

In England it is 40 feet but nevertheless it can vary with the approval of the Local Government Board.

In a general consideration as to how town planning should be carried out in practice, Nettlefold, the English authority on housing, says: "It is not advisable to have wide roads everywhere as has been the practice until recently all over Germany; that only puts up the price of building sites thereby hindering instead of helping, a sane solution of the Housing Problem."

If a town has an engineer he sees that drainage in the proposed streets is possible; in some cases it is not thought of, and the plan becomes official when registered, to be found perhaps years afterwards a sewer cannot be laid.

There are no definite laws limiting the number of separate houses to the acre of building land.

The English law says "open spaces in rear of houses must be in depth equal to the height of buildings thereon," thereby allowing about 50 houses per acre.

In Philadelphia there is said to be a maximum by-law of 40 houses, but some of the new rows show about 50 houses to the acre on lots 14 feet wide x 60 feet deep.

The best of these have backyards in concrete, enclosed with iron fencing. Instead of a lane there is a 4-foot passage and the arrangement is a very good one. A six-room house rents for \$16.00 a month.

In England 12 to 14 houses per acre have been adopted at Bournemouth, Earswick, Letchworth and Hampstead. At Ealing there are 20 to the acre, and it is considered a healthy suburb.

With a cosmopolitan population it must be remembered that there are many people accustomed to the crowded city life, who will not live in a garden city, and until they understand the quieter social conditions and that grass is meant to grow this class will be better housed in rows of the Philadelphia type.

A solid row of houses is better than detached houses unless space is left at the sides, sufficient to eliminate the side alley effect.

If commercial reasons have forced the Government to inspect the vegetable and animal life, and to destroy the diseased individuals, and if it is worth while to inspect each immigrant to avoid pestilence, there is no doubt their mode of living should be looked after and controlled by housing laws.

MODERN PUBLIC HEALTH TEACHING AND PRACTICE IN RELATION TO THE CONTROL OF TUBERCULOSIS

BY F. F. WESBROOK, M.D.,

PROFESSOR OF PATHOLOGY AND BACTERIOLOGY AND DEAN, COLLEGE OF MEDICINE AND SURGERY, UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA; MEMBER, MINNESOTA STATE BOARD OF HEALTH.

Two groups of unwilling obstructionists in the path of public health are interesting. The one hesitates to delve into the unknowable or to undertake the impossible, whilst the other fails even to see complexities and ignores difficulties which should be met squarely at the outset. Perhaps it is a species of fatalism which renders the first group inactive on account of inability to differentiate clearly between disease and death and to realize that although disease may end in death they must not be confused. In fact, disease should be regarded rather as indicative of vital force, being the struggle between man and his adverse environment.

As Sir Frederick Treves has pointed out, if it were not for disease there would be no life left, because there would have been no struggle. Disease is, therefore, a sign of life, whilst death is the absence of life. Disease belongs to the realm of the knowable and even the closure of death's door upon the known and the knowable may be postponed.

To impute sacrilege to those who desire to increase and prolong the period of man's efficiency without realizing the sacrilege which blames Providence for disease that human foresight can prevent and death that human effort may postpone is the too-