

analyzed, but their chief importance is that they throw some light as to the probable source of the impurity. Water from some sources might contain excess of nitrates, and mean nothing, while another sample contains less nitrates and from a different source, be unfit for use. Erroneous conclusions may be drawn from the determination of oxygen consumed and of albuminoid ammonia. Many samples of water are passed by the chemist that are absolutely unfit for use. Although a chemical analysis cannot guarantee pure water, yet it can reveal impurity and danger. A sample of water into which a small quantity of typhoid excreta was introduced could not be detected by the chemist, so that chemical analysis is of use only as indication of the probable source of contamination.

When, however, the specific micro-organism of cholera, typhoid, etc., had been isolated from water, the examination passed out of the hands of the chemist into that of the bacteriologist. But this is even as misleading as the chemical if taken alone. For instance, the cholera bacillus could not be detected in the water that undoubtedly poisoned Hamburg. Neither could the typhoid bacillus be detected in the water that caused the epidemic in Worthing, in the South of England, some few years ago. In water reputedly good, the number of liquifying colonies are few in number, but in sewage-polluted water they are numerous; this fact is of only medium value, because it shows only gross pollution, as most of those liquifying colonies are harmless. Bacteriology, like chemistry, cannot be depended upon to determine absolutely whether a water is injurious to health, since the possibility of accidental pollution is too often overlooked, consequently neither methods alone should be accepted as positive, but both should be combined, indicating more certainly the probable source and effect of contamination.

#### MEDICAL COUNCIL ELECTION.

The following are the candidates in the various divisions:

- Div. No. 1—Dr. Bray, Chatham; Dr. Samson, Windsor.  
Div. No. 2—Dr. Williams, Ingersoll.  
" " 3—Dr. Roome, London.

- Div. No. 4—Dr. Graham, Brussels.  
" " 5—Dr. Brock, Guelph.  
" " 6—Drs. Henry and Smith, Orangeville.  
" " 7—Dr. G. Shaw, Hamilton; Dr. Heggie, Brampton.  
Div. No. 8—Dr. Philip, Brantford; Dr. T. Armour, St. Catharines.  
Div. No. 9—Dr. Law, Beeton; Dr. Hanly, Waukegan.  
Div. No. 10—Dr. Barrick, Toronto.  
" " 11—Dr. Machell, Toronto.  
" " 12—Dr. Cotton, Lambton Mills; Dr. Sangster, Port Perry.  
Div. No. 13—Dr. McLaughlin, Bowmanville.  
" " 14—Dr. Ruttan, Napanee; Dr. T. H. Thornton, Consecon.  
Div. No. 15—Dr. Spankie, Kingston; Dr. Dickson, Pembroke.  
Div. No. 16—Dr. Preston, Newboro'; Dr. Reddick, Winchester.  
Div. No. 17—Dr. Bergin, Cornwall; Dr. Rogers, Ottawa.

The following are the Homœopathic candidates.

- Dr. Geo. Logan, Ottawa.  
Dr. G. Henderson, Strathroy.  
Dr. Cl. T. Campbell, London.  
Dr. L. Lutton, St. Thomas.  
Dr. E. Vernon, Hamilton.  
Dr. W. J. H. Emory, Toronto.  
Dr. J. D. Tyrrell, Toronto.  
Dr. E. T. Adams, Toronto.

The following medical representatives have already been elected:

Dr. W. T. Harris, of Brantford, vice-president of the College of Physicians and Surgeons, has been reappointed by the Senate of Trinity University as their representative to the Council.

Dr. Fife Fowler, of Kingston, has been appointed representative to the Medical Council by the Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons of Kingston.

Dr. Jas. Thorburn has been appointed as the representative of Toronto School of Medicine.

Dr. V. H. Moore has been appointed as the representative of Queen's University.

Sir James Grant, M.P., has been selected as the representative of Ottawa University.