

country. In the present state of communities, one with a malignant or even non-malignant infectious disease, cannot suffer alone; one's neighbour, however careful and attentive to the rules of health, is constantly, from unconscious or unavoidable contact, liable to suffer also. Thus it is that the intelligent, the thoughtful, the careful and well-to-do are "pulled down" by the thoughtless, the indifferent and the improvident.

We may learn and know the best means of preventing disease, but we cannot force either individuals or communities to employ those means, though a large majority would do so in a large measure if they knew how. The State—the chief authorities of the country, can teach them how, and force them in one way or another to use the means. No one will probably deny that now, with the greater interest which has been awakened in sanitation, the authorities would be fully sustained in such a course of proceedings; certainly by all intelligent people; and is it not these who rule? In this free country yet surely it is,

PUBLIC HEALTH BUREAUS AND BOARDS

IN OTHER COUNTRIES.

There is hardly a civilized country, I do not know of one, that has not some sort of National or Government organization specially designed for looking after the public health. England is almost universally regarded as having the most perfect system in the world. It has, it appears, been the longest in existence. The continental countries of Europe have largely copied from Great Britain. Prussia, Austria and Russia have each an Imperial Board. France has a similar body, likewise has Italy, Denmark, the Netherlands, and other countries. The South American States are not behind in regard to this question. In Japan, a Central Sanitary Bureau of the Home Department of the Imperial Japanese Government was established in 1873. In June 1875, the sanitary control of the Empire was entrusted to this Central Bureau. About eight years ago a National Board of Health was organized in the United States, and an appropriation of half a million dollars was made by Congress the first year for the expenses thereof. Previous to this the majority of the States had each their State Board of Health. Now nearly every State has its special

Board. The National Board was almost universally regarded as doing very effective work and being a most valuable institution, but, through political influence, it appears, the appropriation was reduced and its efficiency much lessened. During the present year two Bills have been before Congress, with a view of reorganizing the Board, and placing it in a more efficient position. One of these, we just learn from the *American Lancet* for May, is likely to pass, with an appropriation of \$75,000. It is said to be a "very practical" one. It is in principle very like the one proposed herein.

VALUE AND PROFITS OF SANITARY WORK.

Political economists in England, Germany and the United States estimate the value to the State of a mature man or woman at 20 years of age, on an average, at \$1,000, or, as costing \$50 per year—for feeding, clothing, educating, etc., for 20 years, before becoming of service to the State. All that die before the age of 20 years represent, then, a direct money loss to the State, in proportion to this basis according to the age at which they die. Every fairly healthy child that dies at the age of 10 years represents a loss of \$500, and every one that dies at the age of 5 years represents a loss of \$250, and so on.

The best authority, probably, we can quote, Mr. Simon, late of the Government Board, Great Britain, said a few years ago, in reference to the mortality in England, that the deaths there were "fully a third more numerous than they would be if the existing knowledge of the chief causes of disease were reasonably well applied throughout the country." The mortality statistics there have shown a steady decline in the death-rate from fevers during the past ten years or more of from 80 down to 45 per 100,000 of population; while in preceding years it had averaged over 90 per 100,000. The *Lancet* has pointed to this as "a preliminary triumph of sanitation." In some towns in England the total death-rate has been lowered over 20 per cent.; in many the death-rate from typhoid fever has diminished from 33 to 50 per cent.; and in others the number of deaths from consumption has been reduced 20 to 40 and 49 per cent. According to a late number of the *London Sanitary Record*, (an official organ) in England, in the ten years