UC-NRLF

B 4 619 584

LIBRARY
OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.

Class

BIOLOGY
LIBRARY
G

REPORT

ON

INOCULATION FOR PLEURO-PNEUMONIA IN CATTLE,

BY

ALEXANDER BRUCE,

CHIEF INSPECTOR OF STOCK FOR NEW SOUTH WALES.

By Authority :

SYDNEY: THOMAS RICHARDS, GOVERNMENT PRINTER.

1869.

[2s. 6d.]

12300

University of California.

GIFT OF

Hon. John B. Harmon

1878.

BIOLOGY
LIBRARY
G

REPORT

ON

INOCULATION FOR PLEURO-PNEUMONIA IN CATTLE,

BY

ALEXANDER BRUCE,

CHIEF INSPECTOR OF STOCK FOR NEW SOUTH WALES.

LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF
CALIFORNIA

By Authority :

SYDNEY : THOMAS RICHARDS, GOVERNMENT PRINTER.

1869.

[2s. 6d.]

SF964
N4

WILSON
112-111-111
C

12-11-11

CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
REPORT	1
CIRCULAR TO CATTLE OWNERS—APPENDIX A	7
ANSWERS BY OWNERS OF INOCULATED HERDS—APPENDIX B	10
„ UNINOCULATED HERDS—APPENDIX C.....	79
TABULATED LIST OF ANSWERS BY OWNERS OF INOCULATED HERDS—APPENDIX D	121
„ „ UNINOCULATED HERDS—APPENDIX E ...	129
RESULT OF INQUIRY AS TO INOCULATION—APPENDIX F	135
„ LEGISLATION—APPENDIX G	136
OPINIONS OF VETERINARY AUTHORITIES IN GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND ON PLEURO-PNEUMONIA, AND THE BEST MODE OF DEALING WITH IT—APPENDIX H	137

INOCULATION FOR PLEURO-PNEUMONIA.

REPORT by the Chief Inspector of Stock, shewing the result of the Enquiry, as to the effect of Inoculation, for Pleuro-pneumonia, October, 1869.

AGREEABLY to instructions from the Honorable the Minister for Lands of April last, 1,200 copies of the Circular and series of questions, forming Appendix A to this Report, have been distributed by the Inspectors of sheep among owners possessed of more than 200 head of cattle.

To those circulars and questions 501 replies have been received, of which 279 are from owners who inoculated their herds, and 222 from those who have not done so. In the case of the former, the greater part of these replies convey the required information, but in many of the latter they are both meagre and incomplete.

For the satisfaction of the public, the replies of owners to the more important questions, such as 1, 3, 4, 5, 12, 13, 14, and 15, in the returns of inoculated herds, and 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11, in those of the uninoculated have been printed in the owner's own words, and form Appendices B and C hereto. The answers to questions 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11—relating to the mode of procuring the virus and of inoculating, have, in all the returns except No. 279* been omitted, as they contain no better information on these points than the directions given in the Report on Pleuro-pneumonia, laid before Parliament in 1868.

Tabulated lists of these returns by owners of inoculated and uninoculated herds have also been prepared, and form Appendices D and E. They give the substance of the more important replies by owners, and shew whether they are in favour of, or against, inoculation, and whether they approve or disapprove of compulsory inoculation where the cattle are infected.

Of these lists, again, two abstracts, forming Appendices F and G, have been drawn up, to show at a glance the result of the enquiry as regards inoculation and legislation.

By Appendix F it will be seen that with respect to owners *who inoculated* their herds there are 25 neither for nor against inoculation, 237 in favour of it, and 17 against it; or *about 14 for, to 1 against, inoculation*. Of the returns by owners *who did not inoculate* there are 75 neither for nor against inoculation, 102 in favour of it, and 45 against it; or *about 7 for, to 3 against, inoculation*. While taking *both classes* of returns together there are in all 100 neither for nor against inoculation; 339 in favour of it, and 62 against it; or, *upon the whole returns about 5½ for, to 1 against, inoculation*.

* The answers to questions 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 of this Return have been given because the operation was carefully performed and the precise results noted; and because the evil effects of using virus from an animal in a too advanced stage of the disease is clearly shown by the effects of the inoculation on the portion of the herd first operated upon.

The foregoing figures exhibit a very strong case in favour of inoculation—indeed they establish its efficacy; but although they do so, it may not, perhaps, be out of place to call attention to some additional facts, elicited by this enquiry, which are strongly confirmatory of that result; they are:—

- 1st. The most significant fact, that while the returns by the owners who inoculated show on the one hand that the disease, according to the size of the herd, and the extent of the infection when inoculated, disappeared in the course of a few weeks, or at most of a few months after the cattle were inoculated, those by the owners who did not do so, show that, in many cases, the disease existed in their herds for several years. This will be at once seen on reference to the entries under the head of "Effect of Inoculation," in the tabulated list, Appendix D, and to that under the head of "How long disease existed in the herd?" in tabulated list, Appendix E, which give the substance of the owners' answers to questions Nos. 13 and 14 in Appendix B, and to No. 5 of Appendix C. Unfortunately the answers given by owners to questions 13 and 14 of Appendix B do not, as a rule, state the exact time the disease left the herd after inoculation; but they show that, where the operation was properly performed, it either left the herd at once, or it disappeared without any more cattle being affected than were evidently diseased when the herd was inoculated; or, it shortly died out. *In no case can it be gathered that the disease lasted over six months in a herd which had been properly inoculated.* On the other hand, again, it will be seen that the disease has in the uninoculated herds existed in 3 herds for 6 years, in 9 herds for 5 years, in 6 for 3 years, in 2 for more than 2 years, in 13 for 2 years, in 6 for 18 months, in 2 for 15 months, in 2 for 14 months, in 1 for 13 months, in 2 for more than 12 months, and in 11 for 12 months; *while it still exists in 18 of these herds, and has done so for periods of from 2 to 6 years.*

This difference between the duration of the disease in the inoculated and uninoculated herds, is one of the strongest proofs of the advantages of inoculation; and its opponents will have to prove that this difference arises from some other cause than inoculation, before they can again call in question its efficacy.

- 2nd. The fact that in almost every instance inoculation is spoken of by those in favour of it, as having immediately stopped the disease, or as being a preventive.
- 3rd. The results in such cases as Nos. 2, 10, 43, 51, 85, 96, 97, and 119, of Appendix B,—where cattle, which were inoculated while sound, never were diseased, although afterwards frequently exposed to infection; and those in such cases as Nos. 13, 19, 23, 24, 25, 28, 30, 31, 36, 43, 47, 50, 52, 60, 63, 72, 82, 84, 89, 100, 105, 110, 116, 126, 130, 133, 136, 137, 140, 147, 156, 164, 172, 176, 177, 178, 180, 182, 187, 194, 212, 213, 214, 215, 218, 231, 233, and 277,—where the disease disappeared from herds after inoculation, while it continued among uninoculated cattle intermixing with these inoculated herds.
- 4th. The fact that almost all the Returns in Appendix B by owners opposed to inoculation shew on the face of them sufficient cause for the inoculation proving unsatisfactory; for it is evident that the failures occurred in these cases, either through the herds being thoroughly diseased before they were inoculated, through improper inoculation, or through only a portion of the herd being inoculated.

It requires to be noticed, here, that the term *infected*, in the last question asked, has, in a great many instances, been mistaken by owners for that of *affected* or *diseased*; and through this misapprehension erroneous opinions have been expressed with respect both to inoculation and legislation. In that question the term "*infected*" is used in the broad sense given to it in the interpretation clause of the Sheep Act. In this way whole herds—in which there are only, perhaps, a few head of cattle actually diseased, or, perhaps, not even a single head diseased—would be held to be infected. The evils resulting from the driving together, and inoculating diseased cattle, would therefore never occur, as herds, and perhaps camps, of cattle would be inoculated immediately upon any of them coming in contact with the infection. It would thus seldom occur that even a single head would be actually diseased, when inoculated; and never more than a few at the most.

It is but right, also, to call attention to the very unfair trial which inoculation has, in many cases, received:—(1st) through the cattle being, in a considerable number of the herds, badly diseased before they were inoculated; and (2nd) through improper virus being used, or the operation being improperly performed.

With regard to the first of these impediments to the success of inoculation, it is a well-known fact that a very large proportion of owners did not inoculate their cattle until they were alarmed at the number of deaths among them; and, by that time, the disease had obtained a firm footing in their herds. Thousands of cattle, therefore,—which were evidently diseased, and more than thrice as many thousands, which were so, but shewed no symptoms,—must have been inoculated; and inoculation must be a cure, as well as a preventive, to have been thoroughly successful in such cases. This circumstance is of itself sufficient to account for a great many of the failures in inoculation, as well as for the deaths, which some of the owners attribute to that operation.

As to the second impediment, there is no doubt but a great many mistakes were at first made, both in selecting the virus, and in performing the operation. It was some time before correct information was obtained from Europe on these points; and owners not only used virus which was both useless and poisonous, but inoculated in such a way as to cause the death of many of the cattle. When the operation was first attempted, pieces of putrid lung were placed under the skin of the tail, and in doing so the muscles and even the bones of the tail were frequently severely injured. In this way inoculation was found to be worse than the disease; and with more experience and information that method of inoculating was abandoned for the saturated thread and grooved inoculating knife; while more correct ideas as to the proper virus began to obtain. Still, for some time there were many owners who neglected to make themselves properly acquainted with the right sort of virus, and the correct mode of inoculating, and even up to the present time some owners have failed to do so. This has not arisen from the want of correct information, for ample directions on these points have been frequently given through the press.

The owners to whom allusion has just been made, were no doubt anxious, and, in a certain sense, did everything in their power to make the operation a success; but there were many professional inoculators who did not care whether it was successful or not, so long as they were paid at the rate of 6d. to 1s. a head for the cattle they inoculated. As the occupation of inoculation was a very remunerative one—bringing in at times from £5 to £10 a day—many, who knew very little of the disease, and less about the selection of virus, took to it; and to conceal their ignorance, and keep up the deception, surrounded the operation with a great deal of mystery; while there is no doubt, but in many instances they used virus (preserved as they termed it) which had in reality nothing but the right color to recommend it.

From what has been said, it will be seen that between the fact of many of the herds being badly diseased when inoculated, the want of correct information at the outset, the blundering of those who tried their best to operate correctly, and the ignorance and recklessness of those so-called professional inoculators, inoculation could not but in many cases be a decided failure; and the number of failures is not greater than might, under the circumstances, have been expected.

This is, to some extent, borne out also by the Returns to question 12 in Appendix B (Number of deaths from excessive swelling?), for where inoculation was improperly performed, it not only failed, but generally caused the death of the cattle operated upon. Thus, while the deaths from inoculation, in even large herds where the cattle cannot be regularly examined and attended to after the operation, ought not to exceed 2 per cent.—and it is oftener under than over that rate—the Returns shew that in six cases they were $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.; in 13, 3; in 1, $3\frac{1}{2}$; in 7, 4; in 13, 5; in 1, $5\frac{1}{2}$; in 1, 6; in 2, 7; in 1, 8; in 9, 10; in 3, 12; in 1, 15; in 1, 16; and in 1, 75 per cent.; while in 3 cases they are stated as “a great many.” These make in all 60 returns in which over 2 per cent. of deaths were caused by inoculation; while there are 94 returns which give the deaths from that cause at 2 per cent. and under; and 43 in which there were no deaths at all. Besides these, there are 37 returns which give no information on the subject. There are two portions of the colony, the Monaro and Gwydir districts, in which the losses from or rather after inoculation were particularly severe. This is to be accounted for partly in the herds being very badly diseased when inoculated, and no doubt partly also to the use of improper virus, and to incorrect inoculation.

The general opinion of owners again with regard to compulsory inoculation will be gathered from Appendix C. It there appears that of the owners *who inoculated* their herds there are 46 neither for nor against legislation; 172 in favor of it; and 61 against it; or *nearly 3 for, to 1 against, inoculation*. Of the returns by owners *who did not inoculate* their herds, there are 39 neither for nor against legislation; 82 in favour of it; and 101 against it; or *about 4 for, to 5 against, legislation*. Taking the returns again by the owners of *both inoculated and uninoculated* herds together, there are 85 neither for nor against legislation; 254 in favor of it; and 162 against it; or *upon the whole returns there are more than 6 for legislation, to 4 against it*.

The term “not necessary” has been used by owners in all the three senses of “for,” “against,” and “neither for nor against”; and it is entered in these abstracts according to the owner’s meaning.

As there is thus a very large majority of owners in favor of passing an Act to oblige those whose cattle are infected to inoculate them; and as it is clearly shewn by the result of this inquiry that pleuro-pneumonia is by means of inoculation a controllable disease, it is recommended that Parliament should be asked to pass an Act which, although it would not make inoculation compulsory, would relieve the cattle which were properly inoculated from the restrictions and disabilities to which uninoculated infected stock would under such an Act be liable; and would thus indirectly tend to make the practice of inoculation universal throughout the colony, *on the approach of infection*. Thus, while all infected cattle were, as they ought to be, placed in quarantine, and not as they now are allowed to travel in any part of the colony infecting the different herds with which they come into contact,—the time during which properly inoculated cattle should be kept in quarantine should be made shorter, by two-thirds, than that during which uninoculated infected cattle should be quarantined, while, on the other hand, properly inoculated cattle should be allowed to travel over infected ground, without being held to be infected. Provision would, in that case, require to be made for the examination and licensing of inoculators, and for a certain fixed brand or mark to denote that the animal bearing it had been duly inoculated.

In recommending legislation for pleuro-pneumonia, the difficulties, which always more or less attend the carrying out of measures for the prevention of disease in cattle, have not been overlooked. The principal of these are the difficulty of dealing with cattle, in which an outbreak of the disease occurs while they are travelling, and that of eradicating the infection in wild herds and in town dairies.

With respect to travelling cattle which might prove to be infected, there is no reason why they should not be treated the same as travelling infected sheep are under the "Diseases in Sheep Act of 1866," and be either sent back to the run from which they started, or placed upon the nearest suitable land, where those of them which were actually diseased should be destroyed without compensation to the owner, and the rest inoculated and quarantined for, say two months from the last appearance of the disease. In that case, compensation as under the Sheep Act, should be paid by the owner of the cattle to the proprietors of the land on which they were quarantined, for the loss he sustained through the cattle being placed upon it.

The stoppage of travelling cattle in this way would no doubt entail considerable loss on their owner; but it is surely much better that he should suffer under such circumstances, and that the infection should be stayed, than that he should continue his journey, leaving the infection in every herd with which he came in contact, and spreading it broadcast throughout the Colony.

As to the eradication of the disease again from wild herds, it would no doubt be difficult in some of the scrubby portions of the Colony to effect this without considerable delay and expense; but with these exceptions wild cattle are now being gradually exterminated, and where this could not be done the risk of the disease spreading from them, should they become infected, is not very great, as they would be surrounded by inoculated herds. The town dairies would be also sources of risk for a time, as the infection is certain to exist for a much longer period in the cow houses and sheds—once they are contaminated—than in paddocks or on open runs. It is now kept alive in these dairies through the changes of cows which are continually taking place; and it is carried by the cows from the dairies to the paddocks to which they are sent when dry. From the paddocks again it is taken by bullock teams and store cattle into the interior. But with strict inspection and a thorough disinfection of the infected premises, this risk also could be removed.

In this way this disease might be eventually eradicated from the Colony, and if it could, to take no action but to trust to the disease dying out, as some owners recommend, would be the merest folly; for pleuro-pneumonia will, if not eradicated, behave the same in this Colony as it has done in every other part of the world. It will disappear, or rather smoulder, for a time, to break out again as virulently as ever, when a fresh race of cattle have grown up, and the circumstances, which favour an outbreak of the disease, occur.

As will be seen by the opinions of six of the very highest veterinary authorities at Home on this and other points, given in Appendix H, pleuro-pneumonia is quite as virulent now in Great Britain and Ireland as it was in 1844, two years after its outbreak there; and that they consider the proper mode of dealing with it is to slaughter the affected cattle in a herd, and quarantine, isolate, and disinfect the others under legislative enactment.

INOCULATION FOR PLEURO-PNEUMONIA.

APPENDIX A.

Stock Branch,
 Department of Lands,
 Sydney, April, 1869.

SIR,

The Government being very desirous of obtaining authentic information with respect to the efficacy of Inoculation for Pleuro-pneumonia in Cattle, have resolved to call for Returns from all owners of Cattle possessed of more than 200 head, which would supply this information,—with the view, if deemed expedient, of introducing a measure making Inoculation compulsory in the case of those herds in which the disease appears.

2. I am, therefore, directed by the Minister for Lands to request that you will fill up and retransmit to me the accompanying Return, at your earliest convenience; and that you will not only make your answers as full and explicit as possible, but that you will also give any other information which you may consider would tend to further the object of the present inquiry.

3. I am to add, that all information received in this way will, so far as you are individually concerned, be held strictly private.

I have, &c.,

ALEX. BRUCE,

Chief Inspector of Sheep.

**Answers by Owners of Inoculated Cattle to the following
Questions :—**

1. Date of inoculation.
 2. Name and address of owner of cattle, including post town of station where cattle were running.
 3. Number of cattle inoculated.
 4. State of cattle when inoculated ; if diseased, state per-centage of those showing symptoms.
 5. How long were cattle diseased before they were inoculated ?
 6. Describe the lung and animal from which the virus was taken for inoculation.
 7. How was virus taken, and how kept ?
 8. How long was virus kept before it was used ?
 9. How was the operation performed ?
 10. How, when, and to what extent were the effects—*i.e.*, swellings, twisting, &c.—of the inoculation visible ?
 11. Were milking cows which were inoculated milked immediately after inoculation ? If so, did it affect the milk, in quantity, quality, or in any other way ?
 12. Did any deaths occur from excessive swelling caused by the inoculation ? If so, state what per-centage, and what means were tried to cure the swellings, and their effect.
 13. State result of inoculation.
 14. State here, also, any circumstance which you may consider proves or disproves the efficacy of inoculation, and especially whether any cattle which were properly inoculated were afterwards exposed to the infection, and if so, whether or not they were affected by it.

Give also any other information which you may consider of value with respect to the disease or to inoculation.
 15. Do you consider that an Act should be passed, obliging owners whose cattle are infected to inoculate them ?
-

**Answers by Owners of Uninoculated Cattle to the following
Questions :—**

1. Date of infection.
 2. Name and address of owner of cattle, including post town of station on which the cattle were running.
 3. Number of cattle.
 4. State of cattle when infected.
 5. How long diseases existed in the herd.
 6. Per-centage of cattle affected.
 7. When the disease finally left the herd.
 8. The number of deaths.
 9. Present state of the cattle.
 10. General remarks.
 11. Do you consider that an Act should be passed obliging owners whose cattle are infected to inoculate them?
-

APPENDIX B.

1.

1. From the year 1867 to present time.
3. About 700.
4. Those inoculated were in good health, but previous to inoculation the average deaths were 30 to every 100.
5. About three months.
15. I think it really necessary that such an Act should be passed.

2.

1. From three to four years ago.
3. About 500.
4. In good health when inoculated ; those that were diseased I did not inoculate.
12. None died.
13. Those inoculated remained safe, and did well.
14. Virus taken at the first stage of infection is the best ; taken at an advanced stage is injurious.
15. Cannot form an opinion.

3.

1. Between 1864 and 1868.
3. In 1864, 1,000 ; between 1864 and 1868, 400.
4. Diseased, 10 per cent.
5. One month or five weeks.
12. About 3 per cent. of those that came under my notice died from excessive swelling ; sometimes chopping the tail off close to the butt will save them.
13. Stopped the disease.
14. I noticed that after all the cattle, except a few strangers, had been inoculated, all that had been missed were diseased. I believe that one-half of those that take the disease recover—I am certain that a great many of them do ; and for two years after the disease first broke out, nearly every beast that I killed had been diseased ; they appear just as healthy as those that have never had it. I never knew a beast that had been properly inoculated die with that disease, but I have seen a great many die that had the disease when inoculated.
15. No. I consider that if any man does not believe that inoculation will stop the progress of the disease that he ought not to be compelled to inoculate, for he may think that he will lose more cattle by doing so ; and owners that believe in it will always inoculate when they can get virus ; and I believe there are herds that have been diseased.

4.

1. The whole herd, in March, 1864.
3. 900 or more.
4. To the best of my opinion, about 20 per cent. were showing symptoms.
5. It first made its appearance in my herd in September, 1864.
12. My stockman said at the time there were only two that died from excessive swelling, and no attempt was made to cure them.
13. It was a perfect success in my herd.
14. As I have before stated, the whole herd was inoculated in March, 1864, but there were some few left on the run ; they could not be found at that time, and were not seen until August, 1864, and some of them were suffering from the disease ; I allowed them to run a short time, to see if it would be fatal to any of them ; in less than a week three of them were dead ; I then inoculated the rest (about thirty), of which none after were found dead ; and none of those that were done in March were in the slightest affected, although running together. The disease made its appearance in the herd of ——— twelve months before it broke out in mine. The runs are divided by a range of hills. When I found that ——— cattle were affected, I employed an extra stockman to keep the cattle from mixing ; but at length a yearling steer was found amongst mine, and it was affected, and it was with great difficulty that we got it to the yard ; I had it put into a small paddock by itself, for the purpose of sending to ——— to satisfy him that his cattle were being allowed to come amongst my cattle. Up to that, mine were free from disease ; in about fourteen days or less the cows at this place began to show symptoms of disease, and afterwards began to die.
15. I cannot conceive there can be anything of more importance to this country than an Act to compel owners to inoculate their cattle when the disease makes its appearance ; as I believe it is the only safeguard to prevent its spreading.

* The number in the middle of the page denotes the number of the Return,—that on the left hand margin, the number of the Question to which the Answer is given.

5.

1. February 1st to April 26th, 1868.
3. 2,600 head.
4. Some had the disease, but I could not say how many.
5. I commenced inoculating as soon as ever I saw the disease amongst them; I began in February 1st, and left off April 16th, 1868.
12. I lost a great number of cattle from the swelling, say ten in the hundred; I never did anything with them after I inoculated them, I just let them take their chance, except any favourite ones, for I found getting them out of the bush and putting them in the crushing bail did them more harm than dressing them; cattle don't want knocking about after they are inoculated.
13. We never had the disease very badly in our herd; all our neighbours around us had it before it showed itself in our cattle. I think that inoculating cattle is a great thing, and a preventative from the disease.
14. I will give you the way that I have inoculated my cattle. I first of all get my cattle in, draft them as near one size as possible, so that the large ones and small ones are not put into the crushing pen together. I then put one man with a pair of shears to cut the hair from the side of the tail; I have another man or boy with a basin, with a number of pieces of wool setons about an inch long, with a knot at one end soaking in the basin in the virus; I always use two needles to that.
15. I do think so.

6.

1. 625 head; this was in March 26th, in 1864.
5. Five months before we commenced; in two months after we inoculated, the disease disappeared, and I have not seen a diseased beast on the run since.
12. I can safely say that we did not have over ten head die, after they were inoculated from swelling; we simplify the remedy together with tar and turpentine.
13. Positively a preventive of disease.
14. The system that I used was as follows:—Any cattle that were infected with the disease we did not inoculate them, because if we did so it would not prevent them from dying; but any cattle that did not show only a slight symptom of the disease, those cattle may be inoculated with safety, the reason why I say so is, because I proved it; I inoculated cattle that were infected with the disease, strong, and it did not prevent them from dying.

7.

14. I received your letter concerning the pleuro-pneumonia in cattle. It broke out in some of mine twelve months ago, and those that took it, I found no remedy but to bleed them severely. I had one very fine ox that took it, and I put him in a paddock by himself; some time after I got two fine springing cows which I turned into the paddock with him for convenience; in a few weeks I also found them to have the disease. My son went and got some stuff and inoculated all that I had, and ever since that time I have seen no signs of the pleuro in cattle. I think that if inoculation was made compulsory in all herds throughout the Colony, that pleuro-pneumonia would die away from our shore.

8.

1. 10th April, 1868.
3. 500.
4. A few showing symptoms—say 2 per cent.
5. Supposed to have taken infection on road travelling down from Queensland; say from five to seven weeks.
12. No deaths from swellings.
13. After inoculation the cattle ceased dying from pleuro, and only a few that we think had taken the disease previously died—from six to eight head.
14. I fully believe inoculation to be a *preventative*, but not a *cure*. I think if cattle are properly inoculated with good virus before infection, that they do not take the disease. There are now very few, if any, symptoms in the herd—not $\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. in 4,500 head; and I firmly believe that there is not a herd in this district that is *totally free* from pleuro in a more or less degree. The cattle are always liable to infection from travelling stock, where there is a road through the run, if uninoculated.
15. I think that if inoculation were made compulsory in all herds, the disease would eventually die out; and all the young stock should be inoculated at time of branding or weaning.

9.

1. 1865, 1866, and 1867.
3. In 1865 a herd of about 800 running on the ——— (since sold), and about 150 on this establishment; and in the two following years their increase, and two lots of store cattle there purchased.
4. Cattle very much infected with the disease, the first year many deaths occurring before the operation was performed. On the ——— the estimated loss was about 12½ per cent.; here it was 25.
5. About four months, the fattest of the cattle appeared the most disposed to take the disease, and with those it was the most fatal.
12. The deaths from the effects of inoculation I estimate at 3 per cent. Some cattle die from pleuro after inoculation, but these I believe are infected previous to the operation.
13. When the disease first appeared in my cattle, before they were inoculated, fresh cases were to be seen nearly every day; after inoculating, in a week or ten days there were no fresh cases.
14. I have not the least doubt that inoculation is a preventive to the disease called pleuro-pneumonia, as in all the cases where I have seen it so treated the disease has disappeared; in one instance, an animal which had been properly inoculated appeared to have the disease, it was about ten days after the operation, but in a few days it was quite well; therefore it is probable other causes may have produced similar symptoms.
15. I do not think it necessary to make inoculation compulsory. Every owner has the remedy in his own hands. If A inoculates his herd, and B, his neighbour, does not, he is the loser; A's cattle will not take it a second time. But I think if it was compulsory to burn animals that died travelling, it would be a wholesome precaution, not only for pleuro, but all other diseases.

10.

1. About October, 1864.
3. Fifty head.
4. All clean.
12. Only one, as above stated.
14. The cattle I inoculated, as before described, about fifty head, was in a paddock by themselves, and in another paddock close by I had sixteen very fine bullocks fattening, when disease came into them and took five of them; the remainder I disposed of, fearing more of them might go, they being good beef. My son being down about the time from my Namoi station, where the disease had raged very high, taking I believe something like a third of the herd; my son anxious about the rapid spreading of the disease, resolved upon trying inoculation, but not until a great many had died, and as I before said, disease very much in the herd, after which it soon began to abate, and he pronounces himself very much in favour of inoculation.
15. Although I fully believe in inoculation, I am not in favour that an Act should be passed obliging owners to inoculate, for the very fact the disease has been in every herd that I know of, and occasionally I hear of fresh cases, but not to any great extent, of which I think we shall always be subject.

11.

1. June, 1864.
3. 200.
4. Partially healthy; 5 per cent.
5. A few days.
12. Deaths at ———:—*Milking herd*, where I inoculated fifty, I lost one; fifty *I did not inoculate, I lost one*. At ——— I inoculated 150, and lost twenty-five head. I account for this in many ways, but principally because the ——— herd was not quiet, the ——— herd was.
13. On the whole, as a general thing throughout the whole country, I consider inoculation unsatisfactory, and if carried out arbitrary.
14. I think I have stated before in No. 12 what No. 14 wishes; and now, with regard to any other information, I beg respectfully to state, and I believe any one who has a large herd of cattle, say from 3,000 upwards, would lose more by inoculation than by not inoculating. I cannot bring before your notice more than you know yourself.
15. That seven herds of cattle out of ten are what are considered wild herds, or in other words, not perfectly quiet to handle, therefore after inoculation in such herds, the great battle and drawback becomes the second consideration; after inoculation, sickness, of various kinds, set in, swelling of the hinder parts; cattle are some miles from the head station, and cannot travel, it is quite out of the question to dress them on the spot where found, and to drive them is impossible. My opinion is, if of any value, legislation on such a subject is better left alone. I can recommend sulphur, and believe such to be a perfect cure. I shall be glad to give you all the information in my power when we meet, which I fancy will not be many days hence.

12.

1. 1867.
3. 1,000.
4. About 5 per cent. showing symptoms of disease.
5. Can't give this information.
12. None died, except those affected before inoculation.
13. Stopped the disease.
14. Disease has not made its appearance since the inoculation.

13.

1. First time, about the year 1861, upon cattle bred by myself; about July, 1868, about 300 purchased.
3. 6,000 head.
4. Very bad, *all*, more or less.
5. Supposed to be about three months.
12. After inoculation, from swelling, about 1 per cent. died, or less. No method adopted to cure swelling, but I have known in several instances, that where the swollen parts have been lanced the beasts have recovered.
13. Total eradication of the disease.
14. I do not know of a single instance of cattle that had been properly inoculated again taking the disease. In one instance, a number of cattle in a high state of disease (*not then inoculated*), and some dying, were put into a paddock with cattle which *had been inoculated* some three years previously; not one of those cattle which had been inoculated was even sick; the diseased cattle were six weeks with the inoculated cattle originally in the paddock, and were then inoculated, when the deaths ceased within a fortnight, and the cattle recovered during that season, and are now fat, and fit for market.
15. There is not a diseased beast in the paddock. Has also 3,000 not inoculated (grown up since the rest were), which have neither been infected nor inoculated.
Does not consider inoculation should be made compulsory; as a rule, owners will inoculate.

14.

1. September, 1855.
3. 500.
4. About one-third showed symptoms.
5. One month after exhibiting symptoms.
12. About 3 per cent. died; and the means used were cutting off the tails above the joints where inoculated; found this effective.
13. Satisfactory.
14. Exposed, but not affected. My cattle were inoculated for safety sake; but my opinion is, they would have done as well without, as I do not believe I would have lost a greater per-centage had I let them have their chance.
15. I do not.

15.

1. About 8th November, 1868.
3. 330 head.
4. The cattle were poor when inoculated, having a short time previously been driven from Maitland here, as store cattle.
5. These cattle showed symptoms of pleuro on the journey, though none died on the road; after arrival (about a fortnight), one beast took disease, and another shortly afterwards.
12. Two beasts died through the inoculation, out of 330; they were not attended to; others may have died, but their tails were cut off about half way up, which allowed blood to escape, and the beasts immediately got well.
13. No cattle were ever known to be infected after inoculation, except those having pleuro at the time of the operation, which are almost sure to die. We think the cause of the swelling in the tails is often caused by the needle being run into the bone of the tail, or the operation being carelessly performed.
14. We prevent newly inoculated cattle from mixing with uninoculated cattle for a month or so, though we cannot say that the inoculation carries disease. We buy from 600 to 800 store cattle every year, and when we find pleuro existing in cattle purchased, we immediately inoculate, and never had in any case a single beast die after a month or two had expired after the operation, and then only cattle which were supposed to have been infected at the time, or were carelessly inoculated. Some persons still deny that the inoculation prevents disease, but we consider it to be a *certain preventative*. Sometimes we have purchased a lot of cattle, and have thought disease did not exist amongst them, but after a month or so had elapsed, one or two may die, and the pleuro remain amongst them, killing perhaps one or two per month for a year. We now, however, consider it better to inoculate upon the first appearance of pleuro, thereby avoiding occasional losses after the cattle are fat or nearly so.

15. We are of opinion that an Act to enforce inoculation in the infected herds would be exceedingly beneficial to the stockholders in general, as well as the owner of the infected herd. We also consider that any herd may be inoculated, and should not lose 1 per cent., if done with any degree of care.

16.

3. 700.
4. Nearly all fat, about 3 per cent. showing symptoms.
5. Had been first noticed about seven days before inoculated.
12. No deaths from swelling.
13. About 100 died after inoculation; all these cattle were kept together.
15. No.

17.

14. I think by inoculating with good virus would prevent the disease spreading, and eventually do away with it, for I consider inoculation to be a preventative, but not a cure.

18.

1. February and March, 1862. I have not inoculated cattle here; but when living on the _____, in 1862, _____, inoculated part of his herd. As well as I remember about *them*, I will give you the particulars.
3. 1,500 head, in a herd of about 6,000.
4. The cattle first inoculated were a mob of store cattle (600 head), that had travelled 400 miles; about 10 per cent. were diseased.
5. Cannot tell about the store cattle (first done), the remainder of herd inoculated had not pleuro when done.
12. Yes, about 3 per cent.; some were brought in, and the tail lanced, I think this saved a good many. The one that lost the end of tail had the bad part cut off from sound.
13. Of the store cattle that were diseased when inoculated, a great many died—I should say 15 per cent.; of the other 900 inoculated, about 5 per cent. died.
14. The disease went through the _____ herd in about four months, the uninoculated cattle getting rid of it as soon as the inoculated ones. I have seen inoculated cattle (done in the way I mention) get the pleuro, and die from it. I think the disease is an epidemic, which attacked different parts of the country at different times, taking about five months to go through a herd; you will always see a few cattle bad every year afterwards. The pleuro broke out on this run after the drought of '62; this was three years before I bought; I have put on 3,500 store cattle since buying, some of which were diseased. I did not inoculate, but left the cattle alone. One lot stopped dying very soon after being turned out; the loss was small, but I always see a few cattle bad every year—about 1 per cent.
15. No; I think if cattle are left alone, you would not lose as many as by inoculating them. If you inoculated cattle travelling, you would drop a great many from swelled tails, without their being diseased.

19.

1. November, 1867.
3. 600.
4. Very bad—20 per cent.
5. Nine months.
12. 1 per cent. See No. 10 in reference to the latter part of this question.
13. In less than three months the cattle were perfectly free from disease.
14. The next station to mine is occupied by _____; he only inoculated a few of his, and cattle of his that have strayed on my run, I have seen them die, when none of the cattle that had been inoculated suffered in the least. The chief thing is to get a beast in the proper stage to take the virus, also to look well after the cattle when inoculated.
15. Yes.

20.

1. In the spring of 1864.
3. About 1,000 head.
4. Inoculated none shewing symptoms of disease—any that appeared sick not brought into the yard.
5. The first appearance of the disease in the herd was about eight or nine months before the time of inoculation, but only in a few in one mob on the run.
12. About 3 or 4 per cent. of deaths occurred from swellings throughout the herd. The means used to cure them, was the knife,—cutting out all the coloured flesh, and dressing with butter of antimony and Venice turpentine; only the worst cases were attended to in this manner, and of over fifty treated only two died, and I feel satisfied that more than half of those fifty would have died had they been let alone.

13. A considerable number of the cattle lost the brush and a few joints of the tail; some few, the entire tail. After inoculation the disease gradually abated throughout the herd, but whether the good effect was the result of inoculation I cannot say.
14. The cattle were not paddocked, but turned out on the run after they were inoculated, and on account of the wet weather, when they were mustered, we could not collect more than about 1,000 head, whereas the entire number in the herd was about 1,400, consequently from 300 to 400 were not done, and it is possible that nearly all of the carcasses found after inoculation were those of the uninoculated ones; but from the mountainous nature of the run, and the small mobs the cattle run in, it was impossible to form a positive idea of the correctness of this.
15. As far as my experience led me, it is still a matter of doubt with me whether any benefit resulted from inoculation, as I am of opinion that the disease was abating in my cattle before I inoculated them; my impression is, however, that if a herd be inoculated before the disease has reached it, and consequently before the cattle could have taken the least infection, that then it would act as a preventative, as vaccination does with human beings in small-pox.

21.

1. A.D. 1866.
3. 500 head.
4. Generally healthy, symptoms of disease shewing through the whole herd; about thirty died.
5. Fourteen days.
12. I had no cattle die from excessive swelling; use a seton, made of worsted, with dressing of Venice turpentine, in preference to open incision for discharge, also as a preventative against the fly.
13. The disease (pleuro-pneumonia) disappeared.
14. The disease entirely disappeared from amongst my herd. They were daily exposed on three sides of my run to diseased cattle, also to stray diseased cattle on my run, and cattle once properly inoculated have never shown symptoms of a relapse of the disease. Cattle infected should not be inoculated; cows in calf should not be inoculated (visibly so); it kills the calf, causes the cow to cast her calf; if far advanced, it generally proves fatal to the cow.
15. I do consider an Act should be passed, compelling owners of cattle to inoculate, as the only remedy for its extermination.

22.

1. About July, 1864.
3. 950 at both places included.
4. The cattle were badly diseased—about 40 per cent. showing symptoms at the time.
5. Time not exactly known, but generally supposed to be from four to six months before they were inoculated.
12. Some deaths occurred from excessive swellings—percentage unknown. In most cases of excessive swellings, the tail cut off above the parts affected proved effectual if taken in time.
13. Those cattle that were properly inoculated did not take the disease, and began gradually to improve in condition.
14. In all cases where cattle were properly inoculated before they had actually taken the disease it has proved a preventive; and in cases where they were afterwards exposed to the infection they were not affected by it.
15. I consider that an Act should be passed, obliging owners whose cattle are infected to inoculate them; because I believe inoculation to be a preventive, and there are many who would not unless compelled.

23.

1. June, 1866.
2. 220.
4. Only one showed symptoms of disease at the time of inoculation, but about two a week had been dying for the previous three months.
5. About three months.
12. Not one. The only death was that of the beast which was diseased at the time the operation was performed, as stated in answer to question 4.
13. Two bullocks only (workers) afterwards (about three months) showed any symptoms of disease, by breathing hard and standing away by themselves. I had them bled copiously, and they were quite well again in a week.
14. I first inoculated the milking cows, working bullocks, and young stock, and placed them in the paddocks they usually occupy. After these had perfectly recovered, I purchased three lots of store cattle at from thirty to fifty head each at intervals of two or three weeks. These I shall distinguish as Nos. 1, 2, and 3.

They were all put into the paddocks in which the farm cattle which had been inoculated were kept. About a week after purchasing lot 3 the disease broke out in lot 2, and two or three died. Then it appeared in lot 1, and subsequently in lot 3, carrying off two or three weekly from the three lots for about three months. I then inoculated them as described in answer to question 9, and I lost only the one which was diseased at the time the operation was performed. Not one of the farm cattle which had been previously inoculated and which were running with the diseased stock subsequently took the disease, except the two working bullocks which I have alluded to, and then only in a very mild form. Before inoculating at all, I took, for the sake of experiment, six yearling calves; of these, I inoculated two with the seton at the tip of the tail; of the other four, I inoculated two by making an incision at the end of the tail and inserting the virus, and the other two by making a slight incision on the ribs. The first-mentioned two were both successful; of the second two, one was successful, and the other unsuccessful. The two last-mentioned were swelled in the body, head, tail, and loins, and died in dreadful agony.

15. I can see so many and such serious difficulties in the way of compulsory inoculation, that I think it would be better to leave the matter in the hands of the stockholders themselves.

24.

1. April, 1862.
3. 1,000.
4. 75 per cent.
5. About one month.
12. Very few. I do not think I lost 3 per cent. when I first commenced to inoculate. I done about two hundred head of quiet cattle about the house; there was only one of them died from excessive swelling.
13. When I commenced to inoculate, my cattle were dying very fast; after they were inoculated, they ceased to die.
14. I believe that inoculation is not only a preventative but a cure. I had ten cows milking in 1867—two of them were inoculated in 1862 when calves; the other eight caught the pleuro; one after the other, seven of them died, and six of their calves. I thought for a time it was the Cumberland disease they had. When the seventh cow died her calf was bad, and I killed him to see what ailed him. When I opened him I found it was the pleuro, I took some of the virus from him and inoculated the eighth cow; it cured her—she lost half of her tail. I have the cow milking now. There were four working bullocks that were inoculated in 1862, in the paddock with these cows all the time, and it never took any effect on them. The virus I used was the colour of amber. I believe that if cattle are inoculated properly they will never take the pleuro again. I inoculated the seven milkers that died with what they call preserved virus, that I got from a veterinary surgeon—it never took the slightest effect. I believe that if the virus does not swell the tail it is no good.
15. I consider that an Act should be passed obliging owners whose cattle are infected to inoculate them.

25.

1. August, 1863.
3. 800 head.
4. Slightly diseased; $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.
5. About a week.
12. Yes, $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. The swelling chiefly occurred in the tail and hips. Cut 4 inches of the tail off, and make an incision between the hip bone and the butt of the tail, about 2 inches deep. Apply Venice turpentine, after being first well washed with warm water for about a week, or until the swelling disappears—a sound cure.
13. A decided preventive from pleuro-pneumonia.
14. A great number of our neighbours' cattle were dying around us who were not inoculated, without affecting ours in the least after being inoculated. They were exposed, but not in any way affected. Cattle inoculated ought not to be disturbed but as little as possible. We consider the spring of the year to be the best time for inoculating, as there is then more young grass, and the cattle require to be well purged.
15. We consider that an Act should be passed to compel owners of cattle infected to inoculate, as we had, and have considerable experience amongst cattle.

26.

1. July, 1863.
3. 280 head.
4. All healthy but four, those diseased, of which three died. Thirty died before inoculated.
5. In the herd three months.

12. Two died from swelling on the rump. Cutting the tail with a knife in different places, also the rump, using Venice turpentine and butter of antimony.
13. None after were affected with pleuro-pneumonia.
14. I am not aware of any cattle being infected after inoculation. Cattle reared in this district are more liable to die with pleuro-pneumonia than cattle from the interior are.
15. I do not consider owners should be obliged to inoculate when pleuro-pneumonia appears in their herds.

27.

1. In July, 1864.
3. About 1,200.
4. Some diseased; others showing no symptoms of disease.
5. About two months previously the first symptoms were observed.
12. Some deaths occurred—percentage uncertain; no means of alleviation were tried.
13. Quite as many cattle seemed to die after the inoculation as before it, and no decided benefit was observed to result from it.
14. I am by no means assured that inoculation is beneficial, but tried it, as it was reported to be so in many cases. Bleeding all the cattle in spring or autumn, and giving them salt on their run would, it seems to me, be a preventive of any blood disease.
15. I do not think it essential to compel inoculation; but I do think that the owners of infected cattle should be compelled to keep them in secure paddocks, and prevented driving them about the country.

28.

1. June, 1867.
3. 157.
4. A portion of the herd were diseased, but not those which were inoculated. Of the portion of the herd diseased, 30 per cent. showed symptoms. The disease is very far advanced before a beast shows symptoms, and a beast is very bad before symptoms can be seen.
5. One month.
12. Some of the cattle died from the effect of inoculation—I believe it was caused by the needle passing through the bone of the tail. No means were tried to cure, for they usually died in less than four days. I should say about $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.
13. I believe inoculation will prevent disease, but to inoculate sound cattle you would lose $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. with any care.
14. I inoculated my milking herd, because the disease had made its appearance in another part of the run, the milking herd then had never been diseased; there were then thirteen fat cattle which I intended to send to market among them; the thirteen fat I did not inoculate. In the course of two weeks these thirteen began to die, and five died in a very short time, and I thought it advisable to kill the remaining eight for rations. The inoculated cattle were exposed to the disease, but not affected after well.
15. I cannot see that an Act should be passed to insist on owners inoculating, for I believe that if the disease once appears in a camp of cattle, that inoculation among that lot would only hurry and increase deaths; and to inoculate other portions of the herd, you must have diseased cattle close at hand to get virus from.

29.

1. June, 1865.
3. 2,000 head.
4. 2 per cent. dead daily. State of cattle good. Store condition inclined to poor.
5. Three weeks.
12. No deaths from above cause.
13. Perfect cure, as cattle ceased dying, and took to fattening immediately.
14. With regard to inoculation, the only thing I can say with regard to it is this—that those cattle were dying, and that as soon as inoculated they ceased doing so, and I have also seen other herds of cattle dying at a most alarming rate—in fact, if they kept on for a few weeks there would not have been many left on the station—when inoculation was resorted to, and after a few days the disease disappeared, and the cattle seemed to thrive and fatten immediately after. Cattle once inoculated seldom or ever take pleuro again; but some that may have been diseased at the time of being inoculated may, if they get very poor, in a year or two after, take to coughing, and linger on for a year or so, and then die. In this district, I do not believe there are any herds that have shown any symptoms of pleuro but have been inoculated; therefore, I think pleuro, except in beasts that have not been inoculated, is very rare, but I have seen even this winter one or two beasts die from something like pleuro; but there is a throat disease, which is most difficult to distinguish from pleuro, and therefore it would be very hard to say a beast died from pleuro without first examining such beast, as I have shot beasts to procure the lung, and then found the disease to be that of the throat.

15. I do not think that an Act is required to meet the case ; because I believe every owner of stock, for his own benefit, would take the precaution to try and preserve his property by every means in his power, without being compelled to do so.

30.

1. As far as I know, all cattle in the Wellington district were inoculated in June and July, 1864.
3. 4,000 head were inoculated by ———, and in 1868, about 1,000 young cattle were inoculated.
4. Diseased. At least 25 per cent. were showing symptoms of disease.
5. Immediately on appearance of disease, inoculation was resorted to.
12. In cases where cattle were travelling, I have known the loss to be from 5 to 7 per cent. ; quiet has a great deal to do with it. If properly inoculated, the loss is very trifling.
13. To inoculate tends to give the beast the disease in a milder form, and no doubt is attended with less danger than if taken afterwards ; and in all cases where inoculation takes properly, the same symptoms are visible as in a diseased beast.
14. In September, 1864, and about two months after inoculation, I started 400 head of fat cattle for the Melbourne market, and amongst them were sixteen head of uninoculated cattle, the whole of which showed more or less symptoms of disease, whilst the inoculated cattle were to all appearance totally free from disease. This I can vouch for, and I think is a good proof of the necessity for inoculation.
15. It is my opinion that all cattle should be inoculated. But not one case came under my notice in this district where the owners refused to inoculate.

31.

1. May 9th, 1864.
3. 1,500 head ; about 400 head at present left.
4. 5 per cent. showing symptoms of disease.
5. About a week from the time the symptoms of disease were first observed.
12. Scarcely 1 per cent. died. Means used to reduce swellings—lancing had desired effect in all cases after a few days.
13. All the herd in perfect health in one month from the time of inoculation.
14. The herd has been exposed to the infection ; not one of the beasts were affected by it ; cattle fatten a great deal better after inoculation than before it, which is a proof of their being in perfect health, and not injured by the inoculation, as some suppose. Think cattle should be inoculated on the first appearance of the disease in the herd, or as soon as a beast is sufficiently affected by it to obtain the virus.
15. Do not think it necessary, as owners would be at a heavy loss, in some cases to the extent of two-thirds of their herds, who neglected to inoculate them. If neighbouring herds were infected, and their owners neglected to inoculate them, should have no anxiety respecting my own ; for on its first appearance in the herd, should inoculate them, feeling convinced by doing so the loss by deaths would be very trifling, and if properly done there would not be the slightest fear of their being affected by it, if exposed to the infection.

