

1908.
NEW ZEALAND.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF HOSPITALS AND CHARITABLE INSTITUTIONS ACTS:

CONFERENCE OF DELEGATES OF HOSPITAL AND CHARITABLE AID BOARDS AND SEPARATE INSTITUTIONS, HELD AT WELLINGTON ON THE 9TH, 10TH, AND 11TH JUNE, 1908.

Presented to both Houses of the General Assembly by Command of His Excellency.

CONTENTS.

| | PAGE | | PAGE |
|---|------|---|------|
| Inspector-General to Hon. Minister for Hospitals and Charitable Aid | 1 | Agenda paper placed before Conference | 44 |
| Summary of resolutions passed by Conference | 2 | Supplementary agenda paper placed before Conference | 52 |
| Minutes of proceedings of Conference | 5 | Copy of Bill discussed by Conference] | 55 |
| Report of proceedings of Conference | 12 | Index | i |

INDEX.

INDEX TO SUBJECTS.

| | PAGE |
|--|----------------------|
| Appeals | 9, 33 |
| Appointments of medical officers and matrons | 8 |
| Apportionment of expenditure | 9, 32 |
| Bequests for specific purposes | 10, 35 |
| Boards, one only in each district | 1, 5, 6, 19 |
| Chairman of | 9, 11, 31 |
| Continuity of office | 1, 7, 23 |
| Election, mode of | 1, 6, 7, 19 |
| Representation of honorary medical staff | 2, 11, 38 |
| " voluntary contributors | 9 |
| " Government | 8, 19, 29 |
| " general | 1, 6, 7, 19, 22 |
| Travelling-expenses | 9, 31 |
| Vacancies | 11 |
| Borrowing-powers of Boards | 9 |
| Chairman, election of | 11 |
| " position an honorary one | 9, 31 |
| Children and charitable aid | 10, 36, 43 |
| Committees, election of | 1, 7, 27 |
| Conference, admission of Press | 18 |
| " Chairman | 11, 37, 43 |
| " Committee of | 5, 8, 11, 19 |
| " method of procedure | 5, 6, 7, 18 |
| " report of | 11 |
| " Secretary | 11, 31, 37 |
| Consolidated Fund to bear cost of hospitals and charitable aid | 7 |
| Continuity of office of Boards | 1, 7, 23 |
| " Contributor," definition of | 8, 10, 31 |
| Date Act to come into force | 5 |
| " of elections | 9 |
| Delegates, list of | 5 |
| Departmental control | 2, 8, 10, 29, 34, 35 |
| Districts, creation of new | 11 |
| " proposed | 1, 8 |
| Drunkards in hospitals | 11, 36 |
| Election of Boards, mode of | 1, 6, 7, 19 |
| " Trustees | 10, 34 |
| Endowments | 10 |
| Government control | 2, 8, 10, 29, 34, 35 |

INDEX TO SUBJECTS—continued.

| | PAGE. |
|--|------------------|
| Guardians, appointment of | 10, 36 |
| Honorary medical staff, representation on Board | 38, 2, 11 |
| Husbands deserting | 10 |
| Inspector-General to be member of all Boards | 8 |
| Industrial schools, committal of children to | 10, 43 |
| Leaseholders' contributions | 9, 32 |
| Leasing-power | 9 |
| " Maintenance," definition of | 10 |
| Maintenance, recovery of cost of | 9, 33 |
| Medical officers and matrons, appointment of | 8, 29 |
| Old-age pensioners | 11, 37 |
| Patients, treatment of, from districts in which there is no hospital | 36 |
| Police cases in hospitals | 11, 36 |
| Probationers, training of | 10, 36 |
| Property, power to sell | 9, 43 |
| Rateable values, adjustment of | 9 |
| Rating on land only | 11 |
| Rating, method of | 33 |
| Remits considered and struck out | 8 |
| Representation | 1, 6, 7, 19, 22 |
| " of Government | 8, 19, 29 |
| " voluntary contributors | 9 |
| " honorary medical staff | 2, 11, 38 |
| Samaritan Home | 23, 24 |
| Selling-power of Boards | 9, 43 |
| Separate institutions | 1, 7, 10, 23, 34 |
| Settlement, establishment of | 9, 10, 33 |
| Sites, power to acquire | 11, 38 |
| Stamp duty, exemption from | 10 |
| Subsidies, reduction of | 2, 7, 10, 27, 40 |
| Superannuation | 11, 36 |
| Tenders | 9 |
| Town districts, inclusion of | 9 |
| Travelling-expenses | 9, 31 |
| Trustees, election of | 10, 34 |
| Vacancies on Boards or Committees | 11 |
| Women and children, protection of | 10 |

INDEX—continued.

INDEX TO SPEAKERS.

| | PAGE. |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| Bagnall, Mr. .. | 20, 21, 22, 26, 27, 31, 32, 34, 35, 37, 38, 39, 41, 43 |
| Bain, Mr. .. | 21, 26, 41, 43 |
| Batchelor, Dr. .. | 22, 35, 38, 40, 43 |
| Bellringer, Mr. .. | 20, 22, 27, 31, 35, 36, 37, 41, 42 |
| Bolton, Mr. .. | 23, 25 |
| Brown, Mr. .. | 21, 32 |
| Burke, Mr. .. | 21 |
| Carson, Mr. .. | 21, 29, 30, 32, 39, 42, 43 |
| Chapman, Mr. .. | 24 |
| Chairman, The .. | 13, 18, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 27, 28, 29, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 40, 41, 42, 43 |
| Chayton, Mr. .. | 26 |
| Chepmell, Mr. .. | 28 |
| Cooper, Mr. .. | 20, 23, 41 |
| Cranby, Mr. .. | 21, 36 |
| Crawford, Mr. .. | 22, 33 |
| Darton, Mr. .. | 24, 31, 32, 39 |
| Davis, Mr. .. | 21, 29 |
| Davison, Mr. .. | 20, 41 |
| Dunlop, Mr. .. | 35 |
| Eaton, Mr. .. | 20, 26, 31 |
| Evans, Mr. .. | 25 |
| Fowlds, Hon. G. .. | 12 |
| Fraser, Mr. .. | 22, 23, 42 |
| Gallaway, Mr. .. | 19, 20, 22, 25, 29, 31, 33, 35, 37, 40, 42, 43 |
| Harper, Mr. .. | 35 |
| Hogg, Mr. .. | 21 |
| Horner, Mr. .. | 42 |
| Horrell, Mr. .. | 20, 28, 29, 36, 37, 39 |
| Inspector-General (see Chairman). | |
| Jordan, Canon .. | 37, 42 |
| Kempthorne, Rev. .. | 24 |
| Kirk, Mr. R. C. .. | 21, 24, 28, 29, 31, 34, 38, 39, 41 |
| Knight, Mr. .. | 25, 30, 40, 41 |
| Liardet, Mr. .. | 34 |
| Logan, Mr. .. | 23, 30, 33, 36 |
| London, Mr. .. | 24 |

INDEX TO SPEAKERS—continued.

| | PAGE. |
|--------------------------------|--|
| Loudon, Mr. .. | 19, 22, 23, 28, 30, 40 |
| Luke, Hon. C. M. .. | 19, 20, 25, 30, 34, 35, 36, 39 |
| Luke, Mr. J. P. .. | 19, 22, 24, 28, 29, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 39 |
| Lyle, Mr. .. | 24, 30 |
| Manhire, Mr. .. | 20, 22, 24 |
| Marx, Mr. .. | 20, 23, 27 |
| Maxton, Mr. .. | 19, 20, 31, 36, 39 |
| McGrath, Mr. .. | 21 |
| McMahon, Mr. .. | 28, 29, 41 |
| Milligan, Mr. .. | 24, 29, 32 |
| Minister of Hospitals .. | 12 |
| Moore, Mr. .. | 20, 26, 30 |
| Morrison, Mr. .. | 26 |
| Mulvihill, Mr. .. | 22 |
| Norris, Mr. .. | 23, 28, 29, 30, 32, 33, 35, 42, 43 |
| O'Brien, Mr. .. | 19, 21, 23, 30, 31, 36 |
| Payling, Mr. .. | 18, 20, 26, 27, 35, 39 |
| Pearce, Mr. .. | 20, 32 |
| Power, Mr. .. | 25, 30 |
| Quin, Mr. .. | 23, 27 |
| Rayner, Mr. .. | 24 |
| Rhodes, Mr. .. | 22, 26 |
| Ritchie, Mr. .. | 20, 30, 42 |
| Rutherford, Mr. .. | 37, 38, 43 |
| Scantlebury, Mr. .. | 21, 23, 25, 30, 37, 41 |
| Stead, Mr. .. | 22 |
| Stevens, Mr. .. | 23 |
| Stevenson, Mr. .. | 33, 35, 43 |
| Talbot, Mr. .. | 21, 26 |
| Talboys, Mr. .. | 25, 34, 36, 37 |
| Tapley, Mr. .. | 20, 25, 29, 31, 41 |
| Tapper, Mr. .. | 20, 24, 27, 28, 32, 33, 37, 39, 41, 43 |
| Valentine, Dr. (see Chairman). | |
| Vaughan, Mr. .. | 19 |
| Walker, Mr. .. | 23 |
| Webb, Mr. .. | 20, 23, 26, 27, 28 |
| Williams, Mr. .. | 29 |
| Wilson, Mr. J. G. .. | 22, 23, 29, 30 |

REPORT.

The INSPECTOR-GENERAL OF HOSPITALS AND CHARITABLE INSTITUTIONS to the Hon. G. FOWLDS,
Minister for Hospitals and Charitable Aid.

SIR,—

18th June, 1908.

In response to expressed wish of the Counties Conference, held in June of last year, the proposed Hospitals and Charitable Aid Bill was circulated among the authorities concerned, and a Conference of delegates from Hospital and Charitable Aid Boards and separate institutions was held in Wellington, commencing 9th June, 1908.

Some 100 delegates attended the Conference, which lasted three days. During this period the main principles of the Bill were discussed, and the 212 remits bearing on those principles were dealt with as opportunity arose.

In addition the Conference made certain very valuable suggestions and recommendations on hospital and charitable-aid matters, which will no doubt be fully considered by the Government before the new Hospitals Bill is brought down.

