The autopsy report which was enclosed is as follows:

Los Angeles County Health Department
To: Dr. J. L. Pomeroy.
From: George H. Roth, M. D.
Date: September 21, 1932.
Subject: Alfred E. Yoder—Case of Rabies.

July 25, 1932—11:45 A. M., Mr. Yoder bitten in Glendale City. 12 M., wound treated and dressed by Doctor Kaufman. 12 M., one dose Pasteur treatment.

July 26—Yoder called at Glendale Health Center. One Pasteur treatment by Dr. Kaufman. Medical Social Service arranged for Pasteur vaccine from General Hospital and referred patient to Burbank health officer.

July 27—One Pasteur treatment by Doctor Ransome, Burbank.

July 28—Two Pasteur treatments by Doctor Ransome, Burbank.

July 29—Two Pasteur treatments by Doctor Ransome, Burbank.

July 30—Two Pasteur treatments by Doctor Ransome, Burbank.

July 31—Two Pasteur treatments by Doctor Ransome, Burbank.

August 1—Two Pasteur treatments by Doctor Ransome, Burbank.

August 2—One Pasteur treatment by Doctor Ransome, Burbank.

August 3—One Pasteur treatment by Doctor Ransome, Burbank.

August 4—One Pasteur treatment by Doctor Ransome, Burbank.

Total—Sixteen doses in eleven days, following bite.

Patient discontinued treatments. Five treatments due but not taken.

August 19—Onset of illness: difficulty in swallowing; vomiting.

August 21—Dr. C. T. Hallburg called.

August 22—Dr. C. H. Carpenter called. Difficulty in swallowing. Blood pressure 150/56; "Consolidation noted in lungs."

August 23—Patient died in convulsions at 10:17 A. M.

August 23 and 24—Autopsy by Dr. A. F. Wagner, Los Angeles County autopsy surgeon. Finding: Patient died as result of having been bitten by a "mad dog" and that pneumonia and other conditions found were secondary to the prime cause of death, which was rabies.

September 14—Coroner's inquest—Jury returns verdict: "Cause of death—rabies; secondary, pneumonia and other conditions."

(Signed) GEORGE H. ROTH, M. D.,
Director, Bureau of Communicable Disease Control.

October 15, 1932.

Dear Doctor Pomeroy:

Thank you for your letter of October 7 directed to me in care of the Los Angeles *Times*. I appreciate the irritation which my published statements must give you, and so I don't mind in the least the scolding you take occasion to give me.

But I want to say, just between ourselves, that I think the abstract of the case of alleged rabies that went to autopsy is one of the least convincing I have received—and I have received many reports of cases of alleged rabies in man. In fact the abstract gives no clue to the cause of death and makes no allusion to any evidence of rabies the autopsy may have revealed.

Even if this was a genuine and unquestionable case of rabies in man, under the circumstances may I not ask, just between ourselves and not for the public, whether any harm is done by my vehement assertions that rabies can't or does not happen in man? I mean, suppose I had been the physician in that particular case. I would have advised the Pasteur treatment, and I do invariably advise it, in spite of my own doubt that rabies occurs in man. What, then, is your objection to my teaching?

Again, what difference did it make in the outcome of the illness that the man received sixteen doses of virus in the eleven days following the bite? And I might fairly ask what difference does it ever make in any case to give fourteen or twenty-eight doses of Pasteur virus. It seems to me that the scientific evidence rather indicates that the treatment itself is a cause of death or a contributing cause in too many such cases.

Certainly I do not wish to add any difficulty to the work of any health authority. No one can quote me as encouraging or creating any such obstacle to the work of the health officer. I think perhaps your annoyance is partly due to my attitude toward some of the absurdities of health departments.

Yours sincerely,
(Signed) WILLIAM BRADY.

October 28, 1932.

William Brady, M. D.,
265 El Camino,
Beverly Hills, California.

Dear Doctor Brady:

In reference to rabies you ask the question as to what harm your public statement that rabies does not occur in man might have on the public. May I state I have had some twenty years' experience in public health work and know whereof I speak when I say that statements of this kind from an M. D. are used by antivivisectionists and organizations of this kind before local governing bodies to show that medical opinion is divided on the question to prevent the passage of ordinances regulating rabies in dogs.

