How Far May a Cow be Tuberculous Before Her Milk Becomes Dangerous as an Article of Food?

BY

HAROLD C. ERNST, M. D.,

BOSTON.

REPRINTED FROM

THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF THE MEDICAL SCIENCES,

NOVEMBER, 1889.

Extracted from the
American Journal of the Medical Sciences for November, 1889.

HOW FAR MAY A COW BE TUBERCULOUS BEFORE HER MILK BECOMES DANGEROUS AS AN ARTICLE OF FOOD?[1]

By Harold C. Ernst, A.M., M.D.,
of Boston.

The change of opinion in regard to the infectious nature of tuberculosis has been very marked in the last few years, not among the scientists, but among the people at large. Of course the medical world has, as a rule, accepted the conclusions to be drawn from Villemin's work of twenty-five years ago, and the discovery of the specific cause of the disease by Koch has only added strength to the theories advanced in certain quarters before that time.

The change of opinion spoken of is, after all, hardly a change, but, more properly, an acceptance of the knowledge gained in regard to the disease by the more recent and exact methods of research, and a much wider diffusion of that knowledge. More and more is it the rule that the knowledge of the transmissibility of tuberculosis by means of infected material is recognized among those whom it concerns the most, and nothing but good can come from the diffusion of that knowledge.

It is hardly too much to say that proper methods of management of tuberculosis, both in human beings and in animals, involve more important interests—pecuniary as well as vital—than any other subject that engages the attention of medical men. It is well known that one-seventh of the human race, approximately, perish from this disease, and when we acknowledge to ourselves, as a fair review of the evidence at hand must force us to do, that most, if not all, of this loss is preventable our duty is plain before us. That is, never to cease speaking of it, never to give up trying to reconcile the money interests of man with his own welfare, and to do all in our power, by the collection of clinical and experimental evidence, to make the case complete.

The work showing the etiological relationship of the bacillus of tuberculosis to the disease was, to all intents and purposes, complete upon the

[1] Read before the Association of American Physicians, Washington, Sept. 20, 1889.

publication of Koch's monograph upon the subject. Nothing more in the way of proof was actually needed, and, indeed, very little has been furnished. At the same time, confirmatory evidence was demanded by some who had and many who had not access to the original details, and this confirmatory evidence has been furnished in such overwhelming amount that it is to-day but a waste of time to repeat, what is accepted the scientific world over, that in the organism described by Koch we have the specific cause of this pathological change, and that without its activity we do not have tuberculosis in any form or under any conditions.

An imperfect understanding of the nature of bacteria in general, and of this organism in particular, has led to many attempts to arrest the pulmonary form of the disease it produces, by therapeutic measures, most of which would have been seen to be useless at the outset, if a knowledge of the problem had been complete. It is not upon drugs or mechanical means that our reliance should be placed in attempting to stamp out this scourge of civilized man. Our attention must be turned in the direction of proper preventive measures, and until the necessity for this is impressed upon physicians in general, and by them upon the people at large, so that the preventive measures suggested after mature deliberation will be complied with, but little can be effected, and the knowledge gathered after so much hard labor must be considered as wasted, for the time being.

In order to the suggestions upon which the stamping out of tuberculosis must depend, there is necessary a large amount of investigation into the methods by which it spreads and by which the virus is carried from person to person. Among these methods are undoubtedly the excreta—more especially the sputum—from persons affected with the disease; the excreta are carelessly treated and scattered broadcast to the injury of persons susceptible but not previously affected. The methods of distribution in this way, and the behaviour of the bacillus of tuberculosis outside of the body, have been well and recently treated by Cornet (*Zeit. f. Hyg.*, Bd. v. S. 191, 1888).

Other methods of distribution are of importance, however, and until within a few years have not received attention from the medical profession at all commensurate with their value. These methods of infection are those arising from the ingestion of food materials coming from the domestic animals, especially the flesh and milk of cattle.

In Koch's *Etiology of Tuberculosis* he uses the following expressions:

"Since by far the greatest number of cases of tuberculosis begin in the lungs, it is to be supposed that the infection in all these cases has taken place in the manner just suggested—by the inhalation of phthisic sputum dried and made into dust. The second principal source for the tubercle-bacilli, viz., tuberculosis of the domestic animals, appears not to have anything like the importance of the phthisic sputum. The animals, as is well known, produce no sputum, so that during their life no tubercle-bacilli get from them

into the outer world by means of the respiratory passages. Also in the excrement of tuberculous animals the bacilli appear to be only exceptionally present. On the contrary, it is a fact that the milk of tuberculous animals can cause infection.

