West Meadows;" "Flossy," No. 22, is out of "Maid of West Meadows," and she out of No. 19. "Belle of West Meadows' calf," No. 21, is also out of No. 19, and the whole lot are diseased. Mildred, No. 2, is the dam of one bull sold, now coming three years old. Mildred is out of Pansy, No. 1. Hyacinthe, No. 3, is out of Pansy, "Mildretta of Orono," No. 4, is out of Mildred and she out of Pansy. "Gray Nose," No. 34, is out of Hyacinthe, and she out of Pansy. Highland Belle, 2d," No. 17, is the dam of one bull sold, now coming three years old. "Highland Belle, 2d," is also the dam of Edith, No. 18. Both bred on the College farm. A bad lot. "Tulip, 4th," No. 23, is the dam of one bull sold, now coming four years old. "Tulip's calf," No. 24, is out of Tulip, 4th, and Berry, No. 49, is also out of Tulip, 4th, all diseased. Old Pet, No. 40, is the dam of one bull now coming fours old. Old Pet is also the dam of "Pet's calf," No. 41. Princess Alba, No. 27, is the dam of the

Kent bull. "Jersey Lily," No. 28, is out of Princess Alba, and Crummie, No. 29, is also out of Princess Alba. The "Kent bull" is the only one of these animals from which I have yet had the pleasure of seeing the lungs and glands, and these plainly show the primal formation of the tubercular deposit from different centres, while his dam was "rotten to the core." Last but not least is Juno, 2d; she is the dam of two bulls sold from the farm, now coming two and three years old. Juno, 2d, also produced Susie, No. 31, all bred on the College farm. Juno 2d, was sold from the farm to Mrs. Stetson of Bangor, and although examined by Dr. Micherner last April, who failed to discover any unsoundness at that time, I consider her a dangerous animal to be at large. I also failed to discover any unsoundness about the Kent bull in July, but four months later his lungs showed unmistakable lesions of the disease. The above nine cows, excepting Juno, 2d, were all killed at Orono, and all found thoroughly diseased, and are the dams of eleven bulls, all now in service in this State, and it will be noticed that they are each the dams of from one to four other calves which we killed at Orono, who were also badly diseased, and still I am told we have no proof, only a suspicion that these young bulls (for which the College has received about \$350.00) are themselves diseased. In the above statement, I have had nothing to say, recollect, about the sires of the above bulls, that would surely contribute to and intensify the hereditary taint. In the male, tubercle is also deposited in the generative organs; in the structure of the testicle, producing orchitis; in the tunica vaginalis, producing dropsy (hydrocele), and in the structure of the cord, producing schirrus. What say you, farmers of Maine, do you wish to patronize these bulls, or have them come in contact with your "flocks and herds," or do you think the State of Maine can afford to issue that kind of stock, and then refuse to redeem their depreciated and worthless coupons? Although it has been my constant endeavor to keep this report within the strictest limits conformable with what the importance of the subject demands, yet as I approach



the close of a document that may appear lengthy and tedious to many readers, I feel that I should fall far short of my duty to others, were I to refuse to comment upon the cause of an apparent delay in pronouncing the "College cases" fully and safely disposed of, which results from the first and only "difference of opinion" with any of my associates, in an experience of five years of earnest and successful labor to free our State from such contagious diseases as, very fortunately for us, have been "few and far between." On August 25th, I again wrote Mr. Gowell, asking him how many bulls had been sold from the College herd, since he had been Superintendent, whose dams we killed, and were known to be diseased. On August 28th, I received the following reply :

"DEAR SIR :—The calf was sold to Mr. Kent last September. It was about four months old at that time. Price paid, \$20. Within the last four years fourteen bulls and bull calves have been sold from the farm. Eleven of them were bred from cows that we killed. The dams of two others could be regarded with suspicion, as they were taken from the herd because of 'refusal to breed' and unknown trouble, although examined by Dr. Wilde, post-mortem. These bulls were sold for something like \$350. Many of them being but a few days old, explains the low price, together with the desire to benefit the farmers by selling low; 'farmers' prices' our motto. Ten of these bulls were sold previous to 1885, nearly two years ago, and must have been used a great deal already; those sold in 1885 probably have been used limitedly. The Kent bull is the last one that went out."

