

THE RELIGIOUS PRESS AND QUACKERY.

—The *Weekly Medical Review* writes in this wise: Of all the outrageous inconsistencies of modern times, the strange affiliation of the religious press and quackery is the worst. It is bad enough to see humbug medical advertisements in the secular newspapers, but these are run to make money, as well as to furnish news. It is different with a religious paper. Its main object is, or should be, to advance the cause of truth and righteousness. How disgusting and false to principal does such a periodical seem, when we find the editorial head held high in the atmosphere of purity and honesty, while the advertising tail is low down in the mire of falsehood and avarice; and a great proportion of this singular union is tail. We hold that the editor of a religious paper, more than almost any of his brother editors, is expected, from the very confidence which his work commands, to tell the truth. He is just as responsible for deception in the advertising columns as in the editorial. He occupies as sacred a place and ought to have more influence than the minister in his pulpit. As we listen (or read), we hear him say "Catarrh cured; enough of the remedy sent to effect a cure for \$3.00;" or, "Send six cents and receive free a costly box of goods which will help all to more money, right away, than anything else in this world;" or, "I have a positive cure for consumption. Thousands have been cured." A plain question is, are statements like these true or false? And, if false, what business has a religious journal to publish them,—for money? The meanest medical journal in the land (and medical journals are not all criterions of decency) would scorn to accept some of the advertisements of the average religious paper.

THE DIETETIC VALUE OF WATER —

Dr. Fowler, in the *Cincinnati Medical News* says, I venture the statement that the cause of one-fourth the cases of disordered digestion in fashionable life is a lack of sufficient water in the dietary. It has become customary with men to substitute at their meals wines and liquor; and women, if they do not indulge in these, draw the line at a few sips of ice-water, fearing, as they say, that water freely indulged in will produce obesity, or, by diluting the digestive fluids, induce dyspepsia. The habitual substitution of wines, malt liquors, &c., for water is pretty sure, in the long run, to result in evil in the majority of cases. For, in the first place, where pure or undiluted wine is drunk the individual is not disposed to take enough to supply the system with the requisite amount of fluid, and if he should, everything is upset by the pernicious effect of the contained alcohol. Beer, though containing less alcohol, is open to the same general objections. It should never permanently, or for any lengthened time be allowed to take the place of pure water. Water taken at meals [never when there is food in the mouth] sipped in quantities sufficient to satisfy the thirst acts only beneficially. Indeed, an excess will not hurt, for it is quickly absorbed, and increasing the blood pressure favors digestion by thus inducing a freer flow of the juices. It is a digestive agent as well as food. The result of the ingestion of pure water, tends to keep the kidneys and urinary passages clear of concretions and morbid changes, and with the skin and lungs equally active, the bodily house is well swept. The same result is impossible with artificial beverages. He who stints himself in the drinking of water is dirty inside.