32.

1. 6th October, 1865.
3. About 1,800 head.
4. The disease was in the herd, but a great number of those inoculated were free from it ; the percentage I cannot say, but believe it was very small.
5. About three or four months.
12. Some deaths occurred, but cannot state percentage, but believe it was small. No means were taken to cure.
13. Beneficial as a preventative.
14. I believe that the cattle operated on were turned out on the run, and those which were not diseased at time of operation, although exposed to the infection, were not affected ; of those known to be affected at time of operation, the greater part, if not all, died.

33.

14. In the month of March, 1866, I started with a mob of cattle from a station on New England, *en route* for Broad Sound. The herds from which the cattle (1,300 in number) were taken were suffering severely from pleuro-pneumonia. Two days before starting the cattle were inoculated with virus of a light sherry colour, taken from the lungs, and round them. About the ninth day after starting, the effects of inoculation

began to shew, by the swelling of the tails only of some, and the swelling of the rumps in others; these latter got into a very bad state, the swellings broke, and omitted a most offensive smell, and most of the beasts so affected died; we lost about 2 per cent. from the effects of the operation. During the whole time I was on the road, however (three months), I never had a *single* fresh instance of pleuro, although we passed through districts (the Darling Downs especially), where the disease was raging.

15. Decidedly.

34.

1. October and November, 1865.
3. 3,500.
4. Diseased; 50 per cent.
5. A few months.
12. At least 10 per cent.; no means were tried to cure the swellings.
13. Those that recovered looked much improved in appearance and general condition, after they were restored to their usual health.
14. I have known the yearlings and calves of a herd of cattle, *not inoculated*, nearly all die, while the older cattle which *were inoculated*, had no deaths. Also, I have known a team of bullocks, where seven out of ten have been inoculated, the other three having died at different periods from pleuro.
15. From my experience I consider an Act should be passed.

35.

14. It is now several years since my cattle suffered from pleuro-pneumonia, and as I made no memoranda of the results, I am not in a position to give the requisite information; besides, any answers I might give would be valueless, as they would be apt to mislead.
15. If practicable.

36.

1. March, 1863.
3. About 600.
4. Cattle were dying daily of pleuro-pneumonia. About 15 per cent.
5. About six months.
6. Cannot; did not see lung or animal when killed.
12. Yes; about 4 per cent of cattle died after inoculation. No steps were taken to cure the swellings.
31. Pleuro-pneumonia in a few weeks disappeared from the herd, and I have not since had the disease amongst my cattle, though it was in this district and in this neighbourhood for a year or more after they were inoculated.
14. The above statement I think proves the efficacy of inoculation, but I am unable to give any information of cattle, after being inoculated, having been exposed to the infection. So satisfied am I of its advantages, that if pleuro-pneumonia was again to appear in this part of the country, I would at once, or so soon as I could obtain the virus, inoculate the whole of my herd.
15. I do not think an Act should be passed to compel the owners of cattle to inoculate. It is the duty of every man to preserve his property, and it is only the cattle-owners who neglect their duty by not inoculating who are likely to suffer from pleuro-pneumonia. I do not like *over-legislation*, and fear we have too much of it already.

37.

1. November and December, 65; January, 1866.
3. 2,000.
4. Diseased; about 3 or 4 per cent.
5. Uncertain.
13. Unsatisfactory; as the crushing, &c., to which the cattle were exposed, caused more deaths than would have occurred had the disease taken its course through the herd.
14. As we did not inoculate half the herd, and as the disease left shortly after we had finished inoculating, I cannot judge of its efficacy. I have never noticed any cattle attacked by pleuro after inoculation.
As the season when we inoculated was very bad, a greater number of deaths occurred from herding, crushing, &c., than would have taken place had the cattle not been inoculated.
15. Judging from what I have seen of the disease, I do not consider that such an Act should be passed.

38.

1. Between the 10th April and 14th June, 1868.
3. About 5,600.
4. They were in good condition; about 50 or 60 per cent. showed symptoms of disease.
5. Some showed symptoms in February, 1868, but only a few; at that time the diseased ones becoming more numerous until they were inoculated.
12. No deaths that we know of. A few, say ten or fifteen at most, were swelled about the root of the tail; all got well without any dressing; none were much swollen.
13. The result is, that in nine or ten weeks after inoculation the herd were perfectly sound, and remain so up to this time.
14. At the time our cattle were last diseased, we had 900 store cattle which had been inoculated about eight months before; three of this lot took the disease, and they were done again; all the rest kept sound, although running in the same enclosure with those that were dying. We had inoculated our herd five years before; all the cattle that were done at that time, remaining on the run, were free from disease last year. I at one time inoculated about 500 head out of a paddock in which they were dying very fast; sixty-three head we could not get out of the paddock, on account of a creek which ran through it being flooded; four of those inoculated died, and only eleven of the sixty-three that were not done, lived, and they were never any good. The cattle had been all running together before the creek got up. Our cattle were first diseased six years ago. The disease was much more fatal then than last year; they sickened and died off in a few days, very few recovered. Last year the disease was in a much milder form, not so much fever, and altogether of a slower, more lingering nature; and I think a large number of the cattle would have recovered enough to get fat without inoculation; but I think a beast once diseased will never be sound until he is inoculated; the recovery is only partial, the disease is still there, and only requires some slight cause to make it active again, whereas the inoculated beast may have only a very small portion of lung remaining, it will be perfectly sound, and perform the office which nature requires.
15. Yes.

39.

1. About November, 1867.
3. 2,370.
4. Cattle badly diseased when inoculated, and dying very fast; about 15 per cent. showing symptoms.
5. About twelve months.
12. Not 1 per cent. occurred through inoculation. Should any swelling occur at the butt of the tail, the beast should be put into a crush pen, and the tail cut off as high up or till the blood appears healthy.
13. The result was favourable.
14. I believe in inoculation, as the cattle were dying fast before, and after inoculation scarcely one instance of pleuro-pneumonia occurred, and the cattle have been in a healthy state ever since.
Cows heavy with calf should not be inoculated, as death is almost sure to follow.
I have inoculated about 500 head in ——— for myself and others, and scarcely a death occurred afterwards; also, about 2,370 at ———. I believe cattle that have died from pleuro-pneumonia should be burnt, as other cattle smelling them will catch the infection.
The greatest art in inoculating is to know how to take the virus and to pass the seton in without touching the bone.
15. I believe that an Act should be passed obliging owners of infected cattle to inoculate, and competent persons appointed in each district to see that cattle diseased badly should be destroyed and burnt by their owners.

40.

1. Three years next January.
3. 1,000 head.
4. They were in good condition; the percentage was about four per day.
5. About four days.
12. A few died—from four to five, when they were first inoculated. I bled them in the tail by making an incision, and if that did not stop the swelling, I cut the tail off to the root; I also cut the rump open when they were swelled, and that finally cured them, or rather removed the swelling.
13. I believe it cured them.

14. I do unhesitatingly assert that the steps I have taken with my herd at the time the disease was prevalent among them—*i.e.*, inoculating—finally saved the remaining portion of them, and that they never showed the slightest symptoms of disease since then. I have been among cattle for the last forty years of my life, and I look upon inoculation to be the best remedy that was ever introduced as yet, and the inventor deserves a high meed of praise.
I am strongly of opinion that inoculation saved the remaining portion of my herd at the time. As regards the virus, it could not be procured at the present in the neighbourhood.
15. I think inoculation ought to be made compulsory in cases where the herds are affected by the disease, but not otherwise.

41.

1. About 1863.
3. 1,500 at various times, not inoculated at the same time.
4. Cattle in general good store condition, appearing healthy, about 3 per cent. showing symptoms.
5. Varying from four days to three weeks.
12. We did lose more than about $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. through inoculation.
13. Proved well with us, and almost immediately checked the disease if the inoculation was done with care, and in time.
14. Very seldom cattle took the disease twice. We always observed, where the cattle were running thick together, that they caught it quicker and worse on low, cold, swampy ground. We always separated the cattle that showed symptoms from the others, and inoculated them, which we thought did good; in no case we found inoculation doing harm.
We always observed that if a beast was far advanced in the disease before he was inoculated, that it died, but if the diseased cattle were taken in time, inoculation did a great deal of good.
15. We do consider that an Act should be passed to inoculate if the disease was to show much on a run, but not for a few showing symptoms. Ever since the disease showed in this district, a person will see a few here and there.

42.

1. August, 1863.
3. 4,500.
4. Mostly in low condition, 30 per cent. showing disease.
5. The disease had appeared about two months before inoculation was commenced.
12. No deaths occurred from swelling, and nothing further was done with the cattle after being once inoculated.
13. In about five months after the inoculation no disease was visible in the herd, but up to that time occasional cases were to be seen, these cases becoming gradually fewer until the disease went away.
14. In all cases in which the disease has come under my observation, it would appear to have been communicated by contagion. When not brought direct into the heart of a run or district at once by diseased travelling cattle, it would gradually make its way from run to run, and from one portion of a run to another, apparently extending itself as the sound cattle came into contact with the diseased ones. I have never known an instance of its appearing suddenly upon a run unless the neighbouring runs had been previously diseased, or else infected cattle been brought on in travelling mobs. In February, 1864, I left a station near ———, with 3,200 head of store cattle to be taken to the ——— River. The disease was just beginning to show amongst the cattle when they started; by the time that they had been a week upon the road, they were dying at the rate of about ten a day, and (apparently aggravated by the exertion necessary for travelling, and the intermixture of the sound with the diseased cattle), the disease went on extending itself until sometimes twenty-five would die in twenty-four hours.
When the cattle were in this state, an arrangement was made for stopping, inoculating the cattle, and resting for some weeks on a station on the ——— above ———. For a fortnight after the inoculation, the cattle died very rapidly. After that time, the daily number of deaths began to diminish. In another week there were not more than two or three deaths in a day, and no fresh cases were to be seen making their appearance. In a month from the time of inoculation, the deaths had ceased; and (some hundreds of the cattle that had partially recovered from the disease, having been weeded out and sold), the rest of the journey was accomplished without any further loss. I believe that after the cattle arrived at their destination, no single case of pleuro-pneumonia was ever seen amongst them until all had gone to market.
15. Yes.

43.

3. About 500.
4. No sign of any disease.
12. A few deaths occurred through excessive swelling. No cure was tried.
13. Fewer deaths than previous to inoculation.
14. Inoculation, if properly performed, I believe acts as a preventive; but if cattle are diseased when inoculated, they will die, unless the disease is in a very mild form. I have known cattle in one paddock not inoculated dying rapidly, whilst cattle in an adjoining paddock (who had every chance of being diseased) who were inoculated, did not show any symptoms of the disease.
15. Yes, most decidedly.

44.

1. 31st March, 1869.
3. 450.
4. Cattle were poor, recently purchased in New England; three or four were observed with symptoms of the disease.
5. Disease was noticed seven or eight days before inoculation.
12. 2 per cent. died from excessive swelling; no means were used to cure.
13. I have seen no cattle affected with the disease since they were inoculated.
14. As far as my experience goes, I have found inoculation, when properly done, to be a *certain* preventive of after infection.
I have had only a small herd of cattle (about 300 head) for some years, and have never had them all regularly inoculated; but as far as I can form an opinion without accurate classification, I have noticed that those inoculated are seldom or ever attacked, while those not inoculated almost invariably are, sooner or later.
15. I do not think that an Act making inoculation compulsory is at all necessary. The remedy is so simple that it is in the power of every cattle-owner to protect himself; and any one wilfully neglecting his own interests by not using it, deserves to suffer.

45.

1. October, 1866.
3. 1,270.
4. In good condition; about 6 per cent.
5. The cattle were inoculated immediately after the disease appeared.
12. About 1 per cent. died from the tails swelling; I then put the inoculated cattle into a crush pen on the ninth day, and cut their tails off a little above the swollen place, which saved all the rest.
13. The disease here was not very bad, still none of the cattle I inoculated have ever had the disease since, and did as well in every way as the others that were not done.
14. Some of the cattle while travelling to market, have been mixed with other drafts that were more or less diseased, but none of them seemed any the worse, or showed any symptoms of the disease. I do not think it is any use whatever to inoculate any cattle that have recovered from the disease, or any that show symptoms of the disease.
15. I do not think it necessary to pass an Act obliging owners to inoculate their cattle; in a great many instances, where the disease appears, it is in so mild a form that very few die from it; and a beast will never have it a second time, in my opinion.

46.

1. Some six or seven years ago.
3. About 800 head, mostly milkers, crawlers, and working bullocks.
4. Cattle not diseased when inoculated.
5. Not at all.
12. A great many deaths occurred from excessive swelling, caused by inoculation—75 per cent., I should think; no steps taken to cure the swellings.
13. Very bad indeed; it completely annihilated a fine herd of crawlers I had; they were never the same afterwards.
14. I believe in inoculation of cattle if done at the right time, but here is the difficulty, and with proper virus; but not one out of a hundred know how to get the virus correctly, and at the proper stage, nor can they tell when the beast is diseased, for a long time after it has it. I think no good can result from inoculation after the beast has the disease.
15. Decidedly not, because then I believe it is useless. I would prefer inoculating healthy cattle, and thus prevent that disease attacking them, but it would rest with me whether the virus was good.

47.

1. 17th July, 1868.
3. 300.
4. Showed symptoms of disease at the rate of $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.
5. About fourteen days.
12. About 1 per cent. of deaths after inoculation, which were caused through excessive swelling in the tail and hind quarters. The tail is generally taken off, and tar used to keep away flies.
13. I believe that inoculation immediately stopped the disease, as there were no fresh cases of pleuro-pneumonia afterwards.
14. I have seen a mixed lot of inoculated and uninoculated cattle running in a paddock together; the *uninoculated* took the disease, whilst the others remained *unaffected*. To prove that inoculation effectually stops pleuro-pneumonia, I know of a herd which had been inoculated, and to distinguish them from any cattle which might afterwards be put on the run, they were ear-marked. Some time afterwards fresh store cattle were put on, which took the disease, as well as young cattle which had been bred on the run since the date of the first inoculation. The old cattle which had been inoculated *four years before* were in *no way affected by the disease*, notwithstanding they were running with those which were infected with pleuro-pneumonia.
During the last four or five years I have inoculated between five and six thousand head of cattle, and in every instance I have found that inoculation has stopped the progress of the disease, and by enforcing compulsory inoculation, I think to a great extent the country would be rid of pleuro-pneumonia, for lots of store cattle travelling from the north every year bring the disease into this district, which compels us to inoculate all young cattle that have not previously been done.
I have seen a herd of cattle which had been left uninoculated for four or five months after taking the disease, and the number of deaths was from 30 to 40 per cent.; the remainder were inoculated, and there were no fresh symptoms of pleuro-pneumonia in the herd.
15. I consider that owners of cattle should be compelled to inoculate as soon as the disease shows itself, whether they have been inoculated before or not; but I do not think cattle once inoculated would be likely to be infected.

48.

1. Don't know; four years ago.
3. 2,500. Travelling.
4. 10 per cent.
5. More than a month, to the knowledge of the owners.
12. Sundry deaths occurred from swelling; some swellings having gone as far as the kidneys.
13. Can't say.
14. I never saw any cattle that were properly inoculated have the disease afterwards; that is to say—cattle that were not diseased, when inoculated.

49.

1. I cannot give the exact date, but it was I think in October, 1864.
3. 2,500 head.
4. I commenced inoculating as soon as I saw symptoms of disease; but cannot give you any information as to the percentage diseased.
5. As soon as the disease was observed, operations were commenced.
12. As we inoculated the cattle we turned them out upon the run, and perhaps would not see them for months afterwards, so I had no opportunity of informing you upon this question.
13. As near as I can calculate, I lost about 7 per cent. after inoculation; but cannot inform you whether the deaths were caused by the inoculation, or by them having the disease prior to the inoculation.
14. All cattle that were free from diseases at the time of inoculation, never afterwards caught it, although running with diseased cattle.
15. I think an Act would be very necessary for compulsion in infected districts.

50.

1. May, and up till end of June.
3. 2,300.
4. Disease first showed in April; deaths till first inoculation out of above number, about 250 head; about 600 showed symptoms of disease.
5. Inoculated without loss of time as soon as could be mustered, say about three weeks.
12. Out of 2,200 head, about four died from excessive swelling. Copious bleeding, and lancing the tail, applying a strong plaster of tar; in a few cases the tails were amputated.
13. Very satisfactory; the disease was at once stopped, and has not shown since.

14. Have inoculated in Victoria over 7,000 head of cattle, with the best results; have paddocked and yarded cattle that were inoculated twelve months before with other cattle in all stages of the disease, and never knew infection take place when the cattle were properly done. It requires much experience in selecting the proper virus to inoculate successfully; and if cattle are effectually inoculated, they will never take pleuro a second time. All our cattle are inoculated. If the virus is procurable in the district, we always inoculate our calves at time of branding. We generally keep a supply of setons on hand for our calves; these setons we soak in virus, place them soaking wet on a tin, and dry them in the oven very slowly, then place them in a bottle, and hermetically seal. We find they are as good at six months, or even nine months, as the virus just from the lung.
15. Most decidedly.

51.

1. May, 1864.
3. 250 head.
4. One beast showing symptoms.
5. Over two months.
12. About 4 per cent. died from excessive swelling after inoculation; no means tried to prevent.
13. All inoculated lived except the percentage above.
14. I fully approve of the inoculation, and think the cattle do much better after.
15. I do.

52.

1. August, 1864.
3. 330.
4. The cattle were diseased when inoculated. I should say there were about 3 per cent. showing symptoms of the disease.
5. About a month elapsed from the time I first observed the disease in the herd until I inoculated.
12. No deaths within my knowledge occurred from excessive swelling; about 7 per cent. were affected with excessive swelling. When the animal's tail became swollen and b'ack, I cut off the discoloured portion, which, in all cases, had the desired effect. When the swelling appeared in any other portion of the body, I scarified in such a way that the matter which came from one wound did not enter the other, which in every case relieved the animal.
13. The result of inoculation in my herd was the total disappearance of the disease. After the cattle had recovered from the effects of the inoculation, they improved in condition.
14. I consider that inoculation is the only preventative for pleuro-pneumonia. All my cattle which were inoculated were exposed as much as possible to the infection; many of them running amongst a diseased herd, and in no case, within my knowledge, did any of them which were inoculated take the disease. I had a few head of cattle which were not inoculated, and they took the disease and died. Great care should be taken in getting the virus. The animal from which it is taken should be free from any other organic disease. The virus should be of a straw colour, or resemble sherry wine, and ought not to be used after forty-eight hours, and in some cases less. When the virus begins to putrify, it only injures the animal. After the virus is taken from the lung, it should not be exposed to the air only as little as possible. When using, another vessel should be kept, in which no more than is sufficient for present use ought to be put. Some inoculate without this precaution, but I consider it necessary. I have known many cattle killed by careless inoculation. I have known hundreds of cattle to die from disease, because owners did not, or would not, believe in inoculation.
15. I consider that an Act should be passed making inoculation compulsory upon all owners of cattle.

53.

1. About 1864.
3. About 600.
4. About 5 per cent. showing symptoms.
5. About three months.
12. 1 per cent. died from excessive swelling in the tails, from having been neglected, *i.e.*, through not cutting it off before the swelling reached the body. Cutting the tails is the only remedy I know of to stop the swelling.
13. The cattle became in fine condition immediately after inoculation.
14. I highly approve of inoculation, as it gives power over the disease by cutting off the tail; whereas if taken in a natural way in the lung, it is impossible to give any relief to the beast. I have observed some of my cattle affected a second time, but in a very mild form, and no deaths. My opinion is, that inoculation should be compulsory, and make it an *indictable* offence to inoculate except with *proper virus*.

54.

1. In October, 1862.
3. 2,100.
4. Most of them badly diseased.
5. About three months.
12. Not more than 2 per cent. ; did not adopt means to stop or cure swelling.
13. Was decidedly good ; saved my herd ; cattle thrived very quickly after they recovered.
14. Did not notice that any beasts were attacked after the inoculation, and have been free from pleuro-pneumonia ever since.
15. Yes, decidedly.

55.

1. November 29th, 1868 ; February 6th, 1869 ; February 29th, 1869 ; March 11th, 1869 ; April 18th, 1869.
3. 1,426, by me ; 467 purchased *as inoculated*.
4. The cattle showed no symptoms of disease ; very fair condition for store cattle.
5. None of the above herds showed any disease on their first arrival here. I inoculated whenever I could obtain virus, which I generally succeeded in getting from my neighbours, ———.
12. In some of the lots operated upon, no deaths ; altogether about one in 300. An imported Hereford heifer died from inoculation ; administered medicines sent by Mr. Pottie, v.s., Sydney ; injections of horse oil, belladonna ointment ; applications outward to the swelled part about tail, of corrosive sublimate ; scarifying the swelled parts ; bleeding under the tail.
13. The prevention of pleuro-pneumonia, as far as my experience leads me to judge, and a great susceptibility to fatten *quickly* in the animal properly operated upon.
14. I have had many inoculated cattle running with diseased ones, when I resided in the neighbourhood of Maitland (but not since I have been here) without being affected by the disease ; in short, my experience leads me to think that, when a beast has been properly inoculated—and an undoubted sign is, when the animal shows a stiff or crooked tail, two or three weeks after the operation—I say after such a proof of efficacious inoculation, I have never seen such animal again diseased with pleuro-pneumonia. I am a thorough believer in the efficacy of inoculation (of course the operation must be properly done) ; nor have I jumped at conclusions, but have had reasons for forming my opinion, which want of space only prevents me from giving.

56.

1. Some time about 1864.
3. 600.
4. The cattle were all healthy, but were inoculated as a precaution against infection.
12. None.
13. Satisfactory.
14. None on this run have died, we having been very free from disease ; but there have been instances in this part of the country of numbers of cattle dying after inoculation, and some that were free from disease before.
15. Decidedly not. The matter should be left to the option of owners, as the results of inoculation have not been universally attended with beneficial results.

57.

1. July, 1868.
3. 209.
4. About 3 per cent. showed symptoms, and all died.
5. I can't say.
12. None died from excessive swelling.
13. Of the 209 head, seven died ; five of which were very bad at time of inoculation.
14. Have hardly any experience in this disease ; operation performed for me by a Mr. ———.
15. I do not.

58.

1. September and October, 1863.
3. 700 head.
4. About 2 per cent. of herd.
5. About two months.
12. One or two cows died ; nothing done.
13. Was under the impression at time that it stopped the disease ; but some of my neighbours did not inoculate, and lost less than I did.
14. I believe in inoculation so far that, if I heard of the disease in the neighbourhood, I should inoculate at once. Very soon after inoculation the disease disappeared, and has not broken out since.
15. I do not.

59.

1. July, 1868.
3. 2,800.
4. Diseased ; about 5 per cent. showing symptoms.
5. About three months.
12. No deaths occurred from excessive swellings ; there were a few with swelled tails, but these were taken to the yard, and either scarified or else the tail cut completely off. I should advise the latter plan, to save risk and trouble ; in trying to save the tail, I have lost the beast in several instances.
13. No diseased cattle have since been seen on the runs.
14. The old cattle belonging to the run had been inoculated previously, but showed no symptoms of disease at the time of the second inoculation ; the young cattle, on the contrary, showed symptoms—they had not been inoculated. The disease is not seen here now, unless with cattle coming from other parts, and which have not been inoculated. I don't think there are any cattle in this district which have not been inoculated ; if there are, I know nothing of them.
15. Yes.

60.

1. February and March, 1868.
3. 1,600.
4. Diseased ; about 10 per cent. showing symptoms.
5. About six months.
12. About 1 per cent of deaths ; six of these from about eighty head, done with other virus ; cut the tails off, and made incisions in the rump.
13. No disease has since been seen on the station.
14. I started about 900 of these cattle on the road previous to inoculation, and lost between two and three hundred from disease. The cattle on the adjoining station had not at that time been inoculated, and a great number of them were diseased. I got virus from them to inoculate with. Cattle continued to die on the neighbouring station when inoculation had not been resorted to, while those I had inoculated were and have been up to the present time perfectly free from disease. Those cattle have since been inoculated. It is more than twelve months since I left the Clarence, consequently, I cannot give any information about uninoculated cattle. I think all the cattle in that district are inoculated ; I only knew of one station there, and they have since, I believe, resorted to the usual means to check the disease, viz., inoculation.
15. Yes.

61.

3. 1,000.
4. Were diseased ; 50 per cent. showed symptoms.
5. Six months.
12. Deaths did occur after inoculation ; the swellings were scarified, and salt applied.
13. Disease disappeared shortly after inoculation.
15. I consider an Act should be passed obliging owners to inoculate.

62.

1. No record kept.
3. About 300.
4. Healthy ; the first affected was killed for virus.
5. All healthy.
12. I did not lose a single beast from inoculating.
13. My neighbours round were losing cattle both before and after inoculation ; and their cattle with the disease were often mixed with mine ; but mine, except the one killed for virus, were not affected, except in one instance a bullock after inoculation showed symptoms of the disease, he was put in a paddock and watched, but no remedies applied ; he had the disease in a very mild form, and fattened well after it.
14. I have no doubt of the efficacy of inoculation, if properly performed, and with proper virus. I had determined to inoculate my cattle as soon as the disease came near enough to get proper virus, which I did at the same time mine were done. The cattle of two or three small settlers were done at the same time, and I did not hear of their losing any ; at the same time, their neighbours, who had employed a professed inoculator, were constantly losing theirs, both from the first effects of the inoculation, and the disease afterwards. The virus he used was described to me as blacker than port wine. In another case I knew several were lost, but the needle was passed so deep that the blood ran in a stream from the tail ; in fact, the needle was passed through the tail, instead of under the cuticle only.

Qy.—How long would the virus keep good, if candle cotton was saturated with, and kept in bottles hermetically sealed, the cotton for use passing through a gutta percha capsule?

15. There can be no doubt in my own mind that an Act should be passed, making it compulsory on owners whose cattle are infected, or within so many miles, that they can get the virus fresh.

63.

1. 1865.
3. 600.
4. Diseased; 10 per cent. showing symptoms when inoculated.
5. Three months.
12. The deaths were about 5 per cent. from swelling; no means were tried to cure the swelling.
13. The cattle have shown no symptoms of disease since.
14. Cattle properly inoculated, I am convinced, will never take the disease after, as I have had working bullocks running with infected cattle, and were not the least affected.
15. I think all persons having cattle infected ought to be obliged to inoculate, to prevent the spread of the disease.

64.

1. There has been no cattle inoculated on this run during my time of managing; and if adopted here before my time, there is no account of it here.
2. I am not possessed of any information from any persons having cattle inoculated.
3. On this and the two following questions I am not informed.
12. Of this I have no knowledge.
14. I can afford no information from my own experience, and have never heard any person in this neighbourhood speaking in favour of inoculation, though I believe it may be of service if properly understood; but who is there in the bush that does understand it? and to pay for it being done, we might be paying an impostor who knew less about it than ourselves.
- I am told the disease was very bad in this herd some few years ago, but there is no account kept of the damage done by it; inoculation was also tried, but did not seem to have any good effect, as the cattle died as fast after it as they did before.
15. My experience with infected stock has not been sufficient to justify me in giving an opinion on the last question; but as the question requires to be answered, I must say that I do not.

65.

1. 1862; when the disease first appeared among my cattle.
3. 500.
4. Good condition; about 30 per cent were diseased.
5. About a month, and had they been inoculated when the disease first appeared, the deaths would have been less.
12. None.
13. It is my opinion that where healthy cattle are running with diseased cattle, and they are inoculated, it will prevent them from taking the disease—I found it so in my own herd.

66.

1. June, 1866.
3. About 1,200.
4. Diseased; about 5 per cent.
5. About three months.
12. None.
13. Satisfactory.
14. Nothing more required.
15. No, but I consider it to every cattle-owner's interest to do so.

67.

1. January 1st, 1869.
3. 294.
5. Twelve months.
12. One died from excessive swelling in the thigh, and when opened was found decayed around the thigh bone.
13. If taken in time, will prevent the effect of disease.

68.

1. March 10th, 1868.
3. 210, including calves, working bullocks.
4. In good condition; percentage, about ten.
5. A week.
12. Some I opened on the rump and the butts of the tail, and let out large quantities of matter, and they recovered—dressing the wound with tar and turps. I lost only three by the swelling, as the cattle were quiet and well looked after.
13. The cattle stayed dying immediately after they were inoculated; all that were infected died off in the course of eight or nine days, and there has not been a sick beast since.
14. I think that the effect of inoculation was magic, for I am sure I should have lost them all if I had not done them; and I am sure if properly done, and the virus properly taken, it is a sure safeguard against that terrible disease; there were several infected beasts among mine since, but done no injury to mine. I may add that I have been among cattle and sheep nearly forty years, and I am of opinion that owners of cattle should be compelled to inoculate where the disease breaks out. There are many large stockholders that pay people to do their cattle, and they drive the needle into the bone, which is sure to cause death.
15. I consider that there should be some law to make it compulsory for the protection of stock in the Colony, and no stock should be allowed to travel that are infected.

69.

1. October, 1865.
3. 200 "crawlers."
4. About 10 per cent. showing symptoms.
5. One month.
12. No.
13. Prevented the spread of the disease among those inoculated.
14. To the best of my belief, inoculation is only efficient for twelve or eighteen months, and for clean cattle—it is a preventive for that time. The cattle were inoculated by a party who kept secret the mode of obtaining the virus.
15. I do.

70.

1. February, 1867.
3. 900.
4. A continual discharge from the nostril. 10 per cent.
5. One month.
12. Yes, and some were bled, and some afterwards had the tail cut off.
14. I never knew any beast to be affected after inoculation.
15. Yes.

71.

3. 700.
13. Don't approve of it.
14. Bleeding in the jugular.
15. No.

72.

1. September, 1867.
3. 600.
4. Diseased; about 5 per cent.
5. About six months; the disease had been in the herd, of which several died.
12. 1 per cent. Tail scarified and washed with pickle, without effect.
13. No appearance of disease since, up to the present time.
14. The adjoining herd were uninoculated and dying with disease for some months afterwards, but took no effect on mine. One of my nearest neighbours persisted in not inoculating; and after losing a great number of his herd, was compelled to do so.
15. I consider that compulsory inoculation is necessary to prevent the spread of disease, which was first brought to this district by a team of working bullocks from New England. The less cattle are driven about the better; and it is essential to class them, and let them through the crush as quickly as possible.

73.

1. 3rd May, 1867.
3. 300.
4. A little diseased, but not badly.
5. Ten to twelve months.
12. No deaths from swelling.

13. I lost two cows after inoculation.
14. I inoculated my cattle in cold weather. I believe in turning them in the bush as soon as inoculated, so as they can lie down in clean grass, instead of herding in a dirty stock-yard, and going to the water of their own accord. I approve of a young beast for virus, which I did about 200 with; I took it from a yearling calf of my own herd, about in its first stage, and the virus used the two following days after, and the cattle did well. I like the calf in good condition, for virus. Some cattle were left uninoculated, but they are all right amongst the others.
15. I consider an Act should be passed for the protection of stock.

74.

1. September, 1865.
3. About 450.
4. Tolerably healthy; about 5 per cent. showing symptoms.
5. Two or three months.
12. None.
13. Satisfactory.
14. About 60 to 100 died before inoculation, and only one afterwards—an imported bull.
15. Yes.

75.

1. 11th September, 1866.
3. 500 and upwards.
4. Disease appeared—1 or 2 per cent. showing symptoms.
5. One heifer died some months before the disease was taken notice of, until more began to show symptoms.
12. I lost more than half the cows that swelled, but attribute the loss to neglect in not then understanding the proper treatment before the swelling got into the root of the tail. In cases where the tail was cut off above the swelling, the animal recovered in a few days. Where the inflammation had got too high, the tail was cut off as short as possible, scarified the swelling on both sides as deep as possible, and filled the wound up with Stockholm tar and turpentine; but I believe when it gets so high, is to trust to nature for a cure. After the swelling gets up to the rump, it generally goes down between the hind legs and under the stomach, in some cases into the chest, where it proves fatal.
14. When I inoculated, ———, who had the ——— Run, had the disease very strongly in his herd, which was running with mine. At that time he did not believe in inoculation, and although his were dying every day, in some cases with milkers in the paddock, none of mine took the disease after inoculation, which, in my opinion, clearly proves that cattle properly inoculated will not take the disease. I have seen inoculated cattle smelling diseased beasts' nostril, and feeding alongside of them, none the worse for it. Mr. ——— had many diseased cattle shot, and in many cases burnt, which proved perfectly useless, as many would have recovered if left. After six months' delay, Mr. ——— had his cattle inoculated, but the disease had got so strongly into the herd that it took at least three months and more after before it disappeared—he must have lost about 30 per cent. If a herd was inoculated before the disease appeared, I believe it would be thorough preventive. The younger cattle are when operated upon, the less danger. I think the knife is better than the needle. Working bullocks and milking cows are more likely to take the disease than cattle *in the bush*.
15. I certainly consider an Act should be passed, compelling owners of infected cattle to have their herds inoculated.

76.

1. January and February, 1866.
3. The herd numbered about 2,500 at ———, and about $\frac{2}{3}$ of this number were inoculated.
4. In good condition.
5. About six months.
12. Not ascertainable.
13. The herd, in eighteen months, reduced about 40 per cent. If a beast took the disease after being inoculated, it invariably died; the inoculation having taken place weeks or months previous to the disease showing excepting that occasioned by the inoculation.
14. As stated above, if a beast took the disease after inoculation, it invariably died. Of cattle killed on the station, 99 per cent. show signs of having had the disease, the indication being a lung adhering to either side of the ribs, the lung being partially callous. In this disease, from careful observation, I find that the greatest mortality per month (per cent. of the herd) occurs in November, and the smallest in July, in this district.
15. I do not think so, as I have lost a less percentage in the herd uninoculated than in the two herds that I had inoculated.

77.

1. April 26th.
3. 199.
4. About 3 per cent. showed signs of disease.
5. A fortnight.
12. None.
13. Nearly all the cattle that were diseased previous to inoculation died.
14. Do not consider it infectious; have known one or two to be diseased in the paddock, and none of the others caught the infection.
15. Decidedly not.

78.

1. March, 1867.
3. All the herd—450.
4. Two; symptoms, hard breathing.
5. One week.
12. Lost forty head; excessive swelling; cut off the tail.
14. I consider the disease infectious, as we had none infected until a diseased team came from the New England Road, and passing ———. I believe most of them died, and other teams generally. A pair of mates, one man named ———, had his team inoculated in the usual way, and watched them daily, squeezing what matter he could from the wound in the tail, and did not lose any. I consider if I had known this method of attention, I should not have lost so many. I believe one man named ——— never inoculated, neither has he lost any.
15. Yes.

79.

1. August, September, and October, 1865.
3. About 1800.
4. The herd in store condition; about 30 per cent. showed symptoms of having the disease.
5. About three months.
12. Not ascertainable.
13. The herd in eighteen months' time reduced 50 per cent. If a beast took the disease after being inoculated, it invariably died. See my remarks on the state of ——— herd.
14. As stated above, if a beast took the disease after inoculation, it invariably died. Of cattle that are now killed on the station, 99 per cent. show signs of having had the disease, the indication being a lung adhering to either side of the ribs, the lung being partially callous.
15. I do not think so.

80.

1. First of inoculation, March, 1864.
3. 2,348, at different periods.
4. We lost something like 25 per centage, by disease.
5. Near about six months to nine months.
12. I had something like 2 or 3 per cent. die when I first commenced inoculation; but since I do not remember seeing any; but I generally put an incision or knife cut in the rump, and roll up a little tow with Venice turpentine in it. This caused the wound to run, and the swelling to cease. As long as the swelling don't stop the passage, the beast recovers.
13. The result of inoculation is that pleuro-pneumonia has finally left our herd, and our cattle are in a fine healthy state.
14. I believe any cattle that were properly inoculated are not exposed to infection; and more than that, I believe in vaccination before inoculation, and that it can be carried out as well as inoculation, among small, quiet herds. I have vaccinated some hundreds, and they all take well, and it is much lighter—no swelling to speak of from vaccination; but most people don't take the trouble to find out what is best. Certainly there is more trouble in vaccinating, but it is by far the best. There is no swelling to speak of, and it has the same effect. The Government will have to employ qualified men in different parts to look after inoculation, and see it carried out, and instruct and help them; and men who will tuck up their shirt-sleeves, and go into the yards and work, and who know what they are doing. Half the men don't know proper virus when they see it, whether it is good or bad.

You ask me whether inoculating should be made compulsory. My opinion is that it should be made compulsory in all herds where disease appears, and that proper men, well acquainted with its nature, should be appointed to see it carried into effect—not men that have had no experience. I have tried experiments with virus in all its stages for upwards of three years, on three or four head at a time, and kept them in the paddock,

so that I could see them every day, and see its result. Virus should be taken out of the chest, when the lung is in a proper state. I find a good deep cut with a knife, and a little Venice turpentine rolled up in a lump of tow, will keep the swelling down if put well into the wound. The tow keeps the wound open, as well as keeping the Venice turpentine in the wound, which causes a good discharge. No beast will die through swellings, as long as you see it in time to apply your remedy, and keep the passage clear. Stoppage of the passage will kill very soon, but that can be prevented with care; but with virus properly taken—that is, in a proper stage, and properly used—there will be no swelling to speak of. But in small, quiet herds, I prefer vaccination to inoculation—it is much lighter, and answers just the same—it has just the same effect. I have inoculated and vaccinated 2,348 at different periods, and I don't think I had above six or seven die out of the whole. I had not one die from vaccination. I have cured several head of cattle that had pleuro-pneumonia by bleeding. I have one Hereford bald-face cow milking that was nearly dead with pleuro-pneumonia, and you would think she never had it—she shows no symptoms of it whatever. But I have cattle on the run that had it when it first broke out that are doing very well, breeding every year; but if you run them fifty yards they cough at once as bad as when they had it first. But I believe a great number of people that have inoculated don't know anything about what they are doing or what they are using. As long as they can get virus of any kind, they think it is right. I don't believe that any beast that has had pleuro-pneumonia very bad and recovers, is good for work, or will stand the hardships they would before the lung is so much destroyed—a little exercise overcomes them. I verily believe if inoculation had been studied more at the beginning by experienced men, and made compulsory, a great many thousands of cattle would have been saved.

15. I do believe that such an Act should be passed.

81.

4. None inoculated that showed any symptoms of disease.
5. There were odd ones some length of time before showing symptoms of disease.
12. If not attended to, if they swell, they die.
14. I believe if cattle are properly inoculated before they get the disease, they will not get it after for some years.
15. Yes, I think it would be a good thing.

82.

1. August, September, and December, 1863.
3. 650.
4. With few exceptions, the cattle were in excellent condition, many being nearly marketable. The disease first appeared in a river paddock, where were 250 head of fattening cattle. There were not more than 5 per cent. of these showing symptoms; and had I not seen a good deal of the disease, I should not have known that pleuro-pneumonia was present.
5. About three weeks.
12. Not more than 2 per cent. in the first 200 head; about 20 per cent. in the second 410; and 25 per cent. in the third 37. No cure was attempted.
13. Few deaths occurred in my herd after the effects of inoculation had passed away—not more than $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. per annum; and up to the present time no symptoms of pleuro-pneumonia have appeared, except in a few calves, the progeny of the cows that had disease when inoculated.
14. I am, though a loser to a large percentage, quite convinced that inoculation is a certain preventive and cure. I frequently had stray diseased cattle in my herd, and I can confidently say that not a beast of mine died from the disease six months after inoculation. I attribute my loss to using virus taken from cattle in the last stage of the disease. If I ever had to inoculate again, I feel confident that I could do so with little loss. I should only use the virus from a beast in the early stage of disease, and carefully avoid making the incision so deep as to draw blood. My present herd, with the exception of a few of those inoculated in 1863, is uninoculated, but no disease has ever appeared since then. I have some store cattle from a herd which was not inoculated, though diseased, and I consider that there are a great number of "non-fatteners" amongst them solely from the disease having undermined their constitutions. Many have a bad cough, and a miserable, haggard appearance after cold weather; and several persons who have seen them agree with me in attributing their unhealthiness to this cause. They, however, show no symptoms of the disease; they are without doubt suffering from the effects of disease having been allowed to die out in them. I say so because I had one or two similar cases in my own herd, doubtless from their having escaped inoculation.
15. I do not consider an Act of Parliament necessary.

83.

1. 10th July, 1863.
3. 300 head.
4. When the cattle were inoculated, ten were badly diseased, and 10 per cent. showing symptoms of disease.
5. I could perceive the cattle diseased for about three weeks before the date of inoculation.
12. There were no deaths in the cattle after the inoculation; the swelling in the dairy cattle was fomented with boiled marsh-mallows three times a day for five days.
13. In three weeks after the inoculation was performed, all traces of the disease had disappeared.
14. When I inoculated the dairy cows, they were in many cases forward in calf. I never inoculated any of those calves after, and not one of them took the disease. I never knew any exposed to the infection a second time—not one instance. I inoculated four steers, two in the dewlap and the other two in the ribs, and all four died within a fortnight from the effects of inoculation. This I did for a neighbour who wished to try the experiment.
15. I approve of inoculation, believe it, if properly performed, to be a certain cure. I consider it advisable to pass an Act obliging owners of cattle, when infected, to inoculate them.

84.

1. July, 1864.
3. 2,148.
4. All young bullocks, in fair condition, and only a small number showing disease, say 10 per cent.
5. Only noticed in the herd about two months before inoculation.
12. Only very few died that I am aware of—say 1 per cent.; but the cattle being turned out upon the run, which is not fenced, I, of course, would not see every case of death. To cure excessive swelling, I merely made an incision on each side of the butt of the tail, which appeared to prove effectual when taken in time. It was considered that only a small number of deaths took place, on account of my cattle having been inoculated at an early date, before the disease had got much into the herd; and being very particular with the virus, and not passing the seton too close to the bone of the tail.
14. The case which, to my knowledge, most proves the efficacy of inoculation, is that of the herd belonging to the late Mr. —, at his station on the —, when he lost a great many cattle from this disease; but his neighbours, who inoculated their cattle, did not suffer to nearly so great an extent. I believe that all young cattle, also cows and calves, suffer more severely from this disease.
15. Most certainly not; as an evil-disposed person could then, for the sake of making a person, to whom he owed a grudge, inoculate his herd, and by that means knock his cattle about, and prevent them from becoming fat, report that the herd was infected, and thus do him a serious injury.

85.

1. December, 1866.
3. 130 head.
4. No symptoms of disease showing.
5. About three months.
12. I found six dead through inoculation; I used no means to try to save them.
13. I think it a good thing to inoculate the cattle where the disease shows out amongst the cattle.
14. Since I had my cattle inoculated, I have seen no symptom of the disease.

86.

1. 1864—about November.
3. 6,000, on or about.
4. About 5 per cent.
5. About two months.
12. About one in 300 die from excessive swelling. Bleeding below the tail is the only cure we know, which should be done on the eighth day after inoculation.
13. Inoculation, in our opinion, is a preventative against disease, and not a cure of disease.
14. Inoculation should be adopted upon the cattle showing symptoms of disease; but we are not aware of cattle, after being properly inoculated, having taken the disease. This herd, like most large herds of cattle, show occasional symptoms of disease, but not sufficient to induce us to inoculate.
15. We consider that an Act to compel travelling cattle showing disease to be inoculated would be desirable; but we do not think it would be judicious to compel the inoculation of a large herd because a few head showed symptoms of disease. When cattle are very slightly infected, it may be impossible to get a sufficient number in the proper stage of disease to obtain virus for inoculating the whole herd.

87.

1. April, 1864.
3. 125.
4. No disease, and no symptoms.
12. Thirty-five head out of 125 died. Used butter of antimony, and Venice turps. Had a good effect.
15. I do.

88.

1. Early in the year 1863.
3. About 150 head.
4. The cattle were in good condition, being chiefly milking cows and young cattle, about 10 per cent.
5. About one month.
12. Two or three deaths occurred from excessive swellings, at long intervals, after inoculation; but no means were tried to cure.
13. There were no more fresh cases in that portion of the herd after inoculation.
14. Generally, where the operation of inoculation was performed upon sound cattle there were no more fresh cases; at the same time, it is well known that where strict supervision was exercised over a herd, such as destroying the affected, and maintaining a rigid separation, the disease also ceased. The properly inoculated animal, however, is safer from future contact.

89.

1. November, 1863.
3. About 1,200 head.
4. The herd were in good condition, and about 5 per cent. showed symptoms of the disease.
5. Symptoms of the disease were visible about a week previous to the inoculation.
12. The loss by deaths were about 3 per cent., through excessive swelling. Turpentine and tar were applied to keep off flies, &c., and I think tended to relieve the swellings.
13. Reduced stock in condition; but after recovery from swellings (which would be about three weeks from time of inoculation), usual condition took place, disease disappeared, and the herd has not been visited with it since.
14. I believe the inoculation to be an invaluable remedy against pleuro-pneumonia. My stock were all inoculated, and were very often among other cattle that had the disease, and were not affected by it. I know of one case where a party inoculated their cattle, but did not get them all in at the time. About twenty head were got in afterwards, and having no virus were not operated on. They were placed in a paddock with other cattle that had been inoculated some two or three months previous. They all took the disease and died. They were in good condition when placed with the others. From my experience of the disease, I think if it once made its appearance in a herd, and the inoculation not attended to, the ravages would be very great.
15. I consider such an Act very necessary.

90.

1. 21st November, 1866.
3. About 600.
4. Infected, and the losses were about 150. This disease is very stealthy—no appearance of illness until near death.
5. Eight or ten months.
12. One.
13. I lost a few after the operation; but I conclude they were diseased before, and that hastened their death. But the disease soon died out, and I have seen none for a long time—in fact, I hear but little or nothing about it now.
14. I certainly approve of inoculation; but I was always of opinion that the disease was more epidemic than infectious. I have had no appearance of the disease a second time, but I have ascertained from a friend that he tried the experiment of a second inoculation, and it had no effect whatever. This was done a year after the first. I know of nothing more to add, or I would gladly do so.
15. I do not consider there is any necessity for legislative interference in the matter, most people being too much alive to their own interests to make such a measure necessary.

91.

