

In speaking of the cost as above, it is only right to say that in Birmingham the pails are removed in vans and cleaned, whereas at Tynemouth they are not, and should that be done at the latter place an additional annual amount of about 4s. per pail would have to be added. Of course the expense must depend, to some extent, upon the distance from the depot and other local circumstances in each town, but the author estimates that an average cost of 12s. per pail, per annum, is sufficient to include daily removal, and cleansing of pails, so as to prevent any nuisance.

The cost of cleansing the pails is no doubt very great; but where the excreta and the ashes are all put into the same pail, and reasonable care is taken to provide drainage and keep out slops, it will be found unnecessary to remove the pails to the depots for cleansing, except at intervals, in the poorest neighbourhoods. Where cleansing becomes, after a time, necessary, the author suggests that in the case of galvanized iron pails it would be better to use heat instead of water for the purpose.

A proper drying process, which could be easily devised if a destructor furnace were on the premises, would speedily destroy any injurious attachment or incrustation. In the case of wood pails a simple sluicing with a hose would be a less effectual but still perhaps a sufficient mode of cleansing. Like everything else, the pail system requires a little tact and management in the working; and this is, it may be presumed, one of the duties for which inspectors are engaged.

The first cost of construction of the pail receptacles is very small, for where the cost of a water-closet with ashpit attached would be over 20l., or the cost of a privy and covered ashpit 17l., the cost of a pail closet would not exceed 10l., built of brick and roofed in, and including 4s. for the pail. This should fall upon the owner, and he should be required from time to time to renew the pail when worn out. A pail will last, however, for many years.

Like every other reform, the pail system

of disposing of house refuse has, and no doubt will still have, many difficulties surrounding it. The mere fact of the gradual favour that the 'combined' pail system is gaining over the separate system, on the question of sentiment or nuisance, is a proof that it is gaining headway. The only, though vital and important, argument in favour of the water-carriage system of sewage—viz., its immediate removal from the premises, is the same which forms an important element in the pail system of refuse removal; consequently those should carefully and impartially consider the one, who consistently advocate the other.

Above all things it is to be hoped that no difficulties or expense, either temporary or permanent, will ever induce sanitary authority to return to the unsanitary and dangerous system of fixed ashpits. No argument, and certainly no reason, can be found to justify such a course; and, whether they be constructed as privies or as ashpits only, and on some modified or even improved form, so long as the principle of them involves the accumulation and long detention of the refuse, they must be wrong. No precaution can really be taken to render them innocuous; and even if they be lined out with cement, which will crack; or sloped inside, which will leave a sharp furrow at the bottom for liquid refuse; or sunk into the ground, which will cause percolation; or kept above the ground, which will cause leakage upon the surface; they will surely remain offensive, less only in degree than the old unhealthy privy and ashpit, which has in times past slain so many thousands.

The author, therefore, ventures to recommend all concerned to avoid any kind of fixed accumulative ashpit, whether ancient, modern, or modified in type, and to insist upon such a practice as will absolutely entail a removal every second day, and enable a convenient system of removal every day, whenever considered expedient, in consequence of infectious disease or other causes. In all cases of infectious disease the pail system is most important and by far the safest.

In the water-carriage system of sewage