"With the exception of this one way, therefore (*i. e.*, through milk), the tuberculous virus can only have effect after the death of the animal, and can only cause infection by the eating of the meat. The same conditions hold for the milk of cows suffering from 'perlsucht.' Before all things, if infection is to take place, it is necessary that the milk contain tubercle-bacilli; but this appears to be the case only when the milk-glands themselves are affected with the disease. This explains at once the contradictions in the statements of various authors, who have made feeding experiments with the milk from cows suffering from 'perlsucht.' If infection from tuberculous animals does not appear to be frequent, it must by no means be underrated."

This caution is one which was necessary at the time it was written, and its repetition is as necessary now as ever. What conclusions may be reached in regard to its *extreme* importance, are well shown by the statistics collected and presented by Dr. Brush before the New York Academy of Medicine, on April 29, 1889 (*Boston Med. and Surg. Journal*, cxx. p. 467 *et seq.*). In this paper the author states that after several years of close study of the affection, including a consideration of all accessible statistics, and the habits of the people among whom it prevails, he has arrived at the conclusion that the only constantly associated factor is found in the in-bred bovine species. If a community was closely connected with in-bred dairy cattle, tuberculosis prevailed, and, *vice versâ*, if there were no in-bred dairy cattle there was no tuberculosis. In the discussion following this paper many objections were raised. Dr. Brush went on to say that he believed that the disease was originally derived from the bovine species. He did not believe that less than fifty per cent of all dairy cattle were affected with it, while the statistics he had quoted showed that wherever there was a race of people without cattle phthisis was unknown. He believed, furthermore, that if all the cattle in this country were to be killed, the disease would finally die out entirely here.

Such statements as these are a revelation to the generality of practitioners, and may seem to be somewhat forced, but they certainly indicate, together with the statistics upon which they are based, the existence of a greater danger than has been fairly realized. That the danger from the consumption of milk coming from cows affected with tuberculosis has been understood by individuals at least, and that, too, before the announcement of Koch's discovery, is very well shown by extracts from a letter which I take the liberty of quoting here. The gentleman writing it is a veterinarian in practice in Providence, R. I., and the observations were made and the advice given more than ten years ago. That portion of his letter bearing upon the subject in hand is as follows:

"Mr. W., June 15, 1878, called me to see a white and red cow. Coughs and is short of breath and wheezes. Pulse 60; respiration 14, and heavy at

the flanks; temperature 104°. Diminished resonance of right lung, but increased in part of the same. Emphysematous crackling over left lung and dulness on percussion. Diagnosed a case of tuberculosis and advised the destruction of the animal.

"*Dec.* 12. Cow in a cold rain a few days ago for about two hours. Milk still more diminished than at a visit made on September 25th. Again advised the destruction of the cow. Family still using the milk. Respiration 20; pulse 85; temperature 104.6°.

"*Feb* 22, 1879. Temperature 104.8°; respiration 26; pulse 68. Losing flesh fast. Milk still in small quantities. Advised, as before, to destroy the animal and *not to use milk.*

"*May* 30. Called in a hurry to see cow. Is now as poor as could be. No milk for a week. Pulse 80; respiration 40; temperature 106°. The cow died in about three hours. Autopsy made fourteen hours after death: Lungs infiltrated with tuberculous deposit. Weight of thoracic viscera 43.5 pounds. Tuberculous deposits found in the mediastinum, in the muscular tissues, and in the mesentery, spleen, kidneys, udder, intestines, pleura, and one deposit on the tongue. The inside of the trachea was covered with small tubercles.

"In August, 1879, the baby was taken sick, and died in about seven weeks. On post-mortem of the child there was found meningeal tuberculosis—deposits all over the coverings of the brain and some in the lung.

"In 1881 a child, about three years old, died with, as it was called, tuberculous bronchitis. And in 1886, a boy, nine years old, who for three or four years had been delicate, died with consumption—'quick,' as it was called.

"So far as known, the family on both sides have never before had any trouble of the kind, and the parents were both rugged and healthy people, and so were the grandparents—one now being alive and sixty-eight years old, and the other dead at seventy-eight."