1. The winter and spring of 1862.
3. About 1,700.
4. Diseased on part of run, on which part about one in twenty showed symptoms.
5. About one month.
12. About $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. died from the above cause; no means were tried for their cure.
13. Most satisfactory. The cattle on the part of the run which did not show symptoms of disease before they were inoculated, did not suffer more than about one-twentieth of what they did on the part where the disease first appeared.
14. On the parts of the run furthest from where the disease first appeared, the deaths were almost nil. The disease totally disappeared from among them six months afterwards, and has never shown among either them or their offspring since. I believe in inoculation thoroughly from experience.
15. I do not consider that owners should be compelled to inoculate under any circumstances.

92.

1. December, 1864.
3. 2,000 dairy cows.
4. Numbers very bad, others showing no symptoms.
5. Cannot say for certain. Some above a week, others longer. *No one* can tell.
12. Stated above. Cut the tail off close to the rump, to prevent going into the spine. Cannot say what percentage died; but a large number out of a herd of 7,000. More than 2,000 died, and full two-thirds of those inoculated.
13. I cannot do more than I have stated above, except to state that I do not believe in it.
14. I can only speak of my own neighbourhood, and of my own herd. I believe the inoculation in this district caused the death of thousands; perhaps if not inoculated, they may have died. I have no faith in it, and will never do it again, if not compulsory; and if compelled, should consider that I ought to be paid for every one that died—in other words, that was killed.
15. I should consider it an Algerine Act. I am not aware that any one knows the effect of inoculation—scientific or medical, and people are working in the dark.

93.

1. September, 1867.
3. About 2,000 or over.
4. Saw cattle dying daily.
5. Perhaps three months.
12. In hot weather, I should think from 5 to 10 per cent.; cool weather, only two or three. I used the knife where any swelling appeared.
13. Disease disappeared, and cattle did well in most cases.
14. I have known a few cases where cattle, as I thought, were properly inoculated, parts of the tail having fallen off, *take* disease and die. I have also known herds that were rotten with disease, quite recover without inoculation, and no sign of pleuro for the last twelve months or over. On the whole, I think inoculation does good; and should I see a case of pleuro, I inoculate about the spot it appears, but would not in other parts.
15. We want no legislation on this subject.

94.

1. December, 1867.
3. About 120.
4. Cattle in rather low condition, the season being dry; of bullocks purchased for fattening, nearly half showed symptoms of pleuro, after being some time in paddocks. Those bred on the farm were but slightly affected.
5. About four months. Not having had any previous experience in inoculating, and the cattle being in rather low condition, I was of opinion that there would be a risk of the weakly ones dying under the effects of inoculation, and delayed it too long.
12. Stated above. About 4 per cent, and chiefly cows.
13. In the case of my cattle, the result was highly satisfactory. It reminded me of what I had read of the serpent-bitten Israelites, after looking on the brazen serpent. After inoculating, the cattle (with proper care), almost "ceased to die."
14. In two cases of cows (mother and daughter), the whole rump and tail, gut and uterus became stiff and hard swollen, which hot bathing had no effect in reducing, and the animals died. Cows were more given to this swelling than bullocks, and when it had fairly taken hold, the cattle seldom got over it. I believe this rump swelling may, however, in most cases, be prevented by taking off the tail in time. If tail is only slightly swollen, take off a few inches above inoculated part; if tail is much swollen and stiff, cut off tail near the rump, and score with knife, to cause free bleeding under the tail. On some occasions, the cattle, after inoculating, were scourged, as in diarrhoea, and appeared much sickened for a day or two. Those cattle all did well, and fattened quickly after.

95.

1. 1864.
3. 200 head.
4. Cannot say.
5. Cannot say.
12. Yes (see No. 10) ; no means were used.
13. Cannot say ; but three-fourths died, either from pleuro, inoculation, or both.
14. I can only say that my stock in the — District (below the mountain), out of 500 head, of which 200 inoculated, about half died ; while at my station —, on Monaro, out of 800 head, none being inoculated, the deaths were about 50 head.
15. No. I am of opinion that inoculation would be injurious *after* pleuro has appeared in the herd.

96.

1. June, 1868.
3. 450.
4. Nonc.
12. About 1 per cent, on account of being left too long before cutting the tail or hard lumps out.
13. Cattle improved for the first month, and then fell away in condition, but soon after picked up, and no signs of pleuro followed.
14. Belief that inoculation prevents contagion, as my cattle were exposed after—as on adjoining runs and amongst neighbours' cattle, the disease was bad, and none of my own suffered.
15. I am of opinion that owners should be compelled to inoculate if the disease is in their herds, and think advisable even in the district.

97.

1. 1865.
3. 1,000.
4. Not infected. Nearly all the cattle in the district were.
12. Not amongst my cattle. I have seen cattle very much swollen, and some die. I think it was in consequence of the virus used being from a beast in the last stage of the disease.
13. No beast that I inoculated ever showed symptoms of disease. I find that calves from inoculated cows will not take the disease.
14. My cattle were inoculated before the disease appeared amongst them, notwithstanding all the herds in the neighbourhood (and some cattle running with mine), were diseased, and dying in large numbers. The inoculated cattle never took it. I have known several herds that were diseased and dying very fast. Inoculating it immediately prevented the sound cattle from infection, and stopped the deaths. My experience tends to show that inoculating cattle already diseased hastens death (caused by swelling). There was a herd infected in this district and were dying in large numbers ; when they were inoculated it killed most of the diseased beasts in three to six days, but there were no new cases. I find the only cattle that will not bear the operation are young calves, of which it kills a large percentage.
15. Yes ; I think it would benefit all stockowners.

98.

1. 10th June, 1868.
3. 500 head.
4. 4 per cent. showing symptoms.
5. About 12 days.
12. About nine head died from swelling, out of 500 inoculated.
13. If properly inoculated it is a cure, and also prevents the disease. If the cattle are exposed to other cattle diseased, there is not the slightest fear of their taking it.
14. Any cattle inoculated will not take the disease. I believe in inoculating the cattle, if the disease has appeared in the herd, but not otherwise.

99.

1. 1866.
3. 3,000.
4. Dying of disease, and quite one-fourth showing symptoms.
5. One year.
12. Many died—I should think quite 10 per cent., after inoculation ; but they may have been diseased when done.
13. The result was satisfactory ; they ceased to die.

14. I do approve of inoculating at the time I had mine done. I had some cows on the run, and although the disease was not so fatal as at first, odd ones of the inoculated continued to die; but so few fatalities, that I did not consider the losses by it so great as to induce me to do the whole herd; and it continued in them up to 1867, when I sold the herd to Mr. ———.
15. I do not.

100.

1. No record kept.
3. No record kept.
4. A few died previous to inoculation. Cannot say percentage.
5. Disease showed itself about two months previous.
12. None.
13. Lost only two calves from disease after inoculation; and one heifer took disease after inoculation, and recovered.
14. Our cattle were exposed to infection for six months after inoculation. The joint lessee of this place at the time, Mr. ———, did not inoculate his cattle, and he lost a large percentage. We lost none, although ours were running amongst his, and when *his* cattle were inoculated, they ceased dying.
15. Yes.

101.

3. 1,000 head.
5. About three months.
12. Of what was seen, about 5 per cent. deaths. Those that were swelled, if seen in time, by cutting the tails off they got well.
14. I have inoculated over 1,000 head, but not of the above-named cattle, and believe that it (inoculation) is a preventive; but to what extent cannot state, as all cattle I have had to look after were in the bush, and not seen often, therefore cannot state perfectly what good (if any) had been done.
15. No. Should inoculation prove effective, owners of cattle will look to it themselves.

102.

1. Spring of 1864.
3. About 1,000.
4. About 4 per cent. diseased.
5. Some four months previously solitary cases of disease had appeared.
12. Yes, several—say, 2 per cent. No means used to cure swellings, except some turpentine and tar to clear out maggots when the raw sores got fly-blown.
13. We believe that inoculation, when properly performed, acted as an immediate stopper to the disease at ———.
14. We believe that out of the 1,000 head inoculated at ———, there was no greater loss than the percentage stated in answer to question 12, say 2 per cent. A portion of this loss may have been owing to *inflammation* and getting *fly-blown*, neither being seen until it was too late to attempt any remedies. Since the inoculation in the spring of 1864, the disease has not made its appearance, and consequently no inoculation has been performed at ———.
15. As the result of former experience, we are decidedly of opinion that where pleuro-pneumonia sets in, if the owner of the cattle will not voluntarily take the most effectual means to have them properly inoculated, *he should be compelled to do so by Act of Parliament.*

103.

1. 12th August, 1864.
3. Sixty.
4. Several badly diseased; about 20 per cent.
5. I could not say, as I was ignorant of the disease till they began to die. The second week they began to die I inoculated.
12. Only one animal died—a very valuable cow. She was the first to swell, and I did not know what remedy to apply. She swelled very much, and became unable to pass anything. Others swelled, but on observing the first symptoms, I was advised to cut off the tail about the centre. They all recovered.
13. The deaths ceased immediately, as if by magic, and very few died afterwards. Several showed no symptoms of inoculation, but never took the disease afterwards.

14. The first two weeks, one or two died daily. The deaths ceased immediately on inoculation, and I had no deaths for nearly a month; then a few died that I considered badly diseased at the time of inoculation. Four or five were badly diseased at the time of inoculation, and I omitted to do them. Three of them recovered, although they had the disease badly, one losing her calf. I have these still in my possession, and they do not seem to suffer from the effects of the disease. The disease continued till January, 1865, in my herd, and one beast died in that month. None of the inoculated cattle took it that were not suffering less or more at the time of inoculation. I had about 250 head at my farm and on the run at ———, which is about ten miles from ———; but there being no proclaimed road by the Government to that place, Mr. ———, whose land we had to pass through on sufferance, stopped all cattle traffic and working bullocks that way,—the consequence was that the disease never reached ———; and Mr. ——— herd escaped also, except his fattening cattle that run adjoining or near to ———. He, on discovering the disease, killed every animal in the paddock.
15. I do; it is the greatest safeguard to owners of cattle. The disease was brought into our district by a dealer who brought in diseased cattle, one of which was turned out on the road to die, and smelled (through the fences) the cattle in the paddocks off the road. It lived about a fortnight. I think, if cattle were once inoculated, that the owner ought not to be compelled to inoculate a second time the same cattle. I have great faith in inoculation.

104.

3. Between 400 and 500 within the last twelve months.
4. About 5 per cent. showed symptoms.
13. Disappearance of disease.
15. I consider that inoculation should be made compulsory in herds that are infected.

105.

1. In November, 1862.
3. 5,000.
4. Very bad; about one-third showing symptoms.
5. About four months.
12. There was about 1 per cent. died from swelling; I used to get a sharp knife and cut the swelling open, and then the beast would get well.
13. The disease left the herd in December, 1862.
14. I have every reason to believe in inoculation, if properly inoculated. My cattle were exposed to the infection, but were not affected by it. The best method of inoculation, I find, is with a needle and worsted drawn through the skin at the tip of tail.
15. Yes, I do.

106.

1. July, 1862.
3. About 500.
4. Healthy.
5. Not diseased when inoculated, until the summer following in 1863.
12. About seven in 100, by swelling from inoculation; means tried—fomenting, and dressed with farmer's friend.
13. A good many died the summer following, such as about eight a week.
14. Inoculation did not prevent my cattle from dying.
15. I don't think this Act should be passed.

107.

1. Five years since, ending August, 1869.
3. 3,000.
4. About 10 per cent. showed symptoms of pleuro-pneumonia.
5. Probably a month. When the disease had spread, I inoculated all the cattle I could find.
12. About 3 per cent. of my cattle died from excessive swelling. The means I tried to cure the swellings were to cut off the tail, if it only was affected; but when the swelling extended, I made an incision in the part swollen.
13. The cattle inoculated have never been affected since. The young cattle I inoculate whenever the disease appears, which is usually every year.
14. I may here add, that when I first tried inoculation, I made an incision in the tail of the animal with a knife, and applied virus to the wound. This had little or no effect. I afterwards ascertained that the proper mode was to run the needle through the tail, and leave worsted, previously saturated with the virus, in the opening.
15. I am decidedly of opinion that owners of infected cattle should be compelled to inoculate them.

108.

1. About four years ago, by former proprietors of station.
3. 1,000.
15. Yes, we consider that an Act for such a purpose should be passed.

109.

1. From June to October, 1863, inoculated at various dates.
3. About eighty head.
4. Did not inoculate until disease appeared amongst cattle. Only five or six showed symptoms when I inoculated the first few.
5. Saw first beast of mine diseased in February, 1863, just before I inoculated the first lot. I think disease may be in cattle on a run six or even twelve months before what is called first stage becomes apparent.
12. Several died from swellings caused by the inoculation being too severe; some, I think, died through the swellings extending along the region of the kidneys, and others died through the swelling stopping any passage from the intestines. Did not try any cure, but think some of them might with proper treatment have been saved.
13. Lost about as many from swellings after inoculation as would have died had I left them to the mercy of the disease. The same answer applies to all the herds I had been through that were inoculated that season.
14. I have a few cattle that by chance took the infection from inoculation properly and effectually. Those cattle, I feel confident, will never take it again. They were inoculated in 1863. In the latter part of 1867, I bought fifty head of store cattle. They were diseased, but the disease did not make its appearance for six weeks after I purchased. The store cattle were put to graze in a paddock with about 100 head of cattle that I bred myself. Fifteen head of the store cattle died of the disease, and four head of my own breeding died. On examining the four head I found them to be the increase of cows that were not inoculated, and never had the disease. Any of the cattle that were inoculated in 1863, nor any that had the disease and recovered, nor any of their increase, did not take the disease from the store cattle though running with them the whole season.

110.

1. During the last four years.
3. From 2,000 to 3,000.
4. About 10 per cent.
5. From two to three months.
12. An old one died from excessive swelling. If I saw the tail swollen very much I cut it off.
13. I believe it to be a preventive, and that cattle will not take the disease if properly inoculated, as I have travelled in company with cattle that were inoculated and not one of them died or was sick, and my cattle were not inoculated and were dying daily. I had about 20 per cent. die out of a mob of 400 head, and they were yarded in adjoining yards at night frequently.
14. The greatest thing in inoculation is to get the proper virus, or virus in a proper stage of fever; and very few persons know how to take virus that will have the proper effect. If a beast is properly done it will cause the beast to be a little sick and feverish, and the hair on the neck to rise; and will not take the disease afterwards. I have inoculated thousands, and closely observed its progress and results.
15. I consider an Act should be passed to compel owners of cattle to inoculate when the cattle are affected.

111.

1. Latter end of 1867, early part of 1868.
3. 150 head.
4. Some poor, others middling condition; a few diseased, say five in every hundred.
5. A few weeks; but those that were diseased eventually died, death being accelerated by inoculation in nearly every instance.
12. I had one die from excessive swelling; I tried bleeding by scarring the swollen parts, hind parts especially, but I was too late in commencing operations. I believe if I had bled earlier she would have recovered.
13. A perfect preventive against the disease ever afterwards. Although the inoculated cattle may be running among diseased cattle where they are dying very fast, I never knew an instance yet of an inoculated beast taking the disease, and I have taken a great interest in this one matter.

14. I am quite of opinion that until inoculation is carried out to its full extent, that the herds of cattle in this Colony will never be free from the disease; and I think that too much care cannot be bestowed on keeping stockyards, paddocks, &c., as dry and free from mud and as roomy as possible. I think penning a large number of cattle in small, wet, muddy yards, for a length of time, will bring on the disease as quickly as any other cause.
15. I do. Nothing but inoculation will prevent the disease from spreading.

112.

1. 1866 and 1867.
3. 1,900.
4. 25 per cent.
5. Three months.
12. 2 per cent.—removing part of tail to cause bleeding.
13. Perfect cure.
14. In some instances odd ones have taken the disease, but I have not observed any of such die.
15. I am in favour of an Act to compel cattle owners to inoculate all cattle.

113.

1. September, 1865.
3. 500, more or less.
4. None were inoculated that the disease could be noticed on.
5. Six months.
12. I have had only two die.
13. All the cattle that were inoculated showed no symptoms of disease since they were done.
14. I consider if inoculation is properly done it is a preventive of the disease. Take the virus from a young beast (say) half gone with the disease, and get it as near as possible straw colour—not to be used when tainted.
15. I consider that if inoculation were done properly it would be a preventive to the disease.

114.

1. 14th December, 1868.
3. Seventy head.
4. Were diseased—four head; one died *before inoculation*.
5. Two months.
12. Three head died, one working bullock and two cows, all of which had been driven about a good deal; the worker had gone with a dray one very hot day, and began to swell up at once afterwards.
13. All dry cattle got into better condition, and never seemed thrown back by the operation; milking cows that were driven in every day were the only cattle that showed swellings and twisting in the tail almost all of them losing the point off it.
14. Two cows were much affected with the disease at time of operation, and both quickly recovered; one of them being in calf had a miscarriage but is now fat—being always in paddock they were not mixed with any others. One old bull running in the mob not inoculated has shown no signs of disease.
15. I am decidedly of opinion that all cattle infected with the disease should be inoculated.

115.

1. January, 1865.
3. 437.
12. About 5 to 6 per cent.
13. After six weeks the herd in perfect condition.
14. I highly approve of it.
15. I do consider it quite right that an Act should be passed to inoculate diseased cattle.

116.

1. About June, 1866.
3. About 300 head.
4. Many, comparatively, were dying of disease at the time; most of those which took the disease died—about 4 per cent.
5. Several weeks.
12. None of those inoculated in the *tail* died; *no* means were tried to cure the swellings.
13. After a short time the disease left the cattle. Several weeks after, three of those that had been inoculated took the disease in a mild form; I bled them, and they recovered; I am inclined to think they would have recovered even without the bleeding.

14. Many of the neighbours with small lots of cattle, either from fear or unbelief, would not inoculate; but I at length persuaded them all to inoculate, after which the disease which was among their cattle left them. I sometime after bought some diseased cattle not knowing they were diseased, and put them among the inoculated cattle; many of these (the diseased) died, but not one of the inoculated cattle took the disease. I then, after several weeks, inoculated the second lot; then the disease left them. This happened again with the same result. Were I to inoculate again, I should do it in the same way, with the exception that I would not put a knot in the thread; then I think it would work out, as I killed some of the cattle many months after and the thread was still in and I could not draw it out on account of the knot.
15. I am much perplexed how to answer this question; I at present firmly believe in inoculation, having good reason to do so. It would no doubt be a very good thing if people would inoculate, but my very belief in its efficacy inclines me to think that it should not be compulsory. If inoculation is efficacious, those who choose to resort to it will be safe and only those.

117.

1. About five years ago.
3. Between forty and fifty.
4. Diseased; ten or twelve showed bad symptoms—look drowsy, thin, eyes dull, &c., running at the nose.
5. About three or four weeks.
12. None.
13. Successful.
14. Since the time above mentioned only two have died, and even these I think were not fully inoculated; none bad now.
15. No—self interest must introduce the practice.

118.

1. About three and a half years ago.
3. About 3,000.
4. Herd partially diseased, 150 per cent about.
5. About a year.
12. A good many; about $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.
13. Cattle became very dozy and feverish, but ultimately disease disappeared.
14. A neighbour, a free selector who would not inoculate, lost half his cattle. It is very difficult to prove whether inoculation is efficacious, but in the Company's case the evidence is in favour of its efficacy.
15. The theory of such an Act would be good, but I do not see how all cases can be met by any set of rules or regulations, unless great latitude were allowed and discretionary power in Inspectors or Boards of Directors.

119.

1. 1864.
3. 800.
4. No disease when inoculated.
5. Healthy.
12. None in this instance, but liable to die when swelling if not attended to; bleeding in the tail is considered an effectual cure.
13. None died out of the 800 inoculated.
14. These cattle were exposed to infection, but none took the disease; consequently, I believe in its efficacy. The cattle should be herded after inoculation for about a fortnight; if the swelling does not appear great in that time, they may be let loose with safety. I consider the disease contagious.
15. Yes.

120.

1. 1863, 1864.
3. 1,000.
12. No.
13. Disease immediately left the herd.
15. Yes.

121.

1. Four years back.
3. 1,600.
4. 5 per cent. showing signs of disease.
5. Nine months.

12. Odd ones died; used tar.
13. Firmly believe I lost more by inoculation than if I had left it alone.
14. Refer to question 13.
15. Decidedly not.

122.

1. 1865.
3. From 300 to 400 head.
4. Diseased, about 20 per cent.
5. About three months.
12. One only. The swelling commenced in the point of the tail slowly working upwards; and the half of the tail was cut off, and the bullock recovered shortly after.
13. The disease left the herd shortly after they were inoculated.
14. I approve of cattle being inoculated twice within six months.
15. Yes.

123.

1. August, 1866.
3. About 1,200.
4. At the time of inoculation, the disease was beginning to show slightly on the run; I had not seen more than a dozen dead, and those chiefly working bullocks; about twenty head showed decided symptoms of the disease.
5. The disease had not shown itself on the run more than three weeks before the cattle were inoculated; at first only the working bullocks were affected.
12. No deaths were observed from any of these causes, although some might have occurred unseen, since I let all the cattle go as soon as they were inoculated, in order to avoid the knocking about which would be occasioned by herding or paddocking cattle at that time of year.
13. So far as I can judge, the cattle were saved from the disease by inoculation, as our losses were not more than 5 per cent. from the disease, which carried off, it is supposed, 50 per cent. on ——— run, which adjoins ———.
14. I don't consider it certain that inoculation was the sole cause of the ——— cattle escaping the disease, since the disease about that time moderated generally all over this neighbourhood, and some uninoculated herds escaped pretty well, and it is hard to make any very accurate observation on any herd running in unenclosed land; milkers and working bullocks are the most easily experimented on, as one sees them every day. The former I did not inoculate, and I think a larger proportion of the working bullocks (twenty-four); five were first attacked, and three died, and two recovered, these were bled freely, and also inoculated; the (nineteen) other bullocks were also inoculated, but none died; they were at very hard work all the time, rather low in condition, and were worked as usual immediately after inoculation. Inoculation, in my opinion, *can do cattle no harm*, and is not an expensive nor troublesome operation, which the evidence, as far as it goes, is in favour of its being a protection against the disease, which is no doubt an infectious one, since it was introduced into this district by teams of carriers' bullocks from down the country.
15. An Act compelling owners of diseased herds to inoculate would probably prevent the spread of infection; but if the Act provided for compulsory destruction of diseased cattle, it would be difficult to enforce it, and very hard on bullock-drivers in particular.

124.

1. At various times, from April, 1866.
3. Over 5,000 head.
4. Cannot say.
5. Cannot say.
12. A great many—cutting off tails—which did not appear to be much use.
14. Many of the cattle took the disease after inoculation. Inoculation was certainly very carefully performed by myself, by virus selected also by myself. I doubt the advisability of knocking a herd about for the sake of inoculation in a mountainous country like this, where there are running streams, if large mobs never camp together, but where store cattle or large mobs are put together I think it desirable. I give an instance. I went to ——— to approve of a mob of store cattle in 1867, which I had previously bought, with an odd beast seen diseased in one corner of the run. When I arrived there, the cattle not having been inoculated, were dying at the rate of 2 per cent. a day. I threatened to throw up the purchase if they were not inoculated and free of risk. I at once inoculated, and the death rate the *second day after inoculation sensibly diminished, until in about five days it ceased altogether*; but a great number of swellings occurred, which caused me to think that the cattle were all more or less diseased, and that by

putting a counter-irritant in the tail it caused the disease to fly to that part. It is worthy of remark that these cattle had to swim the Clarence when flooded; and all cattle that had shown symptoms of disease, and yet recovered, sank immediately they got into deep water. I may also state that I found disease worse on the runs where cattle watered at stagnant water. I have bought many lots of store cattle since, and have always found that inoculation is necessary once cattle are put together.

15. I consider any compulsory legislation, except at the ports where cattle are imported, most decidedly objectionable.

125.

1. July, August, and September, 1864.
3. 1,882 head.
4. About 20 per cent.
5. About two months.
12. In some few instances, caused, I believe, from pricking the bone of the tail with the needle, excessive swellings did occur, but cannot state what percentage; the only means tried were cutting off the tail near the butt.
13. I think about 6 per cent. would die after inoculation.
14. I believe cattle properly inoculated are safe from the disease, having a great deal of difficulty in finding a diseased beast on the run two months after commencing inoculation.
15. Yes.

126.

1. 1864 and 1865.
3. 5,000 to 6,000.
4. Half badly diseased, and most in fine order.
5. Five or six months.
12. About 2 per cent.—no means applied, but continued fomentation has the desired effect.
13. A complete success, and no re-appearance of the disease after, not even up to the present day.
14. I consider that the operation of inoculation is most efficacious; and in all my experience for thirty years with stock, I approve of the matter in every respect; following, as I have always done, Mr. Bruce's course of information in his able articles through the Press, almost to the letter of the word. No cattle that I ever put under its influence ever show the slightest symptoms afterwards under the influence of the above. I do hereby declare, to the best of my judgment, that inoculation should be studied and practised, both as a cure and as a preventive, by all owners of herds. It is an advantage to saturate the worsted for twelve hours before using it for the seton, if the virus is from a proper lung.
15. I do consider that it ought to be compulsory, if free from the contagion itself, so that it may act for, and prevent pleuro-pneumonia, as well as to cure infected herds.

127.

1. Last summer.
3. About 400 head.
4. The diseased cattle I did not inoculate, and the percentage might range up to 8.
5. Some three or four months.
12. Yes, about 6 or 8 per cent. died from swellings. When the swelling extended high up, the tails were cut off, others were lanced; both adoptions were highly effective.
13. The result was highly satisfactory to me; of about 400 head, I put the deaths down between twenty and thirty.
14. The only circumstance I know of proving the efficacy of inoculation is, that all my inoculated cattle had no return of the disease amongst them, but they were not allowed to mix amongst the uninoculated cattle, which were kept on the lower part of the run, and singular to say, the disease passed over them without killing any.
15. Yes.

128.

1. 28th November, and 13th December, 1864.
3. 230.
4. No symptoms of disease.
12. About 8 per cent. died; scarification and amputation, but none saved thereby.
13. Those cattle that the effect acted mildly upon lost three to four joints of tail, some few half the tail, by decay. They fell off in condition very much, even before the drought set in, which was very severe that autumn and winter. My loss from then till spring was quite 50 per cent.

14. The most of my dry cattle, after inoculation, were exposed to the infection, but none were affected by it. Some fifteen head (mixed cattle) were left uninoculated, *i.e.*, could not be found at the time, also some neighbours' cattle were mixed with mine, but not inoculated. About two years ago the disease made its appearance amongst those cattle, the most of which died, as also some four or five that had been inoculated but not affected by it. I believe had my cattle been inoculated in the spring, when the grass was young and rich, I should not have lost the 50 per cent. named above. I believe inoculation to be a preventive to disease.
15. I do so consider.

129.

1. 1865.
3. About sixty head.
4. Not more than six.
5. The greater portion were not diseased.
12. About seven head died from swelling. We tried bathing with hot water and keeping on warm cloths.
13. I am under the impression that most of the cattle died from disease and poverty.
14. In my opinion a beast should not be inoculated. I have seen it extensively tried in this district, and believe it has killed more cattle than the disease. I have upwards of 100 head of cattle which have always been healthy, and which have never been inoculated.
15. I believe such an Act would be injurious, and cause great loss to breeders generally.

130.

1. 1866, and the increase of 1867 and part of 1868.
3. About 9,000 or 10,000 in the three years.
4. Two camps showed symptoms of disease in February, 1866; about 15 per cent. on one camp, 2 per cent. on the other. Store cattle purchased in 1868 showed 10 per cent. symptoms.
5. Cattle inoculated immediately symptoms showed.
12. About 1 or 2 per cent. died from excessive swelling; some were saved by bleeding and cutting their tails off.
13. The disease disappeared within three weeks of inoculation on the camps affected, also with store cattle purchased. An odd one that missed inoculation showed symptoms, and was at once slaughtered as virus was wanting.
14. The store cattle I purchased were put into a paddock with others. When the disease appeared, some of the young cattle of my own breeding uninoculated became affected, but none of those that had been operated upon except one. I then inoculated all the cattle newly purchased and the young cattle through the run; the disease disappeared, and I have seen no more of it.
15. I think that an Act compelling owners to inoculate would prove beneficial.

131.

I must first apologize for not attending to your request, as it was quite forgotten till now. As I am not owner of more than 100 head of cattle, I thought it was not necessary to fill up the form, but will give you a little information on the subject. At the time pleuro-pneumonia was prevalent a few years ago, and inoculation was being performed in different parts of the Colony, I had from thirty to forty head, one or two of which were dying weekly with the disease. I inoculated them all, but no indications of the disease at the particular time appeared. None died after; but a bullock that did not belong to me was in the yard at the time the others were inoculated, and not being able to keep him out of the paddock I turned him again into my paddock with the inoculated cattle—of course I did not inoculate him. A few days afterwards he took the disease, and, being very bad with it, I had to send a man to shoot him. From the foregoing, inoculation must be a preventive of the disease. The virus, I think, was taken from a beast that had had the disease from three to five days. I cannot remember which lung, but one was too far gone, almost black; the other lung diseased, the virus of which (which was used) about the color of sherry wine. It was used the day after it was taken. It was applied to the lower part of the tail by dipping a piece of twine in the virus, then drawing it through the skin leaving a little of the twine in. I think the tail dropped off one. I think that an Act should be passed compelling owners to inoculate their cattle or herds when infected.

132.

1. March, 1863.
3. 500.
4. 7 per cent.
5. Ten months.
12. 2 per cent. ; by cutting the tails off above the swelling.
13. It stopped the disease.
14. I believe inoculation to be a perfect cure.
15. I believe an Act should be passed obliging owners of infected cattle to inoculate.

133.

1. 1863.
3. 700.
4. Diseased ; 15 per cent. or thereabout.
5. Four months.
12. A few died. I cannot exactly state the percentage, but I should think not more than 2. The only means tried were cutting off the tail.
13. Most satisfactory in every respect.
14. My cattle were exposed on all sides, but none of them were affected after inoculation. The only valuable information I can give may be deduced from the above remarks.
15. I most strenuously maintain that this Act should be passed, as, in my opinion, it is the only way by which the spread of the disease can be stopped.

134.

1. December, 1865.
3. 300.
4. Cattle diseased when inoculated, about 15 per cent. showing symptoms.
5. Six weeks.
12. No deaths occurred from swellings caused by the inoculations. When the top of the tail was much swollen, I cut part of the tail off and made an incision in the swollen part, kept it clean, and applied bluestone a few mornings. I found this a good remedy.
15. I cannot give an opinion respecting inoculation, mine being diseased before I inoculated them.

135.

1. About six years since.
3. 150 head.
4. Badly diseased, sixty having died ; two-thirds.
5. Six weeks.
12. Two died from swelling. No means were employed in any way to save them.
13. The animals inoculated ceased to die almost immediately.
14. All the animals inoculated have been free from all disease since. Some of my neighbours who neglected to inoculate their cattle had severe loss.
15. I strongly approve of an Act being passed, and shall do all in my power to promote it.

136.

1. Do not know date—about three and a half years ago.
3. About eighty.
5. Immediately after it broke out.
12. I had none that died from inoculation ; I had no more trouble with them.
13. I believe it put a stop to the disease amongst my cattle, for I think none took it afterwards.
14. There were cattle frequently amongst mine that were diseased, but mine never showed any signs of disease afterwards. I believe it to be a preventive, but not a cure after they are affected. I believe none of mine died after they were inoculated but what plainly showed it at the time, and none have been affected since that time.
15. I think persons ought to be obliged to inoculate cattle when diseased.

137.

1. January, 1866.
3. 3,000.
4. About 100 per month dying ; can't say.
5. Dying for two months previously.

12. Yes. Not more than 5 per cent. Nothing was tried.
13. By the end of March, 1866, the deaths had entirely ceased.
14. I fully believe in the efficacy of inoculation. My cattle have been continually exposed since to the infection, and I observe in the cattle I slaughter on the station many of them have one lung gone; but none are dying, although the most of the cattle now on the run have not been inoculated.
15. Yes, if the herd have never been inoculated. At the same time, out of 1,000 breeding cows I inoculated I had not more than 1,000 calves the following season; and if the Act were compulsory it would decrease the stock enormously.

138.

1. 1st May, 1864.
3. 600.
4. Low in condition; about 5 per cent.
5. One month.
12. Yes, deaths about 1 per cent.; no means tried.
13. Death from that time ceased; that is, from the time they were inoculated.
14. None of the cattle that were properly inoculated were afterwards exposed to the infection. I consider the best time for inoculation is from the beginning of May to the latter end of July; because, if the weather be too hot, there is great danger from flies. Also, that virus should be taken from the beast about the middle stage; as in a beast dying of itself the virus is too strong, and causes great swelling.
15. Yes.

139.

13. After my herd was inoculated, my next neighbour's cattle were attacked in a very virulent form; but I suffered nothing in consequence, though the two herds were in constant contact.
14. I believe inoculation to be decidedly efficacious. When my cattle were attacked shortly after the disease broke out in this Colony, I lost very considerably; but when the herd was inoculated, the disease at once stopped in a marked degree. I have inoculated my young cattle since so long as I could get virus, but for two years past have been able to get none.
15. If the small owners through the bush and Township can be reached—yes; but I believe it almost impossible to get at these people, whose cattle run everywhere.

140.

1. October, 1865.
3. 2,000
4. Mostly healthy; about 10 per cent.
5. About four weeks; delay occasioned for want of proper virus.
12. 10 per cent. Taking tails off; in some cases had twice to cut same tail. Made incisions in hips and other parts; some died; saved the greater portion of those so affected.
13. After the whole herd had been inoculated, intently watched progress, drafting those not affected, and those too much so for further operations; found inoculation beneficial to the herd.
14. I know cases of inoculated working bullocks which had been exposed to infection, having to travel near 200 miles through infected herds, without further injury, while those not inoculated had died nearly 50 per cent. Those which caught the infection without inoculation, and recovered, were so affected as to be of little use afterwards.
15. I do not consider such an Act would be beneficial, as those who have experienced the benefit of inoculation, when the disease first makes its appearance, will require no forcing.

141.

1. March, 1865.
3. 940 head.
4. About twelve head (or $1\frac{1}{4}$ per cent., were diseased.)
5. From four to six days.
12. About $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. died; caused by excessive swelling at the root of the tail. I had the tails cut off some within 4 inches of the root, which saved their lives; had the others been similarly treated, the effect would, I think, be the same.
13. I have reason to believe that had I not inoculated my cattle the disease would have spread.

14. Of the twelve head which were suddenly and at the same time attacked, four recovered ; and I think that if those which died had been confined in paddocks, and properly attended to, that the losses by inoculation would have been comparatively small. Some others in this neighbourhood who refrained from inoculation at the same time, have had serious losses. I have had no losses by disease since, although my cattle have been depasturing occasionally with others which were dying of disease.
15. I consider that the owners of cattle infected should be by Law compelled to inoculate.

142.

1. I first inoculated in Queensland in '63, and upon Manaroo in '64.
3. Kept no count as I made no charge. I have inoculated several thousand.
4. I have inoculated cattle that were dying very fast, but never made account of those showing symptoms.
5. I have inoculated cattle that have been dying off and on for eight months ; and I have also inoculated cattle that have never shown any symptoms.
12. I had four or five old cows die, out of about 800 head of mixed cattle, through not opening them upon the butt of the tail when the swelling went up. I opened eight others which were severely swollen, and they soon recovered. Some I opened upon the loins, and took out large lumps of matter.
13. Successful in many cases.
14. I feel sure that cattle that are properly inoculated will not take the disease again—however, for a number of years—as I have had twelve head which I inoculated, among ——— cattle which were not inoculated, and he lost over 200 head out of 400. I have shown a great many how to take the virus, and how to inoculate, and they have all been successful. I have taken virus from a bullock that has died with the disease, half an hour after he died, and the virus was perfectly good, but I only got a small quantity of it.
15. I think that an Act should be passed obliging owners of cattle that are infected to inoculate whether they have been previously inoculated or not.

143.

1. November, 1867.
3. 500.
4. Were dying diseased ; half.
5. Three months.
12. 5 per cent. Cutting the swollen parts, bluestone and lard mixed.
14. None affected after being properly inoculated.
15. I think an Act should be passed, as there are many that have not inoculated their herds.

144.

1. About 1865.
3. About 150.
4. In good condition ; but were diseased almost every one of the herd.
5. About two or three months.
12. None were observed ; but the tails of many fell off.
13. Cannot say anything particular about it, in its favour or otherwise ; but believe it is of little use unless performed by some skilful hand.
14. What I have said in the last case applies here. It may serve, if properly applied ; but for my part I have very little faith in it.
15. Such an Act may be of service, if an experienced person were responsible for its due performance.

145.

1. 13th August, 1867.
3. 1,871.
4. On one part of run, about a mile of creek ; 3 or 4 per cent.
5. Fully twelve months in the spot showing disease ; most of the cattle were lost in this place ; my attention taken up inoculating those I could most conveniently muster.
12. All from excessive swelling. I have, when first seeing the enlargement, cut the skin taking out a kernel the size of an egg ; the beast doing well.
13. Very satisfactory. I sent seventy head of cattle to paddock ; three head were not inoculated and all three took pleuro, the others remaining in good health. I have noticed those inoculated on this run always in better condition.

14. I have seen one beast only affected with pleuro since being inoculated. I consider the virus had not taken effect when done. I am only too anxious to be able to inoculate all my cattle—to be compelled to do so would cost more than those running in back places would be worth. I have steeped setons in the virus and used when dried but without success. If there were some way to preserve virus so that a few head could be done at a time, every stockholder for his own benefit would inoculate. From experience, I think, by using proper virus, and letting the cattle on to their run again, 2 per cent. would not be lost. I have proved inoculation to be a curative, having inoculated some that I imagined would be dead in a few days.

146.

1. 1864.
3. About 1,500. Those stations were purchased by me just after the cattle were inoculated.
5. Cannot say.
12. I have known a small percentage to die, but I always attribute it in a great measure to using bad virus.
13. I have never known beasts to have the pleuro after being properly inoculated; but I should say if they had, it would be in a very mild form.
14. I firmly believe in inoculation, not only as a preventive, but I have known it to arrest the disease when premature.
15. Yes.

147.

1. 5th to 12th May, 1863.
3. 350.
4. Diseased to the extent of 5 per cent.
5. About one month.
12. The deaths which occurred were, I think, from the cattle being infected previous to being inoculated.
13. I am of opinion that the inoculation stayed the progress of the disease completely.
14. My cattle, after being inoculated, mixed with those uninoculated cattle on Dora Dora, and none ever showed the least symptom of disease; I therefore believe that inoculation is the best preventive that can be tried.

148.

1. About October, 1865.
3. About 700.
4. In a thriving condition; about 5 per cent. showing symptoms.
5. Some were diseased about one month.
12. Yes, about 5 per cent. or so died. Means used were to cut off the tail above the inflamed part. If done in time it stopped the swelling, but if allowed to go up the tail the flesh seemed to rot on both sides of the rump. When cut no blood came. I have cut large pieces of flesh off both sides of the tail, and used tar and turpentine when flies affected the wounded parts.
13. I think I killed cattle that would not have died. I never proved any good result from inoculation.
14. I know of one neighbouring herd that was never inoculated; I believe they had less deaths than those inoculated. The herd ceased dying sooner than those who continued inoculating, therefore I never tried it since. Great numbers were affected that never died. I saw some take the pleuro twice—generally killed them the second time. I also saw inoculated cattle take it, and some die at three, six, nine, and twelve months after inoculation. I kept sick ones among healthy ones for a month, and none of the others took it after. I also saw pleuro cattle left on the run, and remain with sound ones, and not give it to the herd. They die on some runs faster. I remarked cattle which I did not find to inoculate at the time were as free as the rest since from pleuro. It comes and goes very sudden sometimes. I inoculated cattle apparently very far gone with pleuro; some of these lived, and got fat after, and most people said it would kill them quick.
15. I do not consider that an Act should be passed obliging owners to inoculate. I speak from what I have seen and tried among more herds than my own.

149.

1. July, 1868.
3. 400 head.
4. Diseased—10 per cent. showing symptoms.
5. Twelve months.
12. Deaths, $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. No means tried to save.
13. I believe it a preventive from the disease.
14. Some of the inoculated were afterwards exposed to the infection, and were in no ways affected by it to my knowledge.
15. Yes.

150.

1. 20th September, 1867.
3. 7,000 head.
4. Some diseased. We reckoned we lost 5 per cent. after inoculation.
5. The disease showed two months previous to inoculation.
12. About 1 per cent. deaths caused by excessive swellings. Cut the tail above where it is swollen, if possible, and bleed the beast under the tail, near the root, and scarify the place swollen, and rub salt into it, to draw the virus away.
13. After doing about 5,000 the disease began to disappear for a short time, and then occasionally one used to die until it disappeared.
14. I do not think inoculation will prevent cattle from taking the disease, only they will have it in a milder way. I have seen several take it and recover. It is useless to do it if it is not done with strong virus, and the cattle looked after until they recover. Had we have turned our cattle on the run, there would have been a great loss in them. If their tails are not cut off, the swelling will get in their spine and kill them.
15. Yes, if done properly.

151.

1. April, 1865.
3. 500 head.
4. About 6 per cent.
5. From December, 1864, to April, 1865.
12. No deaths.
14. Cattle inoculated here never showed disease since. All we can state is, that from December, 1864, to April, 1865, that is, from the time our cattle were infected to the time of inoculation, we lost from 350 to 400 head.
15. We do.

152.

1. About May, 1865.
3. Ten or eleven hundred.
4. About 600 were the original herd on the run, in fine condition, and perfectly free from disease. About 500 were store cattle, brought on to the run a few weeks previous to inoculation, in fair condition, none showing symptoms of disease.
5. The store cattle were known to have disease among them some six or seven weeks before inoculation.
12. Two or three may have died—cannot be sure now—certainly not many. No means were tried as a cure.
13. The herd on station appeared to benefit by the inoculation as long as they remained on the run, as I doubt if more, or so many as half a dozen died from the disease. Of the store cattle there must have been at least 10 per cent. of deaths on the run from the disease.
14. Some even of the station cattle did die from the disease after proper inoculation. A good many deaths occurred among fat cattle being driven to market some months after inoculation.
15. No, I rather think it too late for inoculation when the disease has made its appearance in a herd.

153.

1. About seven years.
3. 500.
4. About 3 per cent.
5. Fourteen days.
12. Hardly 1 per cent.; and I think those beasts were affected before inoculating.
13. Some of them lost their tails.
14. I never knew a beast take disease after inoculation.
15. No.

154.

1. June, 1864.
3. 400 weaners.
4. Disease all through the herd.
5. About six months.
12. About 2 per cent. Did not try to cure the swelling; some of their tails dropped off.
13. I thought the inoculation successful, but on looking through uninoculated cattle, found they looked as well as those that were inoculated.
14. A small herd of cattle on a neighbour's station were inoculated that were continually mixing with my cattle; some of them died six months after with the disease. I also brought cattle from the ——— that were inoculated some time before starting; a good many died some months after arriving here, through the disease.
15. No.

155.

1. No note made of date.
3. About 1,500 head.
4. Slightly diseased; can't state per-centage.
5. Can't say.
12. A few died, but can't state what per-centage.
13. All those inoculated seemed to fatten more quickly and thrive better after getting over the effects of the inoculation.
14. I noticed some cattle that had been inoculated and had lost the brush, some time afterwards take the disease and die from it.
15. I do not consider that such an Act would have any good effect, but the contrary.

156.

1. June, 1865.
3. About 3,500.
4. In store cattle purchased, about 20 per cent.; in original herd, I should think about 5 per cent.
5. About six or eight weeks.
12. In some cases the tail swelled to a great size; very few suffered severely,—about 2 per cent. may have died, not more, if that. In the event of the swellings becoming excessive, I at once chopped the tail off, which always had a beneficial effect.
13. Most effective,—it was with me a great success; neighbouring cattle, uninoculated, were dying in large numbers, my herds being healthy.
14. I had a good opportunity of testing the efficacy of inoculation. Just at the time of pleuro-pneumonia breaking out in this district I purchased 900 head of store cattle, and placed them on a clean run, forty miles from my original herd, no other stock being on that run; they were infected, and were dying at the rate of ten to fifteen per diem; six weeks after inoculating I had no deaths from pleuro, and the disease entirely disappeared; they afterwards mixed with some diseased herds, but did not suffer. I have every faith in inoculation, if properly and carefully performed, as a preventive, but not as a cure for pleuro-pneumonia.
15. I consider if an Act were passed making it compulsory to all cattle-owners, on appearance of pleuro-pneumonia in their herds, to at once inoculate, that it would decidedly tend to exterminate the disease.

157.

1. January, 1864.
3. 520.
4. About 5 per cent. showing symptoms.
5. About two months.
12. Yes, 1 per cent.
13. No cattle on the station have shown symptoms of the disease since the inoculation.
14. I have reason to believe that the lives of a number of the above cattle were saved by inoculation. Owners of neighbouring herds who were later in inoculating lost more than I did. About a month after inoculation the cattle were brought up and the thread drawn from the wound.
15. Yes.

158.

1. July, 1864.
3. 150.
4. In good condition, very few of them showing any symptoms of disease; about 1 per cent.
5. About ten months.
12. About ten died out of the 150 inoculated. Tried no means to save those ten as they were in the bush.
13. With the small number I inoculated, I consider the result satisfactory.
14. I have only to state, that at the time we inoculated those few we had about 300 head which were not inoculated, and the per-centage of deaths was not as much as in the inoculated; at the same time, I believe that the disease was leaving the run, in fact it never was very bad on this station. I can only account for that fact through its being situate rather in the back country.
15. Yes.

159.

1. 20 January, 1865.
3. 210 head.
4. And about 20 per cent.
5. About six weeks.
12. Deaths, about 5 per cent. By attending and fomenting the swelling until it became ripe for lancing.

13. The result of inoculation is a cure for the disease if properly attended to; if not, it is death to the cattle.
14. I have never known cattle to die from the disease if properly inoculated.
15. I should recommend such an Act to be passed—for all cattle to be inoculated in each district, whenever the disease breaks out in it, by a competent person, as it is contagious.

160.

1. 1866.
3. 40.
4. Twelve diseased when inoculated.
5. Fourteen days.
12. There were no deaths occurred with me; the disease showed no symptoms after inoculation.
14. My cattle were exposed among diseased cattle after inoculation, but were in no way affected by it. I am of opinion that all cattle should be inoculated immediately the disease appears in the neighbourhood; and further, I consider that the virus should be taken from a young beast, and care should be taken that it is not kept too long before using it.
15. From my experience among cattle, I am of opinion that all owners of cattle which are infected should be obliged to inoculate them immediately.

161.

