

63. Before doing so we must direct attention to the fact that in the view of several authorities this disease is believed to be on the increase.

64. It is doubtful whether this is really so, for the reasons that (1) the apparent increase may be due to better recognition, and consequently more frequent notification, of the disease; (2) that, general hygiene being improved, and this improvement having already greatly diminished the tubercular death-rate in places where the malady was very prevalent, it is probable that the increasing attention given to hygienic requirements will still further reduce its virulence.

Remedial Measures.

65. The two points to be borne in mind in considering remedial measures are: (1.) That the disease can be transmitted to man from the lower animals, and from man to the lower animals, by one or other of the methods which we have already discussed, and especially by the ingestion of tubercular-diseased meat or milk. (2.) That it spreads from animal to animal.

66. The first of these, being in part dealt with under the Public Health Act, is usually considered apart from the measures taken to prevent disease in cattle; but, though this procedure is perfectly possible with most other diseases of the lower animals, it cannot be applied to tuberculosis, for not only is the disease communicated from animals to man, but also from man to animals.

Legislation, therefore, directed to the protection of cattle from tuberculosis should at the same time include such measures as will also prevent its communication to man.

67. In the first place, the question of curative treatment may be dismissed in a few words, since no cure or antidote is known for this disease, except in those cases (almost entirely confined to the human being) where it is only locally manifested, and in which consequently its foci can be excised and removed by surgical treatment.

68. This being so, it is evident that legislation must follow the two lines of—A. Prevention. B. Extirpation.

A.—Preventive Measures.

69. These should include provision for: (1.) Improved hygiene of cattle-sheds, &c. (especially in the direction of providing proper ventilation, pure water-supply, and adequate disinfection of stalls, &c., wherein tubercular animals have been kept). This has been partly met in the Dairy and Milk Shops Order, but its administration by the local health authorities is at present imperfect, and we would suggest that it should be much more stringently enforced, and that veterinary inspectors should be given more extended powers of entry into all places where animals are kept.

70. Improvement in the hygienic surroundings of animals should include isolation of all suspected cases (see also par. 17), precautions against the flesh or milk of diseased animals being given as food to others, *e.g.*, to pigs, fowls, &c., and care that fodder, litter, and water should not be taken from one animal or stall and given to another.

71. Our attention has been drawn to the frequency with which animals obviously diseased, sometimes even in the last stage of the malady, are sold in open market.

Although in England and Ireland, under the provisions of the Nuisances Removal Act as embodied in the public Act, 1885, the medical officer of health or inspector of nuisances may seize such animals, yet such seizure is rarely performed.

72. We find the veterinary inspector has no power to prevent such sales, or to seize the beasts for slaughter, since tuberculosis is not included in the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act of 1878.

73. We further find that there is actually a regular trade in such stock infected with tuberculosis, and that they go by the name of “wasters” and “mincers,” being frequently slaughtered in the neighbourhood of the larger towns, to which such portions of the meat as are likely to escape the observation of the inspector of nuisances are sent for the purpose of sale among the poorer inhabitants, and especially for the making of sausages.

74. We are therefore very strongly of opinion that power should be given to the veterinary inspector to seize all such animals in fairs, markets, or in transit.

75. Notwithstanding the uniform prevalence of the disease in Europe and elsewhere, there seems to be no reason to apprehend that, with our present regulations for the slaughter of animals at the port of debarkation, and for quarantine of those imported for breeding, there is any special danger of increasing the infection in England by introduction from abroad. The danger, however, exists in regard to the stock brought from countries which are exempt from slaughter on landing, and subjected to the ordinary veterinary inspection during the present period of detention of twelve hours.

76. It is therefore evident that the present rules for the prevention of the introduction of disease into the United Kingdom from abroad are incomplete. A further difficulty arises owing to the failure of many veterinary surgeons to detect the disease in its early stages.

77. It is certain that hitherto, in those cases so frequently referred to, where the disease is stated to have been found to be exceedingly marked on *post-mortem* examination, although presenting no obvious symptoms during life, no proper veterinary examination was made.

78. As, however, it is impossible to suppose that extensive pleural or pulmonary disease would not be revealed by a careful physical examination of the chest by percussion, auscultation, &c., the statements to the contrary made on this point would not outweigh any legislative proposals, although such proposals would be partly dependent upon such proper and adequate physical examination.

79. Since all authorities are agreed that the disease is very marked by heredity, we think it highly desirable that breeders should, in their own as well as in the public interest, discontinue breeding from tuberculous stock.