Never before in the history of the Dominion has so important a Conference been held regarding the system governing our hospitals and charitable aid. The attending delegates were prominent men in the districts from whence they came, as may be seen from the fact that there were 2 members and 3 ex-members of Parliament; 4 mayors; 10 ex-mayors; 8 chairmen of County Councils; 26 chairmen and 3 ex-chairmen of Hospital and Charitable Aid Boards; and 12 chairmen and 2 ex-chairmen of separate institutions. In every sense of the word, therefore, it can be claimed that the Conference was a thoroughly representative one.

It says much for the public spirit and patriotism of these gentlemen that they attended, in many instances at considerable personal inconvenience, a Conference concerning questions which have so important a bearing not only on the treatment to be meted out to the sick and indigent poor, but also on the future history of the people of the Dominion.

Large Districts.—As regards the main principles of the Bill, it was only to be expected that there would be considerable opposition to the proposal to divide the Dominion into larger hospital districts. Many of the smaller hospital districts naturally object, on more or less reasonable grounds, to being merged into one large district. Nevertheless everything goes to show that efficiency and economy of administration are more likely to be effected by large than by small districts especially in conjunction with a system of appointing committees, as agreed upon by the Conference.

Of the twenty hospital districts set forth in the First Schedule of the Bill, the following eight were agreed to by the delegates present: North Auckland, Auckland, Waikato, Hawke's Bay, Palmerston North, Nelson, South Canterbury, Waitaki. The objections of the remaining districts concerned are being carefully gone into, as it was obvious to the Conference that the question could not be decided by a general vote. Those objecting to the amalgamation of their districts have been, or will be, met and conferred with; and in more than one instance it is probable that satisfactory arrangements can be made to meet the objections. In other instances, however, strong local feeling has to be contended with; and very careful consideration will be required as to what in such cases will be the best course to pursue not only in the interests of the district, but also in the interests of the Dominion as a whole.

Mode of Election.—The decision of the Conference with regard to the mode of election was not a matter for surprise. To many, doubtless, the present system of election seems all that can be desired, and in many districts it may have worked well; nevertheless there is a strong feeling throughout the country that the Boards should be elected by those entitled to vote at local bodies' elections, and this feeling cannot be altogether ignored.

Hospitals and Charitable Relief under One Control.—The practically unanimous opinion that hospital and charitable-aid matters should be under the control of one Board was eminently satisfactory, and will undoubtedly make for an economical and easy administration.

Continuity of Office.—The need for Boards to have a longer continuity of office was also unanimously recognised by the Conference, which was also emphatic in its opinion that the position of Chairman should be an honorary one. The country is to be congratulated on having available a number of experienced men who are eager to devote gratuitously a great part of their time to onerous work which does not always bring about that appreciation which is often richly deserved.

Election of Committees.—The decision with regard to the election of Committees is an admirable one, and the power that may be given Boards to appoint Committees, "not necessarily of its own members," will render available for our institutions the services of many desirable persons who under the present order of things are reluctant to come forward.

Separate Institutions.—"That the system of separate institutions, as at present in force, is approved by this Conference, and should be continued in cases where the majority of contributory local authorities desire it."

It is not surprising that the above was carried. If the text of this resolution becomes law separate institutions in some measure will be subject to the influence of the contributory authorities who find the greater portion of the expenditure. In effect the existence of a separate institution will very properly depend upon the contributory local bodies of the district, who find

the money. Thus one of the chief grievances on the part of the latter against the separate-institution system is to some extent removed. Nevertheless the system is a bad one. There seems no special reason to retain separate institutions except those that can carry on their existence without coming on the rates, as was intended when the Acts of 1885 and 1886 were framed. It was naturally to be expected that all the delegates of separate institutions would support this contention, but it is significant that the two largest benevolent institutions in the Dominion—viz., the Wellington Benevolent and the Otago Benevolent—both separate institutions—voted for an alternative proposal—lost on the votes—to the effect that “the Boards which find the money for charitable aid should have entire control of the expenditure.”

Departmental Control.—In the face of the remits on the subject it was anticipated that the Conference would strenuously oppose anything in the nature of departmental control, special exception being taken to clauses 21 and 23 of the Bill, relating respectively to extensions and new buildings and the appointment of medical superintendents and matrons. Finally, however, the Conference agreed to submit suggested appointments to the Minister in charge of the Department twenty-one days before the appointments were to be made. This could give the Minister an opportunity of letting the Board know if in his opinion such an appointment was undesirable. It was also agreed that plans of extensions or alterations of buildings likely to cost over £100 were to be first submitted for Ministerial approval.

A suggestion that Government nominees were to be appointed to every Board was lost on the voices.

Reduction of Subsidies.—The clauses in the Bill relating to the gradual reduction of the subsidies did not meet with any support, although it was indicated that such reduction was very properly aimed at the expenditure on outdoor relief rather than at the expenditure on hospitals and charitable institutions. Nevertheless no effectual reduction will be made in the expenditure on outdoor relief until the whole cost is borne by local taxation.

Representation of Honorary Medical Staff on Boards.—As regards the many excellent recommendations by the Conference on minor matters, particular notice may be drawn to the fact that by 27 votes to 16 the Conference was of opinion that the honorary medical staff of our larger hospitals should be represented on the District Boards.

I have, &c.,

T. H. A. VALENTINE,
Inspector-General.

The Hon. the Minister for Hospitals and Charitable Aid.

SCHEDULE OF RESOLUTIONS PASSED BY THE CONFERENCE.

SHORT TITLE.

1. That the Act come into operation on the 1st day of April, 1909.

NOT MORE THAN ONE BOARD IN EACH DISTRICT.

2. That the functions of hospitals and charitable aid should be administered by one Board.

INCLUSION OF TOWN DISTRICTS.

3. That the words “and town districts” be inserted after the word “borough” in the first line of clause 4, subsection (1).

REPRESENTATION ON DISTRICT BOARD.

4. That the present mode of representation is the most equitable to all contributory authorities, and it be a recommendation that clause 6 of the amending Act of 1886 be a clause in the amending Bill.
5. That the present basis of apportionment of representation be adopted.

CONTINUITY OF OFFICE.

6. That continuity of office be secured for three years.

VOLUNTARY CONTRIBUTORS TO BE REPRESENTED ON BOARD.

7. That voluntary contributors be allowed to elect a member of the Board.

HONORARY MEDICAL STAFF TO BE REPRESENTED ON BOARD.

8. That in any base hospital where there is an honorary medical staff of not less than six members they shall annually elect one of their number to represent them on the Hospital Board, and he shall be an *ex officio* member thereof.

ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN.

9. Clause 14: Chairman to be elected on the second Wednesday in May. Subclause (2) to be altered to read "If unable within one month to appoint a Chairman, the Governor to appoint one."

POSITION OF CHAIRMAN TO BE HONORARY.

10. That the position of Chairman should be maintained as an honorary one.

VACANCIES ON BOARD.

11. Vacancies on Board or committees to be filled by Board itself, as at present.

APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEES.

12. That the Board may appoint committees, not necessarily from its own members, to carry out the functions of the Board, and may delegate to each Committee such of its powers as may be deemed to be expedient.

POWER UNDER PUBLIC WORKS ACT TO ACQUIRE SITES.

13. Clause 19, subsection (a): Add "Or any addition to any site either by proceedings under the Public Works Act or other methods."

PLANS OF PROPOSED BUILDING OPERATIONS TO BE FIRST SUBMITTED TO MINISTER.

14. Clause 21, line 4: After the word "institution" the words "involving an expenditure of over £100" be inserted, and a three-weeks time-limit inserted.

TRAVELLING-EXPENSES.

15. That the Chairman and members of Boards and committees when absent from home on Board business be paid all locomotion expenses, together with 12s. 6d. a day.

STAFF APPOINTMENTS.

16. That, in lieu of the provision giving the Minister power to veto any appointment, the following provision be made: "That no appointment of medical officer or matron shall be made until after the expiration of twenty-one days after the Minister shall have been notified of the intention to make such an appointment."

CONTRACTS ABOVE £20 TO BE BY PUBLIC TENDER.

17. That the word "twenty" be inserted in place of the word "ten" in the first line of clause 28, subsection (3).

SUBSIDIES.

18. That the subsidies from the Government continue as at present.

ADJUSTMENT OF RATEABLE VALUES.

19. That a special mode of adjustment of rateable values should be laid down in section 37, as between local authorities rating on the annual value and local authorities rating on the capital value.

BORROWING-POWERS.

20. That Boards, as well as Trustees of separate institutions, should be empowered to borrow for certain purposes (*vide* section 32 of 1885 Act and sections 2 and 3, 1907).

POWER TO SELL PROPERTY.

21. That in the event of any small properties coming into the hands of the Board, power be given to sell.

22. That power be given to the Boards, subject to the Minister's approval, to sell or exchange any lands or portions of lands vested in them and found to be unsuitable, or not necessary, for hospital and charitable-aid purposes, the proceeds of such sale to be applied only in the acquisition of other lands, or in the extension of building for hospital or charitable-aid purposes.

ACQUISITION OF INTEREST ACCRUING FROM BEQUESTS.

23. That subsection (2) of section 53 be amended by providing that the interest accruing be accumulated and applied to augment the bequest, and not to apply towards the maintenance of the institution.

SEPARATE INSTITUTIONS.

24. That the system of separate institutions, as at present in force, is approved by this Conference, and should be continued in cases where the majority of the contributory local authorities desire it.

INCORPORATION OF SEPARATE INSTITUTIONS.

25. That when a separate institution is to be established, the promoters shall once a week for four weeks advertise in some local paper their intention of making application to the Minister for the purpose.

26. That no separate institution should be incorporated without the sanction of the Board of the district in which the proposed institution will be situated.

DEFINITION OF CONTRIBUTOR (SEPARATE INSTITUTIONS).

27. That in section 2, line 20, the words "one pound" be struck out, and the words "five shillings" inserted. Section 51, line 19: The words "one pound" be struck out, and the words "five shillings" be inserted. Section 56, line 9: After the word "of" strike out the words "one pound," and insert the words "five shillings."

ELECTION OF TRUSTEES: QUALIFICATION OF VOTER.

28. Section 56, subsection (3): That "three months" be substituted for "one month."

DATE OF ELECTION.

29. That the month of April should be substituted for the month of January, so that the report and accounts can be dealt with at the end of the financial year.

RECOVERY OF MAINTENANCE.