There were 2670 persons bitten by dogs in Los Angeles County territory last year, 418 of whom were given Pasteur treatment. We have had several areas of the county in quarantine from time to time because of rabies in animals, and the total cost of this work, together with impounding, runs close to $30,000 annually. We have had six deaths from rabies during the past few years, but we have as yet been unable, because of objection from the antis, to even secure an adequate licensing ordinance to offset the cost of supervision and to get rid of stray dogs.

You state: "No one can quote me as encouraging or creating any such obstacle to the work of the health officer." I do not see how you can prevent any person from quoting your remarks that rabies does not exist among mankind, and I assure you that in all probability will be used against the Health Department.

I consider you have a wonderful opportunity to assist in the most difficult task of education of the public in the scientific facts relating to the prolongation of life and the hygiene of living. I do not know, of course, if you have ever had any administrative experience in public health, but I sincerely believe that your statements concerning rabies are against the best interests of public health and place you in this respect along with the antivivisectionists and other enemies of public health progress.

This is my sincere and honest opinion as a health officer with the hope that you possibly may realize the effects of your statement, which you are perhaps not fully cognizant.

Very truly yours,
J. L. POMEROY, M. D.,
Los Angeles County Health Officer.

October 29, 1932.

Dear Doctor Pomeroy:

Thank you for the patience you show with me. I know my attitude must irk you, yet I cannot change my view unless I get convincing evidence.

You impute to me a statement that rabies does not occur in man. My invariable statement is that I don't know whether the disease occurs in man, that the evidence we have does not seem convincing to me, and that I should give the patient the benefit of the doubt in any case—that is, the Pasteur treatment to prevent development of disease if the physician in attendance deems it advisable.

If any anti-organization ventures to cite me or my statements about this I'll undertake to make a suitable refutation.

I should join any body of people who might oppose any attempt to establish a dog-licensing racket under any pretext whatever. If your campaign against rabies includes the licensing of dogs, your position is surely a weak one. Even if the county could possibly maintain an effective dog quarantine, the measure would be as effective as the shotgun quarantine against yellow fever was in the old days.

What, only 2670 persons bitten in Los Angeles County last year? You didn't hear of the tenth of them! I venture to say at least forty thousand persons were bitten. Only the more ignorant, superstitious

and fearful victims came to the notice of you health authorities. For instance, four members of my own household were bitten by dogs last year, but we deemed it no business of the authorities. But I judge rather from my own experience when I was in general practice. Dog bites were a common minor emergency, but seldom was a case brought to the attention of the health department. I think that is the usual practice of physicians everywhere.

But I do appreciate the tolerant spirit you have shown, Doctor Pomeroy, and I'd like to call and get well enough acquainted with you so that we may call each other names of we like, without getting miffed over it. You never can tell, I may be like the mule the veterinarian cured in spite of the animal's lack of faith.

Yours sincerely,

(Signed) WILLIAM BRADY.

Subject of Following Letter: Proposed Protection of Milk and Milk Products Through a New System of State Inspection.

To the Editor:—At the recent meeting of the Health Officers' Section of the California League of Municipalities at San Diego, California, a resolution was adopted, whereby the Health Officers' Section went on record opposing the taking over by any department of the dairy and milk inspection program which for so many years has been a part of the public health program. This resolution, copy of which is enclosed, was later adopted by the California League of Municipalities as a whole.

Both as a health officer, and as a taxpayer, and as a physician, and as a member of the California Medical Association, I wish to register my protest against the plan of Dr. J. J. King, which he has recently submitted and transmitted to all parts of the state. I am, therefore, respectfully calling this matter to the attention of the California Medical Association and trust that its officers will take proper action if it becomes necessary to protect the health departments should any attempt be made to weaken the public health program by the transfer of milk inspection work to other agencies.

The health departments and the medical societies throughout the country have been largely instrumental. and particularly so in California, in raising the standards of market milk to its present high plane. Likewise, health officers and the members of the medical profession have done everything in their power to increase the consumption of milk because of the value of milk as a food. The dairy industry indeed owes these men and women a debt of gratitude for their support in the years gone by.

Health departments and public health work must be kept out of politics. The protection of the public health is more important to our citizenry during the present economic crisis than in any other time in our history. The relationship of milk to health and disease has been quite conclusively demonstrated, and it seems quite clear that milk and dairy inspection is, and should continue to be, essentially a function of public health departments as it has been for many years past.

