face" and strike at the root of the evil by conforming to the supreme and inexorable law?" 7 Nothing is more certain than that it is only by a ceaseless and vigilant weeding-out of the unfit varieties (which even under the most perfect system of hygiene must necessarily be born) that a high standard of racial excellence can be obtained.

Strange, indeed, it seems that this stern elemental truth has not been recognised by the pathologist. The explanation lies, I believe, in the fact that, all too intent upon his microscope and test-tubes, he has lost sight of the terrible potentia heredity. But recognising it, as we now, I will suppose, do, how, let us ask ourselves, shall we give full play to that searching process of elimination which alone can sustain a high level of racial fitness? Let me, in answer, repeat what I have so often said in my lectures—namely, that method of elimination is a merciless one; she unceremoniously sacrifices the individual for the benefit of the race— 8 so careful of the type is she, so careless of the single life.

The other object of individual elimination, racially considered, is to prevent the unfit individual from leaving offspring to inherit his unfitness, and Nature in her rough-and-ready way achieves this object by simply wiping him out of existence. The same end can be attained, however, by the unit abstaining from getting offspring and choosing to join the ever-increasing army of the non-marrying.

The question lies, I believe, in the fact that, all too intent upon his microscope and test-tubes, he has lost sight of the terrible potency of heredity. But recognising it, as we now, I will suppose, do, how, let us ask ourselves, shall we give full play to that searching process of elimination which alone can sustain a high level of racial fitness? Let me, in answer, repeat what I have so often said in my lectures—namely, that method of elimination is a merciless one; she unceremoniously sacrifices the individual for the benefit of the race—so careful of the type is she, so careless of the single life.

The other object of individual elimination, racially considered, is to prevent the unfit individual from leaving offspring to inherit his unfitness, and Nature in her rough-and-ready way achieves this object by simply wiping him out of existence. The same end can be attained, however, by the unit abstaining from getting offspring and choosing to join the ever-increasing army of the non-marrying.

The following is a brief summary of the administrative measures carried out:—All persons who have been attacked have been removed to the Infectious Diseases Hospital, and the houses which they occupied and their clothing have been disinfected. An effort has been made to induce persons who have been in contact with these patients to undergo a fortnight's isolation for observation in a specially set apart house, or, if such are, or have been, under observation in this manner.

A house-to-house inspection has been made in the
neighbourhood of all the infected houses with a view of discovering cases of illness. Every house found in a dirty condition has been disinfected. Fortunately, none of the rag-sellers were arrested, although a report that an outbreak occurred had been sent away. We were thus able to disinfect the whole of the rags which could have been infected by these girls and women. The workshop also was disinfected. All persons who have been in contact and who are not undergoing quarantine are being kept under observation at their homes.

A CONSTANT WATER-SUPPLY AND THE LONDON SANITARY AUTHORITIES.

Over 50 years ago the City of London Commissioners of Sewers received from "their faithful and obedient humble servant, John Simon" (now Sir John Simon, K.C.B., D.C.L., L.L.D.), a report on the sanitary condition of the City, to which he attached a number of charts and maps. The report dealt with questions of drainage, which that year for the first time was under municipal control, with offensive trades, with intramural burial, with unhealthy houses, with the social condition of the poor, and with water-supply. At the present time cesspools in London have ceased to exist, house drainage systems are provided in all new buildings, and intramural burial has been abolished except at St. Paul's Cathedral and Westminster Abbey. Large blocks of insanitary houses have been removed, and the social conditions of the poor have greatly improved. Much this is due to the fact that the demand for water is increased, and that a supply can be relied upon as a matter of necessity. Large areas have been disinfected. All persons who have been in contact and who are not undergoing quarantine are being kept under observation at their homes.

family on one floor was situated in a room hired by another family which occupied a room on a higher floor, where it was conveniently placed for washing the children. Lord Llandaff's Commission have lately heard evidence given by Sir William Knight, chairman of the Southwark and Vauxhall Water Company and a gentleman who has held the position of Lord Mayor of London. The Commissioners had also brought to their notice an ingenious cistern which was designed to suit London requirements. When water is constantly supplied it can be drawn as it is required, and therefore the terms of the requisition rendered the provision "wholly nugatory." Evidently those who framed the Act were more to blame in the matter than the water companies.

Between the years 1852 and 1871 questions concerning water-supply frequently engaged the attention of Parliament. A report of the Royal Commission on the Prevention of the Pollution of Rivers appeared in the year 1866, and ultimately led to the introduction of Bills. The object was to provide a constant supply, or give it in succession to the several districts of the metropolis is a barrier which must maintain thousands in a state of the most unwholesome filth and degradation." No one will be found to disagree with Sir John Simon's dictum. When water is constantly supplied it can be drawn as it is required, and there is no reason why it should be stored in a house. When the supply is not constant storage becomes necessary. On the comparative merits of these two systems the report from which we have already quoted contains a decided expression of opinion. The words are as follows: "I consider the system of intermittent water-supply to be radically bad, not only because it is a system of stint in what ought to be lavishly bestowed, but also because of the disturbance and inconvenience which it creates that large and extensive receptacles should be provided, and because of the liability to contamination incurred by water which has to be retained often during a considerable period." We are quite aware that many sanitary authorities have spoken in favour of cisterns, but this was in the belief that the water companies might break down, so that storage would become necessary. If the water companies supply water unfailingly there can be no need for cisterns.

Lord Llandaff's Commission have lately heard evidence given by Sir William Knight, chairman of the Southwark and Vauxhall Water Company and a gentleman who has held the position of Lord Mayor of London. The Commissioners had also brought to their notice an ingenious cistern which was designed to suit London requirements. When water is constantly supplied it can be drawn as it is required, and therefore the terms of the requisition rendered the provision "wholly nugatory." Evidently those who framed the Act were more to blame in the matter than the water companies.

Between the years 1862 and 1871 questions concerning water-supply frequently engaged the attention of Parliament. A report of the Royal Commission on the Prevention of the Pollution of Rivers appeared in the year 1866, and ultimately led to the introduction of Bills. The object was to provide a constant supply, or give it in succession to the several districts of the metropolis is a barrier which must maintain thousands in a state of the most unwholesome filth and degradation." No one will be found to disagree with Sir John Simon's dictum. When water is constantly supplied it can be drawn as it is required, and there is no reason why it should be stored in a house. When the supply is not constant storage becomes necessary. On the comparative merits of these two systems the report from which we have already quoted contains a decided expression of opinion. The words are as follows: "I consider the system of intermittent water-supply to be radically bad, not only because it is a system of stint in what ought to be lavishly bestowed, but also because of the disturbance and inconvenience which it creates that large and extensive receptacles should be provided, and because of the liability to contamination incurred by water which has to be retained often during a considerable period." We are quite aware that many sanitary authorities have spoken in favour of cisterns, but this was in the belief that the water companies might break down, so that storage would become necessary. If the water companies supply water unfailingly there can be no need for cisterns.

The report on the Sanitary Condition of the City of London for the year 1852, by John Simon, P.R.S. The report is dated Nov. 6th, 1852.

1 The Kent Waterworks and the Hampstead Waterworks Company (a business afterwards acquired by the New River Company) were not required to give a supply at any height exceeding 180 feet above the high-water mark of the River Thames. It was decided that the height of the supply had to be at least 40 feet above the level of the pavement nearest the point at which such supply should be required.