

B.—Extirpation.

80. In order to insure the gradual extirpation of tuberculosis we are of opinion that it should be included in the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Acts, for the purposes of certain sections of those Acts, so as to provide—(a) For the slaughter of diseased animals when found diseased on the owner's premises; (b) for the payment of compensation for the slaughter of such animals; (c) for the seizure and slaughter of diseased animals exposed in fairs, markets, &c., and during transit; (d) for the seizure and slaughter of diseased foreign animals at the place of landing in this country.

81. Notification of this disease should not be compulsory, because it may exist without developing any sufficient outward evidence to enable the owner to detect it, and its growth is so slow that non-notification of its existence, even in a large number of cases, would do little to nullify the stamping-out effect of the Act of 1878.

82. The powers and responsibilities of inspectors in ordering the slaughter of diseased animals should be the same for tuberculosis as for pleuro-pneumonia, according to section 51 (5) of the Act of 1878.*

83. An additional argument in favour of the slaughter of diseased animals is to be found in the fact that frequently tuberculosis and pleuro-pneumonia actually occur together, or are mistaken one for the other, so that in either case slaughter would be highly desirable.

84. Further, tubercle, though hereditary, is nevertheless much less contagious than the other diseases included under the Act of 1878, and it is clear, therefore, that the immediate slaughter of diseased animals would go far to stamp it out, though doubtless, owing to heredity, this stamping-out process would be gradual in its effect.

85. The annual reduction of the disease would probably be very considerable, and, even should it not be so, that would not constitute any reason against the adoption of the proposed regulations, since, however small the effect produced, the result to the nation must necessarily be gain.

Payment of Compensation for Loss of the Animal.

86. (3.) As in the other diseases scheduled in the Act of 1878, so in this, the owner should be compensated for the slaughter of a tuberculous animal at the rate of three-fourths of its value before it was slaughtered, and the valuer should shape his estimate according to its worth to the owner, i.e., as a milk-producer, or for any other special purpose.

87. If the animal should be one of great value, as in the case of pedigree stock, its worth might be determined by arbitration, and the three-fourths value paid in compensation under the provision before referred to.

Conclusion.

In terminating our inquiry, we desire to state that the great number and importance of the facts which were brought before us compelled us to extend the taking of evidence beyond the limits which we had originally contemplated, and to delay the presentation of our report to your Lordship. We recognise that the two subjects referred to us, pleuro-pneumonia and tuberculosis, are of the highest interest and importance, not only to the stockowners of the United Kingdom, but also to the public at large.

We believe that, if our recommendations be firmly carried out, pleuro-pneumonia may, within a moderate period, be exterminated in this country; and, although we cannot dare to indulge in such sanguine expectations with regard to tuberculosis, we still venture to hope that much may be done to reduce its extent, and to minimise a disease so dangerous alike to animals and to mankind.

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT ON TUBERCULOSIS BY PROFESSOR HORSLEY.

The foregoing report on tuberculosis, which I have signed, is entirely in accordance with my views on the subject so far as it goes; but there are two points upon which I consider further legislation to be absolutely necessary. These are—

1. *Breeding.*—Tuberculosis is notorious, even among the laity, as a disease which is transmitted from parent to offspring. This is a fact with which cattle-breeders are specially familiar, and which finds strong expression in the evidence attached to this report. Further, this generally-received truth has been completely confirmed by the results of scientific investigation, as is also duly set forth in the report. Considering, therefore, the extreme importance of this point, I think that the act of wittingly breeding from animals so infected should be made an indictable offence. The only objection that can be raised to such legislation, which if effected would prevent the dissemination of the disease among cattle in this country, is that, owing to the present state of want of knowledge among cattle-owners and even veterinary surgeons of the early symptoms, and physical signs on examination, of this disease, prosecutions would occasionally occur in cases in which no fault could properly be attributed to the owner, and that, therefore, such prosecutions would be needlessly vexatious.

Considering, however, the extreme rarity with which such cases would occur, and that, as in the matter of non-notification, each case would be tried before district magistrates on its own merits, this objection is deprived of the force it might have possessed.

Notification of the Existence of the Disease.

2. This point requires no explanation, since it is clear, that, unless the veterinary inspectors or authorities receive information of occurrence of diseases, it is impossible to insure the thorough carrying-out of the provisions of the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act.

* Section 51 (5) of Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1878: "A certificate of a veterinary inspector to the effect that an animal is or was affected with a disease specified in the certificate shall, for the purposes of this Act, be conclusive evidence in all Courts of justice of the matter certified."