30. Section 74 should be recast somewhat as follows: "Where any person who receives relief at the hands of a Board or the Trustees of a separate institution has not at the time of first receiving such relief therefrom resided for the period of one year in the district within which such Board or Trustees control the administration, the Board or the Trustees, as the case may be, may recover the whole cost of such relief from the Trustees or the Board of the district in which such person last resided for one whole year: Provided that during the time any such person is in a hospital or other institution or separate institution, or is in receipt of outdoor relief in the district within which such person has taken abode, no such person shall be deemed to have been resident therein for the purpose of establishing settlement within the meaning of this section.

31. That the principles contained in the foregoing resolution be made to apply to section 75 of the Bill.

"MAINTENANCE" TO BE CLEARLY AND COMPREHENSIVELY DEFINED.

32. That the fees to be paid by patients to be more clearly defined under the heading "Maintenance," so as to prevent hospital abuse.

DEPARTMENTAL INQUIRIES.

33. That the following addition be made to section 77, subsection (1): "and that copies of any report be forwarded to the respective Boards interested."

EXEMPTION FROM STAMP DUTY.

34. That all declarations and documents should be exempted from stamp duty.

GUARDIANS OF ORPHANS.

35. That a clause similar to clause 4 of the Act of 1886 be inserted providing for the appointment of guardians.

COMMITTAL OF CHILDREN TO INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS.

36. That the Government be requested to make provision by which Magistrates would not be empowered to commit children to an industrial school unless the Hospital and Charitable Aid Board of the district had first refused to make provision for such children.

PROTECTION OF WOMEN AND CHILDREN.

37. That Charitable Aid Boards have more power to protect women and children.

POWER TO BRING BACK ABSCONDING HUSBANDS.

38. That action should be taken by the Government to bring back deserting husbands.

OLD-AGE PENSIONS.

39. That provision should be made in connection with the old-age pensions by which, in case of persons who are evidently more than sixty-five years of age, but who have no documentary evidence thereof, the Magistrate may satisfy himself in such a way as he thinks fit.

40. That, in the case of pensioners who get drunk, their pensions should not be cancelled for so long a period as five years, as is now done.

SUPERANNUATION.

41. That provision should be made whereby employees of the Hospital and Charitable Aid Boards should be allowed to participate in the benefits of the Civil Service Superannuation scheme.

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS.

SYDNEY STREET SCHOOLROOM, WELLINGTON, TUESDAY, 9TH JUNE, 1908.

The Conference assembled at 10 a.m.

The Hon. G. Fowlds, Minister for Hospitals and Charitable Aid, presided, and addressed the meeting.

A vote of thanks to the Minister for his attendance and address was proposed by Mr. J. P. Luke (Wellington Hospital Board), and seconded by Mr. W. H. Cooper (Samaritan Home, Christchurch).—Carried by acclamation.

The Minister then left the chair, which was taken by the Inspector-General of Hospitals, Dr. T. H. A. Valintine.

The Inspector-General addressed the Conference.

The Conference resolved that the Press be admitted.

It was decided that the hours of meeting should be from 10 a.m. to 12.45 p.m. and from 2 p.m. to 5 p.m. daily; evening sittings to be held if necessary.

The Chairman ruled that each Board and separate institution should have one vote; that in the case of disagreement between delegates representing the same Board, if the numbers were equal, there should be no vote, but that otherwise the majority vote should be taken to represent the vote of that Board or Institution.

A roll of those present was then taken, the following delegates handing in their names: *Separate Institutions, Hospitals*: Northern Wairoa, Thomas Webb; Mercury Bay, C. O'Brien; Thames, Arch. Burns, A. Court; Waihi, J. J. Scanlon, W. G. Power; Coromandel, T. W. Rhodes; Wellington, Hon. C. M. Luke; South Wairarapa, Mark Maxton; Masterton, R. Brown; Dannevirke, George Wrath; Napier, C. H. Cranly; Charleston, J. R. Rayner; Grey River, W. R. Kettle; Reefton, E. J. Scantlebury; Kumara, E. Mulvihill; Westland, H. B. Bock; Waimate, T. Sinclair; Oamaru, J. Mainland; Dunedin, Alfred Tapper, Dr. Batchelor, J. Loudon; Cromwell, James Ritchie; Arrow, G. D. Baird; Wakatipu, John Cockburn; Southland, John Stead, A. F. Hawke; Wallace and Fiord, John Fraser, Joseph Lyle. *Hospital Boards*: Patea, G. V. Pearce, E. C. Horner; Wanganui, Gilbert Carson, William Ritchie; Wellington, C. J. Crawford, J. P. Luke, George Willis, F. T. Moore; Wairarapa, E. G. Eton; Ashburton, Henry Davis, C. Harper; North Canterbury, Frederick Horrell, William Dunlop, G. Payling; Otago, H. L. Tapley, Malcolm Stevenson. *Hospital and Charitable Aid Boards*: North Auckland, D. McCarroll, Joseph Vaughan; Auckland, G. Knight, L. J. Bagnall; Bay of Plenty, Rev. Canon Jordan; Waiapu, K. S. Williams; Waikato, William P. Chepnell, John Fisher; Taranaki, C. M. Lepper, F. C. J. Bellringer; Stratford, P. F. Ralfe, H. N. Liardet; Hawera, Jacob Marx, J. T. Quinn; Palmerston North, Walter Rutherford, J. G. Wilson; Picton, A. G. Fell, D. A. Chaytor; Nelson, G. Macmahon, Buller, G. R. Lamplough; Inangahua, E. J. Scantlebury; Grey, W. R. Kettle; Westland, J. McGuigan; South Canterbury, John Talbot, H. S. Russell; Waitaki, Robert Milligan; Maniototo, Robert Logan; Southland, A. Bain, Thomas Green; Wallace and Fiord, G. O. Cassels, H. E. Hurst. *Separate Institutions, Charitable Aid*: Hawke's Bay Children's Home, R. D. Maclean; Wellington Benevolent Institution, D. Robertson; Wellington Society for Relief of Aged Needy, C. P. Powles; Reefton Ladies' Benevolent Society, Jane T. Lewis; Hokitika Benevolent Society, James Toomey; Samaritan Home, Christchurch, W. H. Cooper; North Otago Benevolent Society, Andrew Fraser; Otago Benevolent Institution, Alfred Tapper, J. McRae Galloway, W. T. Talboys. *Charitable Aid Boards*: Thames and Coromandel, C. O'Brien; Patea and Wanganui, Gilbert Carson, William Ritchie; Wellington and Wairarapa, George Willis, R. C. Kirk; Hawke's Bay United, W. J. McGrath, C. H. Cranly; Ashburton and North Canterbury, T. C. Norris, P. B. Manhire, J. H. Davison; Otago and Tuapeka, H. L. Tapley, J. H. Walker, Malcolm Stevenson.

The Chairman asked for expression of opinion as to the method of procedure, and it was resolved to take the Bill clause by clause.

Motion No. 1, moved by Mr. P. B. Manhire (Ashburton and North Canterbury Charitable Aid Board), seconded by Mr. W. H. Cooper (Samaritan Home): "That the Bill be taken clause by clause, and that any particular Board that has sent a remit can move the same when the clause is before the Conference."—Carried on the voices.

Motion No. 2 (clause 1, subsection (1), of the Bill), moved by Mr. F. Horrell, and seconded by Mr. William Dunlop (both of North Canterbury Hospital Board): "That the Act come into operation on the 1st day of April, 1909."—Carried on the voices.

On clause 2 (the interpretation clause), Mr. J. P. Luke (Wellington District Hospital Board) moved and Mr. Bellringer (Taranaki Hospital and Charitable Aid Board) seconded the following resolution: "That in the opinion of this Conference the functions of hospitals and charitable aid should be administered by one Board."

Objection was then taken to the procedure, and it was resolved to adjourn till 2 p.m., to enable a committee to arrange the matter of procedure.

The Chairman asked the following members to act with him as a committee: Hon. C. M. Luke (Wellington Hospital Trustees), Mr. J. P. Luke (Wellington District Hospital Board), Mr. Cranly (Napier Hospital Trustees), Mr. Burns (Thames Hospital Trustees), Mr. Payling (Christchurch Hospital Board), Mr. Scantlebury (Reefton Hospital and Inangahua Hospital and Charitable Aid Board), Mr. Kettle (Grey River Hospital Trustees), Mr. Bellringer (New Plymouth Hospital and Charitable Aid Board), Mr. Galloway (Otago Benevolent Institution).

The Conference adjourned, and reassembled at 2 p.m.

Mr. Gallaway announced that the committee had arranged the following procedure:—

1. That the delegates agree among themselves who shall record the vote of his Board or institution.
2. That the voting be recorded on a voting-paper.
3. That the following questions be considered seriatim:—
 - (a.) Whether hospital and charitable matters be administered in each district by one Board.
 - (b.) Election of Boards—who is to vote.
 - (c.) Election of Boards—basis of representation.
 - (d.) Election of Boards—continuity of office.
 - (e.) Abolition of separate institutions.
 - (f.) Reduction of subsidies.
 - (g.) Government control.
 - (h.) Discussion of Bill clause by clause.

Motion No. 3, proposed by Mr. Luke and seconded by Mr. Bellringer, was then again put to the Conference—viz., “That in the opinion of this Conference the functions of hospitals and charitable aid should be administered by one Board.”—Carried: For, 63; against, 4.

The voting was as follows:—

Ayes.—Separate institutions, hospitals: Northern Wairoa, Mercury Bay, Thames, Waihi, Coromandel, Wellington, South Wairarapa, Masterton, Dannevirke, Charleston, Grey River, Reefton, Kumara, Westland, Waimate, Dunedin, Dunstan, Cromwell, Naseby, Arrow, Wakatipu, Southland. Hospital Boards: Thames, Coromandel, Patea, Wanganui, Wellington, Wairarapa, Hawke's Bay, Ashburton, North Canterbury, Otago. Hospital and Charitable Aid Boards: North Auckland, Auckland, Waihi, Bay of Plenty, Waipapu, Waikato, Taranaki, Stratford, Hawera, Palmerston North, Picton, Nelson, Buller, Inangahua, Grey, Westland, South Canterbury, Maniototo, Southland, Waitaki. Separate institutions, charitable aid: Hawke's Bay Children's Home, Wellington Society for Relief of Aged Needy, Reefton Ladies' Benevolent Society, Greymouth Benevolent Society, Hokitika Benevolent Society, North Otago Benevolent Society, Otago Benevolent Institution. Charitable Aid Boards: Thames and Coromandel, Patea and Wanganui, Wellington and Wairarapa, Hawke's Bay United, Ashburton and North Canterbury.