Of course there is much room for criticism, if these cases be quoted as carrying out an exact clinical experiment, and no one can say that the occurrence of the three deaths in the same family was anything more than a coincidence. At the same time it must be acknowledged that they offer very solid suggestions for consideration, and that the light thrown upon the disease by the investigations of recent years make the advice of the veterinarian to "kill the cow and stop using the milk" much more sound than it appeared to the minds of the medical gentlemen who "laughed" at him at the time it was given.

It is my hope within the coming year to collect a series of clinical observations which will be of interest and some service in elucidating the question of how many cases of tuberculosis occur which produce suspicion in the minds of medical or veterinary attendants of having an origin in the milk from infectious cows.

It is upon this question of possible danger from the domestic animals —especially cattle—that much recent work has been done, but the subject has been by no means exhausted.

If there is danger to human beings from the widespread existence of tuberculosis among cattle, some sort of restrictive measures must be taken, by means of which this danger can be lessened. At the same time legislation calling for so much pecuniary loss as would be the case if the present supply of tuberculous cattle were to be destroyed, can

only be asked for with a backing of as much carefully gathered scientific evidence as can be obtained, and it is the part of preventive medicine and the experimental method to furnish some of this evidence.

Through the liberality and broad-mindedness of an association of gentlemen in Boston, it is possible to present the results of certain experiments undertaken to determine the question which is expressed in the title of this paper. "How far may a cow be tuberculous before her milk becomes dangerous as an article of food?" is an extremely important point to decide. If it be considered already settled and Koch's dictum be accepted, that there is no danger in the milk, if the mammary glands be not affected, then there remains only for the veterinary surgeon to determine the existence of such lesions, and restrictive measures can go no further. If, however, the milk from cows with no visible lesion of the lacteal tract be shown to contain the specific virus of the disease in a not inconsiderable number of cases, and if this milk be shown to possess the power of producing the tuberculous process upon inoculation in small quantities and in feeding experiments carried out with every possible precaution, then restrictive measures must have a far wider scope, and be carried on from an entirely different standpoint than has heretofore been considered necessary.

It is familiar to most of us that little importance has been attached to this question—the danger of milk from tuberculous cows with no lesions of the udder—for the reason that many experiments have been made with negative results, and because *à priori* reasoning would seem to indicate the absence of such danger; because tuberculosis is not a disease like anthrax, in which the specific poison is to be found in all parts of the system and is carried from one place to another by the blood-stream. Koch's assertion that the milk from cows affected with tuberculosis is dangerous only when the udder is involved, appears to be based upon theoretical considerations rather than practical work in this especial direction. It has been widely accepted, however, and the weight of his name has caused the assertion to be repeated many times with but few attempts to verify its correctness.

The increased attention that has been paid to the disease among cattle, and the suspicions that have been aroused that tuberculosis among the domestic animals is a more frequent cause of its appearance among men than has been supposed, have made a careful investigation of this point imperatively necessary. With the exception of a few successful experiments by Bollinger (*Deutsch. Zeit. f. Thiermed.*, Bd. xiv. S. 264) and Bang (*Ibid.*, Bd. 11, S. 45, 1885), no evidence of great value is to be adduced. These authors, as well as Tschokke (quoted by Bollinger), bring out isolated cases showing successful inoculation experiments with the milk from tuberculous cows with no disease of the udders, but the experiments are so few in number that they cannot be

accepted as furnishing more than a probability, and extremely critical persons might be justified in ascribing the results to contamination.

Bang (*Congrès pour l'étude de la Tuberculose*, 1, p. 70, 1888) gives new results. Examining twenty-one cases of cows affected with general tuberculosis but with no signs of disease in the udder, he found but two whose milk showed virulent qualities upon inoculation in rabbits. He concludes that since the cows experimented with were in advanced stages of the disease and yet showed such slight virulent properties in their milk, the danger from cows in less advanced stages is much less. And this conclusion he thinks is borne out by experiments with milk drawn from eight women affected with tuberculosis; specimens were used from all for inoculation and none were found to be virulent. He draws the conclusion, therefore, that it is not necessary to consider all milk dangerous coming from tuberculous cows, but that it should always be *suspected*, because no one can say when the udder will be diseased, and because, without this, the milk from tuberculous cows contains the virus in rare cases.