1. 6th December, 1867.
3. 470.
4. Low in condition; 50 per cent.
5. Two years.
12. 2 per cent.
13. Cure.
14. I have not seen any of the cattle, inoculated or uninoculated, since.
15. I consider it would be a benefit to the country to have an Act passed to compel people to have their cattle inoculated if diseased.

162.

1. September, 1867.
3. 200 head of cattle.
4. Diseased; from 5 to 6 per cent.
5. Eighteen months.
12. Yes; there were deaths caused by the inoculation, about 3 per cent. Scarifying them on the hind quarters and where they showed any swelling.
13. It banished the disease.
14. Any cattle that were properly inoculated were not afterwards exposed to the disease. I believe that bleeding in the neck veins will save cattle that are diseased.
15. I do consider that an Act should be passed to compel owners of cattle to inoculate if their cattle are diseased.

163.

1. 1865, 1866, and 1867.
3. About 2,000 at each inoculation.
2. Healthy.
3. Healthy.
14. No death occurred to my knowledge.
15. I have never seen any of the inoculated cattle with the disease, although uninoculated stragglers belonging to others have been occasionally dying among our own cattle. It is almost unnecessary to say that the cattle were, of course, a good deal knocked about, as is always the case in passing large numbers through a crush.
14. The reply is partly embodied in that to the foregoing question. On one occasion, running out of virus and having only a few head of cattle to inoculate, we used the affected part cut from the tails of those already inoculated and exhibiting the rotting sores, passing the needle through it, and then perforating the tails of the sound cattle without the seton being inserted, and we found the result precisely similar to what it was when virus was used and the seton left in. I may add that I consider it highly prejudicial to the success of the operation to run cattle into the yard immediately before they are inoculated.
15. I am of opinion that owners of cattle will be too much alive to their own interest to neglect inoculation, when there is so much evidence of its being perfectly successful where properly conducted. And as I have, with five men, inoculated 700 head daily, the expense is inconsiderable. However, I believe that until such time as all the cattle in the Colony are inoculated, pleuro-pneumonia will never thoroughly disappear. In riding through an adjoining run lately I saw several diseased cattle, the owners not having as yet adopted inoculation.

164.

1. April until October, 1866.
3. 1,200.
4. About 3 per cent.
5. About a fortnight.
12. About 2 per cent. died from excessive swelling; the only plan to save the animal was by cutting off the tail.
13. The disease disappeared.
14. Cattle were exposed to infection after inoculation and not in any way affected by it. From my own experience, I believe that if cattle are properly inoculated they are safe from the disease.
15. I do not consider such an Act necessary.

165.

1. 1865.
3. About 500.
4. Diseased, about 20 per cent.
12. Yes, about 10 per cent. Means tried—cutting their tails off, and also slitting their tails, but do not think it prevented any from dying that otherwise would have died.
13. Believe it prevented a great number from dying, as they were dying faster before inoculation than after.
14. I believe that cattle once properly inoculated are not susceptible to the disease after.
15. I believe that an Act should be passed obliging owners of infected cattle to inoculate them. I would also recommend that the Government should send a properly qualified person to collect the virus and inoculate all herds diseased, as the many different systems used is the cause of the many failures.

166.

1. 1865.
3. About 400.
4. About 25 per cent. diseased.
5. Noticed about a month.
12. About 10 per cent. died from excessive swelling. The means tried to cure the swelling were slitting the tails or cutting them off, but do not think it was efficacious.
13. Believe it prevents very many from dying.
14. Believe that cattle once properly inoculated are not again susceptible to the disease.
15. Think an Act should be passed obliging owners of diseased cattle to inoculate them. Would recommend the Government to send a qualified person to collect the virus and inoculate all herds infected, as the many different systems are, without doubt, the cause of the many failures.

167.

1. Early in 1865.
3. Seven.
4. Supposed sound.
15. Certainly not.

168.

1. March, 1863.
3. 3,000.
4. Very much affected. 25 per cent.
5. About three months.
12. If the cattle are far gone when inoculated they will die. I lost about 10 per cent. If the tail swells very much, the best is to cut it away above the swelling.
13. The inoculation stopped the disease.
14. The cattle when inoculated should not be disturbed, neither before nor after. Sometimes the disease will disappear without inoculation, if it is not very bad. When you find a beast diseased, you should take it away from the herd, and shoot it and burn it. Dry weather is the worst time for the disease.
15. I consider that owners should be compelled to inoculate if they travel, or if they have an unfenced run, because the disease is infectious.

169.

1. February, 1865.
3. 5,604.
4. Disease had been visible at times rather strongly for six months, about 5 to 10 per cent. probably showing symptoms more or less.
5. As above, about six months.
12. Probably a few; cannot state per-centage with any sort of accuracy; with milking cows and working bullocks, the diseased part was cut off, and they generally got well.

13. Most successful, disease instantly and entirely leaving the herd.
14. About 2,000 inoculated cattle were sent from this herd, in July, 1865, to Melbourne. Among them were about forty or fifty got in from back that had been missed at inoculation. All were sent and travelled together. About 50 per cent. of those that had not been inoculated died from pleuro on road over, and none of those that had been inoculated died from that cause. The cattle travelled through country about _____, where pleuro was bad at the time.
15. I should say most certainly not.

170.

1. September, 1867.
3. 420.
4. About one-tenth showing disease at the time, and believe that all those seriously affected with disease at the time they were inoculated died. I consider it certain death to inoculate any animal with the disease in an advanced state.
5. About six months, *i.e.*, the disease had appeared in the herd for six months previously.
12. The disease disappeared sooner from this herd than from the herd of my neighbour, who did not inoculate.
14. Every beast slaughtered showed signs of having had the disease. Whether they had had the disease *before* they were inoculated, or whether or not it was the *effect* of inoculation, I am unable to determine. The disease of pleuro-pneumonia has not appeared in this herd since freed, which I attribute to having inoculated. The straggling cattle in the herd which were not inoculated nearly all died. I believe my neighbour, who has *not inoculated* his herd, is *now free* from disease, and believe it has passed through the entire herd, that is to say, those remaining have had it and recovered. As to compelling people in this neighbourhood to inoculate, it would be an *utter impossibility*, as there is *no virus* to be had, and it will not keep for *use* more than *two days*.
I am of opinion that inoculation is beneficial, and that all infected herds ought to be inoculated.

171.

1. 27th October, 1868, inoculated thirty-six head, and 22nd February, 1869, ninety head.
3. 126.
4. The first lot of thirty-six were perfectly sound at the time of inoculation; the beast killed for virus was taken from another paddock in which the ninety head were running.
5. The first case of disease was eight months prior to inoculation, the disease then seemed to disappear, and broke out again seven months afterwards, about a month previous to the last inoculation.
12. Out of the first thirty-six only one died; of the ninety, nine died. Only one was treated for the swelling by ripping it open, and that died.
13. There has been but one case of disease since, and that was one of about a dozen uninoculated cattle which were running in the same paddock with the diseased and inoculated cattle.
14. With one exception the disease certainly stopped immediately after the inoculation; but it would not be fair to attribute it wholly to that cause, because the uninoculated cattle did not take it, except the one mentioned. I have come to the conclusion that either the disease is not so prevalent in this district, or that it is not so contagious as it is represented to be, otherwise more than one out of twelve uninoculated cattle, running with ninety inoculated ones and three diseased ones, should have taken the disease.
15. Yes, certainly.

172.

1. October, 1863.
3. About 600.
4. Before inoculation a great number died, and at time of inoculation we think about 10 per cent. showed symptoms of disease.
5. About twelve months.
12. We think about 1 per cent. died after inoculation. We did not try to cure the swellings.
13. The disease appeared to leave the herd, as after inoculation scarcely any died.
14. Diseased travelling cattle have passed through the run since ours were inoculated, but they did not take it again.
15. We think, from our own experience of inoculation, that it would be a good thing if an Act to that effect were passed.

173.

1. About February, 1863.
3. 800.
4. About 10 per cent. were diseased, *i.e.*, showing symptoms. Cattle may, I believe, be diseased a few days before it would be noticeable, unless they were knocked about.
5. About three months, during which time 500 died.

12. In only two instances did the tail swell to excess, and then about half came away. Six deaths only occurred, and those were very far gone before inoculation.
13. Very satisfactory; and my cattle after getting well, passed through several herds of diseased stock while travelling to a back station, but no sign of disease has ever shown amongst them since.
14. So soon as it is evident that the disease exists in a herd, inoculation should commence. The virus should be taken from a young beast in the first stage of disease. The evils of inoculation I believe to arise either from carelessness or from using virus taken from an old beast in the last stage of disease.
15. I think it would be advisable to compel owners whose stock are infected to inoculate them.

174.

1. November, 1865.
3. 700 head.
4. Very badly diseased; fully 50 per cent, and one or two dying every day before inoculation.
5. Several months.
12. Yes; deaths do occur, about 10 per cent. No means adopted for cure.
13. Two months after inoculation; no further deaths occurred of any importance.
14. To this question not sufficient notice taken to give a satisfactory reply, but believe inoculation to be beneficial.
15. We believe compulsory inoculation would be a benefit to the country at large.

175.

14. I was on the Lachlan in 1861 and 1862 when this disease was taking off thousands of cattle; I inoculated several herds, and saw many others which had been inoculated by inexperienced people, when much mortality prevailed, owing to the ignorance of operators in some cases taking the virus out of dead animals, and in others obtaining it from animals in the last stage, which was wrong, of course, in both cases, it being too virulent. I have inoculated cattle when fully 5 per centum showed symptoms of disease, and have been told after that the losses through the operation hardly exceeded that. I have used both the milk and butter of a dairy herd highly infected with pleuro without detecting any peculiarity. Through an experience of several years I state most positively that inoculation is a preventive to pleuro, and would most strongly recommend that the Government bring in a Bill compelling all stockholders to inoculate their cattle.

176.

1. January, 1867, and June, 1867.
3. 4,000.
4. Of the above, 2,000 were inoculated before disease showed itself; 2,000 when disease showed; about 5 per cent. of diseased cattle.
5. 2,000 inoculated when there was no disease on run, and 2,000 after disease was known to exist; two months previously.
12. 10 per cent. died of those inoculated in January, and not 1 per cent. of those done in June from the same cause; tails were cut off.
13. The result was most satisfactory in staying disease.
14. After the cattle were inoculated in January, to the number of 2,000. No disease was visible for quite a year afterwards, and then only amongst very young calves; these 2,000 never showed symptoms of disease. On the adjoining run the cattle were inoculated in June following, after disease had appeared about two months, being brought there by a neighbour's cattle which trespassed upon me and were very much diseased. After they were inoculated they ceased dying, but for eighteen months after there were a few deaths which I attribute to the few that were not yarded, or to those that did not become inoculated through failure of the process. I have lost several cattle from disease, after their tails have been cut off, from the effects of inoculation, and that twelve months after the operation. I cannot account for this, but the instances are very few. Most of the cattle I lost from swelled tails were cows, not one ox in ten. Inoculation prevented the cows from breeding in the season of inoculation; this was very remarkable. About 1 per cent. of diseased cattle recover; but they are never able to travel, but will fatten. I consider the disease endemic, not epidemic. I have had a good deal of experience, and have sought that of others, and I believe the disease may appear, and does, upon some one part of the run, and may be confined there for some time before it spreads; but it will go through the whole herd, and if inoculated before disease appears will show itself in the young calves. I inoculated 2,000 cattle in January, 1867, before any disease appeared upon my run, and so soon as I could obtain virus, which I did from a few store cattle I purchased and confined in a paddock at one corner of my run. These cattle turned out to be diseased; I discovered the fact when they were being driven to my station. January being a very hot month, I attribute all the losses I had to the fact that the cattle were inoculated in the summer

instead of cooler weather. In any paddock where I had well-bred cattle of certain numbers the deaths that occurred were quite 10 per cent., and this from swelled tails only. On the run the like deaths, I am sure, occurred. On the state of the cattle being known (three weeks after inoculation) their tails were first reduced by cutting off the diseased portion; some were operated upon three times, and their tails then cut entirely off, while others retained half-tails. I am sure three-fourths had their tails cut off. The other cattle of the run (2,000) were inoculated in June, and though done in the same way and with the same kind of virus showed no symptoms of swelling at their tails, and the deaths were not more than 1 per cent. from any cause. I attribute this to the cool season; after the inoculation in January, and the causes that followed, I was convinced that it was the hot weather. Others that had been inoculated at the same time suffered the same. If instead of cutting off the ends of tails, a knife had been freely used (as was done towards the last) so as to let out the virus, nature would have done its part, and the tail destroyed would have dropped off. When nature had been thus left to do its work, the tail has been left twisted in a very ugly fashion. I have discovered that the disease first appears on the lung, in the form of an enlarged bag the size of an egg, where the lung touches the ribs, and when the beast is killed the lung is adhering to the ribs, and being separated, a milky thick matter is found to flow; it is not offensive, and by degrees the lung becomes spotted with dark spots which increase with the disease. I found my fat cattle were the first to be attacked.

15. No; because the man who does not inoculate ought to lose all his cattle; he would be a madman.

177.

1. 1863, 1864, and 1867.
3. About 1,600 during 1863 and 1864, and 400 in 1867.
4. Diseased; about 5 per cent. showing symptoms.
5. About two months.
12. Some deaths from excessive swelling. About 2 per cent. in 1863. Cut tail off above swelling with beneficial effects.
13. With good virus, properly applied, about 1 or 2 per cent. would probably die.
14. I never knew any cattle properly inoculated to have the disease the second time, although I have known them to intermix with diseased cattle. As a preventive, I am, from experience, in favour of inoculation, although there is no disease in the neighbourhood of my stations; but it is likely to be introduced by stock travelling from the north to the southern market.

178.

1. July, 1864.
3. About 2,500.
4. Very bad. About 20 per cent.
5. About six weeks.
12. About 3 per cent. died—caused, we believe, through the bone being pricked with the needle. No means were tried to arrest the swellings, the cattle being in the bush.
13. The entire disappearance of the disease.
14. Strange cattle, which we did not inoculate, died, which proves the efficacy of inoculation. The cattle, as they were inoculated, were turned out amongst others that had the disease; but I think they were not affected a second time.
15. Yes.

179.

1. Kept no date. It was when the disease first broke out.
3. About 400 head, including all ages.
4. In good condition, and cows milking. About 30 per cent. of cows. Number of cows, 150 head.
5. About ten days, perhaps more.
12. Very few; no means used for excessive swelling.
13. Those very bad died; but the disease stopped very soon after inoculation. About 30 per cent. of cows died. I mean, no diseased beast was saved by inoculation—it was a preventive, not a cure.
14. In my case I believe fully in inoculation, and as long as matter could be procured we continued to inoculate all the young stock; but have not done so some years, as no matter could be had. Herd has been healthy since. No case of cattle properly inoculated known since to have had disease. In a few cases performed operation over again, but it never took. No information appears to carry truth with it, as like all our cattle or other diseases what appears a fact to-day appears no fact to-morrow. I believe the disease is now about in places, but it has assumed so mild a shape that it does not appear infectious now, and no notice is taken of it; but, as a cattle-owner of long experience, I believe in inoculation, and nothing else, as a preventive. If it were to appear in my herd again, I would kill every beast that showed symptoms and inoculate all the remainder.
16. No; it would be an Algerine Act, and impossible.

180.

1. January and February, 1865; June, 1865; and January, 1868.
3. 9,220, 1,061, and 1,233. Total—5,574.
4. 3 per cent. only showed symptoms of disease.
5. About ten or twelve days, and in one case nearly a month.
12. About 2 per cent. Cutting the tail on under side, from buttocks downwards, sometimes adopted, and thought useful.
13. Pleuro immediately ceased in herd, but as it did about same time in other herds not inoculated, cannot say positively inoculation is efficacious; but still, on the whole, I believe it to be so, if carried out properly.
14. No pleuro in this herd now, nor at any other time than the dates here given. No; pleuro existed in herd from June, 1865, to December, 1867, and then only in the younger and uninoculated cattle. The older cattle, previously inoculated, showed no symptoms of disease. The disease disappeared in January, 1868, so suddenly that virus could not be obtained to finish the uninoculated cattle in herd. It may also be here mentioned, that in February or March, 1865, it disappeared in like manner. The virus, for cattle, in June, 1865 (which were only brought on to station, from Queensland, in May, 1865), had chiefly to be obtained from neighbouring stations.
15. Decidedly not.

181.

1. October, 1865.
3. About 2,000.
4. Slightly diseased, about 4 per cent.
5. About six weeks.
12. About 2½ per cent. died from swelling caused by inoculation. No means were adopted to arrest the swelling.
13. In several instances cattle apparently quite recovered from the effects of inoculation died from the disease; a few also died that had not been inoculated, so that it is difficult in this herd to state the result, but inoculation was abandoned as useless.
14. It has often been noticed on this and adjoining stations, that one single beast has become affected with pleuro-pneumonia, and that although the rest of the mob constantly fed round and came in contact with the diseased beast no other took the disease.
15. Most certainly not.

182.

1. September, 1863.
3. 1,650.
4. Fair condition; about 3 per cent.
5. Six months.
12. We had but two deaths from swelling; no means were tried to cure the swelling.
13. Some cattle became slightly infected but recovered without treatment, and none since have died from the disease.
14. Two head of cattle escaped uninoculated, which were put into a paddock with a number of cattle that were inoculated; the two uninoculated beasts became affected and died; three of the inoculated beasts also became diseased, and recovered in about a fortnight after showing first symptoms and readily fattened.
15. We do think it would be beneficial for such an Act to be passed.

183.

1. About five years ago.
3. 1,500 head.
4. Few showing symptoms, as they on the run were inoculated as soon as the disease appeared; but 1,000 sent to Melbourne were very bad, a fourth being infected.
5. About two months.
12. Few died from excessive swelling.
13. The cattle on the road to Melbourne were dying fast for some time, and in a few days the disease nearly entirely disappeared.
14. The disease disappeared from this part shortly after the cattle were inoculated, and has not since appeared.

184.

1. June, 1864.
3. 1,100 head.
4. 1 per cent.
5. About one month.
12. Cut the rump open, and fill up with tar. About 1 per cent.
13. Disease disappeared immediately, and never appeared until 1863, when it broke out in the young cattle that had never been inoculated; 1 at once inoculated them, and the disease left them and did not appear in the herd since.

14. All cattle properly inoculated I believe is a sure preventive, I inoculated five head that showed symptoms of disease, and the whole five recovered. I believe if virus is properly taken and used no cattle will die from inoculation; the cattle should be herded, watched, and two days after the first symptom of disease appears the beast should be killed and the virus taken, and you will have virus without any blood being mixed through it. I do not know any way of keeping virus any length of time.

185.

1. 1865.
3. 700 head.
4. Not diseased.
12. About 5 per cent. died.
15. Yes, I should.

186.

1. 16th and 17th January, 1865.
3. 1,260.
4. Diseased, 20 per cent.
5. Not known.
12. Yes (apparently), about 12 per cent.
13. Unsatisfactory.
15. No.

187.

1. June 13th, 1863.
3. About 1,200.
4. About 6 per cent. diseased.
5. About six weeks.
12. Any that died was from extensive swelling. About 4 per cent.; by cutting the tail off and dressing with turpentine.
13. Cattle got healthy and became fat, disease went all out the herd.
14. None of the neighbours inoculated for about eighteen months after; some of the neighbours inoculated after they saw that mine were doing so well; others that did not, their cattle died for about two years.
15. I would inoculate my cattle again as soon as the disease appeared among them.

188.

1. September, 1863.
3. 810.
4. Poor; about 3 per cent.
5. About two months, as near as possible.
12. I can only account for one cow, out of all that was inoculated, that died. This animal was swelled all over the loins, and she was very bad when inoculated; she lived only two days.
13. As I have said above, there was only one animal died, so that the result was every way favourable to inoculation. There was none seemed (with that solitary exception) to require any attention.
14. About two months after inoculation there was no sign of the disease, and I do not think they were exposed afterwards to the infection, as it completely left the herd. Of one thing I feel certain, that if I had inoculated two months previous, when the infection first appeared in the herd, I firmly believe I should not have lost any. The herd at the present time are in good condition and healthy. All the cattle I had were inoculated, young and old; and, as I have mentioned before, about two months after inoculation, it finally disappeared. I have this opinion of inoculation, that if the infection was to make its appearance again I should inoculate directly; and I believe that an Act compelling the inoculation of herds would be in every way beneficial to stockowners.
15. I consider that an Act should be passed obliging owners whose cattle are infected to inoculate them.

189.

1. In June, 1864.
3. About 3,000 out of 6,000.
4. Diseased—about one half showing symptoms of disease. Only inoculated those that did not show any symptoms.
5. About four months.
12. I saw some dead from the effects of inoculation and swelling in the tail, but cannot state the number; but I think about 10 per cent., as the cattle that were inoculated were turned out on the run again. The means tried to cure the swelling was by cutting off the tails and bleeding under the root of the tail near the rump, which I believe saved the lives of a great many.

13. As to the result of inoculation I cannot answer, as my cattle were turned out on the run again after they were inoculated; and they kept on dying for two years after they were inoculated; and I have seen two or three within the last two years with the disease.
14. I think cattle at any time may be liable to the disease called pleuro-pneumonia although properly inoculated, as I have seen them with the disease after being properly inoculated; but I think inoculation will stay the disease for a time, but it will not prevent it from coming again in the same cattle; but if in case any cattle that have been properly inoculated should get the disease again, I do not think so many of them would die as if they were not inoculated. I have seen cattle that have been inoculated with the disease after inoculation and noticed them, and a great number of them got well again; but as to what effect the disease has on cattle which have been properly inoculated, when exposed afterwards to those that are infected, I cannot tell, as all the runs in the district about my run have been diseased; but when I have seen any of my cattle with the disease, that have not been inoculated, I have bled them, and eight out of ten get round again if bled when the disease is just taken.
15. I think it would be useless to pass an Act to make owners of stock inoculate them when they are infected with the disease called pleuro-pneumonia, as I believe if cattle that have got the disease were inoculated at the time it would kill every one you did; so I do not consider that an Act should be passed obliging owners of cattle to inoculate them.

190.

1. Between February, 1867, and August, 1867.
3. About 7,000.
4. Disease was in the herd, and the percentage of those showing symptoms varied in different parts of the run.
5. Inoculation was commenced about six weeks after the disease appeared, and in some parts of the run it had been at least four months.
12. In most cases, where the swelling got into the body from the tail, the animal died, and this was seldom the case except in very hot weather. The loss was not more than 1 or 2 per cent. Cutting off the tails, and setons, were used as means of cure, but with so little effect that we ceased to try them.
13. In several instances the disease ceased almost entirely after inoculation at that part of the run, in others it seemed to have little effect in stopping it, and generally it was most efficacious, where only a few had died or were sick at the time of inoculation; but there were other causes, such as variety of virus, care in operating, &c., which may have had effect also. In two instances some pure bred cattle, in paddocks, were inoculated before disease appeared amongst them, and never had disease; they were carefully operated upon; while some others in an adjoining paddock, left purposely as a test, soon showed disease, and several died, some after inoculation. In two instances, amongst my neighbours, inoculation before the disease had appeared in the herd seems to have saved them, or all that had been operated upon, as in one instance a portion only were thus saved. On the other hand I inoculated a working bullock after disease had advanced so far as to cause him to cough if moved out of a walk; he was quite well and at work again in about three weeks, and had lost the extreme tip of his tail from the virus.
15. I do not think that any advantage is to be gained by such an Act sufficient to compensate the expense of working it. All the cattle on a run, especially in broken country, cannot be got in at or near the same time, consequently enough will always remain unoperated upon to propagate the disease. The self-interest of proprietors will induce them to practice inoculation, if it can be shown to be useful. The loss in this district has been found by numbers in almost every herd to be from one-third to one-half of the whole.

191.

1. March, 1864.
3. About 800.
4. Disease raging. To best of recollection, 10 per cent. or upwards.
5. Several months.
12. Several deaths thus occurred. Some were got in and the putrid gatherings opened with a knife, which had a good effect. About 5 per cent. died. No doubt many deaths might have been prevented if all that required the knife had been found in time.
13. I do not think the result was satisfactory. I would not like to inoculate my herd unless I could turn the cattle operated upon into fenced portion of the run, so as to take in time those which required attention. I should also deem it essential that some one duly qualified should supply the virus in a proper state. I would not trust to my own judgment in obtaining it.

14. The cattle operated upon ran intermixed with those diseased. I cannot state whether cattle exposed to the infection after proper inoculation were affected by it, for many of my cattle, I am convinced, were not properly inoculated, and I could not distinguish those which may have been properly inoculated from the others. I cannot point to any circumstance which either proves or disproves the efficacy of inoculation. In my case the disease was raging at least four months before I inoculated; and it is impossible to say whether I did not inoculate cattle in which the disease had already set in. And to give the preventive a fair trial, it ought to be done the moment the disease appears. It is only fair to state, however, that the disease disappeared about one month or six weeks after I inoculated. Query—Had it run its course?

192.

14. Station purchased last year. Unable to procure information as to previous inoculation, which took place four years ago when cattle were not infected. No disease since. No inoculation since date of purchase.
15. Yes.

193.

1. March, 1867.
3. 600.
4. The cattle that were inoculated were healthy—about 2 per cent. showing symptoms not inoculated.
12. Yes, about 3 per cent.; the tail was cut off some, and I believe it saved their lives.
13. No cattle on the run have showed symptoms of disease since inoculation.
14. We consider the cattle should be attended to after inoculation, so that the tails could be lanced as soon as the swellings become visible.
15. We consider owners of cattle should be obliged to inoculate as soon as the symptoms appear.

194.

1. Last date, February, 1868.
3. 930 head.
4. This lot, newly purchased, stored, showed symptoms soon after coming on the run; about 5 per cent.
5. About three weeks.
12. In 1865, 3 per cent. died from swelling or inflammation reaching the body; no application that we used had any effect. Cutting the tail off close to the rump the most likely to save the animal's life. In 1868. No deaths from inoculation.
13. The spread of the disease seemed checked at once; no fresh case ever appeared; diseased animals generally died off rapidly after inoculation; in a few weeks the herd seemed healthy and thriving.
14. In 1868, in a mob of 1,350 head of store bullocks put on run, were 300 head — cattle which *had been properly inoculated*; when the disease broke out the cattle were grazing and watering together; no — ever showed symptoms, although constantly mixed up with the diseased cattle, both before and after inoculation. In our experience, we never fear pleuro after inoculation has been properly performed, and have never seen a well marked case of pleuro-pneumonia in a beast *properly* inoculated. We attribute our loss in '65 as compared with '68, from effects of inoculation, to the fact that in the former case the virus was taken from a lung too far gone, and the operation improperly performed, the incision being bloodless, through the centre of tail.
15. As we believe inoculation an efficient check to the disease, and know of no other remedy, we answer yes.

195.

1. About October, 1867.
3. About 250.
4. Disease just showing in two or three head.
5. Inoculated as soon as discovered.
12. I consider I lost fully 10 per cent.; but many of these from inexperience. I don't think I should now lose half so many under similar circumstances. Warm fomentations I found to be very efficacious.
13. I have not seen any disease since, and the inoculated cattle improved very much in flesh soon after they recovered.
14. In one particular case several hundred head of cattle were removed from one part of the district to another; they were never inoculated, and I believe the disease carried off great numbers of them. I don't think the owner has ever mustered half the number since their removal. My cattle have been exposed to infection by diseased cattle being about and passing through the run.

15. I believe an Act should be passed as stringent as any with reference to sheep, and that drovers should be compelled to report themselves to an Inspector in each district they might have to pass through, who should examine the cattle, and, if sound, give a statement to that effect. My reason for insisting on an examination in each district is, that cattle may appear quite sound on leaving a run, and after a few days' driving the disease may be distinctly visible.

196.

1. September, 1864.
3. About 300 head.
4. The disease was in the cattle at the time of the inoculation. There might have been 100 or 140 of them had the disease at the time.
5. The disease commenced about three months before the cattle were inoculated.
12. There were some died through swellings. I could not exactly say to what extent. I should say about from twelve to twenty or thereabouts, but I did not try any means to cure them.
13. I believe it was beneficial to the cattle that were free from disease.
14. I could not say whether the cattle are exposed to the infection after inoculation or not, because the disease has never been amongst the herd since shortly after inoculation.
15. Yes, if they are inoculated immediately the disease is observed.

197.

1. September, October, November, December, 1863, and January, 1864.
3. About 1,700 head of a mixed herd.
4. All more or less affected. A large quantity died during the time disease was in the herd.
5. Two months we had observed disease in the herd.
12. Very few, if any, deaths from inoculation. When deaths occur it is generally from using virus of a beast in a dying state, or quite purple in appearance, say color of port wine.
13. We have never suffered much since the inoculation. We occasionally find a beast slightly diseased. I recollect getting one (a cow) in to slaughter some two years since.
14. There have been diseased cattle travelling down the river from Queensland many times since. I am not aware of any of ours taking it from them; but, on the other hand, my next neighbour, Mr. _____ did not inoculate at the time—nearly every one else did—nor do I think he has since.
15. I am decidedly in favour of inoculation.

198.

1. July, 1865.
3. 1,700.
4. 20 per cent. showing symptoms.
5. Three months.
12. 5 per cent. died. Cut the tail off till the blood ran, and it seemed to cure most of them.
13. The disease stopped.
14. Our cattle were exposed to the infection after the inoculation, but they were not affected by it.
15. Yes, decidedly.

199.

1. 29 September, 1868.
3. About 130.
4. Apparently healthy, because every animal showing disease during the previous two months had been immediately killed—say, to the extent of fifty head.
5. Disease first showed itself about beginning of July, 1868; but although it was in the herd, I cannot say any beasts were visibly affected, for reasons stated in No. 4, but no doubt many of them were inwardly affected.
12. Only the four above referred to died with excessive swelling, but whether caused by the inoculation or not I cannot say; post hoc propter hoc, is not an invariable sequence. My opinion from examination of the lungs is, that they were diseased before inoculation, and would have died whether inoculated or not.
13. The remainder of the inoculated cattle have been healthy ever since, and no cases of disease, except those referred to, have since occurred in my paddocks here, although a few hundred of fresh uninoculated cattle have been introduced from my upper stations. There are three or four cases in which the tops of the tails have dropped off.
14. From the fact of my having had at least fifty head diseased, and either killed or dying before inoculation, and from my having had only five or six cases subsequently to inoculation which have died, and from my paddocks here having been free from

- deaths (except these five or six cases, and those within a short period afterwards), I consider the efficacy of inoculation completely proved. The cattle inoculated were exposed to the infection if any arising from the beasts which were diseased and died subsequently to inoculation. I may mention also, that I bought several cows and young bulls from _____ and which he assured me were inoculated; although running for months in the same paddock with infected cattle, none of them were ever diseased. In all the beasts killed, the _____ lung was the one affected, and in most cases it adhered to the ribs. I did not kill any inoculated sound cattle for meat till perhaps six weeks or more after inoculation, and therefore cannot state what effect, if any, it had on their lungs. I am in the habit of killing three or four head of cattle every week for meat, since inoculation, except in two cases, and in those very slightly. I have never found any sign of disease; in these cases the lung appeared to be getting convalescent after being diseased. I believe pleuro to be in the district, but the owners of the cattle, from interested motives, conceal the fact; many beasts have died in other paddocks than my own during the last eighteen months.
15. I consider that cattle should, if possible, be inoculated previously to infection, as I doubt whether it is useful afterwards, but as all the cattle on a run, or in a paddock, do not take it at the same time, an obligatory Act to compel inoculation as soon as discovered should be passed. Also, another to prevent diseased cattle travelling. It would be advisable that owners of cattle in the neighbourhood of diseased runs should inoculate at the same time as the owners of diseased runs.

200.

1. Lastly, about 5 years.
3. 80 head, more or less.
4. 3 per cent.
5. Immediately.
12. No means were tried after inoculation, they having been turned out on the run. About 20 per cent. died after inoculation.
13. Losses.
14. Any cattle surviving the disease never showed any symptoms afterwards. I consider the disease a very dangerous one; but as for inoculation I do not believe in it, except it is dealt with by a competent person.
15. I do not, except dealt with by a competent person.

201.

1. We inoculated in June, 1863.
3. Between 1,700 and 1,800.
4. If we could notice anything the matter with them, we did not think it worth our while to inoculate.
5. Dying six months before anyone commenced inoculating.
12. I believe we had 5 per cent.
13. I believe it done good to unaffected ones; but, if affected, I don't think it done much good.

202.

1. June, 1864.
3. 400.
4. Slightly affected; about 5 per cent. diseased.
5. Symptoms appeared about three weeks previous to inoculation.
12. No deaths occurred from inoculation; about 8 per cent. died from disease.
13. In those cattle that appeared to have the disease latent it brought it out at once.
14. Running amongst these cattle were a number of strangers, which were not inoculated; and a great many of them died and kept dying for some months; and the inoculated cattle escaped, though exposed to actual contact with diseased animals. Working bullocks belonging to station and inoculated, all escaped; and those belonging to carriers, also residing on station, and not inoculated, nearly all died. Have not inoculated since. No disease worth speaking of in district since 1864. I should inoculate at once if any symptoms appeared. I consider inoculation a preventive; but it should be done in cold weather, as little swelling takes place then. *Virus* should be taken from young cattle, not too far gone with disease, and clear and free from blood, and not kept too long. Seton or knife to be carefully inserted, so as not to injure bones of tail, and *virus* carefully inserted under skin.
15. Yes; with the provision that travelling cattle be exempt, till they reach their destination, as cattle may leave their run apparently sound, yet with the disease latent; and, if so, it immediately breaks out on travelling them.

203.

1. June and July, 1865.
3. 1,100 head.
4. Diseased; about 1 per cent.
5. Two weeks.
12. About 4 per cent. died by excessive swelling. I cut the tails which were swollen which had, taken in time, the effect of stopping death.
13. Very successful.
14. On my station there were many of my neighbours' cattle and other stragglers; and I observed, generally speaking, that those cattle which were not inoculated became affected, and, in many cases, died. In another case I bought a team of working bullocks. They became diseased; I inoculated them, and they all lived. At the same time I have seen carriers' bullocks die from this new precaution. The carriers adopted the remedy at length, and were quite satisfied of its success.
15. I most decidedly consider that such an Act should be passed.

204.

1. 1863.
3. 4,872 head.
4. Strong, in good condition; about 12 per cent.
5. One month.
12. Of the milking cows which I kept milking, 50 per cent. died; I had 80 cows milking. 40 died; all those that died were very much swollen at the butt of the tail and hind parts.
13. I cannot speak positively of the results.
14. I am not in possession of anything that will prove that inoculation is either a preventive or cure. I am not in favor of an Act to compel owners to inoculate. I think it necessary to be very cautious as to stage of disease in the beast the virus is taken from; I think under no circumstances should cattle be tailed after inoculation.

205.

14. There has only been four or five cases of the disease appearing in this district, and they have all inoculated with beneficial results. I have had no disease among my cattle; if they should at any time, I shall inoculate the first opportunity.
15. I would not advise compulsory inoculation for several reasons—there would be great difficulties in the way at times.

206.

1. January 5th, 1865, 85 head; January 21st, 15 head; February 3rd to 24th, 1,262 head; March 3rd, 264 head; June 2nd, 56 head.
3. 1,632 head—all that were mustered.
4. About 2 per cent. perceptibly diseased.
5. Uncertain—about four months. The disease was introduced from a neighbouring herd, where store cattle were brought from New South Wales. The season of 1864 was excessively wet, and developed the disease perhaps more than it would in ordinary seasons.
12. I did not see any deaths from swellings, nor hear of any.
13. The disease seemed to disappear quicker than in neighbouring herds, some of which were never inoculated. The cattle seemed also to improve quickly after recovering from inoculation. Some lost two or three joints of the tail, but this I think arose from inserting the needle too deeply. Before the end of 1865 the herd seemed quite free from disease, and have remained so ever since. Neighbouring herds remained diseased much longer.
14. I believe that if the operation is well and carefully performed it is a preventive, and there is comparatively no risk of loss, especially if the virus can be procured from an adjoining herd, instead of waiting till the disease is developed in the one to be operated on; but if that is necessary, every diseased beast should if possible be separated and put in a paddock to await the second stage. If beyond that (which will be known by extensive swellings under the brisket and between the fore legs, and sometimes a cough when the breast is moved or even without its moving) it had better be destroyed. Inoculation will probably kill a beast if beyond the most incipient stage, or if it would die whether or not it would probably hasten the end. In a warm climate like here the disease evidently died out of those herds not inoculated, but I believe a large percentage died that might have been saved had inoculation been performed when the disease was first perceived.
15. I do.

207.

1. 8th June, 1863, at the Tomanbill Station.
2. About 2,000.
3. Infected through all the herds. The infection spread very rapidly and badly.
4. About two months.
5. When I first used the thread and needle several deaths occurred, and the swellings were very great. On those that were quiet I used the knife freely, and applied weak bluestone water to the wound, which had good effect; but by the method I have now adopted in using the lance, I have no deaths and the swellings are very slight.
13. Highly satisfactory.
14. The first cattle I inoculated consisted of a fattening herd, chiefly bullocks, and kept in an enclosure—most of them fat when the disease showed itself. The herd was nominally about 500. They fell off in condition very rapidly. When I got them in to inoculate they were dying from eight to ten daily, and reduced to about 300; but the deaths ceased immediately after inoculation. This I consider proves the efficacy of inoculation beyond a doubt, and I have never known cattle properly inoculated, even though afterwards exposed to the infection, affected by it. Since the pleuro-pneumonia first appeared in the ——— District in 1863 I have had all my young cattle inoculated regularly every year. The disease always showing itself among the weaners, the work is done without any extra hands on the stations. By this means I have no losses with cattle from pleuro worth mentioning.
15. I should rather defer answering this question; although, from having had six years experience in inoculating my cattle, I am fully convinced that all cattle should be inoculated.

208.

1. November, 1866, and in January, 1868.
3. The first time 200 head; and the second time 80 head.
4. About 5 per cent.
5. The first lot about five months, the second lot about two months.
12. No deaths occurred from excessive swelling caused by the inoculation.
13. I found inoculation to be of great benefit to the cattle that were not infected with the disease, as the cattle ceased to die after inoculation, and none died but those that were diseased when inoculated.
14. I believe inoculation to be of great service if applied in time, that is, before the herd is too much infected with the disease. The disease had only been introduced by cattle brought from a distance before I inoculated, on the second occasion that it appeared in my herd, and I only lost a few head; but the disease disappeared after inoculation. The virus ought to be good when applied, not having been kept too long nor taken at a too advanced stage.

209.

1. Cannot tell; they were inoculated when purchased.
3. About 200.
4. I have no information to give in answer to questions 4 to 11, the cattle having come into my possession long after inoculation.
12. The cattle were inoculated long before I purchased them, and I cannot say how many died from excessive swelling; but I was told a large per-centage did die. A great many lost their tails.
13. None of the inoculated cattle have died since they came into my possession in April, 1867.
14. The cattle have generally been very healthy, but there have been a few cases of disease at intervals. Some recovered, and about six died. All the cases were confined to the uninoculated cattle in the herd, not one of those that were inoculated having shown any symptoms of disease.
15. Yes; or rather that cattle owners should be compelled to inoculate, whether infected or not. I also consider that no cattle should be allowed to travel without notice being given to the holders of the country through which they pass, and that no diseased cattle should be allowed to travel.

210.

1. 7 January, 1865.
3. 84 head.
4. Apparently healthy.
5. Disease had appeared in the herd about two or three months previously.
12. Yes, about 5 per cent. The swellings, when about the rump, were scarified, but it proved fruitless; if only the tail, then part was cut off, which mostly proved beneficial. In one or two instances the lower half of the tail dried away and dropped off.
13. It gave a good deal of trouble attending to those that swelled, and watching the others to see if they required attending to.

14. We think that inoculation (where practicable) may *prevent* the disease for a *few months*, but it certainly is *no cure*, or *permanent preventive*, since we have had cattle that we have had to cut part of the tails off of, from the effects of inoculation afterwards become affected with pneumonia, though perhaps recover from it. They were allowed to mix with the general herd, which were not inoculated though infected. We are strongly adverse to inoculation where the cattle are *diseased*; since we have found that the running about for purpose of inoculation does much more harm to those affected, than the inoculation does good to those not affected; and those *infected*, if *inoculated*, are almost sure to die, whereas if left alone in peace and quiet they very often recover and do well. Our herd, though infected and not inoculated, had, we believe, a smaller percentage of deaths through being left quiet, than had our neighbours' who did inoculate.
15. We do not consider such a course necessary.

211.

14. I have the honor to inform you that the only inoculated cattle I have, are 100 head of cows I imported from the Clarence four months ago, and they were inoculated about twelve months previous to my purchasing; and I am happy to say there are no symptoms of my uninoculated cattle being infected with the pleuro-pneumonia, I consider if there should be an Act passed, obliging owners to inoculate, there ought also to be one obliging the persons by whom the inoculation is performed to rightly understand it (particularly using proper virus); otherwise, it is my opinion, in many cases there would be more harm than good done by the disease being uselessly spread. Let competent persons be appointed in each district, to see that parties inoculating have acquired the *necessary knowledge*, and a penalty inflicted on owners allowing their cattle to be inoculated by any person *without such*.
15. Yes, if in conjunction with my first appended remark.

212.

1. About June of 1863.
3. About 200.
4. About 10 per cent. slightly infected at time of inoculation.
5. The herd was infected about three months before we heard of inoculation. Tried many remedies previously, but of no avail.
12. About 2½ per cent. died, but if I had seen them in time I believe I could have saved them. No. 10 explains what means were used to cure them.
13. The cattle speedily recovered and got fat; but I observed, when killing occasionally, that the left lung generally was growing to the ribs, and some few are so up to the present time.
14. The inoculated cattle were amongst the diseased cattle, but never took the disease again. Yet I observed some few that were very bad when inoculated (although they got fat) never entirely got rid of their cough when moved about. I consider the inoculation the only remedy for the prevention of disease, also for curing those that were diseased. A little while ago I saw a work treating on the fumigation of cattle, in Scotland, with flour of sulphur for the pleuro—and cured them: no doubt you have seen the work. There the cattle are housed; here they are not.
15. It strikes me very forcibly that an Act should be passed to compel inoculation, whether cattle are infected or not, although it would be a difficult matter to get virus just now round this neighbourhood.

213.

1. 27th May.
3. Thirty-four head, all young.
4. One or two slightly diseased.
5. One, some weeks.
12. None.
13. Apparently, perfect immunity from the disease.
14. I believe, from my own observation, that inoculation is a very efficacious remedy, but I have not been able to satisfy myself whether the disease is infectious or otherwise; but were it so I do not think it desirable to make inoculation compulsory. Those who adopt that remedy can get rid of the disease, without fear of infection from their neighbour's herd.

214.

1. July, 1864.
3. 1,500.
4. Store condition, 3 to 4 per cent.
5. Seven or eight days.
12. About 1½ per cent.
13. Cattle improved in condition, and disease *disappeared* within a week or *ten days*.
14. Numbers were with diseased cattle after the inoculation, but never in the least showed any symptoms.
15. We do not consider it requisite that an Act should be passed.

215.

1. September, 1868.
3. 39.
4. None of the cattle showed symptoms of disease.
12. One died; he was in the bush. In the other cases where the swelling occurred we made incisions in the tail above the swelling, and let it bleed well.
13. We never have had any of our cattle affected, though the disease has been all round us.
14. I consider that the fact of none of our cattle having been affected by the disease, though mixed with and surrounded by cattle having it, is a proof that inoculation is a preventive.
15. I consider that it would be for the general good that an Act should be passed obliging owners of cattle whose herds are infected to inoculate.

216.

1. Early part of 1863.
3. 1,163.
4. Nearly all healthy; a few stragglers showing symptoms of pleuro—say about 5 per cent.
5. Commenced inoculating as soon as the disease was noticed.
12. About 5 per cent. of the whole herd died; but I believe those were deaths arising from the disease contracted before inoculation.
13. Almost perfect immunity from the disease, the few dying being mostly cattle that were not inoculated or were too far gone for the inoculation to be of any use.
14. I believe inoculation, properly performed with good virus, to be a preventive, in the same way that vaccination is a preventive of the small-pox in the human subject. It is useless after the disease has hold of a beast, and I do not think that it will altogether stop a beast from taking pleuro, but if a beast takes the disease it is in a mild form—having seen the first cases of pleuro in Victoria, on Mr. ——— and practised inoculation on cattle from the first.
15. I consider an Act should be passed compelling all owners of cattle to inoculate them. After disease is in a herd inoculation will only benefit the healthy cattle or those slightly diseased. I consider cattle inspectors should be appointed to see the inoculation properly done.

217.

1. June, 1865.
3. About 1,000.
4. Slightly diseased; about 5 per cent.
5. About one month.
12. I cannot state per-centage of deaths caused by excessive swelling. There might have been 2 per cent. There is no occasion to interfere with the beast unless the swelling is very severe, and appears to be going into the back—that is, where the tail joins the back. The tail should then be cut off as close as possible to the back, and scarify the parts swollen. It is necessary to scarify the same beast two or three times.
13. I believe cattle that are properly inoculated are not liable to take the disease.
14. I do not think it would be advisable for cattle to travel immediately after inoculation. I saw about 500 head of cattle, brought from the Lachlan to this district. They were inoculated just before starting, and were dying all along the road. It is possible that the virus used for inoculating those cattle was taken from a beast in a decomposed state.

218.

- I believe inoculation to result in good effects, and am of opinion it would be to the benefit of cattle owners to make it compulsory to inoculate. In support of this view, I will give an instance in point—without mentioning names of parties—which happened some few years since: Two brothers, living on two separate stations near here, and about 40 miles apart, started some cattle from each station for Melbourne market; one lot was inoculated—the other lot was not. When they started the two lots were driven together in one mob; the uninoculated cattle soon began to die of pleuro-pneumonia, and continued so to die until the surviving ones were treated the same as the other lot with which they were mixed—inoculated; after which there was not one fresh case of disease among the lot the whole journey.

219.

1. 1864.
3. 1,600.
4. Our cattle were not too advanced in the disease when I inoculated them; about 2 per cent.
5. About four or five weeks.
12. Only a very few deaths occurred from swelling. The tails of a good many dropped off. I did not try any means to cure the swellings. I think it would be well to cut off the tail of a beast much swollen, above the part inflamed.
13. The pleuro disappeared altogether a few weeks after inoculation.
15. I do; and I think the sooner the better for the Colony.

220.