Noes.—Separate institutions, hospitals: Oamaru, Wallace and Fiord. Hospital and Charitable Aid Boards: Wallace and Fiord. Separate institutions, charitable aid: Samaritan Home (Christchurch).

Motion No. 4, proposed by Mr. J. P. Luke (Wellington District Hospital Board), seconded by Mr. F. F. Moore (Wellington District Hospital Board): “That the Board consists of members elected as follows: One or more members to be elected by each parliamentary electorate. That as long as the Government contribute the same amount of subsidy as at present they be represented by one or more members on each Board.”

Motion No. 5, amendment proposed by Mr. F. Bellringer (Taranaki Hospital and Charitable Aid Board), seconded by Mr. H. L. Tapley (Otago Charitable Aid Board): “That this Conference is of opinion that the present mode of representation is the most equitable to all contributory authorities, and recommends that clause 6 of the amending Act of 1886 be a clause in the amending Bill.”—Carried on the voices.

Motion No. 6, moved as a further amendment by Mr. J. McRae Gallaway (Otago Benevolent Institution), seconded by Mr. J. Loudon (Dunedin Hospital Trustees): “That the members of the Board shall be elected by those persons for the time being entitled to elect members to a local authority.”—Lost: For, 15; against, 52.

The voting was as follows:—

Ayes.—Separate institutions, hospitals: Mercury Bay, Dunedin, Naseby, Southland. Hospital Boards: Wellington. Hospital and Charitable Aid Boards: Auckland, Waitaki, Maniototo. Separate institutions, charitable aid: Samaritan Home (Christchurch), North Otago Benevolent Society, Otago Benevolent Institution. Charitable Aid Boards: Thames and Coromandel, Patea and Wanganui, Hawke's Bay United, Ashburton and North Canterbury.

Noes.—Separate institutions, hospitals: Northern Wairoa, Thames, Waihi, Coromandel, Wellington, South Wairarapa, Masterton, Dannevirke, Napier, Charleston, Grey River, Reefton, Kumara, Westland, Waimate, Oamaru, Cromwell, Arrow, Wakatipu, Wallace and Fiord. Hospital Boards: Thames, Patea, Wanganui, Wairarapa, Hawke's Bay, Ashburton, North Canterbury, Otago. Hospital and Charitable Aid Boards: North Auckland, Waihi, Bay of Plenty, Waipapu, Waikato, Taranaki, Stratford, Hawera, Palmerston North, Picton, Nelson, Buller, Inangahua, Grey, Westland, South Canterbury, Southland, Wallace and Fiord. Separate institutions, charitable aid: Hawke's Bay Children's Home, Reefton Ladies' Benevolent Society, Greymouth Benevolent Society, Hokitika Benevolent Society. Charitable Aid Boards: Wellington and Wairarapa, Otago and Tuapeka.

Motion No. 7, moved by Mr. T. W. Rhodes (Coromandel Hospital Trustees), seconded by Mr. T. O'Brien (Mercury Bay Hospital Trustees): “That the contributing local authorities and subscribers elect the representatives to the Board in proportion to the amount contributed, representatives to be elected under similar conditions to those which govern the election of members of the Board of Education.”—Lost on the voices.

Mr. Bellringer's motion (No. 5) was then finally put and carried on the voices.

The Chairman put it to the meeting whether the Conference should sit from 7 till 10 that evening.—Lost on the voices.

The Conference then adjourned till 10 a.m. the next morning.

WEDNESDAY, 10TH JUNE, 1908.

The Conference reassembled at 10 a.m.

The Conference resolved to dispense with the reading of minutes.

Motion No. 8. Mr. J. G. Wilson (Palmerston North Hospital and Charitable Aid Board) proposed, and Mr. J. T. Quinn (Hawera Hospital and Charitable Aid Board) seconded, "That the present basis of apportionment of representation be adopted."—Carried on the voices.

Motion No. 9. The Rev. Canon Jordan (Bay of Plenty Hospital and Charitable Aid Board) proposed, and Mr. Walter Rutherford (Palmerston North Hospital and Charitable Aid Board) seconded, "That no speaker in any one speech shall exceed the limit of five minutes."—Carried on the voices.

Motion No. 10. Mr. J. Marx (Hawera Hospital and Charitable Aid Board) proposed, and Mr. J. G. Wilson (Palmerston North Hospital and Charitable Aid Board) seconded, "That continuity of office be secured by election of one-third of the members each year, those to retire to be decided by ballot, thus giving a three-years maximum of office."

Motion No. 11. Mr. Robert Logan (Maniototo Hospital and Charitable Aid Board) moved, and it was seconded, "That this resolution be altered to read simply, 'That continuity of office be secured for three years.'"—Carried on the voices.

Motion No. 12. Mr. Thomas Webb (Northern Wairoa Hospital Trustees) proposed, and Mr. W. H. Cooper (Samaritan Home) seconded, "That the system of separate institutions, as at present in force, is approved by this Conference, and should be continued."

Motion No. 13. Mr. Robert Milligan (Waitaki Hospital and Charitable Aid Board) proposed, and Mr. Mainland (Oamaru Hospital Trustees) seconded, "That the following words be added to the previous resolution: 'in cases where the majority of the contributory local authorities desire it.'"—Agreed to by proposer and seconder of resolution No. 12.

Motion No. 14. Mr. Manhire (Ashburton and North Canterbury Charitable Aid Board) and Mr. Horrell (North Canterbury Hospital Board) moved as an amendment, "That this Conference affirms the principle that the Boards which find the money for charitable aid should have entire control of the expenditure."—Lost: 29 for; 43 against.

The voting was as follows:—

Ayes.—Separate institutions, hospitals: Napier, Naseby. Hospital Boards: Patea, Wanganui, Wellington, Hawke's Bay, Ashburton, North Canterbury, Otago. Hospital and Charitable Aid Boards: Auckland, Cook, Waikato, Taranaki, Palmerston North, Picton, Wairau, Nelson, South Canterbury, Maniototo, Southland. Separate institutions, charitable aid: Hawke's Bay Children's Home; Wellington Benevolent Institution; St. Andrew's Orphanage, Nelson; Otago Benevolent Institution. Charitable Aid Boards: Patea and Wanganui, Wellington and Wairarapa, Hawke's Bay United, Ashburton and North Canterbury, Otago and Tuapeka.

Noes.—Separate institutions, hospitals: Northern Wairoa, Mercury Bay, Thames, Waihi, Coromandel, Wellington, South Wairarapa, Masterton, Dannevirke, Charleston, Grey River, Reefton, Kumara, Westland, Waimate, Oamaru, Dunedin, Cromwell, Arrow, Wakatipu, Southland, Wallace and Fiord. Hospital Boards: Thames, Coromandel, Wairarapa. Hospital and Charitable Aid Boards: North Auckland, Waihi, Bay of Plenty, Waipatu, Stratford, Hawera, Buller, Inangahua, Grey, Westland, Waitaki, Wallace and Fiord. Separate institutions, charitable aid: Reefton Ladies' Benevolent Society; Greymouth Benevolent Society; Hokitika Benevolent Society; Samaritan Home, Christchurch; North Otago Benevolent Society. Charitable Aid Boards: Thames and Coromandel.

Motion No. 12 was then put and carried.

Motion No. 15. Mr. Bellringer (Taranaki Hospital and Charitable Aid Board) moved, and Mr. Quinn (Hawera Hospital and Charitable Aid Board) seconded, "That the subsidies from the Government continue as at present."

Motion No. 16. Mr. Tapper (Dunedin Hospital Trustees) moved, and Mr. J. H. Davison (Ashburton and North Canterbury Charitable Aid Board) seconded, as an amendment, "That the ordinary upkeep of hospitals and charitable institutions be paid out of the Consolidated Fund."

The Inspector-General asked the Conference to defer the question of reduction of subsidies in the meantime, as he would probably have an authoritative statement to make.

It was therefore resolved, on the motion of Mr. Rutherford, seconded by Mr. Quinn, That the question of the reduction of subsidies be postponed.

Motion No. 17. Mr. Norris (Ashburton and North Canterbury Charitable Aid Board) proposed, and Mr. Chepmell (Waikato Hospital and Charitable Aid Board) seconded, "That the Board may appoint standing or select committees of its own members for the purpose of dealing with the several departmental matters in relation to the management of hospitals or institutions, or financial questions, or the distribution of outdoor relief; such committees to report to the Board."

Motion No. 18. Mr. Webb (Northern Wairoa Hospital Trustees) moved, and Mr. G. Macmahon (Nelson Hospital and Charitable Aid Board) seconded, "That the words 'of its own members' be left out."

Mr. Norris agreed to insert before the words "of its own members" the words "not necessarily."

Motion No. 19. Mr. Milligan (Waitaki Hospital and Charitable Aid Board) moved as an amendment, "That the principles contained in the Municipal Corporations Act in reference to the appointment of committees be approved."

Motion No. 20. Mr. Gallaway (Otago Benevolent Institution) suggested the following as a substitution for resolution No. 17: "That the Board may appoint committees, not necessarily from its own members, to carry out the functions of the Board, and may delegate to each com-

mittee such of its powers as may be deemed to be expedient." This was accepted by Mr. Norris, and Mr. Milligan withdrew his amendment.—Carried on the voices.

Motion No. 21. Mr. J. G. Wilson (Palmerston North Hospital and Charitable Aid Board) moved, and Mr. Williams (Waipatu Hospital and Charitable Aid Board) seconded, "That, in lieu of the power of veto that is contained in the proposed Bill, the Inspector-General shall *ex officio* be member of all Boards in the Dominion."—Withdrawn.

Motion No. 22. Mr. Kirk (Wellington Hospital and Charitable Aid Board) moved, "That, in lieu of the provision giving the Minister power to veto any appointment, the following provision be made: 'That no appointment of a medical officer or matron shall be made until the expiration of twenty-one days after the Minister shall have been notified of the intention to make such appointment.'—Carried: For, 50; against, 14.