I shall endeavor to show that it is not at all rare for such milk to contain the virus.

Galtier also (*loc. cit.*, p. 81) has given the result of certain experiments with milk coming from tuberculous cows, but he says that

"certain experimenters claim to have established the virulence of milk coming from animals whose udders appeared to be normal and free from any lesions; the greater number, and I am one of them, have merely encountered a virulence in milk after the udder had become tuberculous. However, as a beginning tuberculosis of the udder is an extremely difficult thing to recognize, especially during the life of the animal, the milk should be considered dangerous which comes from any animal affected, or suspected of being affected, with tuberculosis."

I shall endeavor to show that this view of the case is justified by something more than probabilities.

In the *Deutsch. Arch. für klin. Med.*, Bd. xliv. S. 500, Hirschberger reports the results of an experimental research upon the infectiousness of the milk of tuberculous cows, in which—following out Bollinger's work—he attempts to settle, 1st, whether the cases are rare in which tuberculous cows give an infectious milk; and 2d, whether the milk is infectious only in cows with general tuberculosis, or whether it is also infectious when the disease is localized. He made the trials of the infected milk by injection into the abdominal cavity of guinea-pigs with the usual precautions. His results were as follows:

1. Milk was used five times from cows affected with a very high degree of general tuberculosis in all the organs.

2. Milk was used six times from cows with only a moderate degree of disease.

3. Milk was used nine times from cows in which the disease was localized in the lung.

From these twenty cases the milk was proven to be infectious in eleven. The percentage of positive results in the animals when arranged in accordance with the three groups above given was 80 per cent. in the first group (milk from cows in a very advanced stage of the disease), 66 per cent. in the second group, and 33 per cent. in the third. He found the bacilli in only one of the specimens of the milk, and considers that this, therefore, shows that the inoculation experiments are the more certain guide as to whether the milk is infectious or not.

These results are extremely interesting, although they do not lay as much stress as do mine upon the presence or absence of lesions of the lacteal tract.

The experiments which I am able to report[1] have been made possible by the liberality of the Massachusetts Society for the Promotion of Agriculture, which became interested in the question some time ago, and has put it in my power to carry them on. They have given everything in the way of pecuniary and moral support that the work has required; my own part has been that of general director, and I have had associated with me during the whole time the Society's veterinarian, Austin Peters, D. V. S. For the last year I have also had the very valuable aid of Dr. Henry Jackson and Langdon Frothingham, M. D. V.

All of the inoculation experiments and most of the microscopic work have been done in the bacteriological laboratory of the Harvard Medical School, some of the microscopic work at the Society's laboratory in Boston, whilst the feeding experiments have been done and the experimental animals have been kept at a farm in the country devoted to this especial purpose, and situated among the healthiest possible surroundings. Nothing has been set down as the result of microscopic observation that I have not myself verified, and every portion of the work has been carried out under the most exacting conditions and with every possible precaution against contamination.

Before the farm buildings were used at all they were thoroughly cleaned from top to bottom. Every portion of old manure was carted away, as well as all the old earth. The whole of the woodwork was scrubbed and then washed with corrosive sublimate solution (1 : 1000) and finally whitewashed, and every care was taken to secure good drainage and free ventilation. The result and effectiveness of all this have been best demonstrated by the fact that every animal brought to the place made a most marked improvement in its general condition, while some of them even went so far as to appear to get well.

[1] The full notes of these experiments will be found in the Transactions of the Association of American Physicians, vol. iv., 1889.

In deciding whether the milk from any cow affected with tuberculosis is dangerous, when the udder shows no lesion, the first point is to see whether the milk contains the infectious principle or not. In this case, of course, that infectious principle is the bacillus of tuberculosis, and attention was turned to that for some time. The observations have been carried on over a long space of time, and were made as follows: The milk was taken from the cow in the morning—or evening, as the case might be—the udders and teats having just been thoroughly cleansed. The receptacle was an Erlenmeyer flask, stoppered with cotton-wool and thoroughly sterilized by heat. The specimen was taken at once to the laboratory, there placed n conical glasses, with ground-glass covers—the whole of these having been carefully cleansed beforehand—and then allowed to stand in a clean refrigerator for twenty-four to forty-eight hours, and sometimes for seventy-two hours.

