

duty could have stronger argument for its performance than the thought that it applies to our children.

That the processes of nature are exact is conceded, and hence it follows that vitality can reach its maximum only by environing life with those exact relations necessary to its consummation.

A candle flame or a gas flame will drop 1-20th in luminosity if placed in air changed 1-500th in composition by the evolution of carbon dioxide; or, in other words, the impoverishment of the air in a room by the addition of 20 parts of carbon dioxide in 10,000—a proportion that has been found to exist in many badly ventilated rooms—will cause a reduction twenty-five times as great in the luminosity of the flame.

And if we consider physical energy or vitality as a chemical product in many respects similar to that going on in an ordinary flame, are we prepared to overlook the importance of maintaining the atmospheric factor as near the normal as possible?

If we apply to the question the test of filthy lucre, or more specifically, estimate the cost in filthy Dominion paper money, what do we find? Thirty weeks may be taken as the average school period requiring ventilation other than by the open window, hence a loss of 1-20th in vitality means a total loss of 1 1-2 weeks' work.

Now, at 1 lb of coal to 16,000 cubic feet, and allowing to each scholar the maximum of forty cubic feet of fresh warmed air per minute, it can be shown that this loss in time alone will more than heat three times the needful amount of air. But is it a question of cold cash?

Can we estimate the loss arising from lowered vitality, from increased liability to disease, and to its greater severity when it does come; and leaving out the additional expense of medical attendance and incidentals, should not the Provincial Board of Health press home, *not* the cheapness of fresh air, *but* the criminal costliness of bad air?

It has been said that past neglect was a folly, but would not further neglect be a crime?

Legislation should be enacted in regard to ventilation so as to require—what always ought to be required, but never will be without binding statute, to be enforced, say, by the local Board of Health—that a certain definite quantity of foul air be removed per head per minute; and further, that a like quantity of fresh, warm air be supplied. A law that speaks of proper ventilation without fixing the exact minimum is absolutely worthless. In the first place, it is not definite enough to possess any value, because, in the second place, it can and would admit of any interpretation to suit the circumstances.