The voting was as follows:—

Ayes.—Separate institutions, hospitals: Northern Wairoa, Mercury Bay, Wellington, South Wairarapa, Masterton, Grey River, Reefton, Westland, Oamaru, Dunedin, Cromwell, Naseby, Wakatipu, Southland. Hospital Boards: Coromandel, Patea, Wanganui, Wairarapa, Ashburton, Otago. Hospital and Charitable Aid Boards: North Auckland, Auckland, Bay of Plenty, Waipatu, Cook, Waikato, Taranaki, Palmerston North, Picton, Wairau, Nelson, Buller, Grey, Westland, Waitaki, Maniototo, Southland. Separate institutions, charitable aid: Wairarapa North Benevolent Society; Wellington Benevolent Institution; St. Andrew's Orphanage, Nelson; Reefton Ladies' Benevolent Society; Hokitika Benevolent Society; Samaritan Home, Christchurch; North Otago Benevolent Society; Otago Benevolent Institution. Charitable Aid Boards: Thames and Coromandel, Patea and Wanganui, Wellington and Wairarapa, Ashburton and North Canterbury, Otago and Tuapeka.

Noes.—Separate institutions, hospitals: Waihi, Dannevirke, Napier, Charleston, Kumara, Waimate, Wallace and Fiord. Hospital Boards: Wellington, Hawke's Bay, North Canterbury. Hospital and Charitable Aid Boards: Waihi, Hawera, Stratford, South Canterbury, Wallace and Fiord. Charitable Aid Boards: Hawke's Bay United.

Motion No. 23. Mr. J. P. Luke (Wellington District Hospital Board) moved, and Mr. Tapley (Otago United Charitable Aid Board) seconded, "That as long as the Government contribute the same amount of subsidy as at present they be represented by one or not more than two members on each Board."—Lost on the voices.

The Chairman ruled that, as regards the proposed alterations of the boundaries of the districts, he would take separately, district by district, the opinions of the delegates of districts affected regarding their proposed district.

No objection was raised in the case of the proposed districts of North Auckland, Auckland, Hawke's Bay, Nelson, Palmerston North, South Canterbury, and Waitaki; the Waikato delegates also raised no objections to their district, providing outlying portions such as Waitomo and Taupo could be cut off and formed into a separate district when population increases to a sufficient extent. Objections were raised to the amalgamation of Thames with Coromandel; Cook with Waipatu; Taranaki with Stratford and Hawera (Taranaki agreeing, the two latter objecting): Patea objected to be united with Wanganui: objection was taken to the amalgamation of Wellington and Wairarapa; of Marlborough with Picton; of Grey, Inangahua, Buller, and Westland; of North Canterbury with Ashburton; of Otago with Central Otago; and of Southland with Wallace and Fiord.

The Inspector-General made appointments to meet the dissenting Boards to discuss their objections.

The following committee was set up to discuss the agenda paper, with a view to recommending on the following morning the remits which should be taken by the Conference for discussion: Messrs. J. P. Luke, Gallaway, Kirk, Norris, Scantlebury.

The Chairman conveyed from the Chairman of the Wellington Hospital Trustees an invitation to the delegates to visit that institution.

The Conference adjourned till 10 a.m. Thursday.

THURSDAY, 11TH JUNE, 1908.

The Conference met at 10 a.m.

The Committee set up to consider the agenda paper recommended that the following remits be struck out: Nos. 1, 5 to 34, 36 to 44, 75, 78 to 80, 82, 91, 92, 96 to 103, 106 to 126, 129 to 142, 159, 160, and 165; and, on the supplementary order-paper, Nos. 3A, 14A to 32A, 39A, 65A, 80A, 105A, 107A, 108A to 122B, 133A, 140A, 161B, 161C, 164C, as the Committee were of opinion that the principles contained therein had either been discussed at the previous sittings of the Conference or were matters of detail that could well be left to the Department and Crown Law Draftsman.

The Committee recommended that the procedure be to take the remits remaining, and to discuss the clauses of the Bill to which they refer.—Agreed to.

Remit No. 2. *St. Andrew's Orphanage.*—Interpretation, section 2, line 20: The words "one pound" be struck out, and the words "five shillings" inserted. Section 51, line 19: The words "one pound" be struck out, and the words "five shillings" be inserted. Section 56, line 9: After the word "of" strike out the words "one pound," and insert the words "five shillings."

Motion No. 24. Mr. L. J. Bagnall (Auckland Hospital and Charitable Aid Board) moved, and Mr. O'Bryan (Mercury Bay Hospital Trustees) seconded, "That the word 'ten' be inserted in lieu of the word 'five,' where occurring in the above."—Lost on the voices.

Remit No. 2 was then put and carried.

Motion No. 25. Mr. Tapper (Otago Benevolent Institution) proposed, and Mr. Talboys (Otago Benevolent Institution) seconded, "That voluntary contributors be allowed to elect a member of the Board."—Carried.

Remit No. 4. *Ashburton Hospital Board*.—The words "and town districts" be inserted after the word "borough" in the first line of clause 4, subsection (1).—Put and carried.

Remits 45 to 53 including 46A, were then discussed, and the Conference decided "That the position of the Chairman should be maintained as an honorary one."

Remits 53 to 56 were put, and on them the following motion was proposed by Mr. Carson (Wanganui Hospital Board), and seconded by Mr. Burns (Thames Hospital Trustees):—

Motion No. 25. "That the members of the Board and Chairman, when on Board business, be paid all locomotive expenses, together with 12s. 6d. per diem."—Carried: For, 54; against, 10.

The voting was as follows:—

Ayes.—Separate institutions, hospitals: Thames, Waihi, Coromandel, Gisborne, Wellington, South Wairarapa, Masterton, Napier, Grey River, Reefton, Kumara, Westland, Oamaru, Cromwell, Naseby, Arrow, Wakatipu, Wallace and Fiord, Northern Wairoa. Hospital Boards: Thames, Patea, Wanganui, Wairarapa, Hawke's Bay, Ashburton, North Canterbury, Otago. Hospital and Charitable Aid Boards: North Auckland, Auckland, Waihi, Bay of Plenty, Waipapu, Cook, Waikato, Hawera, Palmerston North, Wairau, Buller, Inangahua, Grey, Westland, Waitaki, Maniototo, Wallace and Fiord. Separate institutions, charitable aid: St. Andrew's Orphanage, Nelson; Reefton Ladies' Benevolent Society; Greymouth Benevolent Society; Hokitika Benevolent Society; Samaritan Home, Christchurch; North Otago Benevolent Society. Charitable Aid Boards: Patea and Wanganui, Wellington and Wairarapa, Ashburton and North Canterbury, Otago and Tuapeka.

Noes.—Separate institutions, hospitals: Mercury Bay, Dunedin, Southland. Hospital Boards: Coromandel, Wellington. Hospital and Charitable Aid Boards: Taranaki, Stratford, Nelson. Separate institutions, charitable aid: Otago Benevolent Institution. Charitable Aid Boards: Thames and Coromandel.

On remit No. 57 the Conference agreed that this scale of travelling-expenses should also extend to members of committees.

Remit No. 59. *Ashburton Hospital Board*.—The word "twenty" be inserted in place of the word "ten" in the first line in clause 28, subsection (3).—Carried.

Remits 60 to 63, with reference to power being given Boards to sell real property, was discussed, and remit No. 60 (from the Waitaki Hospital and Charitable Aid Board.—Section 46: That in the event of any small properties coming into the hands of the Boards, power be given to sell) was agreed to.

Motion No. 26. Mr. Rutherford (Palmerston North Hospital and Charitable Aid Board) moved, and Mr. Bellringer (Taranaki Hospital and Charitable Aid Board) seconded, "That power be given to the Boards, subject to the Minister's approval, to sell or exchange any lands or portion of lands vested in them and found to be unsuitable or not necessary for hospital and charitable-aid purposes; the proceeds of such sale to be applied only in the acquisition of other lands, or in the extension of building for hospital or charitable-aid purposes."—Carried.

Remit No. 64. *Nelson Hospital and Charitable Aid Board*.—That it is desirable that some uniform system of leasing trust lands be introduced, similar to the Nelson and Westland Native Reserves Act.—Put and lost on the voices.

Remit No. 65. *Ashburton and North Canterbury Charitable Aid Board*.—Boards, as well as Trustees of separate institutions, should be empowered to borrow for certain purposes (*vide* section 32 of 1885 Act and sections 2 and 3, 1907).—Carried.

Remits Nos. 66 to 73 and 76 to 77 were discussed, and on remit No. 66 (*Patea District Hospital Board*).—That section 37 is not considered sufficiently explicit to protect leaseholders from solely contributing towards the contributions assessed, as provision is only made for recovery from owners of half the rates levied for hospital purposes by the local bodies, so that where a separate rate for hospital purposes is not struck by local authorities the leaseholder would be solely liable for the full contribution as paid by local authority out of general funds without the possibility of recovery of any portion by the owner) being put, it was lost on the voices.

Motion No. 27. Proposed by Mr. Chepmell, and seconded by Mr. Fisher (Waikato District Hospital and Charitable Aid Board), "That a special mode of adjustment of rateable values should be laid down in section 37 as between local authorities rating on the annual value and local authorities rating on the capital value."—Carried.

Remits 81, 81A, and 81B were discussed, and on remit 81 (*North Canterbury Hospital Board*.—Clause 39, (1) and (2), referring to appeal: This Board considers that appeal should be made to the Supreme Court, instead of to Commissioners or the Minister) being put, it was lost on the voices.

Remit 84. *Coromandel Hospital Trusts*.—That provision be made for giving an institution power to recover the cost of hospital-maintenance out of the sums due to patients under the Workers' Compensation for Accidents Act, and also that old-age pensioners' pensions should be attached for the same reason.—Carried.

Remits 85 to 89, including 84A and 88A, were discussed, and remit 88 was put: *Ashburton and North Canterbury Charitable Aid Board*.—Section 74, relating to relief to persons from beyond a Board's district, should be recast on the lines of a suggestion submitted to the Inspector-General in October, 1907, somewhat as follows: "Where any person who receives relief at the hands of a Board or the Trustees of a separate institution has not at the time of first receiving such relief therefrom resided for the period of one year in the district within which such Board

or Trustees control the administration, the Board or the Trustees, as the case may be, may recover the whole cost of such relief from the Trustees or the Board of the district in which such person last resided for one whole year: Provided that during the time any such person is in a hospital or other institution or separate institution, or in receipt of outdoor relief in the district within which such person has taken abode, no such person shall be deemed to have been resident therein for the purpose of establishing settlement within the meaning of this section."—Carried.