1. December, 1863.
3. 900 head.
4. Good condition, about 400 showing symptoms; loss about 10 per cent.
5. Two months.
12. Two or three died from the inoculation swelling in the hinder parts. I have tried no remedy.
13. I believe the genuine article for inoculation was never ascertained when my cattle were done, therefore I do not altogether approve of it.
14. I have had some infected about six months after being inoculated. The genuine virus for inoculation is to be got in a beast's rump—that is, in one which has been inoculated before; I have tried it myself, without hurting the animal. If cattle have plenty of salt, I don't think they would catch the disease. Bleeding in the neck or tail I have also tried without a failure.
15. I do not, as it is not infectious—that is, when cattle are running on a run, for I have had cattle with the disease from October, 1863, up to the present time, without any losses worth mentioning.

221.

1. August, 1864, to October.
4. Stations very much diseased—upwards of 2,000 had died before we began to inoculate; the loss from one herd that which first began to die, was not over forty head.
5. From one to two years.
12. No deaths occurred from swelling.
13. Made a thorough cure, and not over 1 per cent. of deaths. None died but those that were in the last stage of disease when inoculated.
14. Inoculation, in my opinion, is a sure preventive; and also a perfect cure, if used during the first or second stage of the disease—the cattle at present perfectly sound.
15. Most certainly.

222.

1. August, 1863.
3. 550.
4. Five head, showing symptoms strong, died within a week after inoculation—the rest lived. Previous to inoculation, one, two, and sometimes three in a day, during the space of two or three weeks, were found dead.
5. The cattle showed symptoms of disease about six weeks prior thereto.
12. None.
13. A perfect cure.
14. My belief is, that cattle properly inoculated in due time are free from the said disease.
15. Yes.

223.

1. July, 1867.
3. About 1,300.
4. The disease was showing through the herd: per-centage about 10.
5. About two months.
12. About two. Some we cut the tails off of, and some were lanced.
13. I approve of it.
14. I think all herds ought to be inoculated where any symptoms of the disease is showing, and that immediately.
15. I hold that an Act should be passed compelling all persons who have cattle to inoculate them, where there is any symptoms of the disease.

224.

3. 500.
12. The method I have used in case of excessive swelling is to cut the tail off above the swollen part, which I believe to be the only remedy.
14. In any case where the disease has appeared I strongly advise inoculation. So far as my experience goes I believe inoculation to be the only remedy for the disease. The cattle on this run are now in perfect health.
15. I believe that there should be an Act passed to compel owners of cattle to inoculate them whenever symptoms of the disease appear.

225.

1. November, 1863.
3. 1,000 head.
4. Diseased—10 per cent.
5. Three months.
12. A few died. Tried no means to ease the swelling.
13. It had a good and material effect in improving the condition of the cattle.
14. The inoculation, in my opinion, had a decidedly good effect—were it not for it they would have all died.
16. I do so consider.

226.

1. Some about 1862 ; some about 1865.
4. About 3 per cent.
5. About a fortnight.
12. Never had any deaths.
13. Tends to mitigate the disease.
14. My brothers and self were the first who inoculated cattle in New South Wales ; and we found that out of 350 head—325 of which were inoculated, and 25 of which, the strongest and healthiest, were not,—that the per-centage of deaths from disease was greater in the cattle not inoculated ; and my experience leads me to be of opinion that when a herd is infected the whole should be inoculated.
15. No, as I consider the matter should be left entirely in the hands of cattle owners themselves.

227.

1. October, 1866.
2. 2,000.
4. About one-tenth—200—showing symptoms of disease.
5. About six months.
12. About 150 out of the herd had to be brought in after inoculation, on account of swollen tails. Some tails cut clean off above swelling ; others only opened. About 4 per cent. died from this cause ; many recovered, with entire loss of tail.
13. Apparently, progress of disease completely arrested.
14. Shearing operations following so soon after inoculation, had not opportunity of much observation. Under impression that none that were properly inoculated died from pleuro, unless diseased at time of operation. Some few cases appear now and again of pleuro, but only in young cattle that have not been inoculated. Great care necessary as to state of virus used for operating ; proper state to be decided on chiefly by colour and clearness—which should be a medium between pale and dark sherry. The disease appeared more virulent among the cattle depasturing on low swampy grounds than among those on hilly country, leaving the impression that a tendency to rot was also a predisposing cause of severity of attack.
15. Do not ; but would grant a license to any owner of cattle to enter a neighbour's run on which pleuro was, and in neighbour's presence, or some one deputed by him, kill any cattle he chose evidently diseased with pleuro, to enable him (owner) to obtain virus to inoculate his own herd, paying his neighbour such price for every beast so killed as might legally be appointed ; neighbour with infected stock to have option of keeping any virus so obtained if he required it for his own use, but of course not to receive payment for any cattle killed from which he so kept virus.

228.

1. Do not know.
3. Don't know.
4. Don't know.
5. Don't know.
12. Same.
13. Not satisfactory.
14. The question is, were the cattle properly inoculated ? Cannot say if the same cattle were again affected or not.
15. No.

229.

1. 1866.
3. About 250.
4. About 10 per cent. showed symptoms of disease.
5. Two months.
12. Many—I think fully 12 per cent. I tried no remedial measures.
13. Disease disappeared from time of inoculation—except some few, which I believe were either missed, or the virus was carelessly introduced.
14. My cattle have again broken out ; I inoculated a week ago, and of course cannot now give the result. I am of opinion that inoculation, properly performed, is an almost infallible preventive. I believe, further, that deaths will cease in a herd badly infected almost immediately, except in cases where the disease has taken deep root in the system. In three or four weeks after I inoculated, the cattle amused themselves by running and jumping about, which none of them ever did during the two months before. I believe my heavy loss was from over-inoculating, as I passed the worsted through in two places in the tail, about an inch apart, at the same time. This was only done to the dairy cows, and the greatest number of deaths was amongst them. Straggling cattle died of disease amongst mine after mine were inoculated, and mine were not affected by it.
15. Yes, decidedly.

230.

1. 14th November, 1868.
3. 200.
4. Healthy. 2 per cent.
5. Seven days.
12. 1½ per cent. died from swelling. In some cases the tails were cut off above the swelling. When the swelling reached the rump, the knife was applied to open the part, and it was bathed with very hot water.
13. The result was an entire stoppage of the disease.
14. I am of opinion that if inoculation is properly done with good virus, free from blood or watery matter, it will entirely put a stop to the disease. In my case sixty milch cows died before I could persuade the person in charge to inoculate; since which only four died, and they were attacked before operated upon. The best virus is to be found attached to the inside of the pleura, in large patches, very pure and free from blood. This is, I believe, much better than that from the lungs. It is not found in all animals diseased.
15. I do consider that an Act should be passed to compel persons whose cattle are infected to inoculate immediately, and to burn all bodies of animals that die of the disease. This latter should be strictly attended to.

231.

1. Latter end of January, 1865.
3. 800.
4. Diseased. About 5 per cent. showed symptoms.
5. Six months.
12. A few deaths occurred from this cause—perhaps 1 per cent.; but as I inoculated about sixty crawlers (cattle that always stay about the station, milking cows, &c.), first as an experiment, I was prepared, and kept a constant look-out for any that appeared likely to swell. My remedy was, cut the tail off above where it was swollen; if extended to the rump, cut tail off at last joint.
13. The result of inoculation was that in a month after inoculating the herd had discontinued dying, and were healthy and thriving, while cattle belonging to neighbouring stations that were on the same run and were not inoculated continued dying for twelve months or more after.
14. I never saw one beast of ours that had been inoculated with the disease after, but two or three remarkable beasts that I knew to have had the disease, and were not inoculated, had a relapse of the complaint; and some few that had it and recovered from it never fattened, nor were of any value after. Immediately after inoculating our cattle, the disease disappeared from them; but there were herds adjoining, many of which were on our run, that continued dying. And I have known our stockmen, in collecting, bring home stragglers belonging to neighbours, and the greater part of them took the disease while our cattle remained perfectly free from it. I would have continued inoculating calves at branding, but found a great difficulty in getting virus. I practised it for twelve months after inoculating the herd, and none of the young stock showed disease; but since discontinuing it, odd young beasts have.
15. I consider if an Act was passed rendering inoculation compulsory, it would be very beneficial to stockowners generally, and the only means of exterminating the disease.

232.

I believe inoculation to be a preventive, but not a cure. If cattle are inoculated properly I am sure it would save 99 per cent.; if badly done it would destroy more than it would cure.

233.

1. In the years 1861, 1862, 1863.
3. 3,700 head during the years 1861, 1862, 1863.
4. Diseased when inoculated, from twenty to thirty showing symptoms, and four to five dying per week.
5. About two months.
12. About 2 per cent. died from the effects of inoculation. I tried to cure them by opening the enlargement and dressing it with tar and turpentine, and by taking off the tail above where it had previously fallen off. This method, I believe, saved some of them.
13. All symptoms of disease seemed to disappear in about six weeks or two months after inoculation, and I never saw any beast that inoculation had taken effect upon show any symptoms of disease afterwards.
14. All the cattle that I inoculated after they were done I marked, so that I should know them from the others, until I had finished the whole herd (except five or six) which was about 2,000. After the cattle had thoroughly recovered, and there was no sign of

of disease among them I purchased 500 head of store cattle, which had not been inoculated. I tried to get virus from some of my neighbours, and, as their cattle had been inoculated, could not get any. I however found one of the five or six that I had missed affected with the disease, and got the virus from it and inoculated them; and this convinced me that inoculation was a good preventive against the disease, and not only that, but it saved plenty that had the disease.

15. I think it quite desirable that every person, for his own safety, should inoculate his cattle, if showing any symptoms of disease, as I don't think inoculated cattle would take the infection from those that are diseased.

234.

1. July, 1867, and February, 1868.
3. 1,800.
4. About 10 per cent. showing symptoms.
5. Purchased stock showing disease immediately on arrival; inoculated about one month after purchase.
12. No deaths, to my knowledge, took place from the effects of inoculation.
13. No new cases appeared after inoculation, and the herd soon resumed a healthy appearance.
14. My experience leads me to believe that cattle once properly inoculated do not show symptoms of disease again.
15. I consider all owners of cattle should be compelled to inoculate as soon as pleuro-pneumonia shows in the herd.

235.

1. June and July, 1864.
3. About 1,000.
4. Slightly diseased. About 10 per cent.
5. About one month.
12. Yes. Cannot state what per-centage.
13. About two months after the inoculation my cattle were healthy, but whether from the effects of inoculation or perfect quiet upon the run I cannot say.
14. My cattle ran with another adjoining herd that was not inoculated though diseased, and do not suffer any ill effect. I believe that I lost as many cattle out of my herd though inoculated, as the squatter who did not inoculate.
15. I do not consider it necessary to pass an Act compelling squatters to inoculate cattle.

236.

1. September, 1863.
3. About 800 head.
4. About 12 per cent.
5. About three weeks, or perhaps a month.
12. There were about 3 per cent. of mine died from excessive swelling caused by the inoculation. I saved some of the quietest by getting them in and opening them with a knife; about 2 per cent. saved in this way.
14. In the spring of the year 1865 I bought some 150 head of cattle that came from —, and a few days after I got them home I found they were diseased; and I waited about a week thinking they would stop; but they did not. Every day there were more looking sick, so I got them in to inoculate. I should think there were fully forty that you could notice were sick, and after they were inoculated they got better; and I did not lose one after, except two head that I could not find at the time, and they both died. I lost about four before I did them.
15. I do consider that an Act should be passed compelling persons to inoculate.

237.

1. In the month of June.
3. 386 head.
4. Very poor; about 5 per cent.
5. Cannot say how long, but when I found out that one or two were diseased I immediately commenced to inoculate.
12. One death from excessive swelling, others after inoculation took bad. I then bled them in the neck, and they recovered.
13. I consider that I saved my cattle by inoculating them in time.
14. I believe that all stockholders should inoculate their cattle in due time. After being properly inoculated I think there is no danger of their being infected again. I would not have had any disease amongst the cattle that I have bred myself, but I purchased 386 head from —, of —, agent for —. When they were delivered on my station they immediately took bad. They were diseased before I purchased them, but I was not aware of it. I believe the disease originated from starvation.
15. I consider that an Act should be passed to compel all stockowners to inoculate, especially those who have cattle infected. Had there been something of that kind I would not have suffered as I have done with those cattle that I lately purchased.

238.

1. 10th May, 1869.
3. 600 head.
4. Cattle in good condition in paddocks. Showed symptoms of pleuro-pneumonia about December; about two head per month having died up to May, when herd were inoculated—not more than 1 per cent. showing symptoms.
5. About five months.
12. No.
14. In the month of April I inoculated with knife made for the purpose, about 400 head of cattle, in which the disease had shown but very slightly; the virus used being quite fresh; the result was satisfactory. About three weeks afterwards inoculated 200 head out of another paddock adjoining, with virus kept three weeks in bottle (sealed); among these cattle several had died; I removed them after inoculation to paddocks in _____. A month afterwards, disease in a more aggravated form made its appearance. About twelve have died, and a large proportion of the cattle have been affected, and are still so.
15. Yes.

239.

1. May, 1865; June, 1865; May, 1866.
3. 1726 $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} 1,023 \text{ in May, 1865.} \\ 228 \text{ in June, 1865.} \\ 475 \text{ in May, 1866.} \end{array} \right.$
4. Disease first showed itself in March, 1865—after a general muster, and receiving large drafts of cattle from _____, with much herding and delivering—circumstances were favourable to an outbreak of disease. Between 7,000 and 8,000 head of cattle had to be dealt with. When inoculated, a very large proportion of each mob showed symptoms of pleuro. Many had died, and some were in an advanced stage of disease.
5. A draft of 1,871 head, sent to _____, and another of 1,364 head, sent to _____ left _____ in February and March, 1865, and no disease had then manifested itself. In both mobs, however, disease broke out on the road, and caused serious loss. About the end of March pleuro was noticed on the run; its increase became alarming before inoculation was resorted to in May.
12. No deaths occurred from excessive swelling. Cutting off the end of the tail was effectual in such cases.
13. Check of disease—improved condition. Sent off over 800 head to _____, about sixteen days after they were inoculated. They were herded after the operation, and yarded at night. They were mostly diseased when inoculated. Stood the journey well—very few died on the road. Purchaser's agent was pleased with them on delivery, and wrote me to that effect.
14. Since inoculating in June, 1865, and subsequently in May, 1866, the disease may be said to have disappeared from the herd. I have faith in the operation, and should certainly resort to it again if required. The losses from disease were very considerable before inoculation was tried; very few deaths occurred afterwards. I always herded the cattle after inoculation, and had every opportunity of noting any deaths. I prefer a cool day for the operation, or the early morning, or towards evening, and the cattle should be kept as quiet as possible afterwards. With reference to the cattle operated on in June, 1866, they had been sent down from _____, _____, _____, in a diseased state, and were herded for a considerable time after being inoculated. The _____ cattle at that time were not diseased.
15. From the practical evidence I have had of the effects of inoculation I am strongly inclined to think that such an Act would be beneficial.

240.

1. October, 1862.
3. Between two and three hundred.
4. A few badly diseased. About 40 per cent. showing symptoms.
5. Symptoms of disease had appeared twelve months previous to inoculation, but there were not many deaths.
12. About 4 per cent. died from excessive swelling. There was no remedy applied.
13. The cattle became quite healthy, losing all trace of disease within about twelve months, with the exception of a few which would cough violently when pressed to running; these had been almost the worst when inoculated.
14. I have not known a single instance (although carefully on the look-out) of cattle, even when mixing with others, diseased, taking the disease after being properly inoculated. From my experience I should say decidedly that inoculation, when done carefully, with proper virus, is both a preventive and cure. Obtaining virus in the proper state is of all importance.
15. I do most decidedly consider so, provided proper inoculation were insisted on.

241.

1. March, 1866.
3. 200.
4. The cattle were diseased, but only one showing any symptoms at the time of inoculation.
5. About six months.
12. One died, and the swelling had reached the hips, on which large incisions were made, and about one pound of the diseased flesh was cut.
13. The cattle have shown no symptoms of disease since inoculation, and are now healthy.
14. If the inoculation rises properly I think there is no danger of infection. Should the blood flow in the first incision, make another higher up the tail, and then insert virus.
15. I do.

242.

1. 1864.
3. 172.
4. In good condition (beef cattle), about twenty showed symptoms of disease in the entire herd; and virus taken within one week of apparent symptoms of disease.
5. Less than one month, perceivable.
12. Only four died in the whole herd, and I found bleeding and cutting the congealed lumps right out gave the greatest relief.
13. Very satisfactory, and stayed the disease.
14. The cattle did remarkable well, and fattened very quick.
15. I believe that to inoculate is the best preventive and only remedy to extinguish pleuro-pneumonia.

243.

1. January, 1865.
3. 10 head working bullocks, 20 head milking cows.
5. None of the cattle that were diseased were inoculated.
12. About one half the cattle that were inoculated died from excessive swelling; cutting the tail completely off was the only means tried to cure them; the lives of three were saved in this manner.

244.

1. The last cattle were inoculated on this station about four years ago.
3. About 350.
4. Weaners. About 2 per cent.
5. A fortnight.
12. Did not see any.
15. As far as my experience goes think that an Act if passed should be compulsory to inoculate cattle at age of six months; and think that it would stop it to a great extent.

245.

1. During the year 1866.
3. About 1,000 head.
4. In reasonably good condition on an average. The season was good; disease had made its appearance pretty generally through the herd; about 400 died before inoculation commenced; fully two-thirds of the thousand were infected before inoculation commenced.
5. The disease had prevailed about two months, gradually increasing in severity.
12. Deaths did occur, but I am not prepared to say to what extent. I do not think however that the losses reached 3 per cent. from inoculation alone. I did not attempt anything curative in any case.
13. The deaths were perceptibly lessened immediately after inoculation; and under my personal observation many head that were very bad when operated upon fully recovered afterwards. The herd has not been affected since.
14. I consider the result of the inoculation over my whole herd as the strongest proof I can adduce of its efficacy. I firmly believe in it as a curative operation. None of my cattle after inoculation were specially exposed to infection from others—that is, to other infected cattle from other herds. I consider the disease an epidemic dependent wholly on atmospheric action; and therefore if my theory be correct (allowing the same condition of the atmosphere to prevail after inoculation as before), the cessation of the disease is strong evidence of the efficacy of inoculation.
15. Most certainly; and a stringent enactment should be passed preventing the travelling of infected stock under any circumstances.

246.

1. 1864.
3. 300.
4. Whole herd. Total about 400 head dying. 70 per cent. labouring under pleuro-pneumonia when inoculated.
5. Noticed about two months before inoculation took place.
12. Yes; fifteen out of whole herd inoculated; no means used—left to Nature.
13. I consider that inoculation at the times of branding may prove effectual, and consider that it should not take place at any other time but branding.
14. I consider pleuro-pneumonia is infectious and contagious. I consider that all cattle should be inoculated before disease should show itself in its incipient stage, and recommend that all cattle should be inoculated at time of branding.
15. Yes, at the time of branding, but at no other times, whether diseased or not.

247.

1. Some time in 1861.
3. 21.
4. The cattle were in good condition; there were thirty in number; three died before we inoculated; one we killed for the virus; one was showing symptoms when inoculated, and the only one that died after the inoculation. Two we did not inoculate—they never took the disease.
5. The disease had been on the run from which the cattle were taken about ten months previous. It was then, as we thought, gone.
12. None.
13. I believe it stopped the disease. We had none died, only one after, and she was affected when inoculated.
14. I believe inoculation is a preventative, from the above experience. I also believe any deaths from excessive swelling are caused by the cattle not being properly inoculated. Making the insertion so deep as to touch the bone will cause swelling and loss of tail.
15. I am of opinion that an Act should be passed to that effect.

248.

1. About September, 1864.
3. About 1,000.
5. One-third diseased.
6. One month.
12. About 5 per cent. of deaths. Making an incision above the swelling.
13. Very satisfactory.
14. None.
15. Decline giving an opinion.

249.

1. 1863.
3. 200.
4. Diseased. About one-third.
5. Two months.
12. About 10 per cent. died from the excessive swelling caused by the inoculation. No means taken to cure the swelling.
13. Cattle that had the disease after recovery from the inoculation fattened quicker than those that never were diseased.
14. I consider that when cattle are properly inoculated they can be mixed with infected herds with impunity. I have known several cases where inoculated cattle have been amongst infected ones, and very seldom have taken the disease.
15. Yes.

250.

1. September and December, 1863.
3. Thirty-five.
4. No symptoms.
12. No deaths.
13. I firmly believe it was of great service, as my neighbour's cattle died which were diseased and not inoculated.
15. Yes, and would do so myself.

251.

1. January, 1865; February, 1865; March, 1866.
3. January, 1,000; February, 1,500; March, 1866, 350. Other small lots.
4. In January and February, 1865, I think 25 per cent. had died before I commenced to inoculate.
5. I think about two months.

12. About five head in the first lot of 300 died. These were more swelled a good deal, but by bathing with warm water and well scarifying, they were saved. I had none swell very badly after the first I did.
13. There was no disease a month after the cattle were inoculated. There was another brand of cattle on ——— at the time I inoculated the first cattle; and the disease left the whole herd in about six weeks.
14. I had a milking cow take the disease and recover—that is, she got very nearly fat, then took the disease and died. I have seen no cattle after being properly inoculated again take the disease. The lot of cattle (350) were store cattle; they had the disease when bought. About a dozen of them (half of those sick) died. I inoculated them all. There were two head got over the crush without being done. One of them took the disease and died. Not one of those inoculated again had the disease, for I kept them in hand for two months after. That is the best proof I have had, except a case at ———.
15. No. In the first place, knocking the whole herd about, when the disease is in them, does more harm than the present disease. We have often Cumberland disease at the same time, and it is very dangerous. I would advise all persons to inoculate, if they have cattle on hand, and are sure that it is only pleuro-pneumonia.

252.

1. September 25, 1864, and in July 6, 1865. My cattle on this farm were inoculated three times. I think the first two times the virus was bad.
3. 114 head.
4. Were diseased about 15 per cent. Those looked dull about the eyes that were diseased and made to run began to cough. A few died, and those we found very bad, killed and burnt.
5. About four or five months, and before it was stayed, nine months.
12. None of my cattle.
13. All those that were not affected did not take the disease.
14. From what I have heard and seen the inoculated cattle did not take the disease. My cattle were at times exposed from diseased travelling the road, and I do not remember hearing of any being affected by it. A great many cattle on different parts of my property, the cattle of tenants, and of my own on another part of my property, and none of them were inoculated, and none of them took the disease. I purchased a few head of cattle in ——— that proved after to have the disease, but were kept apart by themselves, and were killed and burnt. None of my other cattle took the disease.
15. I think so, should the disease make its appearance again.

253.

1. 1865.
3. About 150.
4. Disposed for disease. 4 per cent.
5. About a fortnight.
12. See No. 10. In some cases tried opening the swelled parts, but with no beneficial effects.
13. Out of the number inoculated about fifty died.
14. There has been no disease in this part since. My experience would be that inoculation was not of any use when the disease had once taken hold of the animal, but may act as a preventive.
15. I don't consider it would be of any service to inoculate the cattle if once diseased.

254.

1. Spring of year 1864.
3. 600.
4. Numbers diseased.
5. Two months.
12. None.
13. The disease seemed to be stopped soon after the inoculation.
14. The cattle were exposed to infection after inoculation, but did not take the disease again.
15. I have not sufficient faith in inoculation. The disease seems to wear itself out, and the more the herd is driven together the more die; if let alone and kept wider apart fewer die.

255.

1. 1862.
3. 1,000.
4. One-fourth of herd diseased.
5. Inoculated as soon as possible after detection of disease.

12. Deaths about 8 per cent., whether from inoculation or from advanced disease cannot say.
13. Favourable.
14. I should wish my neighbours to inoculate if I had done so, and their herds were badly diseased.

256.

1. October, 1863.
3. 700.
4. About 10 per cent. diseased.
5. Twelve months.
12. About 3 per cent. deaths. Means of curing, none.
13. Very few cases of pleuro after inoculation.
14. In my herd it prevented further infection. Those that were properly inoculated were never affected after.
15. Yes.

257.

1. November, 1865.
3. 400.
4. Diseased. 20 per cent.
5. Six months.
12. Many deaths occurred from swelling—say 5 per cent., but in this instance no remedy was applied; but many persons assert that the swollen parts should be opened, which has a good effect.
13. Less died after inoculation than before.
14. We have arrived at the conclusion that inoculation has proved beneficial in cases where the beast had not been diseased before the operation. Great care should be taken in procuring the virus at a proper stage, and should be used as fresh as possible, and never after two days old. Virus in colour should appear like that of oil, or very light sherry wine.
15. Yes, if disease appears in herd.

258.

1. In 1867, and in February, 1868.
3. 1,800.
4. Perhaps about 2 per cent. showed symptoms of disease at the time.
5. The first lot about a fortnight; the second lot came a month's journey, the disease being in the mob all the time. I do not know how much longer.
12. No.
13. A little after inoculation a few died, which I attribute to the fact of their having been diseased at the time of inoculation; but after a few days no more deaths occurred. This I found to be the case in both instances.
14. In every case where I have known cattle to be inoculated they have ceased dying in a short time after—that is to say, in a few days. In several cases I have known inoculated cattle to be exposed to the infection, but never knew it to make any difference to them. In my own case, those I inoculated in 1867 mixed with those that came in 1868, but I never saw one of them with any appearance of disease.
15. Certainly not. I do not see how legal proof could be obtained that the cattle were not inoculated. Then the disease may come by infection, but it sometimes seems to come by other ways as well; and believing that inoculation will prevent the disease spreading, it is in any one's power to prevent any great loss among his cattle, even though his neighbours may not inoculate.

259.

1. 5th November, 1865.
3. 350.
4. In good condition; three in each 100.
5. Ten days.
12. From excessive swelling. 2 per-centage. By cutting part of tail off; if the swelling continue, cut the whole of the tail off. I have had that swelled in the quarters that I have cut the rump away 3 inches deep. The cows recovered.
14. 350 I inoculated. Sixteen cows that I was milking I did not inoculate; the whole of them died in the autumn. Twenty-four that were not got at the time the herd was being inoculated—one lived out of the twenty-four. There is no clearer proof than the above that inoculation is efficacious. None of the cattle that I inoculated, if recovered, has the disease affected since.
15. I consider every one ought to inoculate for their own benefit, without compulsion.

260.

1. April, 1867.
3. 600 head.
4. About 10 per cent. were diseased.
5. About three or four weeks from the time the disease was first seen.
12. No deaths are believed to have occurred, and no means were tried to cure the swellings.
13. The disease disappeared very shortly after the cattle were inoculated, and this is attributed to the inoculation.
14. I believe that although there may be solitary cases of disease in a herd that has been inoculated, or that the disease has once passed through, that such a herd will never again suffer to any extent worth mentioning; that an animal having been properly inoculated, or having once had the disease, is not liable to have it again.
15. Most decidedly. In the event of the disease appearing again to any extent, owners should be compelled to inoculate.

261.

1. October, 1865.
3. 1,200.
4. Cattle badly diseased. About 15 per cent.
5. About six or seven months.
12. None noticed.
13. I believe at the time the cattle were inoculated the disease was leaving the herd.
14. If a herd of cattle have the disease in it, the best way is to leave them alone, and by no means have them knocked about, and the losses will be trifling.
15. I don't think it necessary for an Act to be passed.

262.

1. January 1st, 1863.
3. 350 head. About the same number not inoculated.
4. When inoculated apparently sound.
5. Showed on the run about March, 1865. About 20 head died with the disease. Kept going and coming. Sometimes one or two died, till inoculated.
11. Being a bush run I could not say what died, but I think about 3 per cent. died.
13. I am happy to say that I have not seen any disease on the run since the inoculation—those that were done, or those that were not.
14. I have known in Victoria, cattle that were properly inoculated take the disease and die. The disease has taken more effect on rich pasture than on poor land. Inoculation is an open question with the Victorian squatters. I do not believe in it myself, as I think the cure is as bad as the disease.
15. May God direct the Government to do for the best!

263.

1. April and May, 1866.
3. 2,500 head.
4. A small per-centage showed disease—otherwise herd looked well.
5. About 2 or 3 months.
12. Great numbers died, evidently from the swelling. In some cases the tail swelling was cut off, in many cases it dropped off.
13. Result is—I do not believe in it at all—I consider it a perfect farce. My next neighbour, ——— who, at that time did not believe in it, lost very few cattle; he did not inoculate; his herd in the paddocks being about the same as my own.
14. A neighbour of mine, one ———, through whose land my cattle, both store and fat, while diseased in both cases, did not lose a beast by pleuro, though my stock, certainly in one case, were dropped and mixed with his (———). I have not done any inoculation since date named, nor do I see any sufficient proof of its efficacy to induce me to renew the operation.
15. Should only be upon such indisputable evidence as none could refute; this you cannot get. In this district the herds are reduced, I believe, one-half by drought, in some cases to one-fourth.

264.

1. July 5, 1865.
3. 3,000.
4. Not showing disease. About 10 per cent.
5. Disease showed itself in the herd about three weeks before any were inoculated.
12. About 3 per cent., by cutting the tails till blood flowed freely, always resulting in a cure.
13. It did not seem to do the cattle any harm in the way of fattening.

14. I do not consider inoculating of any great use, as some herds adjoining were not inoculated, and they seemed to do as well, and have as few deaths as any of the herds that were inoculated. The cattle were exposed to the disease, but did not take it.
15. As far as my experience in inoculation goes I do not think it sufficiently dangerous to pass an Act to oblige any one to inoculate.

265.

1. 1865.
3. 1,200.
4. Cattle not diseased when inoculation was performed. The loss in the herd was about 25 per cent. No cattle showing at the time symptoms of disease were inoculated.
5. Symptoms of disease existed in the herd for about two months prior to inoculation being had recourse to, although just prior to that event the per-centage of those showing symptoms was very much greater than at first.
12. We cannot decidedly say whether death resulted from the operation or the disease, as the latter existed throughout the herd before the former was performed. In cases of excessive swelling, blood-letting and freely opening the parts where matter lay, were resorted to with satisfactory results.
13. Shortly after the herd had been inoculated the disease entirely disappeared. It has only made its appearance again among the young cattle.
15. We are of opinion that such an Act ought to be passed.

266.

1. August, 1865.
3. 4,500.
4. Diseased. 10 per cent. showing symptoms.
5. Fully two months.
12. I should say only 1 per cent. No means were tried to cure the swellings, but we used virus taken from cattle not so much diseased as the virus that was used, when we saw swellings.
13. Immediately after inoculating, this herd of cattle ceased dying.
14. That after inoculation, no cattle, in my opinion, take this disease.
15. I most certainly do.

267.

1. First time inoculated about 1st August, 1863; second time, about 1st December, 1863.
3. 404 head.
4. About 5 per cent. showed disease.
5. Three years.
12. 10 per cent. first time, and 4 per cent. second time. The only means that was tried for swellings was lancing.
13. About 50 per cent. of the cattle became diseased after being twice inoculated.
14. As they were both times inoculated by professional men, and considered to be properly inoculated, I consider the inoculation of cattle neither a preventive or a cure. I had twenty-four head reared calves running amongst the diseased cattle in a small paddock, and they were not inoculated, and yet not one of them caught the infection.
15. Having seen a good many diseased herds, and not having seen any good results from inoculation, I should certainly not recommend an Act to make inoculation compulsory.

268.

10. About two years ago my cattle were infected with pleuro-pneumonia and were dying very fast. I had then inoculated, and in a few days after inoculation they ceased dying. The full particulars which you require I am sorry that I am not able to supply you with, as I was not present when the cattle were being inoculated.
11. I believe that an Act should be passed obliging all who have cattle infected with pleuro-pneumonia to inoculate them.

269.

1. 1864.
3. 25.
4. Healthy.
5. Not diseased at all.
12. No deaths occurred after inoculation.
13. No bad symptoms appeared.
14. My opinion is that if inoculated before diseased, that it is a preventive of the disease; also, if only slightly diseased, if inoculated they can be cured. My opinion is formed not from the few that I had done of my own, but from having seen other cattle inoculated in great numbers on the adjoining station.
15. I do.

270.

1. February, 1864.
3. 2,017.
4. All the herd more or less affected.
5. Symptoms noticed two months previous to inoculation.
12. Very few deaths took place. About $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.
13. Unsatisfactory.
14. Almost my next neighbour, Mr. ———, on ——— station, who also had a large herd equally diseased as mine, and who did not inoculate a beast, I believe got off with fewer deaths than I did, and the disease left his herd just at the same time that it left ours which were inoculated. So that my opinion from practical observation is that inoculation of cattle for "pleuro" is useless.
15. No.

271.

1. My cattle were inoculated in May, 1867.
3. 350.
4. About 5 per cent. of my cattle showed symptoms of disease when inoculated.
5. The cattle showed symptoms of disease about two weeks before being inoculated.
12. Three deaths occurred from excessive swellings caused by the inoculation; the tails were cut off and the animals scored wherever the swelling appeared, but without effect.
13. I saved a great number of lives by inoculation.
14. Cattle which have been properly inoculated in my opinion are not exposed to the disease. Some of my cattle were diseased when inoculated; but since the inoculation the disease has finally left the herd. Cattle should be immediately inoculated when disease appears.

272.

1. 1863 to 1864.
3. About 2,000.
4. About 3 or 4 per cent. showed symptoms.
5. Nearly all were inoculated before much sign of disease.
12. About $\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. None tried.
13. As the cattle fattened rapidly, the season being good, we lost only about 100 head.
14. It is difficult for us to say what effects of the inoculation would have been the season being so fine. One lot turned off a very large number, but although they never showed the slightest symptoms of disease on starting for market, they were very considerably diseased, as much as 50 per cent., on reaching Sandhurst or the slaughter-yards in its neighbourhood, and generally one or two deaths on the road, although any animal showing the least approach to disease was invariably left at home.
15. Yes.

273.

1. 1864.
3. 1,000.
4. Bad. About 25 per cent.
5. About six months.
12. About two in a hundred. We tried no remedy to stop it; not knowing how.
13. I think by experience that it is a great preventive, by seeing herds that were not inoculated. The loss was far greater by not inoculating—I have known 50 per cent., and after inoculation, by attending to, we did not lose more than 2 per cent.
14. I have not seen any after inoculation show any symptoms of the disease. My opinion on inoculation is it is bad to inoculate calves when fresh branded—that the calves with the virus in point of tail, swinging their tail about, they strike the brand and the virus inoculates the brand, and I have seen their back-bone fall in through the effects of it.
15. Yes.

274.

1. August, 1864.
3. 250.
4. Diseased when inoculated, about 3 per cent.
5. Six weeks.
12. About 3 per cent. died, and about 10 per cent. swelled; used butter of antimony for the swelling, with green food, if possible.
13. Perfectly satisfactory, as I never since had a beast infected with the disease, although they ran among diseased cattle afterwards.
14. Neighbours round me refused to inoculate their cattle when I did, and afterwards were forced to do so when they saw that it proved an effectual check in mine, and in all cases it proved an effectual remedy.
15. Yes; compulsory, it required, as some refused to do so, and kept the disease lingering in the district, to the injury of healthy cattle.

275.

1. May, 1867.
3. About 2,000.
4. Cattle diseased, about 5 per cent. showing symptoms.
5. Three weeks, or thereabouts.
12. Four or five died from swelling in the tail; cut off a joint or two, which caused it to bleed, which proved an effectual remedy.
13. Losses, on the whole, about 5 per cent. Those were chiefly very bad at time of inoculation.
14. Cattle properly inoculated previous to having the disease were all right. I think it very little use to inoculate cattle that are badly affected.
15. Yes.

276.

1. I forget.
3. About 120.
4. Nine or ten diseased before inoculation; of these five were very bad, could scarcely walk, but all recovered within a month; none died after inoculation.
5. Three or four were a month, and some more, but all recovered.
12. None died; even some that could scarcely walk before inoculation recovered, to my surprise, in a very short time.
13. Very good.
14. I believe inoculation was the best thing that could be done at the time the disease was raging. I had several die before I knew what means to take, but none after. I should advise all cattle to be inoculated as soon as calved, if possible, for better judges than me consider it would prevent the pleuro. I know it is a sure cure, but prevention is better than cure.
15. I do; with proper instructions how to use the virus, although it acted well with mine in the way it was used. I do not know how long it would keep fit for use, or if there is any better way of using it.

277.

1. First symptoms of disease in September, 1865.
3. 390.
4. In good condition.
5. Three months.
6. 8 per cent.
7. From date of inoculation till finally left, five weeks.
8. Eighteen.
9. Free from disease.
12. By attending to the cattle after inoculation I don't believe that 1 per cent. would die. As soon as swelling takes place on the tail where the virus is put in, cut until the blood runs freely.
15. I consider every one ought to inoculate for their own benefit, without compulsion.

278.

1. May, 1867.
3. 150 head.
4. Some of the cattle were diseased when inoculated.
5. Disease existed about twenty-one days.
6. About 5 per cent.
7. The disease had finally left the herd in one month.
8. Only three deaths occurred to my knowledge.
9. Cattle are perfectly free from disease.
11. I do consider that an Act should be passed compelling those whose cattle are diseased to inoculate them.

279.

1. 3rd December, 1867.
3. 516; in two lots—one of about 96, the other of about 420.
4. The 96 were quite free from disease, and had never been in contact with diseased cattle, or off the ——— Run, and about 60 per cent. of the larger lot appeared to be affected. The latter were brought on the run in November, and the disease broke out on the road about six weeks previously.
5. About nine weeks.
6. The lung was taken for the first lot of cattle from a full grown animal, in an advanced stage of the disease, the best portion of the lung being selected. For the 420 lot the virus was taken from a young least about 10 months old, in an early stage of the disease. The lung was about four times its natural size, of a greyish blue color, and when cut, showed recent marbling throughout, and was surcharged with a large quantity of clean pure lymph.

7. The lung was cut up in small pieces into a large basin, and left for about two hours to drain; the virus was then strained through two or three fine cloths, put into clear glass bottles, and left to settle, when the clear portion was poured off for use.
 8. The cattle were all inoculated with the virus, as described, by the end of the second day. The virus was perfectly sweet on the second day, and was kept for eight days longer in a useful state, by filling the bottle to the depth of an inch with neatsfoot oil.
 9. With needle and worsted thread, the thread being put twice through the tail.
 10. From the 5th to the 75th day. Not a single case of excessive swelling took place in the last lot of cattle inoculated, though the effect was visible by the twisting of the tails; but in the first lot the swellings in about one-fourth were more or less excessive, and in many cases the tails dropped off.
 11. None of the cows were milked after inoculation.
 12. From the effects of inoculation, two heifers which were in season when inoculated, died, out of the first lot; the remainder of those seriously affected were saved by cutting deeply into the swelling and inserting a small piece of rag or two dipped in a mixture of butter of antimony and Venice turps. The two heifers could not be got in in time to dress them. Several of the second lot died after inoculation, but not from excessive swelling.
 13. Satisfactory.
 14. After the first herd were inoculated they were mixed with the other cattle, and none of them took the disease. In the second herd, many of the cattle which were diseased when inoculated, appeared to be benefited by the operation, the deaths gradually diminishing until March, and there has been no appearance of the disease on the run since.
 15. Yes.
-

APPENDIX C.

1.

1. Not infected.
3. 4,000.
4. Healthy, thriving.
6. There may be 1 per cent. on uninoculated cattle.
7. I believe there is no herd *entirely* free from pleuro in this district, in a more or less degree.
8. 2½ per cent. is generally allowed on a herd, unless speying, when 5 per cent. on cows speyed.
9. Thriving and healthy, generally.
10. I think that pleuro exists in some degree in almost every herd, especially where a road passes through the run. Uninoculated are always subject to infection from travelling stock, especially from Queensland. Symptoms of pleuro will appear at times from no apparent reason whatever.
11. I think that if inoculation were made compulsory in all herds, the disease would eventually die out; and all the young stock should be inoculated at time of branding or weaning.

2.

1. January, 1868.
3. About 3,000.
5. About six months.
7. July, 1868.
8. I should think about 400.
9. Our cattle are quite free from the disease.
11. I do think so.

3.

10. In answer to your circular of April, 1869, I beg to say that though I am and have been owner of more than 200 head of cattle for more than three years, I know nothing at all about inoculation. I breed very few indeed, but buy about 1,000 store cattle each year. I should not give a shilling a head more for stores on account of their being inoculated. I have bought mobs knowing them to be slightly infected, but am not afraid of its spreading among healthy cattle. Every year I lose a few both station bred and stores, and among the latter some that have lost their tails by inoculation. It is my opinion that pleuro has died out here, and will never flourish again. I am sorry I can give you so little information on this matter.
- Since writing the foregoing I have got all the information I can from my overseer. He is a man of few words, and not fond of writing, but he knows more of the subject than I do. I enclose his answers to my questions taken from your circular. I don't think his opinion quite coincides with mine, but it may be worth more.

4.

10. Your circular of the 18th of April was duly received by me, and, in reply, I beg to inform you that I am not the owner of 200 head of cattle; but being possessed of a small herd, I deem it my duty, as the question at issue (I mean pleuro-pneumonia in cattle) is of such vital importance to the Colony in general, to offer my humble opinion, coupled with a few remarks on the subject:—Firstly then: Some four years ago, I think, when the disease first broke out in my immediate neighbourhood, an adjoining neighbour of mine had a nice little herd of cattle, say some seventy or eighty head. The disease was taken by two or three of them, I believe, when he set to work and, I believe, inoculated the whole herd. What was the consequence? Why the most of his cattle died, and strange to say that, although his cattle were almost daily running with mine, I never lost but one cow, and I am not sure that she died from the effects of pleuro, as she got a bad fall some days previous to her death, and was heavy in calf, and I neither then nor since have ever inoculated any of my cattle. I knew another poor man, not far distant, who only had a team of bullocks. He, like my other neighbour, as soon as the disease appeared, got his team inoculated. The consequence was, he lost them all but

* The number in the middle of the page denotes the number of the Return,—that on the left hand margin, the number of the Question to which the Answer is given.

one. I could enumerate several similar cases. Another adjoining neighbour, whose cattle were not diseased, inoculated his team of bullocks, but the virus was bad, and did not take (and, I think, lucky for him it did not), for I did not hear that he lost any then or since with the disease. And now, with regard to my opinion of introducing a measure for making inoculation compulsory, I think it would be both cruel and absurd; for what man, I would ask, in this country or any other, having inoculated a beast which recovered, is in a position to prove that that beast would not have recovered equally as well if it had not been inoculated? This is a question which, I think, demands the most serious consideration before passing any such measure. With these few remarks, I remain, &c.

5.

10. In reply to your letter I beg to state I never inoculated any cattle, as I purchase store cattle. They were inoculated before getting them, therefore I cannot give any information as to its result. I am sorry to say I cannot give any opinion as to obliging owners whose cattle are infected to inoculate them.

6.

10. I beg to acknowledge receipt of your circular of 19th ultimo, together with enclosed forms, but instead of attempting to fill up the latter by guess work, will try and give you some idea of the pleuro in this immediate district, in lieu. When I left, about three years since, to reside in this locality, I found several of the small farmers here inoculating with beneficial result, though in some few cases deaths occurred consequent on inflammation caused by the operation. For some months subsequent the disease disappeared, and did not reappear till brought hither by up-country cattle purchased at the sale yards. It is singular that each lot of cattle brought here affected with the disease disseminated it in a different way, and with different results. From contact with some, the result proved always fatal to cattle not before affected; with others, the effect was the cough, mucus from nose, and fever, the result being ultimate recovery, while other lots merely disseminated the cough alone. Since my sojourn here, people have ceased to inoculate, though the pleuro still exists. I am of opinion that, so long as no cattle are brought here from the up-country districts, the disease, though its presence is still perceptible, will assume no active form, but will ultimately die out. You will now hear the dry cough which betokens the presence of the disease; but as long as no febrile symptoms are apparent, people heed it little. Whenever fever presented itself as a concomitant, I have found profuse bleedings at short intervals (till the animal commences eating) the best remedy. I have found no beast taking the disease with fever twice affected. I am of opinion that the disease, as far as my own experience teaches, is alone propagated by contact, the fact being that I purchased strange cattle and have the pleuro, while my immediate neighbours on every side who did not purchase have never had it. I merely own about 120 head of cattle, and as our avocations here are more agricultural than grazing, I regret to say I have not made myself better acquainted with this disease and its various phases. I however will refer you to a gentleman, resident at ———, who has had a great deal of painful experience in both pleuro and the Cumberland disease, who informed me, about a week ago, that he had quite mastered both diseases with sulphur fumes. I feel assured, if you will apply to him, he will afford you much useful information.

7.

1. About 300 that were not inoculated died.
3. About 3,000.
4. Separated from the herd, coat standing, much coughing, and groaning.
5. About six months.
6. One-tenth.
7. Cannot say.
8. About 300.
9. In good health.
10. Not any.
11. Cannot form an opinion.

8.

1. 1864.
3. Above 7,000 altogether.
4. Good condition—some fat.
5. Two years bad—never entirely left.
6. Cannot say.

7. Never entirely, odd cases occasionally, generally after very wet weather.
8. Altogether above 2,500 head.
9. Very good.
10. A severe drought followed close upon the pleuro-pneumonia, and losses occurred, very great; and the Government, although *taxing* the squatters and cattle proprietors, gave no compensation, which, in justice, I consider they ought to do.
11. I should consider it an Algerine Act. I am not aware that any one knows the effect of inoculation, scientific or medical, and people are working in the dark.

9.

1. On or near the commencement of 1866.
3. About 600.
4. I cannot say.
5. Nearly twelve months.
6. I cannot state.
7. About the middle of the year, or a little later, of 1857.
8. About 150.
9. Sound.
10. While the disease lasted they were dying fast, at first in the fields. I then began to boil them down for their hides and tallow. At first I tried medicines, but to no purpose. Still a lot of them got well of their own accord. The lungs, when very bad before they were killed, were in a most shocking putrid state.
11. I do not consider any necessity for any legislative interference in this matter, most people being too much alive to their own interest to make such a measure necessary.

10.

10. I beg to acknowledge receipt of your circular respecting inoculation for pleuro-pneumonia, and to state that we have here only a small herd of about 200 head of cattle, which has not been inoculated, nor have the cattle suffered from pleuro since in my charge, some three years. A bullock, apparently dying from pleuro, was impounded by me about eighteen months ago, but none of the cattle have shown any symptoms of disease. I lost a good many cattle from pleuro in Queensland, and these cattle were certainly infected while travelling on the road through a run where pleuro had broken out. After these cattle were inoculated no deaths occurred, and in Queensland the general opinion was decidedly in favour of inoculation. In Victoria the same impression prevails, and also in this district. I believe a measure making inoculation compulsory in the case of those herds in which the disease appears would meet with general favour.

11.

