

Correspondence.

To the Editor of the Public Health Magazine :—

DEAR SIR,—I would solicit space in your valuable journal, in reply to a note at the foot of the able paper contributed by Dr. Rourke, in order to correct some statements made in criticising the plan I have proposed for utilizing the rain and snow fall in flushing the sewers and ventilating the same. The learned Doctor has fallen into two errors, and controverts two propositions entirely the reverse of the case in point :—First, the system I propose is nearly identical with that carried out with such beneficial results by Dr. Carpenter at Croydon ; and if the learned Doctor will substitute " beneficial " for " baneful," his statement would be more correct.

My knowledge of this is only due to Dr. Rourke's remarks, as previously I was not aware of the sameness of the schemes until my attention was called to the subject, and on referring to the *Atlantic Monthly* for October 1875, page 441, after careful perusal, I find the Doctor entirely in error. Therein he will find the principle the same as advocated by Professor Godfrey and myself.

Error second :—The Doctor says I wish to take a disgusting drain pipe up through the centre of his dwellings, he seemingly being oblivious of the fact that one at least of these disgusting soil-pipes is already in his dwelling, and that the termination of the sewer in the street is within a few feet of his sleeping apartments. My plan only proposes to carry this disgusting soil-pipe up through the roof instead of terminating in his bathroom and water closet. Which will he prefer ?

Had the Doctor taken the trouble to examine either Professor Godfrey's or my own plan, (which were on view at the time the Professor read his paper), and attended to the lucid explanation then given, he could not have fallen into such errors.