At the end of that time from ten to twenty cover-glass preparations were made from various parts of the milk or cream. These were stained after Ehrlich's twenty-four hour method, with fuchsin and methylene blue as a contrast color, and then searched with an immersion lens.

We prepared for examination in the way spoken of above, one hundred and seventeen sets of cover-glasses from as many different samples of milk. Of these specimens three spoiled, *i. e.*, turned sour or acid before the examination was completed, and must be rejected, leaving, therefore, one hundred and fourteen samples of milk of which the examination was completed. These samples were obtained from thirty-six different cows, all of them presenting more or less distinct signs of tuberculosis of the lungs or elsewhere, but none of them having marked signs of disease of the udder of any kind.

Of these samples of milk there were found *seventeen* in which the bacilli of tuberculosis were distinctly present; that is to say, the *actual virus was seen in* 31.5 per cent. of the samples examined (36 : 114 =31.5). These seventeen samples of infectious milk came from ten different cows, showing a percentage of *detected* infectiousness of 27.7 per cent. (10 : 36=27.7). These results are exceedingly interesting, it seems to me, and I confess I am surprised at the size of the percentage named. Not because I had not expected to find the bacilli—I have been convinced for several years that persistent search would show their presence in such cases as those that are here recorded—but because the amount of dilution to which the organisms must be subjected diminished immensely the chance of their being found at all. In no case have they been seen in large numbers, but equally in no case has a diagnosis been made where there was the slightest doubt of the appearances under the microscope.

The large number of cases in which these organisms have been found seem to me to indicate their presence in a still greater proportion of

cases, if only a sufficiently thorough examination of all the milk could be made. This of course is out of the question, but the results here given seem to establish, beyond a doubt, the fact that milk coming from cows with no definite lesion of the udder may contain the infectious principle of tuberculosis, if the disease be present in other portions of the body of the animal. Also, that this presence of the infectious principle is not merely a scientific *possibility* but an actual *probability*, which we should be thoroughly aware of and alive to.

Other interesting facts shown are these: that the cream after rising is quite as likely to be infectious as the milk, because the bacilli were found in the milk nine times after the cream had risen, and in the cream eight times after it had separated from the milk.

In regard to the constancy of the occurrence of the bacilli in the milk, in two of the ten cows in whose milk the bacilli were found, but one sample of the milk was examined; and the bacilli were found in one sample out of several examined at different times, in two cases. In the remaining six cows, bacilli were found two or more times in different samples of the milk. So that, as far as they go, these results seem to indicate that the bacilli are present with a fair degree of constancy. At the same time it should not be surprising if one examination was successful and others failed, because of the chances against success, owing to dilution, which were spoken of above.

In nine of the seventeen cases the time of the milking and the portion of the milk used were noted; that is to say, a sample was taken from the first of the milking, or the last of the milking, and then cover-glasses made from the milk or cream. In these cases bacilli were found in the cream three times, and in the milk four times, from the first of the milking; in samples from the last of the milking, in the cream no times, and in the milk four times; and this too seems to show an interesting point, viz., that the bacilli, if present at all in the udder, are not washed out entirely by the first manipulations of the teats, but may be supposedly present in any portion of the milk. The converse is also indicated, that the manipulation of the udder in the process of milking does not express the bacilli from the tissue into the latter portion of the milk, but that, as before, they may be supposed to be pretty evenly distributed in all parts of the udder if they be present at all.

Before going on to consider the results of the inoculation experiments made with various specimens of milk, it may be well to glance at the condition of the cows that have been under our control from the time of the beginning of the experiments until they were killed, or until the date of preparing this paper.

The history of each cow, as far as we have been able to secure it, bears out our assertion—as far as the examinations have gone, that none of the udders were affected with tuberculosis—certainly so far as gross

appearances were concerned. This was true, also, in the microscopic appearance of every case but one (No. 6, cow F). In this case the gross appearances in the udder were healthy, except that one quarter seemed to be slightly fibrous, and there were one or two yellow spots which were seen to be made up of fat under the microscope. With a low power lens only a slight increase of fibrous tissue was observable, and the oil-immersion was put on merely as a matter of routine. One giant cell was discovered containing a number of bacilli, but a careful search failed to show any others, or any signs of change, except the increase of fibrous tissue noted above. So that the assertion is still true, that we have failed to discover any signs of tuberculosis that were easily recognizable in any of the cows here recorded, and these include all we have had under closer observation.