1. I have seen cattle, few in a herd, no great number of them, have the disease from time to time and season to season for years past.
3. Could not rightly say.
4. In good and poor condition.
5. Only a short time; few died, and the disease disappeared without inoculation.
6. 30 per cent.
7. At different times—casually, as it infected them.
8. 10 per cent. on the herd.
9. Healthy.
10. I look upon inoculation like vaccination. If the virus is good, and obtained at the proper stage, and cattle inoculated before the disease appears, it is good to do it; but if bad virus is got, and the cattle inoculated after the disease gets among them, it is, I think, useless.
11. Decidedly not, because then I believe it is useless. I would prefer inoculating healthy cattle, and thus prevent the disease attacking them; but it would rest with me whether the virus was good or not before I inoculated, because *if bad*, like vaccination, you would certainly by inoculating lodge the disease in your herd, and the deaths from bad virus would be equal to letting the cattle take their chance. I am of opinion the matter for the present should be left an open question, and let people inoculate or not as they think fit, and not make it compulsory. I think the disease is dying off; when it appears, its ravages are not great, only a few in a herd infected, and then it goes off.

12.

1. April, 1865.
3. 500.
4. Good order.
5. About (more than) twelve months.
6. 75 per cent.
7. Between the years 1856 and 1857.
8. About 100.
9. Low condition on account of drought.
10. Inoculation should be performed prior to the first appearance of the disease, and not afterwards.
11. Such an Act should not be passed.

13.

1. No disease ever existed in this herd.
3. About 2,000.
4. Never diseased.
9. Healthy.
10. Having never experienced any disease in the herd, no opinion can be formed of the benefit or the contrary of inoculation.
11. I have had no occasion to observe the effects of inoculation, and cannot therefore, with any confidence, express any opinion on the subject.

14.

1. November, 1865.
3. About 1,600.
4. Very poor.
5. Until the spring of 1868.
6. I should think 70 per cent.
7. One now and then up to February, 1869.
8. About 600.
9. Looking very well.
10. Since May, 1865, we have lost about 1,200 head; about half that number by disease, the others by droughts. When we first saw the disease, we cleared a paddock for an hospital, and as we saw any sick we put them in, and as they died we burned them; but all to no purpose—it got through the whole herd. We sometimes bled them, but I cannot say with any benefit. It appeared worst in spring and fall. Very strange, the next station ——— they scarcely saw it.
11. If ever it was to show in our cattle again, would certainly inoculate.

15.

1. October, 1863.
3. 500 head.
4. Some fat, remainder in the best condition.
5. Not more than fourteen or fifteen days after discovered.
6. Only five head.
7. Early in November, 1863.
8. All cattle (viz., the five above mentioned) discovered to have the infection were immediately killed, and the carcasses carefully burnt.
9. Healthy.
10. I found no appearance of the infection after I killed the five head of cattle. There were other cattle running in the same paddock. They were killed for beef, and not the slightest trace of the infection could be found. The five head of cattle were killed during the first stage of the infection. I believe if I had not killed these five head in time, the infection would have spread through the whole herd.
11. I do not. I have known as much as 12 per cent. of cattle to be lost through inoculation. I believe it is far better to kill the infected beast at once; but perhaps my remarks may not apply to up-country owners, who have not such an opportunity as we have along the coast, of watching cattle not in enclosed paddocks.

16.

1. March, 1865.
3. 250.
5. One year.
6. I forget now.
7. In 1866.
9. Healthy.
11. I do not believe in inoculation at all. I believe that inoculation would spread the disease.

17.

14. Not.

I believe disease to exist in a herd, and not show out until driven.

My cattle are not inoculated. Disease passed through the herd about 2½ years ago, causing about 25 per cent. of deaths, and it has not made its appearance since. Cattle are very healthy. I have known cattle inoculated, and have done it myself, but not taken the virus. If the virus is used at the proper strength I believe in inoculation, but it should be done before the disease sets in; if done while the disease is existing I do not believe in it. A mistake made very often by many who do inoculate, is in using the virus too strong, by which I have known about 15 per cent. of deaths. Any cattle I have known to be *properly* inoculated, I never found take the disease again.

18.

1. 1866 and 1867.

8. 25 per cent.

10. I have known cattle inoculated, and have done it myself, but not taken the virus. If the virus is used at the proper strength, I believe in inoculation, but it should be done before the disease sets in; if done while the disease is existing, I do not believe in it. A mistake made very often by many who do inoculate is, in using the virus too strong, by which I have known about 15 per cent. of deaths. Any cattle I have known to be *properly* inoculated, I never found take the disease again.

19.

1. 1866.

3. About 1,500.

4. In good condition, and apparently healthy.

5. About twelve months.

6. About 50 per cent.

7. Twelve months (1867).

8. About 35 per cent.

9. No disease.

10. We think that inoculation would be beneficial, if done in a proper manner. We do not know in what stage of the disease the virus should be taken from the beast.

11. Yes.

20.

3. 827.

9. Healthy.

10. The cattle now running on the ——— station are perfectly healthy, nor am I aware that they have even been infected—certainly not since I have been in charge. I have, however, given what little experience I have had in inoculation and its effects generally.

11. Decidedly.

21.

1. About June or July, 1865.

3. About 4,000.

4. In good condition.

5. Cannot say.

6. Do not know percentage, but believe it was small.

7. Cannot say.

8. Cannot say.

9. Healthy.

10. I have been obliged to gather all the above information, as the operation, &c., was performed two years before we purchased the station. Of the number of 1,800 inoculated a considerable number must have been sent off fat, consequently the number of uninoculated cattle must be more than two-thirds of the herd.

11. No. I consider it should be optional with owners whose cattle are infected to inoculate them, for I consider the operation merely a preventative—not a cure.

22.

1. Comparatively uninfected.

3. 355.

4. Healthy, thriving condition.

5. Exists more or less in every herd, in a more or less degree.

6. Say 2 per cent.

7. Never entirely free from disease.

8. 2½ per cent. always allowed on general herds.

9. Thriving.

10. I believe we are never entirely free from pleuro ; symptoms on run at various times of odd beasts being infected.
11. I consider every owner of infected cattle should inoculate the herd, and if this were compulsory there would be more chance of the disease dying out. I consider inoculation to be a preventive, but not a cure.

23.

1. About 1st May, 1867.
3. I then had about 600 head.
4. Very healthy.
5. About three months.
6. I believe all the camps of cattle in which the disease appeared were infected right through ; and when the disease left those camps, that they were safer from disease than if they had been inoculated. I believe every one of the cattle in the affected camp had the disease more or less.
7. About August, 1867.
8. About 25 per cent. or 30.
9. Very healthy.
11. I cannot see that an Act should be passed to insist on owners to inoculate, for I believe that if the disease once appears in a camp of cattle, that inoculation among that lot would only hurry and increase deaths ; and to inoculate other portions of the herd you must have diseased cattle close at hand to get virus from.

24.

10. In answer to your circular of April, accompanying forms to be filled up concerning pleuro-pneumonia, we beg to say that it is totally impossible for us to give any information in the matter. It is now only eleven months since we received possession of this station, during which we have had no cases of this disease, so far as we know. Possibly the former owners might be able to give some useful information on this point. We may mention that last year a number of cattle carrying this disease passed through this station, and others further down the river, but certainly with no result so far as we are concerned. From what we can gather in this portion of the district, there is disease somewhat resembling pleuro-pneumonia, in a very mild form, shows itself during the months of January and February, but it is rarely indeed the mortality exceeds 1 per cent. of those cattle attacked.

25.

1. 1864.
3. 800 head.
4. In ordinary condition.
5. About ten to twelve months.
6. About 7 per cent.
8. About fifty head.
9. Healthy.
10. If it be established that inoculation is beneficial at all, I think it should be done while the cattle are healthy, as a preventive.
11. No ; I am of opinion that inoculation would be injurious *after* pleuro has appeared in the herd.

26.

10. The cattle on this run, whilst in my possession, for the last six years, have not been diseased or inoculated. Travelling cattle dying from pleuro have passed through frequently, and on one occasion 600 head of diseased cattle, on their way to Adelaide, daily dying of pleuro, were stopped for six weeks on this run, previously to being allowed to cross the border into South Australia, but my cattle never took the disease. From this, and other circumstances, I think that this disease is not, strictly speaking, contagious, but is communicable to cattle in certain states of health ; and if any of my cattle were attacked, I should certainly inoculate the remainder of the herd, because I have heard of no better remedy, and because I believe the irritation, consequent on inoculation, might alter the morbid condition in which cattle must be before they take the disease.
11. Yes, if it can be framed so as to be effective without being oppressive.

27.

3. 400 head.
9. Healthy.
10. Not understanding the disease, I can't give any information on the matter.
11. I do.

28.

1. 1865.
3. 7,000.
4. Died fast.
5. Is not entirely free at present time (1869), although nearly free from it.
8. About one-third.
9. Healthy.
10. I have the control of three large herds of cattle for years, for the above-named owner, and have never inoculated a beast, but have lost quite one-third of our cattle. I do not think there is any cure for it. My neighbours have inoculated their cattle, and I have noticed them die quite as fast as ours, after being done. With all due respect to you and the Committee, I believe you might as well stick a straw in their rump, as inoculate them, and I have been among cattle all my life, and am now over forty years of age.
11. No.

29.

1. 1864.
3. 1,500
4. Good condition.
5. Off and on up to the present.
6. About 20 per cent. died.
10. The pleuro first appeared in my herd about five years ago, but did not do much harm. It again came amongst them about eighteen months since, and I think has carried off about 20 per cent. The herd were not inoculated, as I was in hopes the disease would leave them as it had done before; and I found, from experience, the less they were knocked about the better. I believe my cattle to have become infected by cattle travelling from Queensland. I am of opinion that all cattle should be inoculated.

30.

1. About July, 1862.
3. 2,100.
4. Bad generally—first stages.
5. Three months.
6. Nearly all were affected.
7. Two months after inoculated.
8. In the whole of the cattle, before inoculation, about 10 per cent.
9. Good.
11. Yes, decidedly.

31.

3. We have about 200 cattle not inoculated. The reason why I did not inoculate these was, because when purchased they were nearly fat, and I thought to be able to sell them at once. These cattle have not improved as others that were inoculated.
11. I do not. I feel certain, before long, every owner of cattle will see the advantage of inoculation, and will inoculate without the necessity of an Act. Inoculated store cattle find a readier sale, because purchasers of such kind of stock, with few exceptions, inoculate.

32.

1. 1866.
3. From 2 to 3,000.
4. In fair condition.
5. About two years.
6. Small; 2 to 3 per cent.
7. 1868.
8. Hardly 1 per cent. ascertained.
9. Healthy.
10. Disease disappeared without remedy.
11. I do not.

33.

3. 100.
8. None.
9. All healthy.
11. I think cattle should be inoculated when disease first makes its appearance in the herd, but not without.

34.

1. 1862.
3. 500 at date of commencement of disease.
4. Good condition.
5. Between five and six months.
6. 30 per cent.
7. 1863.
8. 150.
9. Good health.
10. Where cattle are inoculated as soon as the disease appears, it will in my opinion save many that have the disease upon them.
11. I approve of inoculation, as what cattle I inoculated that were not diseased were not the least affected although running with my diseased cattle. I had twelve working bullocks, one of which became diseased which I shot, the other eleven I inoculated; they did not afterwards show any symptoms of the disease, and have been in a healthy state since. Parties having infected cattle I would oblige to inoculate, as I am sure it prevents the disease from spreading.

35.

1. The disease broke out about May, 1866.
3. 750.
4. Good condition.
5. One year.
6. As far as I can judge about 85 per cent.
7. July, 1867.
8. 63 per cent.
9. Very good.
10. The disease appeared first on my run in May, 1866, amongst my working bullocks, which must have caught it in the end of February. Within three days from first appearance of disease I found they had nearly all got it, and more than half died. The disease did not appear amongst my herd generally for nearly two months after that—when it suddenly broke out in every part, and totally disappeared in July, 1867. Since then I have not seen a single case. During the year of the disease, kangaroos died from it in great numbers; but, as far as I can judge, no other animals except those and cattle. I am quite certain that the disease was brought by the workers, and that they contracted it in an infected paddock 80 miles from here; also, that the disease lay dormant in them for more than two months.
11. I think such an Act most desirable, if it can be properly carried out; but I do not think it is of any use *after* the disease has shown itself in the herd—nor, in my opinion, can virus be brought from a distance. The only case, therefore, in which it can be done with certain efficiency, is where an uncrossable river or some such boundary divides the sound cattle from the diseased. Although I did not inoculate my own herd, I have inoculated a good many cattle belonging to other people with success. I am a great believer in its efficacy.

36.

3. About 400.
9. In perfect health.
10. Although the disease existed in the neighbourhood, and some of my neighbours' cattle were infected, not a single case of the disease was observed on my farm. Whether my escape was from stopping all communication, or from the cattle feeding on the grass salted by the spray from the sea, or otherwise, I cannot say.
11. From what I have seen and heard of the trouble, the deaths, and the loss of the season's milk by inoculation, I would prefer the loss of 25 per cent. of my dairy herd to inoculation. The Colonial Secretary should have power to stop the travelling of cattle, on petition from the inhabitants of a district.

37.

1. First seen about 1st March, 1868.
3. 120 head, having reduced them lately.
4. Standing breathing very hard, and frothing at the mouth, not feeding at all; some that don't froth at mouth die at once.
5. About thirty days.
6. About ten or twelve.
7. I did not see a sick beast on the 1st of April.
8. In all 27 head, some destroyed at first.
9. In sound good health.
10. A great number of cattle are killed by crushing them together in the pen. The strong cattle should be done by themselves; and the early spring, I think, the best time of year.
11. I consider that there should be some law to make it compulsory, for the protection of stock in the Colony; and no stock should be allowed to travel that is infected.

38.

1. September, 1865.
3. About 4,000.
4. Good condition.
5. Six or eight months.
6. About 10 per cent.
7. Slightly affected yet (an odd one).
8. About sixty or seventy.
9. See No. 7.
11. I do.

39.

1. February, 1867.
3. 1,100.
5. Six months.
7. About August.
9. Very healthy.
11. Yes.

40.

1. About 1865.
3. At present about 600 head.
6. Say 50 per cent.
7. The end of 1868.
8. Impossible to say.
9. Healthy, but want grass and water.
10. I have never tried inoculation, and certainly have no faith in it. You might as well inoculate the whole creation; for horses, dogs, and poultry have suffered and died from the same disease. If the disease has not run too far, I have always found, with milch cows, working bullocks, and horses, that extensive bleeding was generally sufficient to arrest its progress. I have also given nitre. I have not tried antimony, but think it would be useful.
11. Certainly not. If cattle are infected, inoculation will not cure them; if not infected, inoculation will only knock the cattle about for nothing. I have about half a dozen cats now ill with the same kind of disease.

41.

1. Appeared on the 9th December, 1864.
3. 5,000 head.
4. Running on open myall runs, and had never, to my knowledge, any other disease amongst them.
5. I believe the cattle were affected with the disease for months before it showed out; but we had it active, and appeared amongst them five or six months.
6. Every beast in the herd, I believe, more or less.
7. Five or six months after it broke out, and, with the exception of a few cases the following summer, never seen since, although diseased cattle have passed through the runs several times since, leaving dying cattle on the run.
8. 15 per cent.
9. Perfectly free from disease, and have always been so since the disease left the herd.
10. Being a person that travels very much, I had good opportunities of judging of the effect of inoculating. From hearsay information I had much faith in it, and at some considerable expense prepared to inoculate this herd, when it appeared in the vicinity; but from what I afterwards saw of the effect of inoculation I never allowed a beast to be operated upon, and have never since seen the slightest reason to doubt the decision I then arrived at—that inoculation was a positive injury. I have remarked that the lungs of every beast I have seen slaughtered for beef on the station (some hundreds) have had the lungs more or less affected with the disease. Shortly after the disease passed over, the affected parts were often a whole lung and part of another—in a little time more I noticed that the affected part appeared to be re-forming into a sound lung again. I now can often see where large portions have been evidently recently renewed. Not a beast we slaughter is exempt from the attachment of the lining of the lung to the ribs, more or less. I therefore conclude that all the cattle have had it, and got over it; that as we have never seen it again on the run, although it is known to have passed through it in travelling cattle several times after it left us; that cattle once having it never have it again, or at least very seldom. My partner ——— tried inoculation on hundreds of cattle at various times, and found it fail in every case.
11. Decidedly not; all owners please themselves. Inoculation does not stop infection, if indeed the disease is infectious or contagious. The very driving together and about of diseased cattle kills many that would otherwise get over it.

42.

1. About the 20th March, 1864.
3. 3,000.
4. Fair condition.
5. About fourteen or fifteen months before it entirely left the herd.
6. I believe that in nearly every beast on the run, and I may say every beast that we killed afterwards for station use, the lungs showed that it had been diseased.
7. About June, 1865.
8. From 300 to 500.
9. Good.
10. Where this and the ——— Runs adjoin the cattle of the two stations intermix. The disease made its appearance simultaneously in the two herds. The ——— people inoculated their herd soon afterwards, and they left off dying they very naturally attributing it to inoculation; however, I did not inoculate, and my cattle on that side of the run left off dying at the very same time, and I have not seen any signs of the disease among them since. When I state that the disease existed among the herd fourteen or fifteen months, I should also state that after the first five or six months there were only odd beasts to be noticed, and I have not seen a beast with it for certainly three years on the run.
11. Decidedly not.

43.

1. Impossible to say.
3. About 13,000 head.
4. Good condition.
5. Should say about twelve months.
6. Should say from 50 to 75 per cent.
7. Impossible to say.
8. Ditto.
9. Good.
10. It is impossible for any one to say for certain, in herds that are perhaps only mustered once in six months, anything like the exact date the disease makes its appearance, or how long it existed; but should say in the cattle mentioned above, that from the time of its being noticed till it disappeared would be about twelve months. You must remember this is a breeding herd, which would account for its lingering such a length of time; it seems to rage for a few weeks, and then gradually decrease.
11. I would on no account recommend making inoculation compulsory, for the very reason that in many instances by the time it became known, and the cattle could be mustered, it would, in all probability, have run its course to a great extent. I am quite willing to allow, from what I have seen in other herds inoculated, that it is a preventive against the disease, but of no earthly use to an infected beast.

44.

1. About January and February, 1866.
3. About 3,500.
4. In good condition.
5. Since infection it has never thoroughly left the herd, but the deaths from it have materially diminished since the first appearance of the disease.
6. 99 per cent.
7. Never.
8. About 25 per cent., during the eighteen months succeeding infection.
9. The present state of the cattle is healthy; but, as in the Gineroi and Barraba herds, 99 per cent. of cattle killed on the station show signs of having had the disease.
11. I do not think so, as I have lost a less percentage in the herd uninoculated than in the two herds that I had inoculated.

45.

1. No infection on our run.
3. 1,250.
4. Not infected at all.
5. Never existed.
6. None.
7. Never was in it.
8. None.
9. Quite healthy.
11. Decidedly not.

46.

10. I am a resident in the district ——— about 25 years, and, thanks be to Providence, my cattle have never been diseased by any complaint except the red water. Whatever may be the state of the cattle in the interior of the Colony—for my part, I think this part is all right from disease of that kind.

47.

1. About three years since the disease broke out.
4. In good condition.
5. About three months at a time,
6. About 6 per cent.
7. Still amongst them.
8. Three head during the three years.
9. Two head diseased.
10. Travelling cattle are most liable to the disease ; from them my cattle have always taken the disease.
11. No, I do not think that any such Act should be passed.

48.

1. October, 1864.
3. 300 head.
4. Store to fat.
5. Two years.
6. All were affected, and about fifty died ; say 17 per cent. died.
7. December, 1866.
8. Say fifty.
9. All sold out as fat.
10. I believe a compulsory Fencing Bill would be the best preventive against pleuro or any other cattle disease. I had a frontage to the river of $5\frac{1}{2}$ miles ; the river serves as a fence on that side, but on all other sides my run is fenced in with a good substantial fence. The enclosed area is subdivided into four paddocks. In No. 1 paddock I had 300 head, in the other paddocks I had 700 head. I attribute having the pleuro in No. 1 paddock, from the lessee, across the river, driving diseased cattle into the river and shooting at them. If he missed hitting the beast, of course the beast landed on my side ; if he mortally wounded the beast, equally of course the wounded beast swam to my side to die, so that in this No. 1 paddock the pleuro prevailed for two years, but in the other paddocks there was no pleuro, although travelling cattle, on Port Phillip Road, used to camp alongside my fence, and leave one, two, three, or four dead beasts in the morning, yet my cattle inside the fence did not get the pleuro. So between No. 1 paddock and adjoining paddock I have seen a sick beast close alongside fence, and clean cattle close to fence on other side, *yet I have never known infection go through a fence.*
11. I think such an Act would be a most outrageous and unwarrantable infringement of the liberty of the subject, besides it would often be impossible to inoculate. Being inexperienced in the pleuro, I became frightened, not knowing how it would end ; I tried several times to inoculate, but could not get virus ; I had several beasts shot, but they contained no virus. If I had the pleuro again, I should let the disease take its course ; If it broke out in one paddock, I would endeavour to confine it to that paddock ; I successfully did this for two years.

49.

1. No infection.
3. 3,000 head of young cattle, uninoculated at present.
10. The 3,000 head above referred to have been bred since the 6,000 head mentioned in the other sheet were inoculated, and have not been inoculated or diseased. I have had cattle very badly infected in one paddock, and cattle not inoculated in an adjoining one, merely separated by a 2-rail fence not take the disease.
11. No, I do not consider the disease is contagious, and, as a rule, owners of cattle inoculate.

50.

1. 1865.
3. Don't know what number infected.
4. Don't know.
5. About four years.
6. About one-half affected.
7. Not left yet.
8. 30 per cent.
9. Slightly affected.
11. No ; let every owner please themselves.

51.

1. No memoranda to show.
4. Under 500.
5. To this and the following questions it is impossible for me to give answers.
7. Disease does not exist among the herd at present.
11. Certainly not.

52.

1. The autumn of 1866.
3. 3,000.
4. Strong, but not fat.
5. Two years.
6. I believe the whole herd, more or less.
7. The spring of 1868.
8. About 15 per cent.
9. Perfectly healthy.
10. I was not in favour of inoculation from the beginning, consequently none of our herd have been inoculated. I was of opinion that the disease would go through the herd and then disappear; and I flatter myself my opinion has turned out correct, as I have not seen a beast infected with the disease on the run for the last eight months.
11. I do not consider an Act should be passed obliging owners to inoculate. I am convinced the inoculation itself kills from 5 per cent. to 10 per cent. If the disease is in the herd, nothing makes the distemper spread more than herding.

53.

1. July, 1864.
3. 800 at present.
4. Fair condition.
5. Four years and a half.
6. 50 per cent.
7. A few months ago.
8. About one-third.
9. Very poor, for want of grass.
10. Do not consider I lost more than my neighbours who did inoculate.
11. I do not consider it necessary.

54.

1. November 16th, 1864.
3. 2,000.
4. Rather poor.
5. Ever since, more or less.
6. Every one.
7. Still in it.
8. 2,000.
9. Good condition, and Cumberland prevalent.
10. If these diseases continue, very few cattle will be left.
11. I do not.

55.

1. Never infected.
3. 300.
9. All healthy.
10. Believe inoculation to be decidedly injurious.
11. No, decidedly not.

56.

1. 1867.
3. 400.
6. No account kept.
9. Healthy.
10. In 1867 some of my cattle were slightly diseased, but I did not inoculate them or use any remedy. No account at the time was kept, but I have not suffered much loss in consequence. The cattle recovered their strength and usual appearance in a few months. From my own observation, the operating upon cattle diseased—or supposed to be so—without a thorough knowledge of the disease and the use of the proper remedies, acts detrimentally, and causes loss.
11. I am of opinion that an Act should be passed to enforce the use of a remedy for cattle badly infected.

57.

3. 1,200 head, mixed breeding herd.
4. Running on unfenced ridgy land ; in low condition, after long drought.
5. Disease has been in the herd now for about five years, off and on.
6. Percentage has varied according to the state of the season, being always largest in dry hot weather, and generally attacking strong young cattle. At the worst periods, the percentage of those attacked was about ten.
7. Still in it.
8. About half of those affected have died. The number of cattle affected has been much larger on all surrounding stations ; owing, I believe, to the fact that from the ridgy nature of the country, the cattle on ——— run in small mobs, and in time of disease they have never been disturbed or brought together.
9. Unaffected.
10. I had 100 head inoculated on the first appearance of the disease, and within a little time it left the whole herd and did not reappear for more than a year. I did not resort to inoculation the second time for any, and the disease left the same as at first—coming and going at uncertain irregular intervals ever since, *always* appearing in dry hot weather, and wearing off as the drought broke up and the weather cooled.
11. I do not consider that such an Act should be passed,—at least, until experiments have been made, and results ascertained in a much more scientific and definite manner than is usual with stock-owners. I have suffered less from this disease than most of my neighbours who have inoculated ; and no doubt, if I had inoculated on its first appearance, and continued to do so on each reappearance, I would now be a staunch advocate of that method of cure. I have not much faith in the method of cure by inoculation ; every cattle-owner takes the virus at all stages of the disease, as you will see by your returns, and all alike declare the efficacy of their methods. I would suggest that a number of cattle should be taken, of various ages and sexes, half of them inoculated and half uninoculated, and all alike uninfected ; isolate them, if possible, on a sheep run, where they would not be affected by cattle outside the paddock, or by diseased cattle having fed over the grass ; turn a lot of diseased cattle amongst them ; and the result, if closely watched, will go further to prove the efficacy or non-efficacy of inoculation than any number of returns like the present.

58.

1. January, 1864.
3. 1,000.
4. Loss of appetite ; running at nostrils.
5. Six months.
6. 10 per cent.
7. End of June, 1864.
8. 9 per cent.
9. Healthy, but very poor.
10. Scarcity of grass and water, worst disease last summer, 1868 and 1869. If diseased cattle were drafted immediately on noticing disease, and kept inclosed in a paddock from the healthy cattle, I believe there would be less loss.
11. I have not sufficient experience in inoculated cattle, not having seen any, therefore I could not give any opinion.

59.

1. About August or September, 1863, when pleuro-pneumonia first showed here.
3. About 2,000.
4. The cattle were in very good order, and the best generally went off first.
5. About one year—nothing to speak of after.
6. By disease, about 25 per cent.
7. About the latter end of 1864. But I inoculated cattle in December, 1867—all of the young cattle, small calves, and so on.
8. From pleuro-pneumonia, about 500 in six months, before inoculation ; very few after.
9. The present state of cattle—very healthy.
10. Since inoculation the cattle seem to be doing very well, could not do better, only that feed is scarce ; they seem as healthy as any cattle could be. I have seen no symptoms of disease in this herd since 1865—only some that had the disease before we inoculated, which got over it ; but if you run them they still have the straining cough, but the breed and their increase are not affected by it.
11. I do believe that an Act should be passed to compel every cattle-holder to inoculate where diseases of pleuro-pneumonia shows ; if it had been done sooner, thousands of cattle would have been saved.

60.

1. 1865.
3. 9,000.
4. Good condition.
5. Two years or more.
6. Over 50 per cent.
7. Do not know.
8. Do not know.
9. Not aware.
11. I do not.

61.

1. Not infected during currency of present ownership.
3. 420.
4. Nil.
5. Nil.
6. Nil.
7. Nil.
8. None ascertained.
9. Not affected.
10. I have found inoculation beneficial in diseased cattle, when not too far gone. $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. of deaths resulting from the operation, I think a fair average. The virus should be inserted in the tail, above the brush, either with a needle and worsted thread, or a grooved blade of a penknife. If the virus be inserted too high up in the tail, the disease spreads to the back bone, and becomes fatal. Quiet well-bred cattle, in good order, are more subject to the disease than others.
11. I think this would be desirable.

62.

1. 1862.
3. 14,000.
4. In low condition.
5. Three years.
6. Not known.
7. 1865.
8. Not known.
9. Free from disease.
11. Am of opinion that such an Act should not be passed.

63.

10. Since the year 1867 we have seen no disease in this herd of cattle. As that is the year we purchased the cattle, we cannot say what (if any) disease before.
11. Most certainly.

64.

1. I first observed the pleuro in the winter of 1864.
3. About 1,600 head at the time the disease appeared.
4. Condition good. The best condition suffered the most.
5. I have not heard of any diseases being known in the herd before 1864.
6. About fifty.
7. I do not think it has finally left, judging from the lungs. There are no other symptoms at present.
8. About 200 head.
9. Apparently healthy, but low in condition.
10. I have observed the state of the lungs of beasts slaughtered by me for the use of the station. The low condition of the herd is owing to the late drought, but they are fast improving. My cattle have not been inoculated.
11. Yes.

65.

1. About July, 1864.
3. About 3,000.
4. In fair condition—the herd consisting of cows, also calves.
5. A very short time—say not more than a month or six weeks.
6. Say 5 per cent.
7. None were noticed suffering from the disease after August, 1864.
8. Say 2 per cent.
9. In fair condition and healthy.

10. So very few of this herd showed symptoms of disease that I did not deem it necessary to inoculate them, and had I wished, I could not have done so, for I could find but very few cattle from which I could get virus, in what I consider a proper stage.
11. Most certainly not, as an evil-disposed person could then, for the sake of making a person, to whom he owed a grudge, inoculate his herd, and by that means knock his cattle about and prevent their becoming fat, report that the herd was infected, and thus do him a serious injury.

66.

10. To the best of my knowledge, I am glad to say that I have never seen a diseased beast, although I am owner of a few hundred.
11. Yes.

67.

1. April, 1864.
3. Sixty head.
8. I had not one died.
9. Sound.
10. I consider it expedient to inoculate if the disease is in a herd of cattle; but I should not inoculate so long as no symptoms of disease was visible. When I inoculated I had no disease in my cattle, and these I did not inoculate lived—not one died, although thirty-five died out of the 125 head I did inoculate.
11. I do.

68.

1. December, 1866.
3. 1,100.
4. Bad.
5. About three months.
6. Thirty-two.
7. In November.
8. Thirty.
9. Healthy.
10. Mr. ——— inoculated the cattle for me; I had about 130 head done; the cattle were all turned out in the bush directly after they were inoculated; Mr. ——— said it was the safest not to herd them; the cattle that were affected were running by themselves from the rest of my cattle, a very high mountain being between them, so I always kept them apart.
11. No.

69.

1. Early in 1863.
3. About 150, but they were part of the herd that was never diseased; there were forty head of purchased cattle diseased but not inoculated.
4. They appeared in good health and condition; but they were chiefly wild bullocks, newly purchased.
5. Unknown.
6. About seventy.
7. In about three months.
8. Some fifteen or twenty.
9. Extinct.
10. The latter uninoculated cattle did not belong to the proper herd, but were purchased from up-country drovers, and were too wild to be treated. They, however, brought the disease upon the station. The best way to perform the operation of inoculation is by making two parallel incisions, on the inside, near the lower extremity of the tail; the needle then will draw the cord easily through without loss of virus.
11. I do not think that it would be judicious to pass such an Act.

70.

3. 600.
9. Perfect good health.
10. My cattle are not inoculated.
11. If the disease called pleuro-pneumonia is showing to any extent amongst a herd of cattle, I think it is best to commence to inoculate them.

71.

1. First noticed in July, 1862.
3. Before the disease, 12,000 head.
4. When in good condition looked healthy.
5. About five months.
6. About 70 per cent.

LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF
CALIFORNIA.

7. In December, 1862.
8. About 7,000.
9. In good healthy state.
11. Yes, I do.

72.

1. In 1864.
3. 1,000 head.
4. In fair condition.
5. About three weeks.
6. Three to the 100.
7. In 1864.
8. One to 100.
9. Healthy; no disease.
11. No.

73.

3. About 500 head.
9. Healthy.
10. Respecting inoculated cattle, my experience has been very small. Two years since, when the pleuro was at its height in this neighbourhood, I had only thirty milking cows, with their increase; a neighbour inoculated them (they had previously shown no symptoms of disease), and, except a slight swelling on the tail (of some few of them), and being tucked up (as if the system were out of order, so to speak) for a few days, you could discern nothing the matter with them. We have now 500 head more, bought from — in January last; I don't know if ever they were inoculated; we have lost none from pleuro that I am aware of. My opinion is, that it is an epidemic, and not contagious.
11. My impression is, that when a number of cattle in a herd die from the pleuro, that it is too late to inoculate, and only increases the number of deaths, so think such an Act quite unnecessary.

74.

10. In reply to your circular, I beg to say I am not the owner of 200 head of cattle; I only keep a few cows and a working bullock, they being free from pleuro-pneumonia. I have never had any experience with diseased cattle, so I cannot venture to express an opinion as to whether an Act should be passed obliging owners whose cattle are infected to inoculate them.

75.

3. Eighty head.
9. Healthy.
10. None.
11. I think it very necessary where cattle are diseased.

76.

1. I disremember the date.
3. 1,000.
4. Similar to consumption in human beings.
5. About eighteen months.
6. Nearly all suffered a degree.
7. Seemed quite healthy.
8. 250.
9. Healthy.
10. I do not think that after the disease shows in a herd that inoculation is a preventative. I firmly believe that inoculation irritates the disease. I have seen cattle die after inoculation—twelve months after.
11. I certainly do not.

77.

1. About February, 1864.
3. 2,000.
4. Fair condition.
5. Four years.
6. Thirty.
7. About February, 1868.
8. About 300.
9. Healthy.
10. I have known cattle diseased twice. I have also known inoculated cattle take the disease, and some of them die. I cannot give any information with respect to this disease; but I do not believe in inoculation, for the reason stated above.
11. No.

78.

1. About the 1st April, 1868.
3. About 600 head.
4. The cattle were in good condition.
5. About three months.
6. About 20 per cent.
7. About August.
8. About 100.
9. In good health.
10. I never inoculated this herd, but it is my impression that inoculation is a very great preventive of the disease. My neighbours that have inoculated their cattle they seem to be highly satisfied.
11. I consider that the cattle should be inoculated in general, as you will find that the majority of cattle-owners do approve of inoculation.

79.

10. With regard to this circular, I beg to protest against such an interference with the liberty of the subject (Her Majesty's) as it contemplates. Inoculation for pleuro may be a very good thing, but Acts of Parliament regulating what you are to do and what you are not to do, in your private affairs, are not good things, but the very reverse; and there is already a great deal too much of this sort of legislation.

80.

1. June, 1865.
3. 580.
4. Looks very dull about the eyes, and if they are disturbed commences to cough.
5. Six or seven months.
6. Say 4 per cent.
7. November, 1865. No appearance since.
8. From the disease, about ninety head.
9. All in good health.
10. Several of those that were affected I have bled severely, and they have recovered; some that I have bled, died.
11. I consider that if inoculation was done properly, it would be a preventive to the disease.

81.

1. Never had infected cattle.
3. 230.
9. Never infected; always healthy.
11. As I never have seen much of the disease, I do not consider my opinion would be of value.

82.

4. Can give no information, except that these cattle were not inoculated, and were perfectly free from disease when I bought them, after which the herd was broken up into different lots for fattening purposes. 400 head were tailed some length of time, and gave no sign of disease; these I should have inoculated, but virus was not to be had. Two or three old cows got the disease in another lot, put in a fattening paddock; whilst a third lot of bullocks showed no sign of disease, but they fattened rapidly and were sooner out of the way.
10. I have been sixteen years in the Colony, amongst cattle, and am managing a large herd, and have been for the last eight years. I have bought, during the last three years of pleuro-pneumonia experience, about 5,000 head of store cattle for the station, and about 12,000 head of fat cattle for the Australian Meat Company.
11. I consider any compulsory legislation, except at seaports, where cattle are imported, most decidedly objectionable.

83.

10. I have never had any diseased cattle since 1864, but I am persuaded, from what I have seen and heard, that inoculation is a preventive and should be enforced.
11. I do.

84.

4. Such Act could not be carried out in its integrity, and would throw obligations on all who respect the laws, whilst the lawless would pay no heed to the enactment; at least, such is my opinion.
15. No.

85.

1. October, 1865.
3. 600.
4. Healthy, in good condition.
5. About ten months.
6. The whole was affected.
7. About thirteen months.
8. 200.
9. Healthy.
11. I cannot give an opinion respecting inoculation, my cattle being diseased before I inoculated them.

86.

1. In the spring of 1864.
3. 10,000 about.
4. In fine condition.
5. Near twelve months.
6. I think a greater portion of the herd, more or less.
7. About twelve months after its appearance.
8. About 10 per cent. ; 1,000 head.
9. Very healthy ; have never observed a return of the disease.
10. The infection was caused by a team of working bullocks I sent out from ——— near ———. They ran amongst a fine lot of quiet cattle, milkers, &c., which first commenced dying. The disease was very virulent in that lot of cattle, killing one-third of them ; but the general herd was not affected so dangerously, the greater portion of those affected recovering. I was breaking-in to the run at the time over 3,000 cattle from New England, and had to turn them loose, the disease being more fatal while together.
11. I do not think inoculation will prevent the spread of the disease, nor do I think that a herd which has had the disease through it, is more liable to a recurrence of it than an inoculated herd.

87.

1. Do not know—about 3½ years ago.
3. 120.
4. Dying off daily.
5. A month or five weeks.
8. Forty.
9. All healthy, and have shown no signs of disease since.
10. If any of my cattle show any signs of disease, I shall immediately inoculate the whole of them again ; and would recommend every one to do the same, for it does the cattle no harm if properly done. I feel satisfied it is a preventive if done at once.
11. I think persons ought to be obliged to inoculate cattle when diseased.

88.

10. My cattle were never diseased nor inoculated, but they have never mixed with diseased cattle.
11. Yes, if it is proved to be good.

89.

1. The time the disease appeared in the district.
3. 220.
4. Cough and shortness of breath, and desire to be alone.
5. About two years.
6. 15 per cent.
7. When the disease left the district.
8. About half what was infected.
9. In good health.
10. As soon as I noticed any beast infected, I removed it to a small paddock and kept the infected animals by themselves. As soon as any died, I burnt the carcass immediately. As far as I observed, I lost less cattle than those that did inoculate, and had less trouble than they had.
11. Decidedly not.

90.

1. About October, 1866.
3. Having lost a great number of cattle from the drought in the summer of 1865, I suppose the number to be about 1,500.
4. In fair condition, and some very good.
5. About eighteen months.
6. I suppose about 20 per cent.
7. About April or May, 1868.
8. As parts of my runs are very scrubby, I am not able to give actual number, but suppose about 300.
9. In very good condition, and appears healthy.
10. The disease was very slow for months—few deaths in the month; it then attacked small mobs, and nearly carried the whole off. Other small mobs that mixed with them did not lose above one or two, and some none. I thought several times it had left, when a few more would die.
11. I am of opinion that owners, now seeing the benefit of inoculation, will have it done for their own advantage, without being compelled to do it.

91.

1. Somewhere about October, 1865, as near as we can recollect.
3. About 2,500.
4. In fair good condition for New England cattle.
5. About six months.
6. We believe the cattle were all affected more or less, as we never slaughter a beast but the left lung has been more or less affected, but they appear to fatten as well now as before infection.
8. About 10 per cent.
9. Perfectly free from pleuro or any other disease, as far as we can see.
10. We may here remark that, as the cattle are perfectly free from disease, that we would not wish to inoculate, and at the present time would not know where to get virus, unless we went some distance and made inquiry where cattle were diseased; and, to shoot one that had the disease and take the virus, would of course amount to cattle-stealing or virus-stealing. We believe that if the disease called pleuro appears first as an antispesific disease, it would be well to inoculate all calves as they are branded, if virus could be preserved for any length of time to do so, and let those general herds go without inoculation that have not been done.
11. Our belief is that owners will do their utmost to preserve their herds, without an Act being passed as above; but if inoculation does prevent the disease, no doubt but owners will inoculate, but we never did inoculate, and our herd appeared to do as well or even better than those that have been done, and our herds are doing as well now as before the disease appeared in this district.

92.

1. I have not inoculated any since 1863; before I inoculated, I noticed that a few (three or four head) had the disease in February of that year.
3. About 200.
4. When cattle first showed disease they were in good store condition; as they fattened the disease carried them off quicker.
5. About two years, during which time all that got it severely died, and it takes about that time to go right through a herd large or small, but the greatest amount of deaths will take place the first summer.
6. I think all cattle that did not take infection from inoculation got the disease, some only very slightly.
7. Left my cattle 1864. What did not die of cattle bought in 1867, got fat and were all sold.
8. Fifteen out of fifty store cattle—1867 and 1868.
9. Healthy. I fattened and sold any that had a very severe attack of disease; they are always delicate after.
10. I am strongly of opinion that inoculation, if properly done, is a sure preventative to disease. My cattle that were properly inoculated, and the cattle that had the disease but recovered, and all their increase, were running with diseased cattle for a season, and not a single beast took the disease from the store cattle; this I can be sure of, because the herd is small, and the cattle all very quiet. Inoculation from bad virus is useless, and inoculation with strong virus will kill as large a per-centage as is likely to die from the disease in large herds.

11. I do not think that there is any one in the Colony who can say for certain at what stage of disease the virus should be taken to inoculate with safety. Disease is some six or twelve months in cattle before it appears in what is commonly called the first stage; this I could give my reasons for knowing, if necessary; I know that stock-owners differ in their opinion on the subject; I took particular notice of how the disease went through my cattle, and got virus from five different cattle, still I feel doubtful as to whether cattle can or not be properly inoculated, until further knowledge is gained on the matter. I never tried how inoculating with matter taken from the swellings on a beast that had been inoculated with matter from a lung would act.

93.

10. The cattle upon this run have never been infected.

94.

1. 1867.
3. About 300.
4. Middling condition.
5. First appearance, 1867.
6. 5 per cent.
7. It has not left those uninoculated yet, taking an occasional beast off now and again.
8. Not known.
9. Uninoculated cattle dying with the disease.
11. I do; nothing but inoculation will prevent the disease from spreading.

95.

1. 1866.
3. 2,000.
4. Fair condition.
5. Six months.
6. Twenty-five.
7. 1867.
8. 400.
9. Good and healthy.
10. I have found inoculation to be both a cure and prevention, having introduced diseased cattle into the herd without any bad effects.
11. I am in favour of an Act to compel cattle-owners to inoculate all cattle.

96.

1. In 1863.
3. 1,800 head.
4. Cattle in fine condition at that time.
5. On or about four years, and has finally left.
7. In 1868 finally left the herd.
8. On or about 800.
9. Good.
11. I do not consider that cattle not infected should be inoculated.

97.

3. 600.
10. In the year 1864 the herd adjoining to me, which was often mixed with mine, were badly affected; also, the herd on the opposite side of the river. Up to last year I could not say that any beast of mine had died from pleuro; since then five or six have come under my notice supposed to have died from that cause, as the herd on my south side were very bad. The first and second I refer to were inoculated. The disease has died out, but I believe it would have done so had they not been touched. The operation of inoculation I have never seen, but many that have had it done believe in it, but I have never heard of an instance where it has been done on the whole herd. In my own case, supposing the deaths I spoke of have been from pleuro, I could not now find but one beast any one could say was sick. In such case how could virus be obtained? I would suggest that, on a proper complaint of a neighbour's cattle being affected, made to the Sheep Inspectors of the district, he should ascertain, the truth, and if proved to be true, they should be inoculated—taking the time of year into account, for I believe during the summer here it would be quite impossible. A penalty for any person laying an unfounded information of disease.
11. I think it would be most unjust to pass a law, compelling owners to inoculate, and believe it would be quite impossible to carry into effect such a law for the reason that it would be quite impossible to ever collect the herd of any station to one place.

98.

1. Never infected.
3. 700.
10. As disease has never existed in the herd I cannot say anything about it or supply you with any facts bearing on the efficacy or inefficacy of inoculation.
11. The writer believes in inoculation ; and for that reason he considers that an Act should be passed.

99.

11. I do not consider it beneficial to pass such an Act.

100.

3. 600.
10. I have no disease in my cattle, nor have I ever had any.
11. Yes, I think if an Act was passed, obliging owners of diseased cattle to inoculate, it would be a good thing for the country.

101.

3. 400.
9. Free from disease.
11. I do think it necessary if cattle are diseased.

102.

1. 1865.
3. 7,000.
4. Fine condition, and every appearance of health when it first appeared.
5. Don't know.
6. 35 per cent.
7. Don't know.
8. 2,000.
10. Cattle that have pleuro-pneumonia in its first stage, in appearance are healthy, and no one would suppose disease existed, unless you cause them to be run, when those affected commence to cough.
11. Yes.

103.

1. July, 1865.
3. 3,000.
4. In good condition ; many fat.
5. Six months.
6. Twenty.
7. December, 1865.
8. 300.
9. Very healthy.
10. I do not approve of inoculation in this warm climate ; I believe the deaths would have been double had I inoculated them. I have inoculated several lots of cattle, and in every case the deaths from that cause alone were never under 5 per cent. ; at the same time I do believe that it stops the disease ; I am altogether opposed to making inoculation compulsory.
11. Certainly not.

104.

1. None.
3. 100.
4. None.
5. No disease.
6. None.
7. Never infected.
8. None.
9. All healthy.
10. The above 100 head are the progeny of the inoculated 437.
11. I do consider it quite right that an Act should be passed to inoculate diseased cattle.

105.

1. Nil.
8. About five died before inoculated.
9. Good.
11. No ; self interest must introduce the practice.

106.

1. Not ascertained.
3. About 300 head arriving from Queensland and put into a paddock.
4. Good condition.
5. About six months.
6. About 10 per cent.
7. About six months after infection.
8. About fifteen in all.
9. Nearly all eaten.
11. The theory of such an Act would be good, but I do not see how *all* cases can be met by any set of rules or regulations, unless great latitude was allowed—and discretionary power in Inspectors or Boards of Directors.

107.

1. About the summer of 1865.
2. Never had any trial at the station, —— but believe many died.
3. About 250, 100 of which were bullocks, and able to work off the disease, so that no more than about 10 per cent. of them died.
4. Strong and healthy.
5. About twelve months.
6. In my opinion all the cattle had the disease.
7. About the early part of 1866.
8. Ten out of the 100 bullocks.
9. All healthy.
11. Such an Act may be of service, if an experienced hand were responsible for its due performance.

108.

1. In 1865.
3. 300.
4. On the appearance of the disease the cattle were in excellent condition.
5. Twelve months.
6. About 4 per cent.
7. In 1866.
8. Twelve.
9. Healthy.
11. Yes—I am decidedly of opinion that cattle affected by the disease should be inoculated; and I deem it essentially necessary that an Act compelling owners of such cattle to at once inoculate them should pass into law.

109.

