

more attention from the municipal authorities in the interest of the public health. The number of persons suffering from tuberculosis is variously estimated at 30,000 to 40,000, and many of these are undoubtedly infecting their associates, thus adding to the extent of the disease. I believe the time has come when the City of New York should extend its facilities for the treatment of tuberculosis, either by sanatoria or otherwise." The above is undoubtedly a confession of inefficiency, and Dr. Lederle now realizes what we have always advocated, viz., that combined action is necessary if we wish to cope successfully with this scourge. The above will naturally lead us to consider how we in Canada are attempting to deal with the problem. We know that the different provincial and municipal boards of health are practically incapable of dealing with the problem alone. With the exception of a few anti-spitting by-laws adopted in some cities, the municipal governments have done nothing in the matter. The Provincial Governments have in Ontario and Nova Scotia already considered the subject seriously and made appropriations to deal with it. The Federal Government has, I believe, granted to the Canadian Association for the Prevention of Tuberculosis the sum of \$1,000 to help to carry on this work, and it attempts further to remedy the evil by importing immigrants. In 1901, 49,149 immigrants were brought into this country at a cost of \$444,730. In 1902, 67,379 immigrants were brought in at a cost of \$495,842. We have only to compare the two situations, that of invalidation and mortality caused by tuberculosis and the importation of immigrants, to come to the inevitable conclusion that just about the equal number of immigrants are brought in that will fill the gap caused by the bacillus of tuberculosis. If this did not cost the country anything it might not be so regrettable, but this gap is filled at a yearly expense of nearly half a million dollars, without improving our position a single iota. Is this not an object lesson?

Let us cast a glance upon the veterinary aspect of the question. Bovine tuberculosis, according to the last available statistics, exists to the extent of only $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. in the cattle of the country, causing practically no loss, for the simple reason that the meat from these animals, even when the internal organs are very visibly infected, is still fit for consumption. Yet we find that the Federal Government in 1900 spent \$19,992 for the prevention of the spread of tuberculosis in cattle, while in 1901, \$26,054 was spent for the same object. If the cattle are a valuable asset to the people of this country, and an object of concern to the Department of Agriculture, then are not the inhabitants, who really contribute to the value of the agricultural