Very truly yours,

.....

The resolution referred to above follows:

WHEREAS, A plan has been recommended which would remove milk inspection from the jurisdiction of local health departments; and

WHEREAS, The present high standard of the California market milk supply has been attained largely through the efforts of local health officers; and

WHEREAS, It is recognized that milk control is one of the paramount activities of a public heath program; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Health Officers' Section of the California League of Municipalities in regular session assembled, do vigorously oppose any plan whereby all or any part of the milk inspection service shall be removed from the jurisdiction of such health departments.

The King plan as explained in a bulletin, reads thus:

State of California
Department of Agriculture
Sacramento

Dudley Moulton, Director

August 31, 1932.

Proposed Plan for Uniform Dairy and Bovine Tuberculosis Control

Dr. Joseph J. King
Chief, Division of Animal Industry

The plan that I am proposing has to do with regulatory and service functions performed by the state and various municipalities and counties for the dairy industry of California, including the control and eradication of infectious diseases, particularly tuberculosis of dairy cattle.

Under existing conditions dairy inspection systems are maintained by the state and many municipalities and counties, and in the conduct of these functions by these separate and independently conducted governmental agencies much duplication of effort and overlapping of functions are involved. Such a condition not only is wasteful but tends to create resentment and resistance in the industry. This costly and impractical situation can and should be changed so that a uniform dairy inspection system may be provided throughout the state, under the control of only one official agency.

The present plan of tuberculin testing in California does not provide for participation in indemnity payments by all dairymen when reactors to tuberculin test are found in their herds. To overcome such a situation bovine tuberculosis control work and indemnity should be made state-wide and uniform.

To remedy this situation, and also to increase the efficiency of these activities at a huge saving in appropriations, the following plan is proposed:

1. Place expense of dairy inspection and bovine tuberculosis control on a self-supporting basis by licensing owners of dairy cattle at the rate of $1 a head per annum for this regulatory service.

2. Eliminate cities and counties from the field of dairy farm inspection and place this function under the direct control of the State Department of Agriculture. (Cities and counties to continue maintaining their laboratories.)

3. All tuberculin testing of dairy cattle throughout California to be conducted free by the state. Under such a plan the private practicing veterinarian would be employed and paid by the state to test dairy cattle in his immediate locality. This work would be conducted under the supervision of a veterinary inspector in the employ of the state who would also be responsible for the dairy inspection and analogous work in a county or group of counties, such as making appraisals and arranging for tests.

4. Increase of state's share of indemnity paid for reactors from one-third to two-thirds of appraised value, the other one-third to be paid by Federal Government. Indemnity to be paid out of funds created. This will give dairy men full value for reactor after salvage is deducted.

The taxing of dairy cattle as outlined, for the reasons set forth is estimated to furnish a sum in the neighborhood of $800,000 per annum.

This sum will more than take care of state-wide dairy inspection, general disease control, and tuberculin testing and payment of indemnities. This would mean the elimination of large appropriations for dairy farm inspection work by the cities and counties, and also nearly place the Division of Animal Industry on a self-supporting basis.

It would also provide against interruption in the tuberculosis control program inasmuch as there would be an assurance that funds for this purpose would be available at all times.

It should be understood that the most costly part of the tuberculosis control program is during the first three years when the most reactors will be found and most funds will be required to pay indemnities. After this period the cost of control should decrease and under such circumstances the tax may be decreased or a fund may be set up with unexpended surplus to be used for the benefit of the dairy industry; such as promotional and educational work for the sale of dairy products.

To further benefit the dairy industry of California, a fee of $2.50 a head to be charged on all imported dairy cattle for inspection.

This plan will give the dairy industry of California a standard that has no equal in any part of the nation.

It will also give the industry the cheapest kind of insurance; less than one-third of a cent a day a cow and insure a fund for combating infectious diseases.

The state will absorb as many city and county dairy farm inspectors as possible. This can be done by the saving in travel expense by state men who will be located in each county, thus eliminating the existing heavy travel expense.

It is estimated this will save the state, cities, and counties approximately $2,000,000 in taxes yearly.

This plan will include all types of dairies, such as those producing market milk and cream and manufacturing milk and cream.

Let us all forget about love when there is work to be done and we will all be out of the trenches by the end of the next legislature.