

omy is short sighted. Sanitary work is expensive but disease is more expensive. Money is more economically spent on sanitary inspection than on paying the poor-rates for those who, through insanitary conditions, have lost their bread-winners. I am not aware that any attempt had been made to obtain a return of the number of inspectors employed by each local authority throughout the country, in proportion to population; but such a return would be very valuable, and would afford a useful indication of the sanitary activity or in-ertness which characterizes the different parts of the country. In Brighton, with a population of about 120,000 persons, we have a staff of one head inspector and eight assistant sanitary inspectors, in addition to inspectors to superintend the removal of house refuse, and others who attend to defects in water apparatus. Every penny spent on this staff, in my opinion, will pay a return to the borough of Brighton with compound interest, and tend to greatly enhance its already high reputation as a health resort.

3. INSECURITY OF TENURE of office is a grievous difficulty in the path of some inspectors. The duties of an inspector are such as almost necessarily bring him occasionally into antagonism with those amongst his employers who are owners of house property; and especially does this occur in districts where insanitary conditions are rife. The fact also that the inspector is liable to the risks connected with periodic re-election handicaps his work, and renders it extremely difficult for him to satisfactorily discharge his duties. There should be tenure of office during good behaviour, as at Brighton; and in some districts, especially rural, it is desirable that there should be the right of appeal to the Local Government Board in the event of unfair dismissal. Such a system is already in force in Scotland, where the sanitary inspector is only removable with the consent of the Board of Supervision, which represents the English Local Government Board; although, strange to say, the medical officer of health has no such protection.

4. THE LOW REMUNERATION which the sanitary inspector receives, often little more than the wages of an artisan, is very anomalous, when we remember the variety and character of the subjects with which

he is expected to be familiar. If for no other reason, the fact that in the execution of his duty he frequently carries his life in his hands, should surely entitle him to fair remuneration, and to (5) *Superannuation* in case of disablement through sickness or old age. At Liverpool such a system is already in force. The claim to superannuation should not be lost, however, by moving from one sanitary post to another, and with this object the best scheme would be an Imperial and not a local one. If our policemen, our soldiers and sailors, and our civil servants are deserving of superannuation, then surely the sanitary officials, who are the soldiers of peace and health, should not be left out in the cold.

I must pass on from this incomplete and hasty discussion of the sanitary inspector's difficulties to say a few words on the peculiar relation which the sanitary official bears to the British public. He represents a tangible, and often a most disagreeable, interference with that liberty of which Englishmen boast. The Englishman's home is not his castle while it is liable to the official (and he thinks the officious) intrusion of the sanitary inspector. It may be fairly argued, however, that liberty without limits becomes license of a most pernicious character. A man may be at liberty to poison himself with sewer-gas, but how about his neighbours, and even his own helpless children? The fact that men congregate together renders it essential that individual liberty shall be restrained by State interference within the limits compatible with the welfare of others. Some of the greatest triumphs of sanitary science in the past have been by interference with the liberty of the subject. . . . In certain occupations it has been found necessary to step in between master and servant, in order to insure that the conditions of labor shall be as healthy as possible. In regard to house property, this interference with freedom of contract has been felt to be most galling and oppressive. But surely it is as reasonable to enforce sanitary regulations on landlords as to require that a butcher shall not sell unsound meat. Both are vendors; with this difference, that a man may usually change his butcher, but circumstance may oblige him to remain in a house, however unhealthy it may be.