Motion No. 28. Mr. Stevenson (Otago Charitable Aid Board) moved, and Mr. Walker (Otago Charitable Aid Board) seconded, "That the fees to be paid by patients be more clearly defined under the heading 'Maintenance,' so as to prevent hospital abuse."—Carried.

Motion No. 29. Mr. Milligan (Waitaki Hospital and Charitable Aid Board) moved, "That the principles contained in remit 88, and adopted by the Conference, with respect to section 74 of the Bill, be made to apply to section 75."—Carried.

Remit 93. *Nelson Hospital and Charitable Aid Board*.—That when a separate institution is to be established, the promoters shall once a week for four weeks advertise in some local paper their intention of making application to the Minister for the purpose.—Agreed to.

Remit 94. *Wairarapa District Hospital Board*.—Section 51: The committee is of opinion that no separate institution should be incorporated without the sanction of the Board of the district in which the proposed institution will be situated.—Agreed to.

Remit 95. *Oamaru Hospital Trustees*.—Section 51: Subsection (1) to be altered to read, "Any institution that is not or is not intended to be maintained wholly or in part out of the funds of any Board, but is or is intended to be maintained wholly or in part by the voluntary contributions from the public, who have signified their intention to contribute thereto (in sums of not less than five shillings) a yearly amount of not less than one hundred pounds, and who have paid one year's subscription in advance, or a donation of not less than twenty pounds, may be incorporated as hereinafter mentioned as a separate institution under the Act."—Lost on the voices.

Remit 104. *Coromandel Hospital Trustees*.—Section 56, subsection (3): That three months be substituted for one month.—Agreed to.

Remit 35. *Coromandel Hospital Board*.—That the month of April should be substituted for the month of January, so that the report and accounts can be dealt with at the end of the financial year.—Agreed to.

It was resolved to strike out remits 127 and 128, dealing with the setting-aside of endowments by the Crown, as being outside the scope of the Conference.

Remits 143 to 146A were discussed, and remit 146A (*Wellington Hospital Trustees*.—Clause 21, line 4: After the word "institution" the words "involving an expenditure of over £250" to be inserted, and a three-weeks time-limit inserted) was carried after being amended by striking out "£250," and inserting in lieu thereof "£100," the Chairman stating that he would consider the question of a percentage of annual income being taken as a basis of expenditure.

Remits 147 and 148 were discussed, and remit 147 (*North Canterbury Hospital Board*.—Clause 77, (1), with the following addition: "and that copies of any report be forwarded to the respective Boards interested") was carried.

Motion No. 30. Mr. Gallaway (Dunedin Benevolent Institution) moved, and Mr. Tapper (Otago Benevolent Institution) seconded, "That subsection (2) of section 53 be amended by providing that the interest accruing be accumulated and applied to augment the bequest, and not to apply towards the maintenance of the institution."—Carried.

Remits 148A to 154A were discussed, and the Inspector-General promised to recommend the Government that subsidies should be paid on amounts donated for specific purposes.

Remits 155 to 158 were discussed, and remit 157 (*Coromandel Hospital Trustees*.—Section 82: That all declarations and documents should be exempt from stamp duty) was carried.

Remit 161 was discussed, and it was agreed to leave the matter in the hands of the Inspector-General.

The debate on Motion No. 15, moved by Mr. Bellringer, and seconded by Mr. Quinn, was resumed.

Motion No. 31. Mr. Norris (Ashburton and North Canterbury Charitable Aid Board) moved, and Mr. Gallaway (Otago Benevolent Institution) seconded, "That this meeting considers that if the Government reduces its subsidies on outdoor relief it should take over the cost of the maintenance of all children committed to an industrial school."—This was subsequently withdrawn.

Mr. Bellringer's motion, "That the subsidies from the Government continue as at present," was carried without dissent.

Remit 162. (*St. Andrew's Orphanage*.—Appointment of Guardians: That a clause similar to clause 4 of the Act of 1886 be inserted providing for the appointment of guardians) was carried.

Motion No. 32. Mr. Bagnall (Auckland Hospital and Charitable Aid Board) proposed, and Mr. Knight (Auckland Hospital and Charitable Aid Board) seconded, "That the Government be requested to make provision by which Magistrates would not be empowered to commit children to an industrial school unless the Hospital and Charitable Aid Board of the district had first refused to make provision for such children."—Carried.

Mr. Tapper (Otago Benevolent Institution) suggested that Charitable Aid Boards have more power to protect women and children.

Mr. Bain (Southland Hospital and Charitable Aid Board) thought that action should be taken by the Government to bring back deserting husbands.

The Chairman agreed to take these suggestions as expressing the opinion of the Conference, and stated that he would give full consideration to any suggestions handed in by delegates on matters not appearing on the agenda paper.

Mr. Stevenson (Otago Hospital Board) handed in a resolution, "That the principle of charging the land only with rates for charitable aid is inequitable, and such rates should fall equally on all property."

The Chairman promised to take a note of this.

Remit 164. *North Canterbury Hospital Board*.—This Board is of opinion that provision should be made whereby employees of the Hospital and Charitable Aid Boards should be allowed to participate in the benefits of the Civil Service Superannuation Scheme.—Carried.

Remit 4A. *Central Otago, Tuapeka, and Otago United Districts Charitable Aid Board*.—That, should any one or two counties desire to form a separate district, the Governor in Council shall be empowered to grant the same upon receiving a petition bearing the names of one-half of the ratepayers representing two-thirds of the rateable value.—Not adopted.

Remit 34A. *Wellington Hospital Trustees*.—Clause 14. Chairman to be elected on the second Wednesday in May. Subclause 2 to be altered to read "If unable within one month to appoint a Chairman, the Governor to appoint one."—Adopted by Conference.

Remit 38A. *Wellington Hospital Trustees*.—Clause 15. Vacancies on Board or Committee to be filled by Board itself as at present.—Adopted by Conference.

Remit 44A. *Wellington Hospital Trustees*.—Clause 19, subsection (a). Add, "either by proceedings under Public Works Act or other methods."—Carried, with the insertion of the words before "either" of the words "or any addition to any site."

On the motion of Mr. Tapper (Dunedin Hospital Trustees), a committee was appointed to draw up a motion of the Conference's appreciation of the Chairman.

The Inspector-General informed the Conference that the suggestions contained in remits 164b and 164e had already been carried out by the Government as regards police cases and drunkards in hospitals.

Motion No. 33. Dr. Batchelor (Dunedin Hospital Trustees) moved, and Mr. Loudon (Dunedin Hospital Trustees) seconded, "That in any base hospital where there is an honorary medical staff of not less than six members, they shall annually elect one of their number to represent them on the Hospital Board, and he shall be an *ex officio* member thereof."—Carried: For, 27; against, 16.

The voting was as follows:—

Ayes.—Separate institutions, hospitals: Northern Wairoa, Mercury Bay, Wellington, Masterton, Napier, Reefton, Oamaru, Dunedin, Naseby, Arrow, Wakatipu, Southland, Wallace and Fiord. Hospital Boards: Coromandel, Patea, Wairarapa, Waipawa, Hawke's Bay, Ashburton. Hospital and Charitable Aid Boards: North Auckland, Waiapu, Waikato, Palmerston North, Inangahua, Waitaki, Maniopototo, Southland.

Noes.—Separate institutions, hospitals: Gisborne, South Wairarapa, Charleston, Kumara. Hospital Boards: Thames, Wanganui, Wellington, North Canterbury, Otago. Hospital and Charitable Aid Boards: Auckland, Cook, Stratford, Hawera, Wairau, South Canterbury, Wallace and Fiord.

Motion No. 34. Mr. Bagnall (Auckland Hospital and Charitable Aid Board) moved, and Mr. Knight (Auckland Hospital and Charitable Aid Board) seconded, (1.) "That provision should be made in connection with the old-age pensions by which, in the case of persons who are evidently more than sixty-five years of age, but who have no documentary evidence thereof, the Magistrate may satisfy himself in such way as he thinks fit." (2.) "That in the case of old-age pensioners who get drunk, their pensions should not be cancelled for so long a period as five years, as is now done."—Carried.

Mr. Gallaway (Otago Benevolent Institution) asked that a brief statement of the decisions of the Conference be supplied to each member.

The Inspector-General promised that this should be done.

The Conference expressed its appreciation of the manner in which the Secretary had performed his duties.

Motion No. 35. Proposed by Mr. Gallaway (Otago Benevolent Institution), and carried with acclamation, "That this Conference places on record its high appreciation of the services rendered by the Inspector-General of Hospitals, Dr. Valentine, in the conduct of its business, as associated with the consideration of the very complex questions of hospitals and charitable aid. We desire to say that his comprehensive grasp of all details connected with the administration of this great Department of State has materially assisted the Conference in the findings which we believe, if incorporated in an Act and placed upon the statute-book, will go a long way to solve many of the difficulties that now confront those who have the administration of these important Departments. We desire further to add that, in our opinion, the urbanity of manner, mingled with a degree of firmness, displayed by the Chairman has been conducive materially to the success of this Conference."

The Conference then terminated.

E. KILLICK, Secretary.

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS.

FIRST DAY (TUESDAY, 9TH JUNE, 1908).

SPEECH OF HON. G. FOWLDS.

THE HON. MR. FOWLDS, Minister of Public Health, in opening the Conference, said,—

I am very glad to have this opportunity to welcome you to this Conference, and I have no doubt that your deliberations will ultimately result in a Bill that will be acceptable to the Dominion at large. I have every hope that, as was the case when the Acts of 1885 and 1886 were introduced, the new Bill will not be in any sense of the word regarded as a party measure. As you are aware, the Bill which you have assembled to discuss proposes to make considerable changes in the law, and without doubt the various principles will elicit a very considerable and animated discussion. I believe you will all recognise that public opinion has demanded an amendment of the law. This public opinion has found expression year after year in Parliament, and promises have been made that legislation on the subject would be brought down. The chief principles of the Bill are,—(1) That the committees of management shall be essentially local; (2) that such committees shall be amenable to public opinion by being made elective; (3) that the expenditure on the various institutions should be somewhat localised; (4) that the Government, out of consolidated revenue, should meet a reasonable proportion of the cost of the institutions. I mention these principles first, because they were the cardinal principles of the Bill which was introduced by Sir Julius Vogel in 1885, and which subsequently became to a certain extent the law which now governs our hospital and charitable-aid system. You will notice, however, that two of the first-mentioned principles, the election of local committees, never became law; consequently they have been again introduced in the present Bill. The other chief principles of the Bill are,—(5.) The mapping-out of the Dominion into larger hospital districts. (6.) The direct election by the ratepayers of the Boards controlling the committees; such Boards to have longer continuity of office. (7.) That the District Boards should control hospitals and charitable aid. (8.) Putting a limit on the establishment of separate institutions. (9.) The Central Department assuming more control, and especially with regard to buildings and appointments. Now, it is not my purpose at this juncture—indeed, the time is not opportune—to dwell on the various principles embodied in this Bill. I shall have to face the subject in another place, but you may be sure that the suggestions and recommendations of this Conference will carry weight when the Bill is being discussed in Committee.

