

do I consider that consumptive cases should be taken into the general wards of an hospital. The patients therein are generally in delicate health, and therefore more liable to infection. In any of these circumstances, if the sufferers are permitted to be employed with the healthy, it must only be on condition of their using bottles to expectorate into. This leads to the question of special hospitals for consumptives, proposed with two objects: firstly, for their treatment, and secondly, for the object of equal importance, of preventing the spread to the other members of the community.

Such special hospitals are, no doubt, desirable for both reasons, but the practical carrying out of the scheme is surrounded by great difficulties; first, the large number of sufferers would entail a very great accommodation and corresponding expense; and secondly, many sufferers are not so invalided as to prevent them carrying on some occupations of life. No doubt, for the richer classes, such institutions can and should be established, and made self-supporting, but for the poorer, such hospitals at the public expense can only, I am afraid, be maintained for those suffering from the advanced stages of the disease. Philanthropic efforts will no doubt supplement the public purse in finding additional accommodation. These hospitals, both in structure and situation, should be such as to insure the greatest comfort and opportunity for the open-air treatment.

Besides the spread of the germs through the air by the dry expectoration, I will consider the danger by clothes, milk, and meat. Clothes may not be a very common media for the spread, still the tailoring of clothes in over-crowded workshops with the possible infection from one or more sufferers amongst the workmen or women is a possible danger, so is the buying of the second-hand clothes which may have been worn by consumptive owners, and also the storing of infected clothes in the warehouses of pawn-offices. I long ago advocated the compulsory disinfection of all clothes in pawn-offices by the sanitary authorities as a safeguard against the spread by them of this and other infectious diseases. The question of the spread by milk is of great importance, as undoubtedly this is the usual method of the source of infection, and cause of the death of the vast number of children who succumb yearly to consumption of the bowels. Not alone may milk be infected by the germs getting into it by dust from the dried expectoration, but also cows and specially milch cows housed in crowded city byres, are subject to a disease similar to, if not absolutely identical with, consumption in man, which may be communicated by their milk to man. Milk does not destroy the germs—far from it, it acts as food to them, and even when it

turns sour, the germs are not killed, and hence not alone milk, but also butter and cheese may retain and carry the infection.

The question of milk infection has had much attention given to it of late, and I will tell you shortly the chief conclusions come to.

First, a considerable proportion of the cows of these countries are affected with consumption.

2. That cows housed in towns are more subject than those in the country.

3. That over-crowding, damp, and bad ventilation of the byres predisposes to the disease and its spread.

4. That sometimes the udders are infected, and then the milk is almost certain to be infected.

5. That mere inspection will not in the majority of cases indicate whether the cow is suffering or not, but by injecting a substance called tuberculin, obtained from the germ, the fact can be ascertained. Now, to prevent the infection of the users of milk, the authorities ought to have the power to make the following regulations:—

1. That cows should not be housed within the precincts of the town. This power they have not at present.

2. That the byres should not be over-crowded, not damp, but fully ventilated. The powers of making by-laws for such purpose exist, and should be rigidly enforced in town and country.

3. That when a cow is shown to be infected, its milk should be destroyed, and the cow not used further. This power does not exist.

4. That all cows used as milch should be tested by tuberculin, and, if found to be infected, killed, and their owners reasonably compensated if they bought the cow as healthy, and housed it in a sanitary byre. I should not give any compensation to owners who placed their cows in surroundings that predisposed to the disease, and violated the by-laws. This would make owners more careful of the state of their cow-houses. These powers the authorities do not at present possess, but some towns, as Glasgow, have advanced towards the same object, by all the public institutions making it a necessary condition of their milk contracts, that the milk supplied should be from cows who had satisfactorily passed the tuberculin test.

5. Lastly, as a matter of precaution, never use milk, nor give it to your children, without boiling it first. This will destroy the germs and safeguard, not alone for these germs, but those of typhoid fever, scarlatina, diphtheria, and some forms of diarrhoea, all of which may be also carried and spread by germ-contaminated milk. As regards the spread of consumption by meat, luckily it is not nearly so common as by milk. Still, if the butcher is careless in using an infected knife that has been used to remove organs infected, the disease may so spread, nor will

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)