

Officer to commit such persons to a hospital, partly for isolation and treatment, but also with a view to education in the sanitary matters pertaining to their affliction. For this purpose a certain amount of hospital and sanatorium accommodation would have to be provided, if it is the intention to reduce the disease to the lowest attainable limits. Until the disease is brought somewhat under control, it would not be possible to find accommodation for all the needful cases. In the first instance, compulsory measures would have to be applied with great caution. It would be judicious, at first, to deal only with the worst cases. Unless the public is willing to face a considerable expenditure in money, and to agree to the necessary compulsory measures, it is useless and Utopian to talk of stamping out and completely eradicating phthisis.

It has been urged against compulsory notification that it would entail great hardships upon the consumptive, since it would entail loss of employment, etc. Such a result might follow if the public were allowed to believe "that phthisis is a dangerous infectious disease communicable from person to person." But this view is erroneous. The public should be taught that a healthy person living or working in close contact with a patient suffering from phthisis, runs little or no risk, provided that certain simple precautionary measures, such as the destruction or disinfection of the sputum, are carried out. If this were thoroughly understood by the public, there would be much less risk of loss of employment than is feared. Phthisis is only dangerous through the sputum; the sputum can be easily destroyed and disinfected: and if it is destroyed while still moist, there is practically no risk of infection. The consumptive in himself is almost harmless and only becomes harmful through bad habits. If it became the rule that a consumptive could only maintain his situation by the strictest observation of all the safeguards to others, a great step would have been taken onward. It must be remembered that the healthy have a right to be protected against infection. No employer should keep an employee who is a source of danger to his fellow-employees; nor should the authorities permit it, if they can prevent it. The healthy have a right to demand that the phthysical person should adopt the necessary precautions to prevent the spread of his disease. There is now a widespread and exaggerated fear of the disease. The notification of cases, the distribution of proper literature, and the adoption of preventive means would do much to correct the present view, and to enable the consumptive to obtain employment.

If the public once realised the enormous benefits to be gained by reducing consumption to its lowest attainable limits, compulsory notification and other measures necessary for dealing with the disease would be agreed to.