Those from which milk was used for inoculations that are not here given had no signs that permitted of even a probable diagnosis by skilled veterinarians.

We also made an interesting series of experimental inoculations in rabbits and guinea-pigs with milk or cream from various cows, in varying quantities and at different times. Of rabbits there were used fifty-seven animals. Of these, five were inoculated with milk which had turned sour, two died of intercurrent diseases in a few days (coccidium oviforme), and of one the material was lost before the microscopic examination was completed—so that eight animals are to be rejected, leaving forty-nine upon which the results can be based. Out of these, five were made more or less tuberculous, as proven by microscopic examination, and in forty-four the results were negative—that is to say, we obtained 5 : 49, or 10.2 per cent. of successes out of all inoculations in rabbits.

There were used thirty-three different specimens from thirteen different cows—that is, there were 23 per cent. (3 : 13) successful results from the cows used, and 15.15 per cent. (5 : 33) successful results from the specimens used.

Positive results were obtained from

Cow P twice (at different times).

Cow L once.

Saunders cow twice (at different times).

The results of the inoculations of guinea-pigs are more striking. There were sixty-five animals used in all. Of these, nine were inoculated with sour milk or cream, and two died in a day or two of other diseases (peritonitis and pleurisy). There are, therefore, but fifty-four that should be counted. In them, there were twelve positive results, or 28.57 per cent. (12 : 42) successes out of all the inoculations. There were used thirty-two specimens from fourteen different cows, and the successful results came from six different cows—that is, 42.8 per cent. (6 : 14) of the cows were shown in this way to have infectious milk, and 37.5 per

cent. (12 : 32) of the specimens used were shown to have active infectious properties.

Positive results were obtained from

Cow P (three times in two different inoculations).

Cow D (three times in three different inoculations).

Cow F (once).

Slocum cow (once).

Saunders cow (once).

Mayhew cow (three times in two different inoculations).

The combining of the results obtained from both rabbits and guinea-pigs shows the following: Successful results were obtained in milk from cow P three times (two different specimens) in guinea-pigs, and twice in rabbits (two different specimens); from cow L once in rabbits; from cow O three times (three different specimens) in guinea-pigs; from cow F once in guinea-pigs; from the Slocum cow once in guinea-pigs; from the Saunders cow once in guinea-pigs, and twice in rabbits (two different specimens); and from the Mayhew cow three times in guinea-pigs (two different specimens)—that is to say, out of fourteen cows used the milk was shown to be infectious in seven, or 50 per cent., by inoculation experiments.

An interesting fact is also shown, and that is, that bacilli were found in the milk or cream, and successful inoculation experiments made in animals with the same specimen in five different cases (including eight of the successful ones) as follows:

Comparison of the dates when Bacilli were found in the Milk and the same Milk was used for successful inoculation experiments.

Cow.	*Positive.* Cover-glass.	*Positive.* Guinea-pig.	*Positive.* Rabbit.
P.	Cream, A. M.	Cream, A. M., March 9, 1889	Cream, A. M., March 9, 1889
	Cream, P. M.	Cream, P. M., March 9, 1889 Cream, P. M., March 9, 1889	Cream, P. M., March 9, 1889
O.	First of milking, cream, March 9, 1889.	First of milking, cream, March 9, 1889	
Slocum.	Last of milking.	Last of milking, June 10, 1889	
Mayhew.	Last of milking, milk.	Last of milking, milk, June 21, 1889	

The inoculation experiments, above detailed, seem to me to be deserving of consideration because they were done under the most careful precautions that could be devised. In all cases the experiment animals were kept under observation long enough to determine, so far as could be seen, that they were in good health, and after the inoculations they were separated and kept under close watch, but in healthy surroundings. Some of those that were used were inoculated immediately after purchase, because of a scarcity of the supply at the farm, and were not in good condition. But as no sign of tuberculosis appeared in any of these, their ill health cannot come in as a disturbing factor in the results.