It is freely recognised that there are a great many gentlemen amongst you who have for a great number of years had considerable experience in the local administration of the Acts now governing our hospital and charitable-aid system. It was with a view of getting such gentlemen together that the Department adopted the suggestion of the Counties Conference of last year, and called this Conference after circulating the Bill among the various bodies concerned. I think that this Conference will agree with me that it was the right and proper thing to do, so that those who would have to administer the laws proposed should have at any rate some say in the framing of the Bill.

This is not necessarily the actual Bill which it is proposed to introduce, and there is little doubt that some of the remits already submitted will be included in the draft of the new Bill. Many of you are aware that the Acts of 1885 and 1886 were regarded at the time as tentative measures: it says much for the original framers that those measures have stood the test of twenty-three years, despite the advancement and altered conditions of the Dominion, social and otherwise. There are hospitals now in districts which at the time of the framing and passing of the Bills were never dreamed of; and in considering the Bills retrospectively it is exceedingly interesting to read speeches in *Hansard* when they were being framed. Especially have I been struck by Sir Frederick Whittaker's almost prophetic utterances on the likely effects of those Bills. He did not share the optimism of Sir Julius Vogel with regard to separate institutions, which were introduced with a view to stimulate private charity for their maintenance.

In 1884, the year before the Bill was introduced, of the thirty-one hospitals fourteen were maintained entirely by the Government, the remainder getting subsidies ranging from £1 to £3 for every £1 collected. The sums derived from voluntary contributions then amounted to about one-ninth of the cost of the upkeep of the hospitals of the then colony; now they have fallen to about one-thirteenth. In 1884 the expenditure on hospitals was £67,826, and on charitable aid £34,649—total, £102,575. At that time the population of the colony was 552,590, against 968,797 in 1906–7, for which year the cost was—For hospitals, £185,942; for charitable aid, £102,866: total, £288,808. So that while the population has not doubled, yet the expenditure has nearly trebled. Though the expenditure has gone up out of all proportion to the increase in population, I will admit that the advancement of medical and surgical science and the exigencies of nursing have greatly increased the cost of hospital-administration; but, nevertheless, this great increase gives need for ample reflection.

And now let us turn to the question of the increase in charitable aid. It seems to have gone without the bounds of reason, despite the wave of prosperity which the Dominion has experienced this last twelve years. There is something wrong somewhere, and I sincerely trust that one result of your deliberations will be a reduction in this cost, especially that on outdoor relief, which cannot

but have a bad effect on the Dominion at large. But I find I am getting on to debatable matter, so I will ask you to allow me to leave this Conference for a time in the hands of the Inspector-General, who has doubtless much to say on this and other matters.

On the motion of Mr. J. P. LUKE (Wellington), seconded by Mr. COOPER (Christchurch), a hearty vote of thanks to the Hon. the Minister for his attendance at the Conference and for his address was carried by acclamation.

DR. VALINTINE, Inspector-General, then took the chair, and delivered the following address:—

I join with the Minister for Hospitals in welcoming you to this Conference, but I must frankly admit I do so with somewhat mingled feelings, knowing that in some quarters there is a strong antagonism to the Bill which we have assembled to discuss. However, I extend a cordial welcome to those gentlemen who have come out into the open for a fair fight, and I am sure that the majority have come here with open minds determined to obtain not necessarily this Bill, nor any other Bill, but the best Bill for the people of the Dominion. Many of you have for a number of years taken a great interest and made a special study of the local administration of our hospitals, and the still more complex problem of charitable relief, and your presence therefore at this Conference will not only be of great value to the Department, but also to the Dominion at large; and, though I know that many delegates do not approve of some, if any, of the principles of the Bill, yet I feel sure that they will allow there is need for reform in the present law governing our hospital and charitable-aid system. To their criticisms and suggestions every respect will be given, and to such gentlemen I extend the heartiest of welcomes.

But before proceeding to discuss the principles of the Bill, allow me to tell you a little of its history. When in January of last year I was intrusted with the control of the Department I found that a Hospitals Bill had been introduced the previous session which practically embodied the opinions of my predecessor, the late Dr. MacGregor. That is the Bill before you. It was proposed to reintroduce the Bill last session, but, being newly appointed, I asked the Minister to defer bringing it down until I had had an opportunity of making myself better acquainted with the various problems of my office, some of which were quite new to me. For the last eighteen months, therefore, I have been inquiring into the local working of the Acts governing our institutions and outdoor relief, and during that time I have visited almost every institution in the Dominion, and have had, moreover, opportunities of discussing the local administration thereof with many of those present, and am consequently in a better position to face the big fence than I was a year ago.

That, therefore, is the history of the Bill before you. Generally speaking, with its principles I agree, but it is in no sense of the word a Bill which the Minister wishes to thrust on you; on the contrary, the Bill has been circulated and this Conference called with the expressed view of bringing together all those who are interested in the working of our hospitals and charitable-aid system. It is to be hoped, therefore, that as an outcome of this Conference an amended Bill may be brought down that will be in the best interests of the people of these Islands, and that you will do your best to assist in bringing about such a desirable end.

Before discussing the Bill it might be as well to consider what we are aiming at, and, if you will permit me, I will outline what—to borrow from Rudyard Kipling—might be termed a hospital district “of a dream.” You will then know what ideals we are striving for, and therefore be in a better position to criticize those ideals, and to assist as far as you conscientiously can towards their ultimate realisation. What we want is a hospital and charitable-aid system that will make itself felt in all parts of these Islands—not only, as is the case at present, in the districts immediately surrounding the towns, but also in the far remote country districts—the backblocks—and I believe that to a certain extent this end can gradually be attained, provided the bed-plates of each district are carefully laid.

Many of you will agree with me that each district ought to be self-contained, and provide accommodation for the (1) acutely sick, (2) the chronic and incurable, (3) the consumptive, (4) the aged and infirm; and, further, that such a district should have the means of providing for the indigent poor by means of (5) a carefully watched system of outdoor relief, which might be extended as the occasions—industrial and otherwise—demand. In each district, therefore, there should be, —(1) the base hospital, (2) subsidiary or cottage hospitals, (3) infectious-diseases wards, (4) the consumptive annexe, (5) the old people’s home, (6) chronic and incurable wards, (7) a system of poor-law relief co-operating with private charity (Elberfeld system), (8) a system of district nursing.

Now, that may seem a somewhat formidable list of institutions for one district, but for the sake of clearness I will deal with each of those essentials in turn:—

(1.) The base hospital should be large enough for the requirements of the district, and should be staffed and equipped as thoroughly as modern science can devise. It should be reserved solely for the acutely sick, and should be the only hospital in the district recognised as a training-school for probationers.

(2.) Subsidiary or cottage hospitals, as the case may be, should necessarily vary in size and equipment, according to the district surrounding them. In many instances they would have to be well staffed and equipped, but not to the same extent as the base hospital. In others they should merely be a cottage with a nurse in charge, where first aid could be administered until the patient could be moved with safety to the base hospital. No attempt at training probationers should be made in these hospitals, which should be staffed by registered nurses.

(3.) An infectious-disease or isolation ward is a necessary adjunct to every hospital, so that cases of infectious disease can be isolated promptly. The size of the ward should naturally be in proportion to the hospital to which it is attached.

(4.) The consumptive annexe should be attached to the hospital, base or subsidiary, as the case may be, in that part of the district likely to afford the best climate for the outdoor treatment of consumption, and where there would be enough land adjoining to allow the principles of the open-air treatment to be followed out. Separate accommodation would, of course, have to be made for curable and indigent incurable cases, but not necessarily at the same hospital.

(5.) The old people's home is, of course, a necessity, and little need be said about it now, except that its accommodation should be so arranged that a careful classification of the inmates could be made, so that the really unfortunate and deserving poor should not have to occupy the same rooms as the less desirable inmates which are to be found in such institutions.

(6.) The chronic and incurable ward should be reserved for indigent chronic and incurable patients, and should be erected in the immediate vicinity of and administered in conjunction with the old people's home. It is most undesirable that these cases should be treated in the wards or in the immediate neighbourhood of a general hospital. The hospital should, as I have previously said, be reserved for the acutely sick only, and the admission to the wards of the chronic and incurable not only tends to keep acute cases from being admitted to the hospital, but many patients are reasonably reluctant to enter a hospital where such cases predominate. There is another reason why the chronic and incurable ward should be attached to the old people's home. There are many chronic patients who will stay in a hospital for a great length of time without paying or attempting to pay maintenance fees; but if they are sent to the chronic and incurable ward of an old people's home either the patients themselves or their relatives will make a great effort to pay such maintenance fees or to support them outside. Another argument in favour of having the chronic ward so selected is that a number of the aged in the old people's home are, from their age and infirmity, constantly ailing and on the verge of acute illness—at any moment they may require skilled nursing. Now, I think that most of you will agree with me that no home for the aged should lack the services of skilled nurses, and the present system of allowing these old people, in many instances suffering from paralysis and bladder-troubles, to rely solely on the ministrations of their fellow-inmates is a great blot on our present system, and should not be tolerated any longer.

(7.) A system of poor-law relief co-operating with private charity: I will defer discussing this essential of each district until I come to the subject of charitable aid. Briefly, I would suggest a modification of what is known as the Elberfeld system.

