

protection of drinking water there should be but one standard.

In regard to the use of the word "dwelling," the term is here intended to apply both to residential houses and to all buildings wherein human beings are employed or engaged for any number of consecutive hours. It is not forgotten that the present law, by the Factory and Workshop Acts, the Common Lodging Houses Acts, and others, deals with numerous special cases, and that already some overlapping occurs. But for the purpose of this paper there is much ground that those Acts do not cover, and when such statutes are in effective operation it is not proposed that they should be interfered with by further legislation. It has been stated that with existing dwellings a different standard of sanitation might be accepted and time given for its adoption. With regard, however, to certain classes of such dwellings, I would urge that legislation should at once intervene. I refer to the cases of hotels and lodgings and to Board Schools and other institutions under local control.

The reason for demanding the sanitation of such existing buildings is, that with hotels the public have not always the opportunity of choice. Arriving from the country or from abroad, the stranger in a town must go to such quarters as are available, and the very purpose of hotels is to provide accommodation for travellers who of necessity can know nothing of the arrangements of a dwelling within whose walls they may, under the greatest urgency, be bound for a time to reside. And when we know that, perhaps at home, and certainly abroad, the traveller's life has been cut short by insanitary conditions of hotels, it does not seem much more unreasonable to demand protection from such evils than to insist that for some hours daily there shall be no sale of alcohol.

Lodgings, though not quite in the position of hotels, are included therewith because where the business is a regular occupation the functions of the lodging-house are very similar and the position of the guest almost equally defenceless.

Board schools are placed in the same category, because attendance of the children is compulsory, and they neither know nor care about sanitary arrangements. As to the parents they are probably altogether excluded from an opportunity of inspecting those departments, and it is quite possible that even if it were granted and the condition of affairs were grossly unsatisfactory the parents would come to the conclusion that, in comparison with their own, the arrangements were salubrious and even attractive.

It may be urged that the compulsory action suggested is, in the case of public institutions, unnecessary and vexatious. Without saying that my experience of such cases is extensive, I can state that instances of a very gross character have occurred. Where, in very large buildings under the control of a School Board, the sanitary arrangements had been pronounced faulty and dangerous to health, and several deaths have ensued therefrom, the Board nevertheless failed to take such action as was necessary, and the schools were after the holidays reopened on the alleged ground that there had not been time or it was not then convenient to carry out the operations so imperatively required.

To an audience of this character it would be vain to attempt by reciting sensational cases to enlist their sympathies convincing their reason, but certainly it would not be difficult to illustrate the point at issue by other examples of grievous suffering and distress inflicted upon the young, the weak and the helpless.

We have now to inquire as to the sanitary registration of the buildings referred to. It is conceived that the best mode of enforcing the observance of sanitary regulations is to establish a public register in which to enter a reference to every building which has complied with such regulations, and to provide that no buildings should be inhabited until so registered. The registration would be effected on production of a certificate of due sanitation from some competent authority. Then inasmuch as the sanitary condition of a house may vary with lapse of time, it is proposed that quinquennially an inspection should be made, and the fact, if all be found in order, endorsed on the certificate. But if any discovered evil should within a certain period not be remedied, the house would then at once disappear from the register. In the case of change of tenancy during the quinquennial period, or structural alterations endangering the sanitary arrangements, it should be obligatory on the house owner to obtain inspection and notify results to the sanitary registrar.

In this connection it would be well to consider whether encouragement should not be given to the voluntary sanitation of dwellings, for the time being excluded from compulsory regulations, by entering them in the register when duly certified, on such easy terms as to fees and otherwise as might be thought expedient. It is probable that many house proprietors would be willing and eager to conform to such modified regulations with the view of attracting tenants; or securing more remunerative rents, the result in either case being to the benefit of society at large.

The question still remaining is that of the persons or parties competent to issue the sanitary certificates. Whilst admitting to the full that the educated official persons at present in charge of the public health are competent and desirable authorities to grant such certificates, it is considered that the power in question ought not to be confined to the officials of the State. Sanitary science is still young, and it may be that progress would be more surely made by extending the power to certify to such medical men, architects, engineers or associations as have themselves, or through their staff, recognised diplomas of sanitary knowledge. Just as under the Vaccination Acts, while the act of vaccination is often performed by official persons, the statute may be complied with through means of other persons, provided they are qualified by diplomas of recognised validity.

It is not denied that some difficulty may arise on this part of the subject, and the limits allowed will not permit of its being fully dealt with. But it may be suggested that the reckless or fraudulent issue of certificates could be met by severe penalties, while the offenders would still be left open to the public trial of a civil action for damages at the suit of any injured party.

Lastly, although the measures recommended in this paper may not be "heroic," it is submitted that they are worthy of consideration, and that their adoption would to no inconsiderable degree work for the