3. 650.
4. Heavy breathing.
5. Three months.
6. All, I believe.
7. One month after inoculation.
8. Unknown.
9. Free from disease.
10. Herds uninoculated, loss $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.
11. I think an Act should be passed, as there are many that have not inoculated their herds.

110.

1. In the winter of 1864, after the big flood.
3. The disease broke out in some store cattle put upon the run in the winter, 1864. The number of herd was about 7,000 to 8,000.
4. The store cattle in which the disease showed were in poor condition, and the run had been covered with water by the flood. The cattle had been travelling through great quantities of water.
5. The disease lasted somewhere about twelve months, more or less, though it was only at the commencement that there were many deaths, and those were amongst cattle herded.
6. Probably as many as one-third of the entire herd were affected.
7. There were no deaths after the winter of 1865 to speak of, and the disease was not noticeable after the spring, 1865.
8. From 800 to 1,000; nearly all the deaths were amongst the store cattle which were herded.
9. Very healthy. Cattle all thriving, and nearly all fat.

10. From personal observation, I believe that when cattle have plenty of room and are not disturbed by much camping, driving, or yarding, pleuro-pneumonia will kill very few; it was only the store cattle that were herded that suffered much loss on this run. The cattle belonging to the run escaped with very few deaths, and immediately the store cattle ceased to be herded and were turned loose on the run the disease commenced to decrease and there were very few deaths. Since 1865 the herd has been very healthy and free from disease. I object to inoculation, because I have noticed deaths increase from the camping, yarding, and driving of cattle. The great objection to inoculation is, that when cattle are infected they want peace, rest, and quietness; they should not be driven, camped, yarded, or worked in any way. If you inoculate, you have to camp, drive, and yard cattle—even force them into a crush, which all tends to spread the disease and will add greatly to the deaths. I have seen herds inoculated, and herds left in peace that were infected; and I believe there were not half the number of deaths amongst the cattle that were not inoculated or disturbed that there were in those inoculated.
15. I think it would be most injurious to compel owners to inoculate cattle that are infected with pleuro, because you hasten the action of the disease and make it more virulent by the virus; by yarding and knocking about the cattle you cause many more to get the disease than other wise would, and I feel sure you greatly increase thereby the per-centage of deaths. The only possible way inoculation could be advisable or serviceable would be to inoculate before any of the herd were infected—and how then could virus be obtained? I therefore consider that there is no need for such an Act, and it would be most injurious in its effects.

111.

10. There are only two persons in my district who have had cattle affected with the disease—one ———, the other ———. These persons had their few head inoculated, the operator being ———. This person refuses to give the information required in these documents, therefore I must refer you to him.

112.

1. On or about 1st December.
4. They were in a state of disease, dying one after another.
5. From three to four months.
6. 4 per cent.
7. About the 1st April, when all was considered safe.
8. About twelve head.
9. Healthy and thriving.
11. I should recommend an Act to be passed for all cattle to be inoculated in each district wherever the disease breaks out, by a competent person, as it is contagious.

113.

1. Saw no symptoms of infection.
3. 460 head.
4. No infection.
5. No disease was in this herd.
6. None.
9. Strong, fat, and healthy.
10. That no disease was in this herd I attribute to the fact that the herd is only a small isolated one, running on a sheep station, and not intermixed with any of adjacent herds. I consider that pleuro-pneumonia is decidedly infectious, and that if cattle are *properly inoculated* before showing symptoms of the disease, that it will prevent them being affected by it.
11. If it is an Act made in a careful manner, and one that can be carried out effectually, I say yes.

114.

1. Summer and autumn of 1864.
3. 800 inoculated; about 1,000 on the run.
4. To appearance healthy, but in rather poor condition, that is, the breeding cattle.
5. About six months.
6. 10 per cent.; by which I mean that from eighty to 100 were sometimes sick on the run at once.
7. End of April, 1864.
8. At a guess, before and after inoculation, 300.
9. Healthy; no symptom of disease has ever appeared since.

10. I should like to have, as the lessee of a run, such encouragement as would justify me in fencing portions of it. If the disease were now to appear, I should hesitate about inoculating, owing to the scattered state of the cattle upon the run, and their poor and weak condition. After inoculation I could not watch the effects; and only strong cattle, in good condition, will bear the terrible knocking about which they get, closed up in a crusher to inoculate.
11. I do not; but I should be of a different opinion if owners were in such a position as to be enabled to paddock their cattle as they inoculated them, and to keep their breeding herds in a condition to bear the hardships of yarding and crushing incidental to inoculation.

115.

1. About March, 1864.
3. About 6,000 when the disease first came in them, half which were inoculated.
4. Very near all of them fat.
5. I have seen one or two with the disease within the last two years, and I think the disease existed about four years.
6. About one-half at the time I had them inoculated.
7. I cannot answer you this question, as I think the disease may break out at any time, as I have heard of cattle having it of late in the district.
8. I do not know.
9. To all appearance in good health.
10. As to this question (general remarks), I think whoever it was that was the promoter of trying to get an Act passed to make stock-owners inoculate their cattle is some person who is on the look-out for a billet; and if in case this Act should be passed, it will not be much interest to the country at the present time, and it would be a loss of £1,000 or £2,000 to the present finances of the country.
11. I think it would be useless to pass an Act to make owners of stock inoculate them when they are infected with the disease called pleuro-pneumonia, as I believe, if cattle that have got the disease were inoculated at the time, it would kill every one you done, so I do not consider that an Act should be passed obliging owners of cattle to inoculate them.

116.

10. I have never had any disease among my cattle, and have never inoculated. I can therefore answer none of the above inquiries.
11. I do not think such an Act advisable.

117.

1. Not known.
3. 700.
4. Apparently healthy.
5. From the time purchased.
6. 90 per cent.
7. May, 1866.
8. 1,500.
9. Healthy.
10. The number of deaths (1,500), are all the cattle that died on the run; but more cattle were brought on the run after the 16th and 17th January, 1865, and others were sent off.
11. No.

118.

1. Early in the year 1863.
3. From 1,800 to 2,000.
4. In strong, thriving, healthy condition.
5. Eighteen months, lingering perhaps two years.
6. Fully one-third—perhaps from 35 to 40 per cent.
7. No memorandum was kept, but about the beginning of 1865, except an odd case.
8. Nearly 400—about half those affected. I have generally observed that the greatest mortality was among milkers and working cattle.
9. Healthy, and in excellent condition.
10. Not having ourselves inoculated, we do not consider ourselves competent to give evidence as to what was proper inoculation or not; but we observed that many cattle belonging to our neighbours which had been (on their way) inoculated—so as often to cause loss of tail, and were said to have been diseased and recovered—subsequently died of pleuro-pneumonia. It should be also noted that the suffering of the beast from inoculation was generally extreme, and its after appearance often disgusting. We did not inoculate, because we considered it would have been very troublesome to ourselves and distressing to the stock; and the run being large, and there being no public road

through it, we hoped to be able to isolate our stock, at least from travelling cattle—but unfortunately, our neighbours on the western boundary, having bought and brought a number of diseased cattle into close proximity with ours, introduced the disease. Watching the course of events, we observed our neighbours who inoculated, suffered to a far greater extent than ourselves; we therefore followed out our original idea of disturbing the cattle as little as possible.

11. Our opinion, founded on experience and a tolerably wide observation, is decidedly against the passing of such an enactment.

119.

1. Not infected.
3. 1,000 head.
9. Healthy.
10. I have no remarks to make that will aid the present inquiry, having had no experience amongst diseased herds.

120.

1. The end of 1864.
3. About 1,500.
4. Healthy.
5. About eight months.
6. All less or more that was seen.
7. Uncertain; in 1865.
8. Uncertain; supposed a third.
9. Healthy.
11. No. Should inoculation prove effective, owners of cattle will look to themselves.

121.

1. September, 1866.
3. 450—about.
4. Principally good, some fat; but about 160 poor just brought on station. Disease showed about same time in all.
5. Perhaps nine months.
6. Probably 40 per cent.
7. About May, 1867.
8. Somewhere about twenty-five.
9. Very good and healthy.
10. I have answered above questions as accurately as possible. The dates may be depended upon, but I am not certain as to number of cattle affected and deaths; nearly the whole of the latter was among the 160 poor-conditioned cattle.
11. No, no, no, no.

122.

1. In the year 1865.
3. 2,000.
4. Poor weaners.
5. About three months.
6. 100 out of the 2,000.
7. The disease has not left yet, but I never see more than one beast affected.
8. 100.
9. There may be one beast diseased, but not more.
10. I do not consider that it will ever leave. It may be seen from time to time, but I do not think it will ever attack the cattle as bad as it did at first.
11. I consider an Act altogether unnecessary.

123.

1. Not infected.
3. 300.
4. Not infected.
10. About five years since my cattle became diseased, and were dying very rapidly, before I made up my mind to inoculate, being prejudiced against it at the time. However, I made a trial, and inoculated about 200 head; none of which died, except four that showed symptoms of disease at the time. This herd I have long since disposed of.
11. My opinion is that compulsory inoculation is most necessary.

124.

1. May, 1863.
3. 1,500.
4. Rather low in condition.
5. Three months.

6. The whole of the cattle were affected, more or less; in some it only showed by a cough after running.
7. In August, 1863.
8. About 550.
9. Healthy.
10. The above-mentioned cattle were travelling at the time the disease broke out, and were running on a reserve near — at the time it left. The remainder of the herd (about 1,500), running at —, became affected in June, 1863, and the disease left the herd about September, 1863. The number of deaths, about 800. The winter being very wet and cold, no doubt greatly accelerated the number of deaths.
11. I do not think an Act should be passed making inoculation compulsory, as I am doubtful whether it is of any benefit. I am of the opinion that cattle infected should be kept as quiet as possible, as in the case of the 800 deaths the cattle were tailed on their own run, and greatly knocked about.

125.

1. August, 1864.
3. 6,000.
4. Healthy and in good condition.
5. About eighteen months.
6. Not known.
7. Early in 1865.
8. Not known—probably 15 per cent.
9. Healthy.
10. It was found here, where the cattle were much disturbed and brought together and herded, that deaths were numerous, and daily increasing; while a portion of the herd allowed to remain undisturbed suffered comparatively little.
11. I do not think it necessary, as it remains to be seen if the disease will again appear, to a serious extent, in those herds through which it has already passed; and inoculation, as a *cure*, as far as I have had opportunities of judging, is very doubtful.

126.

14. As this is a very mountainous country I am of opinion that cattle left alone quietly on their run do just as well, if not better, than if inoculated; also, it is my belief they do not suffer so severely in a poorly grassed country as they do in a rich.

127.

1. 1864.
3. 1,100.
4. Very much blown, and the lights much swollen and full of corruption.
5. Three years.
6. The whole of them, little or much, at different times in 1863.
8. 640.
9. Quite healthy.

128.

1. September, 1864.
3. 2,500.
4. Nearly all fat.
5. About six months.
6. About one-third.
7. About March, 1865.
8. About 500.
9. The disease has not shown since.
10. Two neighbours of ours—name of — and —, and one — — their cattle were dying from the disease at the same time, but nothing like so bad as ours. They inoculated; we did not inoculate. Our cattle left off dying just at same time as their cattle.
11. We think not—we think the disease will leave the herd just at same time without inoculation as with it.

129.

1. 1865—early.
3. 1,000.
4. Sound and good condition.
5. Two years, or nearly so.
6. Forty.
7. Late—1866.
8. Some 300.
9. Sound and good condition.
11. Certainly not.

130.

1. April, 1864.
3. About 130.
4. Good order.
5. Nine months or abouts.
6. 50 or 60 per cent.
7. December, 1864.
8. On or about thirty.
9. Low in condition.
10. Never had any experience in the diseases of cattle.
11. We think that an Act should be passed, obliging owners whose cattle are infected, to inoculate them.

131.

1. 1865.
3. 130.
4. Low in condition.
5. Two years.
6. Fifty.
7. 1868.
8. 200.
9. Poor.
10. I consider it would be a benefit to the country to have an Act passed to compel people to have their cattle inoculated if diseased.

132.

1. June, 1866.
3. 150.
4. Good healthy condition.
5. About one month.
6. About one half.
7. About the latter end of July, 1866.
8. Four died before inoculation, none after.
9. In a healthy state at present.
10. Healthy cattle running along with inoculated cattle will take the infection from them. I have experienced it myself on several occasions.
11. From my experience among cattle I am of opinion that all owners of cattle that are infected should be obliged to inoculate them immediately.

133.

1. July, 1864.
3. 450.
4. In good condition.
5. About fifteen months.
6. About 1 per cent.
7. Latter end of December, 1864.
8. Impossible to say, but certainly very trifling.
9. Healthy.
10. I have no remarks to state, as I consider my experience to be too insignificant to form a proper opinion for or against inoculation; although I rather incline to inoculation.
11. Yes.

134.

11. Yes.

135.

1. Can't say.
3. About 5,000.
4. Good condition.
5. Can't say.
6. Can't say.
7. Never left it.
8. Can't say.
9. A few are dying, but the disease now seems to be Cumberland, not pleuro.
10. None to make.
11. I do not consider that such an Act would have any good effect, but the contrary.

136.

1. June, 1864.
3. 3,500.
4. When driving the herd to a camp, some would refuse to drive—they seemed to suffer greatly through difficulty of breathing.
5. It has been in the herd more or less since.
6. All suffering more or less.
7. It has never finally left the herd.
8. About 5 per cent.
9. I notice a few slightly affected.
10. I believe that if cattle are allowed to lie quietly, when the disease is in them, there will be less deaths than when inoculated; there is not the least doubt that the disease goes through the cattle yearly.
11. No.

137.

1. Four years ago my working bullocks and milkers caught the disease from another team of workers. I lost three workers and ten milkers. The disease did not spread to the herd. Two years ago the disease came up the ———, to my herd. I lost a few beasts, but the disease was never violent or general. This last year I have lost a few cattle, but the disease has now entirely disappeared.
3. 800.
4. Generally healthy.
5. About three months.
6. One in 200.
7. Four months.
8. About fifty altogether; but I miss about 200 altogether, but I have every reason to believe, from information received, that about 150 head have been stolen.
9. Very healthy.
10. The losses in my herd have never been severe from pleuro-pneumonia—they have had it in a mild form. I found bleeding in the first stage sufficient for cure. Had the herd been attacked severely I should certainly have inoculated them. Much greater losses are sustained by the constant cattle-stealing carried on, and the difficulty in suppressing it.
11. No. Every one has the remedy in his own hands; and his own interest will induce him to adopt it, particularly as inoculation is now better understood than it was at first; from using improper virus that is taken from a beast too far gone greater injury was done than if inoculation had not been adopted.

138.

1. About March, 1865.
3. About 250.
4. 150 poor store cattle. The others chiefly calves in good condition.
5. From twelve to eighteen months.
6. Of the store cattle 80 or 90 per cent.; of the others about 20 per cent.
7. Some time in 1866.
8. Of the store cattle about 100, of the others about fifteen.
9. Perfectly healthy—no sign of disease.
10. Not having kept any record or notes of the inoculation, except the supposed number of deaths from disease during the year, the above answers are given to the best of my knowledge.
11. No, I rather think it is too late for inoculation when the disease has made its appearance in a herd.

139.

10. Since 1863 no breeding cattle have been kept on the ———. Store cattle are bought and put on the place to fatten. From 500 to 650 is generally the number on the estate. With a few exceptions, hardly a beast remains on the place over ten months. From July, 1863, to July, 1864, 150 died of the disease; in 1865, seventeen; after that only an odd one here and there.

140.

1. 1867, 1868.
3. 300.
4. Badly infected in general.
5. Over two years.
6. 5 per cent.
7. 1868.
8. Not known.
9. Clean.
11. Yes.

141.

3. 250 head.
9. Sound and healthy.
10. To the best of my knowledge there is no disease in the district.
11. I think so.

142.

1. 1st July, 1866, and on the second occasion, November, 1867.
3. 500 head.
4. In good condition.
5. The first time five months; on the second, two months.
6. 5 per cent.
7. March, 1868.
8. Nearly 5 per cent.
9. In good health.
10. I have great faith in inoculation; when applied to my cattle it checked the disease immediately.
11. Yes, an Act ought to be passed for that purpose.

143.

3. About one hundred and fifty (150).
5. Odd cases have been in the herd since April, 1867.
6. Not more than 5 per cent. since April, 1867.
7. There has been no case since January last.
8. About six.
9. Quite healthy.
10. The cattle have been generally healthy since I purchased them, and there have been only a few isolated cases at intervals, the only cattle affected being uninoculated ones.
11. Yes; or rather that owners should be compelled to inoculate whether infected or not. I also consider that no cattle should be allowed to travel without notice being given to the holders of the country through which they pass, and that no diseased cattle should be allowed to travel.

144.

1. February, 1864.
3. 3,000.
4. Healthy.
5. Eight or nine months.
6. (Puzzler.) Not less than three-fourths.
8. 15 per cent. of the herd.
9. Healthy.
10. I have never seen a case of the disease in the herd since (say) twelve months after its first appearance, nor have I noticed disease amongst travelling cattle since then, but have often seen odd cases of the disease in some adjoining herd, say about one beast in 3,000 diseased at one time. In one of the herds adjoining me, a very large one, out of which about 5,000 were inoculated, I had a good opportunity of seeing the effect of the inoculation as practised there. The herd was infected before they began inoculating, and of those inoculated most of them died, while the cattle that were not inoculated appeared to have the disease in a milder form, and far more of them got over it.
11. I consider such an Act would be useless, injurious, and arbitrary.

145.

1. August, 1863.
3. 250.
4. In good condition, and otherwise healthy.
5. No other disease existed except pleuro-pneumonia.
6. Twenty.
7. Still exists to the extent of 2 per cent.
8. Fifteen.
9. In good condition and healthy, with the exception of 2 per cent. suffering from pleuro-pneumonia.
10. From inquiries I have made I find that there has been a larger per-centage of deaths in inoculated herds of cattle than in uninoculated herds.
11. I do not consider that an Act should be passed obliging owners to inoculate whose cattle are infected, as it would cause a great amount of trouble without any benefit being derived.

146.

3. 200.
9. Healthy.
10. I have no faith in inoculation. I have known more to die from inoculation than from the disease.
11. No; but compel them to keep the diseased ones in a close paddock, or destroy them at once.

147.

1. About six or seven years ago.
3. About 4,000 head.
4. Fat, and in good condition.
5. Eighteen months virulently, and occasional symptoms since that time.
6. Very nearly all.
7. Four years back, except the aforesaid occasional symptoms.
8. About 600.
9. All healthy.
11. I think that compulsory inoculation would be advisable.

148.

1. 1865.
3. About 800.
4. Fat and poor, young and old.
5. About eighteen months.
6. 20 per cent.
7. About 1866.
8. Through rest, about 9 per cent.
9. Healthy, and we lost less than those who did inoculate their cattle in this locality.
10. Rest, by all means. A cow will have a calf young by her side, sucking, the cow will die, the calf will live and do well; also, reverse it, the calf will die, and the cow will live and do well in many proved cases with the pleuro.
11. No, no, not as far as pleuro-pneumonia is, for it is not infectious, which I can prove. Rest on the run is the best cure for cattle in the above state, as with man, in pneumonia.

149.

1. About the year 1864.
3. 2,000.
4. In very good condition.
5. More or less from 1864 to the present date. I know this, as I adjoin the run.
6. I cannot say.
7. I believe the disease is still in them.
8. I should say at least 40 per cent.
9. No cattle now on the run, they having been sold.
10. In June, 1867, I bought from Mr. — his station, —; he had to deliver me 2,000 head—when he mustered them he could deliver me only 1,249. I am fully convinced he lost many of these cattle from not inoculating them. I sold the herd last May to Mr. —. I noticed one or two when delivered to be affected—the drought prevented my inoculating them.
11. I most decidedly consider such an Act should be passed.

150.

1. January, 1864.
4. They were in good condition.
5. About twelve months.
6. Very few that caught the disease recovered.
7. About December, 1864, or January, 1865.
8. About 150.
10. I am of opinion that cattle should be inoculated before they are infected.
11. Yes; if they are inoculated immediately the disease is observed.

151.

1. First discovered the cattle dying about the end of July, 1863.
3. 1,500. I cannot say exactly the number, but they are nearly all the old stock cleared off, and no inoculation since.
4. You would tell them by their walk, and they have a rolling motion of the fore legs and a weakness in the shoulders.
5. Eight months.
6. Nearly all.

7. About March, 1864.
8. I should think nearly 1,000 head.
9. Apparently healthy.
10. I have now a herd of about 2,000. I don't think the half of them are inoculated cattle, having bought several times since. Most are inoculated, but some few are not, and the increase has not been done since.
11. I am decidedly in favour of inoculation.

152.

1. No infection or disease.
11. I am of opinion that such an Act would be the cause of the disease spreading to a far greater extent than if it were left to its natural course.

153.

1. First discovered about 19th May, 1868, at ———, supposed to have been caused by a diseased beast dying in the neighbourhood, brought on to the station from ——— by a party driving infected cattle to the ——— to fatten.
3. 1,500 head.
4. Sound and healthy, and in good store condition.
5. Never known to exist before 19th May, 1868.
6. About five head altogether out of the whole herd; they were all in the same neighbourhood; I had them all killed, and the carcasses burnt within a few days after the disease first made its appearance.
7. I believe immediately these cattle were killed.
8. I believe one head—the first beast that was discovered, but which could not afterwards be found. Cattle affected with the disease generally go into a scrub to die, and I suppose this did.
9. Healthy, according to appearance.
10. I think the prompt measures I adopted in immediately killing and burning the diseased beasts stopped the further progress of the disease. I also think that beasts on a run where grass is scarce, are not so likely to be affected by contagion, as when running in paddocks where the grass is thicker and more solid and contiguous. I should have inoculated the cattle on the above runs, had I been able to obtain virus within a reasonable distance. In mountainous runs, also in these districts, it is impossible to get in all your cattle in winter months—when it is very prejudicial to hunt them about, and therefore the operation could only be performed in about eight months of the year.
11. I consider that cattle should, if possible, be inoculated previously to infection, as I doubt whether it is useful afterwards.—but as all the cattle on a run, or in a paddock, do not take it at the same time, an obligatory Act should be passed to compel inoculation as soon as discovered—also another to prevent diseased cattle travelling. It would be advisable that owners of cattle in the neighbourhood of diseased runs should inoculate at same time as the owners of diseased runs.

154.

1. 1863.
3. Between two and three hundred.
5. About six months.
6. All affected more or less, but some not visible.
7. 1864.
8. Between four and five hundred.
9. All looking well and healthy.
10. Plenty of grass and water, and everything looking well

155.

1. November, 1864.
3. About 1,000 head mixed cattle.
4. Healthy, and in fair condition, considering the drought that season.
5. About six months, or till May, 1865.
6. About $\frac{1}{4}$ per cent.
7. May, 1865.
8. About twenty head.
9. Healthy, and in fair condition.
10. A young herd, having sold all my old stock two years ago—in 1866.
11. Not without the disease again makes its appearance, and not then if the cattle are infected.

156.

1. Spring of 1864.
3. About 4,000.
9. Healthy.
10. A large proportion of those diseased recovered and did well. They were left alone as much as possible, as we found that running about when sick did a great deal of harm. The cattle were running at large without any inclosure, and we could not say what percentage were diseased. For a long time a few would be seen sick, and some dead. The herd is now very healthy.
11. We do not consider such a course necessary.

157.

1. I think, about March, 1863.
3. About 400 head in all.
4. Fat, and in good condition, when infected; soon got very poor.
5. About three months before inoculation; after inoculation soon disappeared.
6. About 10 per cent.
7. A very short time after the inoculation.
8. I think from 150 to 200 head.
9. I fancy the cattle do not look so healthy now as they did some few years since. I observe a great many get swellings in their jaws and under the throat, which, if opened in time, runs away in matter; if let alone gets into a hard lump, and the cattle appear to be choking, and it frequently turns to cancer. In former years, before the pleuro, I did not see one-fifth so many as since affected in this way. Sometimes there will be a lump as big as a large apple between the windpipe and the neck-bone, which, if not cut it will soon kill the cattle; it is very difficult to get at it there. I have seen a large one and several smaller ones around it, all full of putrid corruption.
11. It strikes me very forcibly that an Act should be passed to compel inoculation, whether cattle are infected or not, although it would be a difficult matter to get virus just now—around this neighbourhood at all events.

158.

3. About 3,000.
9. Healthy, but poor, from scarcity of grass.
10. This herd has not been inoculated, but from the experience of my friends in inoculation I have reason to believe in it as a preventive for pleuro-pneumonia, and purpose inoculating this herd as soon as the virus can be obtained.
11. I do.

159.

1. Not known.
4. In good order.
5. Six months in summer.
6. 3 per cent.
7. In winter season.
8. Not known.
9. In good order.
10. My opinion is, if cattle are left quiet and not disturbed when symptoms of the disease show themselves, the decrease will be less, and generally most of diseased cattle will recover.
11. I do not consider that it would be any benefit to prevent the disease from taking its course.

160.

1. During the last five years.
3. About eighty head.
5. Five years.
6. About one-half.
7. I believe since I inoculated in May.
8. About 10 per cent. per annum.
9. Apparently free from disease.
10. My herd being a milking herd, and consisting chiefly of cows in milk and young calves, I never cared to try inoculation until, my losses continuing year after year, I was afraid I should lose all unless I took some steps to eradicate the disease. Nearly all the cows I have at present have had the disease, and have recovered.
11. I do not think it advisable to pass an Act for the purpose of compelling owners to inoculate. Paddocks adjoining my own have never had disease in them, although the cattle have occasionally mixed.

161.

1. July, 1864.
3. 2,000.
4. Store condition.
5. Two or three weeks.
6. 3 to 4 per cent.
11. We do not consider it requisite that an Act should be passed.

162.

3. Seventy.
10. The above number of cattle run in another direction ; and the disease not having made its appearance there we have not inoculated. They are still free from disease.
11. I consider that it would be for the general good that an Act should be passed obliging owners of cattle whose herds are infected to inoculate.

163.

1. During 1866.
3. 150 head.
4. In good condition.
5. About eighteen months.
6. 8 or 10 per cent.
7. About the commencement of 1868.
8. 4 or 5 per cent.
9. Healthy.
10. About half those affected recovered ; but it is very difficult to arrive at correct accounts on bush runs, and on our run we lose a great number in diggers' holes. Inoculation answers very well in some instances, *with perfectly sound cattle ; but it is certain death to an infected beast.*
11. I think that inoculation should be entirely at the option of the owner.

164.

10. Last year (1868) the disease infected this part of this district ; several stock holders lost some cattle by it. Preparations were made for inoculation, but the disease left and I believe all the cattle are now free from it. I think the best way to prevent this and other complaints to which cattle are subject, would be, to let every land-owner up to the amount of 320 acres in the settled districts, purchase their pre-emptive right on easy terms—say from 2s. 6d. to 5s. per acre—and be encouraged to fence and improve it. The cattle would then be kept separate from each other, and the disease more easily managed, and the general fare of the country improved, instead of becoming worse every year, as it is now.
11. I should think that if people found it to their advantage to inoculate they would not require an Act to compel them to do so.

165.

3. 200.
10. Touching the question as to the efficacy of inoculation in this district, there is no immediate appearance of any cattle plague or pleuro-pneumonia in cattle at the present time ; certainly, there have been a great many cattle dying the last eight months back, but I attribute it to the scarcity of food (grass), owing to the continued drought in this part of the country ; that is the reason of weak cattle taking to ground (falling down) in a debilitated state.
11. According to the general decision of the voice of the country.

166.

3. 150.
5. About twelve months.
6. About 5 per cent.
7. About two years since.
8. About twenty head.
9. Healthy.
11. I do not.

167.

1. July, 1864.
3. 1060.
4. Healthy, and in good condition.
5. Six months.
6. About 1 per cent., for the first three months, and in December about 10 per cent.
7. February, 1865.

8. 300.
9. Healthy.
10. The first time I noticed the disease was just after very cold wet weather, and I thought little of it till I found the disease increasing to a most alarming extent. I believe every herd that is not inoculated is liable to become diseased at any time, and every time the cattle are driven or knocked about.
11. I consider if an Act was passed rendering inoculation compulsory, it would be very beneficial to stock-owners generally, and the only means of exterminating the disease.

168.

10. Having had no experience in the disease called pleuro-pneumonia, and during my residence here (eighteen months) the herd having been perfectly healthy, it is impossible for me to give you any practical replies to the questions contained herein.

169.

9. Healthy.
10. I cannot give any remarks on this, as the disease did not appear on my run at all.
11. I consider an Act would be the ruin of all cattle-owners, as it would introduce the disease where it might never appear; therefore I think it should not be passed.

170.

1. Cannot say.
3. 300.
4. Apparently healthy.
5. Off and on for years.
6. 50 per cent.
7. About a year ago.
8. One-third.
9. Healthy.
10. I would advise the following experiment to be tried:—Inoculate a perfectly healthy animal (away from any diseased herd) in the most approved manner; when duly under the virus, kill the beast, and note the state of the lung.
11. My answer to the above will depend on the above-mentioned experiment.

171.

1. About 1865.
3. About 100 head.
4. In good condition.
5. About two years.
6. One-fourth.
7. 1867.
8. About twenty.
9. Healthy.
10. I have never had any cattle inoculated, nor have I had much opportunity of seeing its effects, having so few cattle in this district. I think well of inoculation as a preventive, but not otherwise.
11. Decidedly not, especially as the district has been free from pleuro-pneumonia for the last two years or more.

172.

1. 1865.
3. 200.
4. Frequent coughing, dulness, and refusing food.
5. About eighteen months.
6. About 50 per cent.
7. 1867.
8. About twenty.
9. Quite sound.
10. The only information that I could give upon the subject of inoculation of cattle for pleuro-pneumonia, would be from hearsay. I understand that the parties in charge of my stations in the ——— and ——— districts, have or will answer these questions. The few cattle, say about 200, that I have here, had the disease among them about three years since, but we did not inoculate any of them; I think about half of them took the disease, and about 10 per cent. of the whole died; they are now all quite free from disease. I have not yet been able to satisfy myself as to the advisableness of inoculation; in fact I scarcely think it can be of any advantage, although some persons who have had considerable experience in those matters assert that not only does inoculation act as a preventive but as an almost instantaneous cure.
11. I do not think it would be advisable to have such an Act passed.

173.

1. Did not keep date; constantly going and coming.
3. Three years back, 1867, 5,000; now, through drought, 1,200.
5. One or two months coming and going.
7. Latter end of 1865.
8. No idea.
9. All in good health, fat, and free from any disease.
10. Several of my neighbours inoculated, and lost four times as many as me. I speak from the carcasses I saw lying about on the ground. To my knowledge I knew herds to be inoculated, and very large numbers die; of course if I thought it useful I should have inoculated, having at that time one of the largest herds in the district. I should imagine the parties who employed people to inoculate, considered them capable of properly inoculating; but, right or wrongly performed, I know for a certainty it came again as usual. I consider inoculation useless, and the operation as fatal as the disease.
11. I consider it would be better to take all the graziers have got left from this five years, hardship, floods, disease, drought, &c. I think it better to pass an Act to forgive squatters who are near, and many beggared, quite, three years' rent.

174.

10. The pleuro-pneumonia never having been seen on my runs, and never having seen it in any of its stages, I cannot answer any of the questions; but should the disease appear amongst my cattle, I consider inoculation a preventive, and to a certain extent, a cure.
11. Yes.

175.

1. Never had occasion to inoculate.
10. Cannot give any information of value, not having had experience in the matter.
11. If it has been clearly proved that the disease is contagious or infectious, I believe an Act should be passed to make it compulsory to inoculate cattle so infected.

176.

1. December, 1865.
3. 300.
4. In good condition, and not far to travel for water or grass.
5. Four months.
6. 75 per cent.
7. April, 1866.
8. Most all the calves, but only 17 head of grown-up cattle.
9. In good condition, and never have been infected since.
10. I do not believe in inoculation, as I think pleuro-pneumonia will go through all the herds in the Colonies in time, but once the cattle having suffered a recovery, they will never get diseased again. Cattle infected have passed through my herds several times since 1866, and never infected any of them up to date.
11. I do not by any means, as I believe inoculation will kill nearly as many as the disease itself.

177.

1. In the spring of 1868.
3. 200.
4. The cattle were in middling condition.
5. Six or eight months.
6. Out of 450, 200 only were inoculated—the rest died.
7. About May, 1866.
8. 250.
9. Healthy.
10. I would recommend all persons, as soon as the disease appears, to inoculate without loss of time.
11. I do.

178.

1. 1865.
3. About 2,000.
4. Healthy.
5. Four years.
6. About 50 per cent.
7. I think about June last.
8. To the best of my knowledge, I lost 700.
9. Free of the disease.
10. None to make. My firm opinion is that inoculation is of no benefit.
11. I certainly think not.

179.

1. In the beginning of 1865.
3. 7,000 head.
4. In good condition.
5. Nine months.
6. 40 per cent.
7. In the end of 1865.
8. 1,500.
9. Healthy.
11. No.

180.

4. About 3,000.
5. Do not know how long, but have seen it in herd since 1864, but not to any extent.
6. 2 per cent.
7. Some of the herd show it now about 2 per cent. in 1,000.
8. Nil.
9. Healthy as regards pleuro-pneumonia.
10. Have not seen any die of it since I took charge of station, in May, 1863; but have killed about six for pigs.
11. As far as my experience goes, think that an Act, if passed, should be compulsory to inoculate cattle at age of six months, and think that it would stop it to a great extent.

181.

1. 1861.
3. 300 head was on the run at ———. All the cattle I now own are in ———; about 100 head.
4. See by the other side, Nos. 4 and 6.
5. For about fifteen months; I mean those that were left at ——— and not inoculated.
6. From 8 to 10 per cent. would be affected in a herd.
7. 1862.
8. About 30 per cent.
9. The cattle were in good health when sold, about two years ago.
10. The above remarks are made about a herd of cattle owned by the late ——— and myself, ———; were running at ———. Those 30 on the other side were brought to ———, and showed disease after. The remarks I made about them were the only experience I had of inoculation.
11. I am of opinion that an Act should be passed to that effect.

182.

1. 1865.
4. Very poor.
5. Twelve months.
6. 30 per cent.
7. 1866.
8. 150.
9. In good health.
11. I consider that all cattle should be inoculated, whether they are diseased or not.

183.

1. 1864.
3. 400.
4. Apparently healthy.
5. About three months.
6. About one-third.
7. In about three months, *after heavy rain*.
8. Fifty.
9. Good.
10. I believe the disease to be contagious, from the fact that cattle kept in *one* paddock, on ——— have been *entirely* free from it, while others in adjoining paddocks, separated only by three-rail fences, have suffered severely.
11. Yes.

184.

10. I have not the requisite number of cattle (200), as stated in the circular, and did not consider I was entitled to fill this form.
11. I do not think it necessary to compel owners to inoculate; did not do so myself; never had any disease among my cattle; have only about eighty head.

185.

1. Nil.
3. 250.
9. Healthy.
10. My cattle are all healthy.
11. No.

186.

1. Never infected.
3. 50.
9. Healthy.
10. I attribute the healthy state of my cattle partly to the fact of the timber having been killed some years ago, partly to the cattle always having been in good condition, the land never having been overstocked; many of my neighbours' cattle have died of the disease on my land and among my own cattle. Not having had any of my own cattle inoculated, I can only state that my neighbour's cattle appeared to me to die in as great numbers after inoculation as before, a result which may have been occasioned by their having been operated on during a wrong stage of the disease. With reference to compulsory inoculation, such a law to be of any real value ought to be universal,—a measure clearly impracticable, from the number of wild cattle in almost every district, which constantly mix with the quiet herds.
11. I should certainly object to any Act being passed with the above intention.

187.

10. I held a large herd of cattle running in this neighbourhood up to about seven years ago, since which period it has rapidly disappeared, partly from straying in dry seasons and not being recovered, to a small extent from pleuro-pneumonia or other disease, but principally from being driven off and stolen; my herd sharing the fate of previous other herds formerly running in this neighbourhood. Some few cattle are dying at present.
11. Compulsory inoculation would be difficult to carry out. In almost every instance in this part the cattle became affected and die before the owner is aware of it, if he ever is. The few cattle left in this district may be best designated as straggling lots.

188.

1. The beginning of 1866.
3. 600.
4. Good store condition.
5. Eighteen months or less.
6. Of those perceptible, about 20 per cent.
7. The middle of 1867 or thereabouts.
8. Not more than 5 per cent.
9. In store condition, good health, and free of disease.
10. Have seen cattle after recovering from inoculation take the disease and die; cannot say whether they had been properly inoculated or not.
11. No, as I do not believe in it either as a cure or a preventive.

189.

1. 1867.
3. 2,000.
4. Fat.
5. Twelve months.
6. 10 per cent.
7. December, 1868.
8. 3 per cent.
9. Healthy and good condition.
10. Slight symptoms in one slaughtered in August, 1869.
11. Yes, I do.

190.

10. The disease called pleuro-pneumonia has never been amongst my cattle, nor do I think it can be said that it ever has been on the ——. About two years ago a few working bullocks died on the upper part of the —, but from what cause it was not clearly ascertained; it was supposed by some to be pleuro-pneumonia.
11. I do not think it necessary that an Act should be passed obliging owners to inoculate their cattle, as I am under the belief that the disease will die out in a few years.

191.

1. No infection.
3. 160.
8. None.
9. Perfect health.
11. Yes, and would do so myself.

192.

1. November, 1864, at ———.
3. About 1,500.
4. In very fine condition after heavy fall of rain.
5. About fourteen weeks.
6. Very nearly all; about 30 per cent. died.
7. February, 1865.
8. About 30 per cent. died.
9. Clean.
10. The disease left the cattle soon after inoculated; the ——— cattle. I have seen an odd case since, but very trifling. Cattle that are being driven or herded are most subject.
11. No. In the first place, knocking the whole herd about when the disease is in them, does more harm than the present disease. We have often Cumberland disease at the same time, and it is very dangerous. I would advise all persons to inoculate, if they have cattle in hand, and are sure that it is only pleuro-pneumonia.

193.

10. Never infected or inoculated.
11. I think, from what has come under my own observation, that inoculation is much to be recommended, but can't say I like the idea of forcing owners to inoculate, although for their own benefit to do so.

194.

10. I am the holder of a dairy farm, and the amount of stock is something under 200 head, none of which has ever been affected, so that from personal experience I am unable to offer any suggestions; but I believe the information necessary to cause a Bill to be passed for compulsory inoculation should be such as to warrant such a measure, as with my present experience I am opposed to such a Bill becoming law.
11. I do not.

195.

1. December, 1866.
3. About 10,000 head in both Colonies.
4. Low condition, caused by drought.
5. Nearly 12 months.
6. Impossible to say.
7. About the end of 1867.
8. About 15 per cent.
9. Free from disease.
11. Certainly not.

196.

1. From May, 1864, to July, 1865.
3. 150.
4. Showed no signs when my other cattle were infected.
5. From nine to ten months in the herd that was affected.
6. About 15 per cent. in the herd affected.
7. In August, 1865.
8. About 20.
9. In good health.
11. I think so, should the disease make its appearance again.

197.

11. I have never had any cattle inoculated. My opinion crushing infected cattle in yards in order to inoculate tends to promote the disease. I consider an Act should not be passed.

198.

3. 620.
4. Not diseased.
10. Do not consider pleuro-pneumonia infectious, as I have known calves suck cows that have been diseased and died, and the calves have not shown any signs of disease.
11. Not in favour of compulsory inoculation.

199.

1. Unknown.
3. 250.
5. Unknown.
6. 1 per cent.
8. Two known.
9. Healthy.
11. My answer to this has been more fully given in my return of the —— cattle. In this poor, dry, but healthy country, I am much afraid that the interference of the law would be felt an evil more than the disease of pleuro-pneumonia.

200.

3. Between 700 and 800.
9. In perfect health.
10. Very few were infected on this run. What died on this run was through starvation.
11. I don't think that inoculation is of any service.

201.

1. On or about January, 1866.
3. 3,500 head.
4. In strong condition.
5. Twelve months.
6. From 7 to 9.
7. About January, 1867.
8. About 220.
9. Well and sound.
10. None.
11. Yes.

202.

3. 100.
9. Healthy.
10. I have seen a few cattle dead lately, but I suppose it is from eating thistles. I have not any cattle diseased, and have had no experience whatever, therefore I am sorry I cannot give you any information.
11. I consider an Act should be passed for the above.

203.

1. 5th July, 1865.
3. 700.
4. In good condition.
5. Three months.
7. October, 1865.
9. In good condition.
11. As far as my experience in inoculating, I do not think it sufficiently dangerous to pass an Act to oblige any one to inoculate.

204.

1. About the middle of the year 1865.
3. About 4,000 head.
4. In good condition.
5. About twelve months.
6. Fifty.
7. In 1866.
8. Ten per cent.
9. Healthy.
10. I never inoculated my cattle.
11. No.

205.

1. October, 1867.
3. 3,000.
4. Good.
5. Six months.
6. Fifteen per cent.
7. June, 1868.
8. Ten per cent.
9. Healthy.
11. Yes.

206.

3. 2,000.
4. Breathe heavy, and keep shifting the ears backwards and forwards.
5. Not long.
6. About one in 200.
8. From ten to twenty.
9. Sound.
10. I have seen cattle that had been inoculated show the disease the year following, but whether the inoculation had taken effect I could not tell. I don't believe in inoculation; bleed them the same as you would a horse, and put them in a paddock where they could not get water—that is what I did—and lost but few while some of my neighbours lost thousands.
11. No.

207.

9. Very healthy. Neither having inoculated any cattle, nor having had any cattle affected with pleuro-pneumonia on the run for several years, with the exception of one lot which I purchased, and through which the disease had nearly passed, I cannot answer the above questions. I am of opinion that inoculation is an effectual remedy when applied in time, that is, when the cattle are only slightly affected with the disease, but when applied in a later stage I think it does very little more good than clearing your herd quickly of diseased cattle, most of the badly affected ones dying after the operation. The disease is not infectious, but I think is contagious, and you might have cattle in one paddock dying fast from pleuro-pneumonia when in the adjoining one they would be quite healthy. We are now quite free from the disease here.
10. When pleuro-pneumonia has been through a herd and decimated it, the cattle are disposed to fatten rapidly and assume a more healthy appearance than they had before, as there are very few that escape the disease in some form or other, and the probability is that after the disease having been thus through a herd that herd will be safe for some years, and I would always rather buy cattle from a herd that had lately suffered severely than from one that had been free from disease for some time.
11. No; I think that one to prevent owners travelling with or selling diseased cattle would be of more use.

208.

1. 1866; a few died, but very few.
3. In 1866 there were about 10,000 head on this station. From drought and removal of fat and store stock, reduced to less than half.
5. There were a few cases of disease through 1866 and 1867, and in fact I do not think the herds can be said to be quite free from it yet, though the cases are so few as to be scarcely noticed.
8. Could not tell.
9. Very good, but much reduced from drought and robbery.
10. Any Act which would oblige owners of cattle to inoculate must result in the destruction of great numbers of stock. The disease is evidently on the decline, though not gone yet; and any action taken which may add to the already fearful destruction should only be upon such indisputable evidence as none could refute; this you cannot get. In this ——— district, the herds I believe are reduced by one-half their original number by drought; in some cases, to one-fourth.

209.

1. In 1865.
3. 200.
4. Unknown.
5. Eighteen months.
6. 30 per cent.
7. Unknown.
8. About 40.
9. Healthy.
10. No particular notice was taken of numbers and dates. The above statement is an approximation.
11. We do think it both advisable and necessary.

210.

10. I never inoculated any cattle. I have had but a few head, and I have not seen any diseased cattle near here this last three years. I do not know any party near here that has 200 head of cattle.
11. Yes, I consider that they should be obliged to inoculate.

211.

10. Though there has been no disease nor inoculation upon this station, those adjoining have had disease and prevented its spreading through inoculating; to such cause I attribute our freedom from it. I have no doubt in the efficacy of inoculation as a preventive to disease, having known instances where it positively stopped the spread of the disease. The cattle upon this station not having been diseased, it is unnecessary to answer many of the above questions. They are still uninoculated, though cattle upon stations immediately adjoining have been so; to that I attribute the freedom from disease upon this station.
11. I do.

212.

1. Winter, year 1864.
3. 3,500.
4. Cattle in good condition; became dull after infection, and usually died in a few days.
5. Three months.
6. Nearly the whole herd.
7. Beginning of year 1865.
8. 1,700 to 1,800.
9. Free from disease.
11. I have not sufficient faith in inoculation; the disease seems to wear itself out, and the more the herd is driven together the more die; if let alone and kept widely apart fewer die.

213.

1. August, 1865.
3. At that time about 5,000.
4. Low in condition, from slight drought.
5. About two months.
6. About 30 per cent.
7. Cannot say, as I left the station.
8. Cannot say—a great many. I should say from pleuro, 1,000.
9. Healthy.
11. I most certainly do.

214.

3. About 500.
8. None.
9. Sound.
10. I have not inoculated any cattle, and to the best of my belief have not lost any from disease during the last three years.
11. Certainly not.

215.

1. First observed in April, 1864.
3. 1,600 head.
4. Condition very good.
5. About twelve months.
6. 30 per cent.
7. In July, 1867.
8. About 7 per cent.; or 112 head.
9. Healthy.
10. The adjoining herds to my station were affected six months before the disease made its appearance amongst my cattle, but I used the precaution both before and after pleuropneumonia made its appearance amongst my herd of burying all dead cattle. I have very little experience with regard to inoculation, but from the little I have seen I believe in it as a preventive, but this should be done voluntarily.
11. I do not; as I believe that cattle-holders in general will use every desirable means of protecting their herds from disease without being compelled to do so.

216.

10. There have only been four or five cases of the disease appearing in this district, and they have all inoculated with beneficial results. I have had no disease among my cattle—if they should at any time, I shall inoculate the first opportunity.
11. I would not advise compulsory inoculation for several reasons—there would be great difficulties in way at times.

217.

1. January, 1868.
3. 1,200.
4. Thriving, in condition.
5. One month.
6. 20 per cent.
7. February, 1868.
8. 5 per cent.
9. In good health.
10. January too hot. Did not inoculate till weather got cold; in the meantime disease gone.
11. Yes.

218.

3. Uncertain.
9. Sound and healthy.
10. It would be impossible to fill this form up satisfactory. I have seen no disease on the run while in my possession.
11. I consider inoculation should be compulsory where cattle are infected.

219.

