

but it is said, the greatest intellects that the world has seen have not been flesh-eaters but vegetarians. The ancient Prophets and Philosophers, Milton, Shakesphere, Newton, Wesley, and Franklin are all quoted as opposed to flesh-eating and as living on the direct productions of the soil. The Anglo-Saxon race may be showing its greatness in spite of its tendency to beef-eating, it is said; which as Shakespeare has written "does harm to the wits"

IT MAY BE that these eminent men were not strict vegetarians, but ate only a small quantity of animal food. And it may be that it is not the partial flesh diet, *per se*, that is less favorable to mental effort, but the excessive amount of food eaten, as a whole, or of the nitrogenous elements, when flesh forms a part of the diet. In short, as beef and mutton are highly concentrated foods, had Rider Haggard indulged less, "freely in beef and mutton,"—perhaps a good deal less, yet a little—the effect would have been better than that of discontinuing them altogether. People who eat flesh are more liable to over eat, and so clog the whole internal animal economy, as well as the mental.

IN THIS CONNECTION the Westminster Review, commenting on a new work recently published by the Vegetarian Society, endorses the work as follows. We must frankly admit that the arguments are almost all on the side of the vegetarians. They claim—and they support their claim with arguments not easy to answer—that flesh-eating is at once immoral, unwholesome and uneconomical. That it is less wholesome and economical than their own system, they claim to have proved, from their own personal experiences; and if it has these two characteristics, it is certainly hard to resist the further argument that it is immoral. For if flesh-eating is not beneficial to the body, mind, or pocket, how can we justify the appalling amount of suffering inflicted on animals by the practice?

AN EMINENT authority has said that whenever there was a case of typhoid fever somebody ought to be hung. Another writer has given it as his opinion that the time would come when a case of typhoid fever would be regarded with as much stigma as a case infected with *acarus scabiei*, commonly known as the "itch." These expressions were intended to emphasize the fact that the disease is dependent upon filth of one form or another and that some one is responsible

for the infection from the filth having found its way into a human body. As an exchange says, the public understand this idea sufficiently well to remark upon the appearance of the disease, that "there must be *something* wrong with the premises."

TYPHOID fever, it appears clear from statistics, destroys not less than 3,000 lives, mostly of the best lives, in Canada alone every year. Yet this great destruction of human life might be prevented by proper sanitary administration. Who is responsible, who should be hung for want of such administration. A case of small-pox creates great consternation; and the deaths of half a dozen persons by a railroad accident is viewed with horror. Yet with what calm equanimity the people contemplate these 3,000 victims of the typhoid bacillus, which a little prompt and vigorous action would soon exterminate.

AT ONE TIME in the history of the world, consumption, it appears, was regarded with a loathing akin to that with which small-pox is now regarded. Yet how calmly the Canadian people look upon the 10,000 to 15,000 deaths caused by this disease every year in the Dominion. These deaths, too, for the most part, could be prevented, yet not so readily and effectually, in the present state of our knowledge, as the deaths from typhoid fever. Great advancement in the treatment of cases of the disease is being made, however, which together with preventive measures, might, if vigorously pushed, soon greatly lessen the mortality from this most destructive of all diseases.

WHILE THE OUT OF DOOR TREATMENT stands first, and in the earliest stages is frequently successful, the hot air treatment bids fair to be of much benefit in later stages. The bacilli of consumption are peculiarly susceptible to influences of temperature. Their vitality is lowered, it appears, by a temperature of 101.3° (about 3° higher than the blood) and they are killed by a temperature of 107-6°. In a particular case reported by Prof. Kohlschutter (Berliner Klin. Wochen, Mar. 11—in Brit. Med. Jour., March 30), after 7 weeks of inhalation of hot air, the size of the chest increased from 89 to 95½ centimetres. The breathing improved greatly. The "bacilli appearances were remarkably altered." While "at first the bacilli were numerous and more or less uniformly scattered, subsequently they were found only in groups of 3 or 4, and were far fewer, and at a