The results obtained from certain feeeding experiments with calves show that there were thirteen calves used, and fed for varying lengths of time with milk from cows affected with tuberculosis, but not of the udder. Of these, the material was thrown away from one before the microscopic examination, and this should be rejected in the final results. Of the remainder there were five positive results obtained and one suspicious. The latter is counted as negative, for the reason that, although giant cells and granulation tissue were seen, no bacilli were found. There were, therefore, five out of twelve positive results, or 41.66 per cent. It should also be said that of those counted as negative three sets of specimens were suspicious, but were hastily examined for the purposes of this paper, so that a more careful search may very probably increase the percentage of successes.

In the series of feeding experiments on one set of pigs, the milk being given to them from the same cows as before, there were seven pigs used in all, from one litter and healthy parents. Of these, examination showed negative results in two, positive results in two, one was subjected to a very hasty microscopic examination, and the material from two was thrown away—a mistake, as was shown by the results of the microscopic examination of the material from No. 3. There are to be counted, therefore, only five, giving as successful results 40 per cent.

By the cover-glass examinations we have shown that the milk contains infectious material in ten cows out of thirty-five from which the milk was examined for bacilli—that is, in 28.57 per cent. We have also shown that the milk was infectious, by inoculation experiments, in seven out of fourteen of the cows from which the milk came—that is, 50 per cent. And we have shown the infectious nature of the milk by ocular demonstration and successful inoculation from the same specimens in five cows out of fourteen used—or, 35.7 per cent.

These results are, to a certain extent, preliminary—that is to say, they are but part of the work upon this subject which is being done under the auspices of the Massachusetts Society for the Promotion of Agriculture. The work will not be completed, at any rate, until next year.

They show, however:

1st, and emphatically, that the milk from cows affected with tuberculosis in any part of the body may contain the virus of the disease.

2d. That the virus is present whether there is disease of the udder or not.

3d. That there is no ground for the assertion that there must be a lesion of the udder before the milk can contain the infection of tuberculosis.

4th. That, on the contrary, the bacilli of tuberculosis are present and active in a very large proportion of cases in the milk of cows affected with tuberculosis but with no discoverable lesion of the udder.

THE AMERICAN JOURNAL
OF THE MEDICAL SCIENCES.

WITH the first issue for 1890, THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF THE MEDICAL SCIENCES enters upon its seventieth year, still the leader of American medical periodicals. In its long career it has developed to perfection the features of usefulness in its department of literature, and presents them in unrivalled attractiveness. It is the medium chosen by the leading minds of the profession on both sides of the Atlantic for the presentation of elaborate Original Articles; its Reviews are noted for discernment and absolute candor, and its Classified Summaries of Progress present, each month, an epitome of medical advances gleaned by specialists in the various departments. According to unquestionable authority, "It contains many original papers of the highest value; nearly all the real criticisms and reviews which we possess; and such carefully prepared summaries of the progress of medical science and notices of foreign works, that from this file alone, were all other publications of the press for the last fifty years destroyed, it would be possible to reproduce the great majority of the real contributions of the world to medical science during that period." Published monthly. $4.00 per annum.

The Medical News.

With the beginning of the New Year the features of THE MEDICAL NEWS as a newspaper will be largely developed. The province of a weekly medical periodical lies in furnishing its readers with prompt and condensed information relating to advances in all departments of medicine; and to this end, long and elaborate articles will not appear in THE NEWS. Only such material will be presented in THE NEWS as is thoroughly practical, and by judicious condensation ample space will be found to make every number one of interest and importance to every reader, whether general practitioner or specialist. Several new departments will be added, namely: Clinical Memoranda, Therapeutical Notes, Hospital Notes and Special Articles, giving opportunity for the presentation of much therapeutical and practical information in the briefest possible form.

Necessarily different in their spheres, THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF THE MEDICAL SCIENCES and THE MEDICAL NEWS are mutually supplementary, and every reader of both periodicals may feel assured that nothing in the life of the great medical world will escape his attention.

The Year-Book of Treatment for 1889

Gives a classified statement of the value and uses of all remedies which have been introduced and practically tested during the year. Price, $1.25; or in combination with either or both the above journals, 75 cents.

The Medical News Visiting List for 1890

Contains 48 pages of indispensable practical information and data and 176 blank pages, ruled to accommodate all records of practice. Handsomely bound in red seal, $1.25. In combination with either or both above periodicals, 75 cents. Thumb-letter Index, for quick use, 25 cents extra.

LEA BROTHERS & CO., PUBLISHERS, PHILADELPHIA, 706 & 708 SANSOM STREET.