3. 2,500.
10. Our herd has never been inoculated. We cannot say the exact time that the disease appeared, nor when it left the herd; neither can we state what per-centage were affected by it, but we can confidently assert that if we had inoculated the herd after the disease made its appearance our losses would have been much greater—for the fact of passing them through small yards, and a crush, together with the inoculation itself, would have killed more than the disease. We do not consider inoculation to be a preventive against pleuro-pneumonia for any length of time, and when the disease makes its appearance in a herd of cattle we are of opinion that the less they are disturbed the better.
11. We consider that it would be most unjust to compel the owner of any herd, in which the disease makes its appearance, to inoculate his cattle.

220.

10. There were no infected cattle on the ——— when I took delivery, and as far as I know there are no infected cattle on the station.

221.

3. About 600.
4. Not infected.
9. Not infected; clean and healthy.
10. The disease to which these returns relate seems very strong in its progress. Mr. ——— cattle which adjoins, and are constantly mixing with Mr. ——— cattle, suffered great losses from pleuro; and Mr. ———, on the upper side of the run, suffered great losses also; both these herds were constantly mixing with Mr. ——— herd, and both had heavy losses from pleuro-pneumonia; whilst Mr. ——— cattle were not infected at all.
11. I have had very little experience with cattle suffering from pleuro, but what I have had has led me to believe that there is no necessity for compulsory inoculation, and that an Act to render it so should not be passed.

222.

Relative to your inquiry regarding pleuro-pneumonia, I have to note from information received, I believe that the principal remedy is inoculation, which, I think, should be compulsory as soon as the disease is proved to be among the herd, but not sooner.

223.

1. February, 1864.
3. 2,500.
4. In good condition.
5. Six or eight months.
6. Cent. per cent.
7. February, 1865.
8. 7 per cent.
9. Nearly all fat; no disease.
10. Same remarks apply here as in the other page.
11. No, no.

APPENDIX D.

TABULATED LIST of Answers of Owners of Inoculated Cattle.

No. of Return.	Date of Inoculation.	Number of Cattle Inoculated.	Number Diseased in herd at date of inoculation.	How long had Disease been in herd at date of inoculation.	Number of Deaths from excessive Swellings.	Effect of Inoculation on Disease.	For or against Inoculation.	For or against Legislation.
1	From 1867	700	30 per cent.	About 3 months	Nil	Preventive	For	For.
2	3 to 4 years	500			3 per cent.	do	do	Neither.
3	1867 and 1868	1,400	10 per cent.	5 weeks	2 head	Stopped disease	do	Against.
4	March, 1864	900	20 "		10 per cent.	Perfect success	do	For.
5	April, 1868	2,600	Some		10 head	Great thing and preventive	do	do
6	March, 1864	625		5 months		Positive preventive	do	Neither.
7	June, 1868					Left the herd	do	For.
8	1866-67	1,000	25 per cent.	4 months		Ceased in ten days	do	Not necessary.
9	October, 1864	50	None		1 head	Began to abate	do	Against.
10	April, 1868	500	2 per cent.			Ceased dying	do	For.
11	1864	200	5 "	A few days	16 per cent.	Unsatisfactory	Against ..	Against.
12		1,000	About 5 per cent.			Stopped the disease	For	Neither.
13	1861 and 1868	6,000	All	3 months	1 per cent.	Totally eradicated	do	Not necessary.
14	September, 1865	500	33 per cent.	1 month	3 "	Preventive	do	Against.
15	November, 1868	330	2 "	3 weeks	2 "	Ceased in a month	do	For.
16		700	3 "	7 days	Nil	Did not cease	Neither ..	Against.
17						Preventive	For	Neither.
18	1862	1,500	10 per cent.		3 per cent.	Unsatisfactory	Against ..	Against.
19	November, 1867	600	20 "	9 months	1 "	Left entirely in less than 3 months	For	For.
20	Spring, 1864	1,000		8 or 9 months ..	3½ "	Gradually abated	do	Neither.
21	1866	500		14 days	Nil	Entirely disappeared	do	For.
22	July, 1864	950	16 per cent.	5 months	Some	Preventive	do	do
23	June, 1866	220	12 "	3 "	Nil	do	do	Against.
24	April, 1868	1,000	75 "	1 month	Few	Ceased to die	do	For.
25	August, 1863	200	1½ "	1 week	¾ per cent.	Decided preventive	do	do
26	July, 1863	280	8 "	3 months	2 "	Ceased	do	Against.
27	July, 1864	1,200	Some		Some	No decided benefit	Neither ..	do
28	June, 1867	157	"	1 month	2½ per cent.	Preventive	For	do
29	June, 1866	2,000	20 per cent.	3 weeks	Nil	Perfect cure	do	Not necessary.

No. of Return.	Date of Inoculation.	Number of Cattle Inoculated.	Number Diseased in herd at date of Inoculation.	How long had Disease been in herd at date of Inoculation.	Number of Deaths from excessive Swellings.	Effect of Inoculation on Disease.	For or against Inoculation.	For or against Legislation.
30	July, 1864.....	4,000	25 per cent.	1 week.....	1 per cent. ..	Preventive	For.....	For.
31	May, 1864.....	1,500	5 "	3 months.....	Few	Left in one month	do	Not necessary.
32	October, 1865	1,800	Some		2 per cent. ..	Preventive	do	Neither.
33	March, 1866	1,300	Great many		10 "	do	do	For.
34	November, 1865 ..	3,500	50 per cent.	Some months ..		do	do	do
35								do
36	November, 1863 ..	600	15 per cent.	6 weeks	4 per cent. ..	Left in a few weeks	For.....	If practical.
37	1865-66	2,000	3½ "			Preventive	do	Against.
38	June, 1868	5,600	55 "	2 months.....	Nil	Left in nine or ten weeks	Neither ..	do
39	November, 1867 ..	2,370	15 "	12 "	1 per cent. ..	Ceased	For.....	For.
40		1,000	25 "	4 days	5 head	Cured the herd	do	do
41	1863	1,500	3 "	3 weeks	½ per cent. ..	Soon checked	do	do
42	1863	4,500	30 "	2 months.....	Nil	Gradually ceased	do	do
43		500	None	7 days	Few	Preventive	do	do
44	March, 1869	450	3 per cent.		2 per cent. ..	Certain preventive	do	Not necessary.
45	October, 1866	1,270	6 "	At once.....	1 "	Preventive	do	do
46	6 years ago	800	None		75 "	Stopped immediately	do	Against.
47	July, 1868	300	1½ per cent.	14 days	1 "	Preventive	do	For.
48	4 years ago	2,500	16 "	1 month	Sundry	do	do	Neither.
49	October, 1864	2,500	Some			do	do	For.
50	May to June.....	2,300	33 per cent.	3 months.....	4 head	At once stopped	do	do
51	May, 1864.....	250	½ "	2 "	4 per cent. ..	Preventive	do	do
52	August, 1864	330	3 "	1 month	Nil	Disappeared totally	do	do
53	August, 1864	660	5 "	3 months.....	1 per cent. ..	Disappeared	do	do
54	October, 1862	2,100	Many	3 "	2 "	Saved the herd	do	do
55	1868-69	1,426	None		½ "	Preventive	do	Neither.
56	1864	600	"		Nil	do	do	Against.
57	July, 1868	209	3 per cent.			Stopped.....	Neither ..	do
58	October, 1863	700	2 per cent.	2 months	2 head	Disappeared	For	For.
59	July 1868	2,800	5 "	3 "	Nil	do	do	do
60	March, 1868	1,600	10 "	6 "	1 per cent. ..	do	do	do
61		1,000	50 "	6 "	Some	Shortly disappeared	do	do
62		300	None		Nil	Perfect preventive	do	do
63	1865	600	10 per cent.	3 months	5 per cent. ..	Disappeared	do	do

No. of Return.	Date of Inoculation.	Number of Cattle Inoculated.	Number Diseased in herd at date of Inoculation.	How long had Disease been in herd at date of Inoculation.	Number of Deaths from excessive Swellings.	Effect of Inoculation on Disease.	For or against Inoculation.	For or against Legislation.
102	Spring, 1864.....	1,000	4 per cent.	4 months.....	2 per cent. ..	Immediately stopped	For.....	For.
103	August, 1864	60	20 "		1 head	Ceased immediately	do	do
104		450	5 "			Disappeared	do	do
105	November, 1862 ..	5,000	33 "	4 months.....	1 per cent. ..	Left in two months	do	do
106	July, 1862.....	500	None		7 "	No effect	Against ..	Against.
107	August, 1869	3,000	10 per cent.	1 month	3 "	Ceased	For.....	For.
108	August, 1865	1,000		6 months.....		Not stated.....	do	do
109	October, 1863	800	13 per cent.		Several	Preventive	do	Neither.
110	1865 to 1869	2,500	10 "	2 months.....	1 head	do	do	For.
111	1167-68	150	5 "	Some weeks	2 per cent. ..	Perfect cure	do	do
112	1866-67	1,900	25 "	3 months.....	2 head	Preventive	do	do
113	September, 1865 ..	500		6 "	3 head	Preventive	do	Neither.
114	December, 1868 ..	70	5 per cent.	2 months	5½ per cent. ..	Left in six weeks.....	do	do
115	January, 1865	437			Nil	Shortly left	do	Not necessary.
116	June, 1866	300	4 per cent.	1 week.....	Nil	Preventive	do	Against.
117	1864	45	25 "	4 weeks.....	2½ per cent. ..	Disappeared	do	Neither.
118	1866	3,000		12 months.....	Nil	Thorough preventive	do	For.
119	1864	800	None		Nil	Immediately left	do	do
120	1863-64	1,000		9 months.....		Very unsatisfactory	Against ..	Against.
121	1865	1,600	5 per cent.	3 "	Some	Shortly left	For.....	For.
122	1865	350	20 "	3 weeks	1 head	Preventive	do	Neither.
123	August, 1866	1,200	2 "		Nil	Unsatisfactory	Neither ..	Against.
124	April, 1866	5,000			Great many ..	Preventive	For.....	For.
125	September, 1864 ..	1,882	20 per cent.	2 months.....	6 per cent.	Disappeared	do	do
126	1864-65	5,500	50 "	5½ "	2 "	Preventive	do	do
127	1866	400	8 "	3½ "	7 "	do	do	do
128	December, 1864 ..	230	Nil		8 "	Very unsatisfactory	do	do
129	1865	260	10 per cent.		7 head	Left in three weeks	Against ..	Against.
130	1866-67-68	9,500	Few		1½ per cent. ..	Disappeared	For.....	For.
131		100				Stopped.....	do	do
132	March, 1863	500	7 per cent.	10 months.....	2 per cent. ..	Preventive	do	do
133	March, 1863	730	15 "	4 "	Nil	No opinion	do	do
134	March, 1865	300	15 "	6 weeks	Nil	Ceased to die	Neither ..	Neither.
135	March, 1863	150	66 "	6 "	2 head		For.....	For.

136	March, 1865	80				Nil	Stopped	For	For.
137	January, 1866	3,000	50 per cent.	3 months		5 per cent.	Ceased in three months	do	do
138	May, 1864	600	5	1 month		1	At once stopped	do	do
139							Preventive	do	Not necessary.
140	October, 1865	2,000	10 per cent.	4 weeks		10 per cent.	do	do	For.
141	March, 1865	940	14	6 days		1½	Cure and preventive	do	do
142	1863-64	800				5 head	Preventive	do	do
143	November, 1867	500	50 per cent.	3 months		Nil	No opinion	Neither	Neither.
144	1865	150	Nearly 100 per cent.	3		2 per cent.	Cure and preventive	For	do
145	August, 1867	1,871	3½ per cent.			2	do	do	For.
146	August, 1864	1,500				Few	Preventive	do	Neither.
147	May, 1863	350	5 per cent.	1 month		Nil	Failure	Against	Against.
148	October, 1865	700	5	1		5 per cent.	Preventive	For	For.
149	July, 1865	400	10 per cent.	12 months		2½ per cent.	Ameliorates	do	do
150	September, 1867	7,000	Same	2		1	Beneficial	do	do
151	April, 1865	500	6	5		Nil	Preventive	do	Against.
152	May, 1865	1,050		6½ weeks		2 or 3 head	Uncertain	do	do
153	May, 1865	500	3 per cent.	14 days		1 per cent.	do	Neither	do
154	1863	400	All through	6 months		2	Most effective	For	For.
155	June, 1864	1,500	Slightly			A few	Preventive	do	do
156	June, 1865	3,500	20 p.c. & 5 p.c.	6 or 8 weeks		2 per cent.	Satisfactory	do	do
157	January, 1864	520	5 per cent.	2 months		1	Stopped it	do	do
158	July, 1864	160	1	10		3	Cure	do	do
159	January, 1865	210	20	6 weeks		5	Banished it	do	do
160	1866	40	30	14 days		Nil	Preventive	do	do
161	December, 1867	470	50	2 years		2 per cent.	It left	do	Not necessary.
162	September, 1867	200	5 or 6 p.c.	18 months		3	Preventive	do	For.
163	1865 and 1867	6,000	Nil			Nil	do	do	do
164	April to Oct., 1866	1,200	3 per cent.	14 days		2 per cent.	Stopped it	do	do
165	1865	500	20			10	Preventive	do	do
166	1865	400	25 per cent.	1 month		10	do	do	do
167	1865	7	Sound				Stopped it	Neither	Against.
168	March, 1863	3,000	25 per cent.	3 months		10 per cent.	Most successful	For	For.
169	February, 1865	5,604	7½	6		A few	Disappeared	do	For.
170	September, 1867	420	10	6			Stopped it	do	do
171	1863-69	126		1 month			Left the herd	do	do
172	October, 1863	600	10 per cent.	12 months		10 per cent.	Preventive	do	do
173	February, 1863	800	10	3				do	do

No. of Return.	Date of Inoculation.	Number of Cattle Inoculated.	Number Diseased in herd at date of Inoculation.	How Long had Disease been in herd at date of Inoculation.	Number of Deaths from excessive Swellings.	Effect of Inoculation on Disease.	For or against Inoculation.	For or against Legislation.
174	November, 1865 ..	700	50 per cent.	Several months. .	10 per cent. ..	Left the herd	For	For
175	1861-62					Preventive	do	do
176	1867	4,000	5 per cent.	2 months.	5 per cent.	Stopped it.	do	Not necessary.
177	1863-64 and 1867..	2,000	5 "	2 "	2 "	Preventive	do	Neither.
178	July, 1864	2,500	20 "	6 weeks	3 "	Entirely left	do	For.
179		400	3 "	10 days	Very few	Soon stopped	do	Against.
180	1865 and 1868	5,574	3 "	About 1 month. .	2 per cent.	Ceased	do	do
181	October, 1865	2,000	4 "	6 weeks	2½ per cent.	Unsatisfactory	Against ..	do
182	September, 1863 ..	1,650	3 "	6 months.	Nil	Preventive	For	For.
183	1864	1,500	25 "	2 "	Few	do	do	Neither.
184	January, 1864	1,100	1 "	1 month	1 per cent.	Disappeared	do	do
185	1865	700	Nil		5 "		do	For.
186	January, 1865	1,260	20 per cent.		12 "	Unsatisfactory	Against ..	Against.
187	June, 1863	1,200	6 "	6 weeks	4 "	Ceased	For	Neither.
188	September, 1863 ..	810	3 "	2 months.	1 "	Left in two months	do	For.
189	June, 1864	3,000	50 "	4 "		Unsatisfactory	Neither ..	Against.
190	1867	7,000	Various	6 weeks	1 or 2 p. c.	Preventive	For	do
191	November, 1864 ..	800	10 per cent.	Several days....	5 per cent.	Unsatisfactory	Neither ..	Neither.
192							do	For.
193	May, 1867	600	2 per cent.		3 per cent.	Preventive	For	do
194	February, 1868 ..	930	5 "	3 weeks	3 "	Checked at once	do	do
195	October, 1867	250	2 or 3 per cent. .	Immediately ..	10 "	Preventive	do	do
196	September, 1864 ..	300	33 per cent.	3 months.	15 "	Beneficial	do	do
197	1863-4	1,700	All	2 "	Very few	Preventive	do	do
198	July, 1865	1,700	20 per cent.	3 "	5 per cent.	Stopped it.	do	do
199	September, 1868 ..	130	Sound	2 "	4 head	Preventive	do	do
200	1864	80	3 per cent.	Immediately ..		Unsatisfactory	Neither ..	Neither.
201	June, 1863	1,750		6 months.	5 per cent.	Beneficial	For	For.
202	June, 1864	400	5 per cent.	3 weeks	Nil	Preventive	do	do
203	June & July, 1865 .	1,100	1 "	2 "	4 per cent.	Very successful	do	do
204	1863	4,872	12 "	1 month		Doubtful	Neither ..	Against.
205	1866 and 1868	1,660	25 "		Nil	Satisfactory	For	Neither.
206	1865	1,682	2 "	4 months.		Disappeared	do	For.
207	June, 1863	2,000	All the herd	2 "	Several	Highly satisfactory	do	Neither.

208	1866 and 1868	280	5 per cent.	5 and 2 months	Nil	Beneficial	For	Neither.
209		200			Large	Preventive	do	For.
210	January, 1865	84	All healthy	3 months	5 per cent.	Ameliorates	do	Against.
211							do	For.
212	1863	200	10 per cent.	3 months	2½ per cent.	Cure	do	do
213	May, 1869	34	2 head	Some weeks	Nil	Apparently preventive	do	Against.
214	July, 1864	1,500	3½ per cent.	8 days	1½ per cent.	Disappeared	do	Not necessary.
215	September, 1862	30	Nil		1 head	Preventive	do	For.
216	1863	1,163	5 per cent.	Immediately		do	do	do
217	June, 1865	1,000	5 "	1 month	2 per cent.	do	do	Neither.
218						do	do	For.
219	1864	1,600	2 per cent.	4½ weeks	Very few	Uncertain	do	do
220	December, 1863	900	40 "	2 months	2 or 3 head		do	Against.
221	October, 1864	5,600	Very great	18 "	Nil	Thorough cure	For	For.
222	August, 1863	550	Dying	6 weeks	"	Perfect cure	do	do
223	July, 1867	1,300	10 per cent.	2 months	2 per cent.	Satisfactory	do	do
224						Only remedy	do	do
225	November, 1863	1,000	10 per cent.	3 months	A few head	A good effect	do	do
226	1862 and 1865		3 "	14 days	Nil	Mitigated	do	Against.
227	October, 1866	2,000	10 "	6 months	4 per cent.	Completely arrested	do	do
228					Some	Not satisfactory	Neither	do
229	1866	250	10 per cent.	2 months	12 per cent.	Disappeared	For	For.
230	November, 1868	220	2 "	7 days	1½ "	Entirely stopped	do	do
231	January, 1865	800	5 "	6 months	1 "	Disappeared	do	do
232							do	Neither.
233	1861-62-63	3,700	25 head	2 months	2 per cent.	Disappeared	do	For.
234	18 7-68	1,800	10 per cent.	1 month	Nil	do	do	do
235	July, 1864	1,000	10 "	1 "	Some	Uncertain	Neither	Not necessary.
236	September, 1863	800	12 "	1 "	3 per cent.	Stopped	For	For.
237	June	386	5 "		1 head	Preventive	do	do
238	May, 1869	600	1 "	5 months	Nil	Satisfactory	do	do
239	1865-66	1,726	Large per cent.	2 "	"	Checked it	do	do
240	October, 1862	250	40 per cent.	12 "	4 per cent.	Stopped it	do	do
241	March, 1866	200	11 "	6 "	2 "	Preventive	do	do
242	1864	170	"	1 month	2 "	Very satisfactory	do	do
243	June, 1865	30	None	Never	50 "	Unsatisfactory	Neither	Neither.
244		350	2 per cent.	14 days	Nil	Satisfactory	For	For.
245	1866	1,000	66 "	2 months	Under 3 p. c.	Stopped it	do	do

No. of Return.	Date of Inoculation.	Number of Cattle Inoculated.	Number Diseased in herd at date of Inoculation.	How long had Disease been in herd at date of Inoculation.	Number of Deaths from excessive Swellings.	Effect of Inoculation on Disease.	For or against Inoculation.	For or against Legislation.
246	1864	300	70 per cent.	2 months.	5 per cent.	Stopped it.	For.	For.
247	1861	50	10 "	10 "	Nil	Very satisfactory	do	do
248	September, 1864	1,000	33 "	1 month	5 per cent.	Preventive	do	Neither.
249	1863	200	33 "	2 months.	10 "	Preventive	do	For.
250	September, 1863	35	Nil	Never	Nil	Great service	do	do
251	1863-66	2,850	25 per cent.	2 months.	26 per cent.	Stopped it.	do	Against.
252	1864-65	114	15 "	5 "	Nil	Preventive	do	For.
253	1865	150	4 "	14 days	33 per cent.	Unsatisfactory	Neither	Against.
254	1864	600	Numbers	2 months	Nil	Stopped it.	For	Against.
255	1862	1,000	25 per cent.	"	"	Favourable	do	Neither.
256	October, 1863	700	10 "	12 months.	3 per cent.	Preventive	do	For.
257	November, 1865	400	20 "	6 "	5 "	Ameliorated	do	do
258	1867-68	1,800	2 "	3 weeks	Nil	Stopped it.	do	Against.
259	November, 1865	350	3 "	10 days	2 per cent.	Preventive	do	For.
260	April, '867	600	10 "	4 weeks	Nil	It disappeared	do	do
261	October, 1865	1,200	15 "	6 months.	"	"	Neither	Not necessary.
262	January, 1868	350	Nil	3 years	3 per cent.	Unsatisfactory	Against	Neither.
263	1861	2,500	Small per cent.	3 months.	Large per cent.	Stopped it.	do	Against.
264	July, 1865	3,000	10 per cent.	3 weeks	3 per cent.	Stopped it.	Neither	Neither.
265	1865	1,200	"	4 months	1 per cent.	It disappeared	For	For.
266	August, 1865	4,500	10 per cent.	2 "	"	Unsatisfactory	do	Against.
267	1863	504	5 "	3 years.	7 "	Ceased to die	For	For.
268	1867	"	Dying fast	"	Nil	Preventive	do	do
269	1864	25	None	Nil	"	Unsatisfactory	Against	Against.
270	February, 1864	2,017	All, more or less	2 months.	4 per cent.	Unsatisfactory	For	Against.
271	May, 1867	380	5 per cent.	2 weeks	1 "	Satisfactory	do	do
272	1863-64	2,000	Great many	"	4 "	"	Neither	For.
273	1864	1,000	25 per cent.	6 months.	2 "	Preventive	For	do
274	August, 1864	250	3 "	6 weeks	3 "	Satisfactory	do	do
275	May, 1869	2,000	5 "	3 "	5 head	Preventive	do	do
276	"	120	6 "	"	Nil	Very good	do	do
277	1865	390	"	"	"	"	do	Neither.
278	1867	150	"	"	"	"	do	do
279	1867	429	60	9 weeks	2 head	Satisfactory	do	do

APPENDIX E.

TABULATED LIST of Answers by Owners of Uninoculated Cattle.

No. of Return.	Date of Infection.	No. of Cattle.	How long Disease existed in herd.	Percentage of Cattle affected.	When Disease finally left.	No. of Deaths.	For or against Inoculation.	For or against Legislation.
1		4,000	Never	1 per cent.....		2½ per cent.	For	For.
2	January, 1868	3,000	6 months.....		July, 1868.....	400 head	For	For.
3							Neither	Neither.
4							Against.....	Against.
5							Neither	Neither.
6		120					do	do
7		300	6 months.....	10 per cent.....		300 head	do	do
8	1864	7,000	5 years.....		Still in	2,500 head.....	Against.....	Against.
9	1866	600	Over 12 months		1867	150 head	Neither	Not necessary.
10		200	Never.....	Nil.....	Never	Nil	For	For.
11			Short time.....	30 per cent.....		10 per cent.....	do	do
12	April, 1865	500	2 years.....	75 "	1867	100 head	Neither	Against.
13		2,000	Never.....				do	Neither.
14							For	do
15	November, 1865	1,600	3 years.....	70 "	July, 1869.....	600 head	For	Against.
16	October 6, 1863	500	15 days	5 head	November, 1863	5 head burned	Against.....	Against.
17	March, 1865	250	1 year		1866		do	do
18	1866			25 per cent.....		25 per cent.....	For	Neither.
19	1863	500	6 years.....		Still in		Against.....	Against.
20		1,500	12 months.....	50 per cent.....	1867	35 per cent.....	For	For.
21		827					do	do
22	July, 1865.....	4,000	Can't say	Small	Can't say	Can't say	do	Against.
23		355	More or less	2 per cent.....	Still		do	For.
24	May, 1867.....	600	3 months	2½ "	August, 1867	27½ per cent.....	Neither	Against.
25							do	Neither.
26	1864	800	12 months	7 per cent.....		50 head	do	Against.
27							For	For.
28		400					do	do
29	1865	7,000	4 years.....		Still	33 per cent.....	Against.....	Against.
30	1864	1,500	5 "		"	20 "	For	For.
31	July, 1862.....	2,100	5 months.....	Nearly all	5 months	10 "	do	do
32	1866	200					do	Not necessary.
		2,500	2 years	2½ per cent.....	1868	1 per cent.....	Against.....	Against.

No of Return.	Date of Infection.	No of Cattle.	How long Disease existed in herd.	Percentage of Cattle affected.	When Disease finally left.	No. of Deaths.	For or against Inoculation.	For or against Legislation.
33	1862	100	Never.....	Nil.....	Never.....	Nil.....	For.....	Neither.
34		500	5 or 6 months.....	3 per cent.....	1863	150	do	For.
35	May, 1866.....	750	1 1/2	85 "	February, 1867.....	63 per cent.....	do	do
36		400		Nil.....	Never.....	Nil.....	Against.....	Against.
37	March, 1868.....	120	30 days	10 per cent.....	April	27 head	For.....	For.
38	September, 1865	4,000	4 years.....	"	Still there	65 "	do	do
39	February, 1867.....	1,100	6 months		August		do	do
40	1865	600	3 years.....	50 per cent.....	1865		Against.....	Against.
41	December, 1864	5,000	12 months.....	All	June, 1865.....	15 per cent	do	do
42	March, 1864	3,000	14 "	"	"	400 head	do	do
43		13,000	12 "	62 per cent.....			For.....	Against.
44	February, 1866.....	3,500	3 years.....	99 "	Not left	25 per cent.....	Against.....	do
45		1,250	Never.....	Nil.....	Never.....	Nil	Neither	Neither.
46			Never.....			"	do	do
47	1866		3 years.....	60 per cent.....	Still in	3 head	do	Against.
48	October, 1864	300	2 "	All	December, 1866	17 per cent.....	For.....	do
49		3,000					Neither	Not necessary.
50	1865		4 years.....	50 per cent.....	Still in	30 per cent.....	do	Against.
51		500					do	do
52	1866	3,000	2 years.....	All	1868	15 per cent.....	Against.....	Against.
53	July, 1864.....	800	4 1/2 "	50 per cent.....	Lately	33 "	Neither	Not necessary.
54	November, 1864	2,000	5 "	All	Still in	2,000 head.....	do	Against.
55		3,000	Never.....	Nil.....	Never.....	Nil	Against.....	do
56	1867	400					Neither	Neither.
57		1,200	5 years.....		Still in		Neither	Against.
58	January, 1864	1,000	6 months.....	10 per cent.....	June, 1864	9 per cent.....	do	Neither.
59	September 16, 1863	2,000	Over 12 months	25 "	1864	500 head	For.....	For.
60	1865	9,000	Over 2 years.....	Over 50 per cent.....			Neither	Against.
61		420					For.....	For.
62	1862	14,000	3 years.....		1865		Neither	Against.
63							For.....	For.
64	1864	1,600	5 years.....		Still in	200 head	do	do
65	July, 1864.....	3,000	6 weeks	5 per cent.....	August, 1864	2 per cent.....	Neither	Against.
66							For.....	For.
67	1864	60				Nil	do	do
68	December, 1863	1,100	3 months.....	32 head		30 head	Neither	Against.
69	1863	150		45 per cent.....	3 months	17 "	For.....	do.

70	600								For	Neither.
71	12,000			70 per cent.				7,000 head.	do	For.
72	1,000			3				100 head	Neither	Against.
73	500			"					For	Not necessary.
74									Neither	Neither.
75	80								For	For.
76	1,000			Nearly all			February, 1868	250 head	Against	Against.
77	2,000			30 head			August, 1868	300 "	do	do.
78	600			20 per cent.				100 "	For	For.
79							November, 1865	90 head	Neither	Against.
80	580			4 per cent.			Never	Nil	For	Neither.
81	230			Nil					Neither	do.
82									For	Against.
83									do	For.
84									Neither	Neither.
85	600			All			13 months	200 head	do	do.
86	10,000			All			12 months	10 per cent.	Against	Against.
87	120							40 head	For	For.
88				Nil			Never	Nil	do	do.
89	220			15 per cent.				7½ per cent.	Against	Against.
90	1,500			20			May, 1868	About 300	For	Not necessary.
91	2,500			All				10 per cent.	Against	Against.
92	200			All			1864		For	Neither.
93									Neither	do.
94	300			5 per cent.			Still in		For	For.
95	2,000			25			1867	400 head	do	do.
96	1,800			"			1868	800 "	Neither	Neither.
97	600							Nil	do	Against.
98	700			Nil			Never		For	For.
99								Nil	Neither	Against.
100	600			Nil			Never		For	For.
101	400								do	do.
102	7,000			35 per cent.				2,000 head	do	do.
103	3,000			20			December, 1865	300 head	Against	Against.
104	100			Nil			Never	Nil	Neither	do.
105								5 head	do	do.
106	300			10 per cent.			6 months	15 "	For	For.
107	250							10 "	do	do.
108	300			4 per cent.			1866	12 "	do	do.
109	650			All					do	do.

No. of Return.	Date of Infection.	No. of Cattle.	How long Disease existed in herd.	Percentage of Cattle affected.	When Disease finally left.	No. of Deaths.	For or against Inoculation.	For or against Legislation.
110	1861	7,500	12 months.....	33 per cent.	Spring, 1865.....	900 head	Against.....	Against.
111							Neither.....	Neither.
112	December.....		3½ months.....	4 per cent.	1st April.....	12 head	For.....	For.
113		460	Never.....	Nil		Nil	do.....	do.
114	1864	200	6 months.....	10 per cent.	April, 1864.....		do.....	Against.
115	March, 1864.....	6,000	4 years.....	50 "			Against.....	do.
116			Never.....				Neither.....	do.
117		700		90 per cent.	May, 1866.....	1,500 head.	do.....	do.
118	1863	1,000	2 years.....	37½ "	1865.....	400 head	Against.....	do.
119		1,000	Never.....	Nil		Nil	Neither.....	Neither.
120	1864	1,500	8 months.....	All	1865.....	33 per cent.	do.....	Against.
121	September, 1866.....	450	9 months.....	40 per cent.	May, 1867.....	25 head	do.....	do.
122		2,000	4 years.....	100 head	Still there.....	100	do.....	Not necessary.
123	1864	300	Never.....	All			For.....	For.
124	May, 1863.....	1,500	3 months.....		August, 1863.....	550	Neither.....	Against.
125	August, 1864.....	6,000	18 months.....		1866.....	15 per cent.	do.....	do.
126				All			Against.....	do.
127	1864	1,100	3 years.....			640 head	Neither.....	Neither.
128	September, 1864.....	2,500	6 months.....	¾ per cent.	March, 1865.....	500 head	Against.....	Against.
129	1865	1,000	2 years.....	40 "	End of 1866.....	300	do.....	do.
130	April, 1864.....	130	9 months.....	55 "	December, 1864.....	30 head	For.....	For.
131	1865	130	2 years.....	50 head	1868.....	200 head	do.....	do.
132	June, 1866.....	150	1 month.....	50 per cent.	July, 1866.....	4	do.....	do.
133	July, 1864.....	450	15 months.....	1 "	December, 1864.....	Very few	do.....	do.
134							do.....	do.
135		5,000	2 years.....		Still there.....		Neither.....	Against.
136	June, 1864.....	3,500	5 years.....	All	do.....	5 per cent.	Against.....	do.
137	1865	800	3 months.....	¾ per cent.	4 months.....	Very small	do.....	do.
138	March, 1865.....	250	15 months.....	50 "	1866.....	115 head	do.....	do.
139							do.....	Neither.
140	1867 and 1868.....	300	Over 2 years.....	5 per cent.	1868.....		For.....	For.
141		250					do.....	do.
142	1866—1867.....	500	7 months.....	5 per cent.	March, 1868.....	5 per cent.	do.....	do.
143		150	2 years.....	5 "	Last January.....	4	Neither.....	Against.
144	February, 1864.....	3,000	8½ months.....	¾ "		15	Against.....	do.
145	August, 1863.....	250	6 years.....	20 head	Still there.....	6	do.....	do.
146		200				15	For.....	For.

147	1863		4,000	6 years.....	Nearly all.....	Still there.....	600		Against.....	Against.....
148	1865		800	18 months.....	20 per cent.	1866	9 per cent.		For.....	For.....
149	1864		2,000	5 years.....		Still there.....	40		do.....	do.....
150	January, 1864			12 months.....	Nearly all.....	January, 1865	150 head		Against.....	Against.....
151	July, 1863		1,500	8 months		March, 1864	74 per cent.		For.....	For.....
152				Never.....					Neither.....	Neither.....
153	May, 1868		1,500	Infected cattle at once destroyed.	5 head	Eradicated				
154	1863		2,500	6 months	All	1864	18 per cent.		Against.....	Against.....
155	November, 1864		1,000	6 months	4	May, 1865	20		Not necessary.	Not necessary.
156	1864		4,000						For.....	For.....
157	March, 1863		400	3 months	10 per cent.	Shortly	42 per cent.		do.....	do.....
158			3,000						Against.....	Against.....
159				6 months	3 per cent.				For.....	For.....
160	1864 to 1869		80	5 years.....	50 head	May, 1869	50 per cent.		do.....	do.....
161	July, 1864		2,000	3 weeks	3½ per cent.				Not necessary.	Not necessary.
162			70						do.....	do.....
163	1866		150	18 months.....	9 per cent.	1868	4½ per cent.		Neither.....	Neither.....
164									For.....	For.....
165			200						Neither.....	Neither.....
166			150	12 months.....	5 per cent.	12 months.....	14 per cent.		For.....	For.....
167	July, 1864		1,060	6 months	10	February, 1865	30		do.....	do.....
168									Neither.....	Neither.....
169				For years	50 per cent.	1868	33 per cent.		do.....	do.....
170			300	2 years.....	25 per cent.	1867	20 head		Against.....	Against.....
171	1865		100	18 months.....	50	1869	20 head		For.....	For.....
172	1865		200			End of 1865			Neither.....	Neither.....
173			5,000						do.....	do.....
174	Never		Nil.....	Never.....	Nil.....				For.....	For.....
175									do.....	do.....
176	December, 1865		300	4 months	75 per cent.	April, 1866			Against.....	Against.....
177	1865		200	7 months		May, 1866			For.....	For.....
178	1865		2,000	4 years.....	50 per cent.	June, 1864	700 head		Against.....	Against.....
179	1865		7,000	9 months	40	End 1865	1,500 head		do.....	do.....
180			3,000	5 years.....	2	Still there	Nil		For.....	For.....
181	1861		300	15 months	9	1862	30 per cent.		do.....	do.....
182	1865			12 months.....	30	1866	150 head		do.....	do.....
183	1864		400	3 months	33		50 head		do.....	do.....
184			80						Neither.....	Not necessary.
185									do.....	do.....
186			50						Against.....	Against.....

No. of Return.	Date of Infection.	No. of Cattle.	How long Disease existed in herd.	Percentage of Cattle affected.	When Disease finally left.	No. of Deaths.	For or against Inoculation.	For or against Legislation.
187							Neither	Neither.
188	1866	600	18 months	20 per cent.	1867	5 per cent.	Against	Against.
189	1867	2,000	12 months	10 "	1868	3 "	For	For.
190			Never	Nil		Nil	Neither	Not necessary.
191		160	"	Nil		"	For	For.
192	1864	1,500	14 weeks	80 per cent.	1864	30 per cent.	do	Against.
193							do	do
194	Never.	190					Neither	Neither.
195	December, 1866	10,000	12 months		End 1867	15 per cent.	do	Against.
196	1864 and 1865	150	10 "	15 per cent.	1865	20 head	For	For.
197							Against	Against.
198		620					do	do
199		250		1 per cent.		2 head	Neither	do
200		750					Against	do
201	1866	3,500	12 months	8 per cent.	1867	220 head	Neither	Neither.
202	July, 1865	700	3 "		October, 1865		Neither	Neither.
203	1865	4,000	12 "	50 per cent.	1866	10 per cent.	Against	Against.
204	October, 1867	3,000	6 "	15 "	1868	10 "	For	For.
205		2,000	Not long	$\frac{1}{2}$ "		10 to 20	Against	Against.
206							Neither	do.
207	1866	10,000	3 years.		Not yet		Against	do.
208	1865	2,000	18 months	30 per cent.		40 head	For	For.
209							do	do.
210							do	do.
211	1864	3,000	3 months	Nearly 100 $\frac{3}{4}$ cent.		1,750 head	Neither	Neither.
212	August, 1865	3,000	2 "	30 per cent.	1865	Nearly 33 $\frac{1}{3}$ cent.	For	For.
213		500					Neither	Against.
214	April, 1864	1,600	3 years.	30 per cent.	July, 1867	7 per cent.	For	do.
215					February, 1868	5 per cent.	do	do.
216	January, 1868	1,200	1 month	20 per cent.			do	For.
217							do	do.
218		2,500					Against	Against.
219								
220		600	Never	Nil		Nil	Against	do.
221	February, 1864	2,500	12 months	Cent. per cent.	February, 1865	7 per cent.	do	do.
222		100	Never	Nil			For	For.

APPENDIX F.

RESULT of inquiry as to Inoculation.

Inoculated herds (Appendix D) :—

Neither for nor against inoculation	..	..	..	..	..	25
In favour of inoculation	..	..	..	..	..	237
Against inoculation	..	..	..	..	..	17
						<hr style="width: 50px; margin-left: 0;"/> 279

Or, about 14 for inoculation to 1 against it.

Uninoculated herds (Appendix E) :—

Neither for nor against inoculation	..	..	..	..	..	75
In favour of inoculation	..	..	..	..	..	102
Against inoculation	..	..	..	..	..	45
						<hr style="width: 50px; margin-left: 0;"/> 222
						<hr style="width: 50px; margin-left: 0;"/> 501

Or, about 7 for inoculation to 3 against it.

Inoculated and uninoculated herds together :—

Neither for nor against inoculation (Appendix D)	..	..	25
„ „ „ (Appendix E)	..	..	75
			<hr style="width: 50px; margin-left: 0;"/> 100
In favour of inoculation (Appendix D)	..	..	237
„ „ (Appendix E)	..	..	102
			<hr style="width: 50px; margin-left: 0;"/> 339
Against inoculation (Appendix D)	..	..	17
„ „ (Appendix E)	..	..	45
			<hr style="width: 50px; margin-left: 0;"/> 62
			<hr style="width: 50px; margin-left: 0;"/> 501

Or on the whole returns about $5\frac{1}{2}$ for, to 1 against, inoculation.

APPENDIX G.

RESULT of inquiry as to Legislation.

Inoculated herds (Appendix D):—

Neither for nor against Legislation	40	
Add "Not necessary" returns, neither for nor against ..	6	
	<hr/>	46
In favour of Legislation	163	
Add "Not necessary" returns, for Legislation	9	
	<hr/>	172
Against Legislation	58	
Add "Not necessary" returns, against Legislation	3	
	<hr/>	61
		<hr/> 279

Or, nearly 3 for Legislation to 1 against it.

Uninoculated herds (Appendix E):—

Neither for nor against Legislation	34	
Add "Not necessary," neither for nor against Legislation ..	5	
	<hr/>	39
In favour of Legislation	79	
Add "Not necessary," in favour of Legislation	3	
	<hr/>	82
Against Legislation	97	
Add "Not necessary," against Legislation	4	
	<hr/>	101
		<hr/> 222
		<hr/> 501

Or, about 4 for Legislation to 5 against it.

Inoculated and uninoculated herds together:—

Neither for nor against Legislation (Appendix D)	46	
" " " (Appendix E)	39	
	<hr/>	85
In favour of Legislation (Appendix D)	172	
" " (Appendix E)	82	
	<hr/>	254
Against Legislation (Appendix D)	61	
" " (Appendix E)	101	
	<hr/>	162
		<hr/> 501

Or, on the whole returns, more than 6 for, to 4 against, Legislation.

APPENDIX H.

Abstract of the Questions as to the Nature and Origin of Pleuro-pneumonia, and the Legislation necessary for staying its ravages in Great Britain and Ireland, put by the Directors of the Scottish Chamber of Agriculture, in September, 1868, to

JAMES B. SIMONDS, Royal Veterinary College, London ;
 PROFESSOR WILLIAMS, Principal of the Veterinary College, Edinburgh ;
 PROFESSOR MCCALL, Principal of the Veterinary College, Glasgow ;
 PROFESSOR HUGH FERGUSON, H.M.V.S., Veterinary Department, Ireland ;
 JOHN EDWARDS, Esq., Abergele, North Wales ; and
 FINLAY DUNN, Esq. ;

with an Epitome of their Answers to those Questions.

1. Did or does pleuro-pneumonia originate in Great Britain or Ireland?
 All reply in the negative.
2. In what countries did or does it originate ?
Simonds.—No particular country. It is said to have come from Eastern Europe.
Williams.—In the mountainous countries of Central Europe.
M^cCall.—In the Alps of Central Europe.
Edwards.—Unable to say.
Ferguson.—In Europe.
Dunn.—In the southern and south-eastern portions of Russia, and the mountainous parts of Central Europe.
3. How did or does it originate ?
Simonds.—Does not say.
Williams.—An enzootic.
M^cCall.—An epizootic.
Edwards.—Unable to say.
Ferguson.—Do.
Dunn.—Does not say.
4. Is the disease contagious, or how does it continue to exist ?
Simonds.—Infectious.
Williams.—Decidedly contagious.
M^cCall.—Do.
Edwards.—Very contagious.
Ferguson.—Decidedly infectious and contagious.
Dunn.—Distinctly contagious.
5. Is the disease as virulent now as on its first appearance ?
Simonds.—Quite as virulent.
Williams.—Not so virulent when proper measures are taken.
M^cCall.—As virulent.
Edwards.—Not nearly so virulent.
Ferguson.—Far less virulent.
Dunn.—As virulent.

6. Is it now viewed as a native disease?

Simonds.—It should be dealt with as such.

Williams.—I do not think so.

M'Call.—Decidedly not.

Edwards.—Should be treated as such.

Fergusson.—I think so.

Dunn.—I think not.

7. Would bad treatment generate the disease?

Simonds.—No, it only makes the animal more susceptible.

Williams.—Do. do.

M'Call.—Do. do.

Edwards.—Never.

Fergusson.—Does not say whether or not.

Dunn.—Does not say.

8. Is pleuro-pneumonia likely to be taken for other respiratory diseases?

Simonds.—Not by veterinary surgeons.

Williams.—Great similarity of external symptoms.

M'Call.—Do.

Edwards.—Yes, at first.

Fergusson.—Yes, even by veterinary surgeons.

Dunn.—Yes.

9. How should owner act when one head is found infected, and how when one-fourth of the herd is so?

Simonds.—Remove source of mischief as quickly as possible.

Williams.—Slaughter at once all fat and half fat, and isolate and disinfect the lean.

M'Call.—Kill infected animal at once, isolate and disinfect the others, and should disease spread slaughter all fat or in fair condition, and isolate and disinfect the lean.

Edwards.—Recommends the same steps as Mr. M'Call.

Fergusson.—Depends on circumstances, but the most profitable course is to slaughter the cattle.

Dunn.—Would kill the one, but not more; would separate the others.

10. Would you recommend stamping out pleuro-pneumonia like rinderpest?

Simonds.—Stamping out pleuro-pneumonia does not offer the same chance.

Williams.—Would not recommend it.

M'Call.—Would, under conditions to be stated.

Edwards.—Not prepared to recommend it.

Fergusson.—Stamping out not desirable.

Dunn.—Recommends measures less severe and sweeping.

11. Would isolation (quarantine), disinfection, and regulation of traffic, be better than stamping out?

Simonds.—Quarantine and slaughter of infected stock would check, if not exterminate disease.

Williams.—It would be efficient.

M'Call.—Yes; but not sufficiently promptly if carried out at the owner's expense.

Edwards.—Would materially tend to suppress disease, but part of the expenses should be borne by Government.

Fergusson.—If it would not eradicate it would render its appearance rare.

12. Would destruction of those actually affected, and quarantine of the rest, eradicate disease?

Simonds.—It is doubtful if the country can be completely freed from pleuro-pneumonia.

Williams.—Yes, if foreign cattle were not admitted.

M'Call.—Yes, so far as Great Britain is concerned.

Edwards.—Would materially tend to suppress disease.

Fergusson.—No, unless eradicated in Ireland.

Dunn.—Yes, in twelve months.

13. How long should quarantine last?

Simonds.—Not less than one month; two would be better.

Williams.—From three to eight months.

M'Call.—Three months.

Edwards.—Six weeks or two months, and longer, where cattle have been diseased.

Dunn.—Eight weeks.

14. What would you recommend, looking at the question in a national point of view?

Simonds.—Notice of the outbreak to the Inspector, and he should report to local authority, when quarantine, branding, isolation, slaughter of diseased animals, and disinfection of others, should be enforced. Quarantine to extend to six weeks after last symptom of disease.

Williams.—The appointment of Inspectors to carry out what is applicable to each outbreak; the slaughtering of foreign cattle at port of debarkation; and inspection of stock at fairs and markets.

McCall.—The appointment of local authorities and inspectors; the owner of infected or suspected animals to report to District Inspector under penalty; and, if not forfeited, compensation at the rate of two-thirds of value of stock to be paid. These with quarantine of stock and disinfection sufficient.

Edwards.—

1. Careful inspection of imported stock and slaughter of infected.
2. Inspection of fairs and cattle markets.
3. Official supervision of infected stock.
4. Every inducement held out to farmers and dealers to give information of disease.
5. Expense to be borne wholly or in part by the country.

Fergusson.—Slaughter of affected and rigid isolation of other stock.

Dunn.—

1. Local boards to be formed.
2. Notice of outbreak to be given to local board within twenty-four hours, under penalty.
3. Slaughter and segregation and effective disinfection.
4. Premises, farm, locality, or district, to be declared infected.
5. Quarantine of premises, &c., for eight weeks.
6. Cattle carefully examined daily.
7. Proper arrangements for thorough inspection at licensed ports of importation.
8. Fines for infected animals not reported, and for travelling infected stock.
9. Two-thirds of actual value of stock slaughtered to be paid.

EF964
N4

12800

UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY