

the safety of the people, as laid down in the twelve Roman tables.

Richard Hookes in his splendid way tells us: "Of law there can be no less acknowledged, than that her seat is in the bosom of God, her voice the harmony of the world; all things in heaven and earth do her homage, the very least as feeling her care, and the greatest as not exempted from her power." This is the conception of the law that should govern the relations between the people and the doctors. It should embody the justice of the Hebraic code, it should firmly place in the background blatant ignorance, it should regard disease as life destroying and the physician as life saving, and it should hold that in this struggle for life the sick person is entitled to the best that science can give. The legislator who does not go this far is guilty before the people.

THE DANGERS OF SACCHARINE.

While it is fortunate that we have such an acceptable substitute, from a gastronomic point of view at least, for sugar as saccharine, still we must not close our eyes to its dangers. Certainly it should not be placed in the hands of a diabetic who will have to use it over long periods of time, perhaps the rest of his life, without some reservations or qualifications. It should be remembered that while sugar is a food saccharine is only a chemical substance which happens to have for one of its properties an extremely sweet taste. Derived as it is from coal-tar, it would be surprising indeed if it did not possess somewhere some drawback or undesirable quality, for all the members of this family seem to have one pet failing or another. Saccharine has been accused of being instrumental in causing certain forms of cancer, the so-called pitch or tar cancer. Of course, nearly everything in the earth, sea, and sky has been accused at one time or another of producing cancer, but the evidence against saccharine of being at least a predisposing cause of certain forms of epithelioma is sufficiently weighty to make us avoid taking risk of using it except through compulsion. Be it innocent or guilty in the cancer matter, at least we know that it is a chronic irritant to the gastrointestinal tract, particularly to the stomach; that much has been demonstrated beyond cavil by the Department of Agriculture in 1911 and published as Report No. 94. Taken internally over long periods or in excessive doses it causes various digestive disturbances, prominent among which are hyper-chlorhydria and nausea. In fact any dose over five grains may be considered unsafe. We are certainly not justified then in the somewhat complacent attitude assumed by some members of the profession toward this drug, but should issue it to diabetics with the same caution and admonitions with which we would accompany the giving of any other powerful medicine.—*Medical Record*.