

Correspondence.

PLACARDING HOUSES.

Editors PRACTITIONER AND REVIEW:

SIRS,—You will permit me to call attention to the question of placarding houses where there is diphtheria or scarlet fever. I am satisfied that this practice is a bad one. It can do no good, unless as a warning to others that one of these diseases is in the house so ticketed.

In the first place, many cases of mild scarlet fever and diphtheria are not reported, because of the objection to having the house placarded. I think it is not saying too much to state that in many cases, where these diseases appear to be mild, and yet the parents are fully aware of their nature, they do not call in a doctor, as they object so strongly to the placarding system. In these cases the children are around in a short time, and out amongst others, though still in a condition to infect them.

As a warning to others, it is of no value. Children will not visit in these houses though there be no placarding. People that have no acquaintanceship with the family will not be calling, and those who have will know. I am sure that as good results were obtained when the houses were not designated.

It must never be forgotten that when too stringent measures are introduced against an evil they always tend to defeat their own object. This is just what is taking place in Toronto in the cases of diphtheria and scarlet fever.

We all know how dangerous whooping-cough is to infants, and yet the disease is not even reported. No notice is taken of it, and yet it ranks third as a cause of death among children. In our desire to be doing something we are doing foolish things—and injurious things.

Yours, etc.,

SYDENHAM.