I have been thus particular to offer the correspondence in this case, for the reason that the "Kent bull" is the only one described by Mr. Gowell in his letter of August 28th, that I have yet seen, or of which I have any knowledge of their present whereabouts, but as the proper disposal of all the other pivots on this one case, the position I take can now be fully understood, which is, that no one of these outcasts should be allowed to cohabit with other animals or to propagate their kind, and that every one of the vagabonds should be promptly inspected and destroyed, either for beef or otherwise as cir-

cumstances shall develop. It was Shakespeare who said "Diseases desperate grown by desperate appliances are relieved, or not at all." What these animals have inherited they can surely transmit, and by a decree as unchangeable as the law of the Medes and Persians, which altereth not, "the iniquities of the fathers shall be visited upon the children unto the third and fourth generations." In conversation recently with Governor Bodwell, he said that he "considered that the animals sold out of the Orono herd, to go into other herds, should have been looked after long ago, and that proper measures are necessary to prevent further spread of the disease." I am told by others who differ with me as to the proper disposal of the outstanding cases at Orono, first, that the law gives the Commissioners no police powers whatever, that only on appearance of disease which the municipal authorities fear endangers public interests, they are to call upon us. According to this, no matter how much personal knowledge the Commissioners may have of the presence of any contagious disease, the law says "Hands off" until some owner who does not recognize the disease has notified some town officer who does know the law, that he suspects contagion. "To be forewarned is to be forearmed," and if this be true, the sooner the Commissioners are "clothed with power" to act promptly, and to dispense with "red tape" while contagion is being sown broadcast all over our State, the better it will be for the community. The first essential in any attempt to control contagious diseases is the power to enter upon premises and inspect the stock wherever it may be. Without such power the existence of contagious diseases cannot be determined. Owners frequently have no means of determining the nature of a malady from which their animals may be suffering, and oftener still they may be satisfied as to the character of their affliction, but prefer that others should be kept in ignorance of it. With either breeding herds or milk dairies of the business of the owner is generally destroyed as soon as the public learns that the animals are affected, and consequently, the endeavor to keep the public in ignorance

of it is an effort for self-preservation. The second objection to the issuing of summary orders in these cases is "that we have no proof (only a suspicion) that these College bulls are diseased." If the facts that I have collected, presented and grouped "around and about" every one of these animals is not deemed a good and sufficient answer to the latter allegation then I am ready to believe that there is no absurdity so great but that it will find some champion to defend it.

GEO. H. BAILEY, D. V. S., Portland, Me.,  
*Secretary and Veterinary Surgeon of Board of Commissioners on Contagious Diseases of Maine.*

Having been put in possession of all the above facts we hereby fully concur in the above report.

W. B. FERGUSON,  
 SAMUEL BELL,  
*Commissioners for Maine on Contagious Diseases of Animals.*

CH. B. MICHERNER, D. V. S.,  
*Professor of Obstetrics, Cattle Pathology, Materia Medica, Therapeutics and Hygiene, American Veterinary College of New York.*

FREDERICK HENRY GERRISH, M. D.,  
*President Maine State Board of Health.*

A. G. YOUNG, M. D.,  
*Secretary State Board of Health.*

Portland, Sept. 1st, 1886.

Notwithstanding the fact that the above report to the legislature was signed by the full Board of Cattle Commissioners, by Dr. Ch. B. Micherner, Professor of Cattle Pathology at the American Veterinary College of New York, and by Frederick Henry Gerrish, M. D., President Maine State Board of Health, and A. G. Young, M. D., Secretary, and also adopted by the investigating committee, who "made the majority report of the Cattle Commission, signed by Dr.

Bailey and Messrs. Bell and Ferguson, a part of the evidence in this investigation, and as a consequence a part of their own report," Secretary Gilbert when ordered to print said report in the annual report of the Board of Agriculture in the very few copies in which it can be found prefaced and supplemented said report, as follows :

“NOTE—The following paper was prepared by Geo. H. Bailey, Veterinarian to the Cattle Commission, to be presented to the annual meeting of the United States Veterinary Association as a history of the outbreak of tuberculosis among the cattle at the State College farm. It was read before the Committee on Agriculture of the legislature, and ordered printed in the annual report of the Board of Agriculture. *This history contains many errors, incorrect statements and erroneous conclusions for which the author is alone responsible.*”

(Signed)

*Secretary.*

F. O. BEAL, *President.*

W. W. HARRIS, *Treasurer.*

GEO. H. BAILEY, D. V. S., *State Veterinarian.*