(8.) The district nurse: I now come, last but not least, to the person who will supply the link in the chain between the base hospital and the remote backblocks: I refer to the district nurse. The establishment in our remote country districts of a nursing system would be a great boon to those people who have to face the discomforts and hardships of backblocks life. In this matter I do not speak from hearsay; some of you may not be aware that I practised for some years in a large country district, which often necessitated my taking very long journeys of thirty, forty, yes, and even eighty miles to my patients. I have seen women so cut off by distance and bad roads that they have not seen one of their own sex from year's end to year's end. I have had on many occasions to do the duties of nurse as well as doctor to a woman during her confinement. Now, knowing what I do of the hardships of backblocks settlers, it would ill become me if I did not speak out on their behalf. From a professional point of view, it is most unsatisfactory to treat a case a long way from home. Of what avail a journey, at considerable expense to the patient, if the doctor's orders are not carried out? I know what it is to ride away from such cases feeling that if I could have left a good nurse in charge the prospects of the patient's recovery would have been infinitely better. If Boards established district nurses in the backblocks they would benefit a class of people who are all the more worthy of consideration because one hardly ever hears them complain. Consider the possibilities of such appointments: (1.) Fortunately, there are now few districts unconnected with the telephone: In the event of illness the district nurse could ring up the nearest doctor, describe the symptoms, temperature, &c., of the patient, and give the doctor indications whether or not it would be necessary for him to visit the patient. If he did not think a visit necessary, she could faithfully carry out his instructions, and report from day to day on the condition of the patient. By such means much distress and money might be saved the backblocks settler. But, besides this, the district nurse could (2) locally supervise the midwives of her district, and periodically inspect their kit and instruments to see that they are kept properly clean. (3.) In case of accident she could give "first aid," and accompany the patient to the nearest hospital. (4.) She could be the "eyes and ears" of the Boards under which she served, and, having made herself acquainted with the conditions of the various families in the district, could be better able to give information as to the circumstances surrounding those persons applying for charitable relief. Nor would such a nurse be a great expense to the Boards. She would be in a position to know what people could afford to pay for her services, and advise her Board accordingly. I quite believe that a great portion of her salary could be paid by these means. If the scheme did not prove too expensive, additional nurses could be gradually appointed, so that no part of the hospital district would be without its district nurse, and the gaps in the chain would be complete. (5.) Under the same conditions the district nurse could attend to those incurable cases who might be reluctant to go to the incurable ward in the old people's home. From many country districts we hear of demands for Government subsidies to encourage medical men to settle, and such requests are sometimes granted, but not enough is given to allow the doctor appointed to make a fair living. Would not those districts be better served by a district nurse, in conjunction with a doctor at a distance, as I have already indicated? The money raised locally by the settlers, after paying the nurse's salary, would be better spent in guaranteeing the expenses of the doctor's visits when the nurse considered his services necessary. I have suggested this to some of the backblocks settlers, and they seemed to view the matter favourably. Of course, there are considerable difficulties in the way, chiefly as regards getting suitable nurses, but these difficulties can be gradually overcome. Efforts should be made to supply the district nurses from the base hospitals.

By such an arrangement the latter would feel in better touch with the parent institution, and such a scheme would also make for the *esprit de corps* of the nurses in the hospital district.

Having explained an ideal hospital district, we must now consider the amendments in the law necessary to carry out such a scheme. Such districts would of necessity have to be fairly large ones to justify the upkeep of the several institutions indicated, and it would be necessary for District Boards to have under their control charitable aid as well as hospitals. Larger districts would allow the Boards to take a wider view of the hospital and charitable aid of their respective districts, and decide where their base hospital and where their cottage hospitals would be situated. This would have the effect of limiting the constant demands for new institutions, as is the case at present. A large Board, moreover, would be better removed from the pernicious local influence which is having so disastrous an effect on our local administration, especially of charitable aid. There is every reason why a Board should have under its control hospital and charitable aid. Our hospital and charitable-aid system is so closely interwoven that any attempt to define its respective limitations results and will result in disputes between the controlling authorities. For example, a combined Board could decide where to send its cases—to the hospital, to the chronic ward, to the consumptive annexe, to the convalescent home, to the old people's home. But how could that be done under the present system, say, at Dunedin or Wellington, where there are practically four Boards controlling hospital and charitable aid? Two separate institutions and two Boards—two Boards spending the money of the two Boards who find it. What wonder, then, that disputes arise amongst these bodies as to which is responsible for certain cases? The matter is too absurd. If the Conference does not do anything else, I hope it will agree on the need for putting the control of hospitals and charitable aid under one large and representative Board.

The institutions of each district should be controlled by one Board, with local committees to carry out the details of management. It would also be necessary to insure to the Board and committees a longer continuity of office, so that the policy of the Board would not be liable to perpetual alteration, as is the case under the present system. Besides, it is some time before the members of Boards and committees realise the importance of the various problems with which they are confronted, especially with regard to the distribution of charitable aid. This particularly applies to the Chairman, honorary or paid, who should certainly be elected for three years; and, to my mind, this position should be an honorary one.

I have endeavoured to show the need for larger districts and for the control of hospital and charitable-aid matters being placed under one Board. These are provided for, as you know, in the Bill.

We will now turn to the more debatable provisions in the Bill—viz., (1) the mode of election, (2) the proposed reduction of the subsidies, and (3) the Government assuming more control.

As regards the mode of election, many of you are aware that there has been a constant demand for reform in this direction, so that the Boards should be more directly representative of those entitled to vote for members of local bodies; indeed, there are not a few who consider that the hospital franchise should be even further extended.

Speaking generally, the system of nomination by local bodies—in those districts where there are no separate institutions, and where the Boards combine the duties of hospital and charitable-aid administration—works well, though it is not directly representative of those who find the money. I believe that extension of the franchise in the manner indicated in the Bill should have the effect of obtaining the services of many excellent men, who, with no ulterior motive, would make a special study of hospital and charitable-aid matters, and who would confine their public duties to hospital and charitable-aid work.

However, it will be very interesting to hear the various opinions of delegates on this much-vexed question; but I am sure you will all keep in front of you that any legislation that is likely to have the effect of minimising local interest in our institutions would be a very grave mistake.

The Bill foreshadows District Boards taking over the separate institutions, except those mentioned in the schedule. Though I can well imagine that this will hardly meet the views of some of the Trustees, I feel sure that the reasonableness of the suggestion will commend itself to every person who has considered the subject. The present Act was framed with the view of casting on the local bodies the responsibility of providing the greater part of the cost of their local institutions, and thus reducing the demands on the Consolidated Fund, which shortly after the abolition of Provincial Government became almost outrageous. Until the passing of this Bill the grants from the fund were very unequally distributed. At the same time, it was recognised that putting this responsibility on the local bodies might have the effect of lessening voluntary contributions, consequently provision was made in the Act of 1886 for "separate institutions," with the view of encouraging the benevolent to continue their donations. So, if not less than 100 persons subscribe annually £100 in sums of not less than 5s., a separate institution can be incorporated, subject to the approval of the Board, or, failing that, to a commission appointed to inquire into its necessity or otherwise. In almost every case the request of the petitioners is granted, and the opposition of the Board overridden. The history of these institutions is that when once incorporated public interest dies, and the Trustees have to come on the District Board to make good the ever-increasing deficits. In speaking in support of the Bill of 1885, Sir Julius Vogel said, "The object we desire to compass by the Bill is, as far as I can see, identical with the ideal which has been set before us by nearly every speaker. That ideal is to avoid as far as possible *the having to deal with these institutions by means of local rates and to encourage as much as possible voluntary contributions*. The Government believe that nearly all institutions which it is desirable to continue to maintain will, within a reasonable period, be incorporated into separate institutions, and the bulk of those which are not incorporated by the local residents into separate institutions will be more or less institutions which it is not desirable to keep in existence. We therefore consider that within a reasonable period—say, a year or two, or more—all these institutions which it

is desirable should survive will be in the hands of Boards of Trustees as separate institutions." (*Hansard*, Vol. lii., p. 32.) Unfortunately Sir Julius Vogel's hopes have not been realised. At the time of the passing of the Act voluntary contributions amounted to a quarter of the total amount contributed to the hospital expenditure, but they have gradually fallen off, and contributions amount at the present time to only one-thirteenth of the total cost. There are therefore forty-one separate institutions—viz., twenty-seven hospitals and fourteen charitable institutions—for whom the Board of the district have to find funds, though they have no say in the management, which, I think, you will agree with me is an entirely wrong principle, and tends to extravagance, as is always the case where people have the spending of other people's money. It may be argued that the abolition of separate institutions might have the effect of lessening voluntary contributions. It will be seen from the hospital reports that hospitals under Boards are supported nearly as generously by the public as separate institutions; and, besides, if there is any loss in actual money, such should be made good by better administration—an administration that is under the control of representatives of those who find the money. In the event, however, of the Board which has to find the money protesting against the expenditure of a separate institution, the dispute between the Trustees and the Board can be referred to a Commission, whose decision is final. As a matter of fact, such Commissions generally end in the Board having to make up the deficit asked for, or, at any rate, without its being reduced to any considerable extent. Constant deadlocks are therefore recurring, and it is to be hoped that if separate institutions are to be retained, they will be made to rely on their own income and the Government subsidy of 24s. in the pound on contributions, and that no grants from the rates will be entertained.

Lastly, I come to the most debatable and most important of the measures set forth in the Bill—central control. Now, I know that the majority of those present strenuously oppose any suggestions to this effect. The opposition to central control is too deeply ingrained into the people of our race, and I trust I am Briton enough to appreciate this opposition; but, nevertheless, I am strongly of opinion that, both as regards hospitals and charitable aid, especially the latter, there are good arguments to support such a step, apart from the fact that the Government finds, through the subsidies, half the expenditure of hospitals and charitable aid. Let us take the hospitals first: Many of the remits strongly object to clauses 23 and 24, whereby plans of proposed hospital-extensions and appointments of house surgeon and matron have first to be submitted to the Minister for approval. Now, I feel confident that if any delegate present could but accompany me on my tours of inspection I should soon be able to convince him that there is need for Boards or Trustees to submit plans, and in connection therewith I cannot do better than quote the 1904 report of my predecessor: "Ratepayers would be astonished if they realised the amount simply thrown away in defective material and workmanship, as well as faults of construction that necessitate alteration when the building is supposed to be complete, in order to comply with the laws of sanitation." Again, we find hospitals on unsuitable sites, on too small areas of ground, with wards in the wrong position as regards sun and light. Just a caution at the right time would have made all the difference, and saved much money. I freely admit that at the present time—almost without exception—Boards are submitting to the Department plans of new buildings, &c.; but, nevertheless, the power of departmental approval should be granted by law. As regards appointments, the same may be said, though here again I frankly own that as regards the hospital surgeons very few Boards can be reproached. The appointments may have been excellent; but I put it to those present that a man may be a very excellent surgeon, but may have practically no tact or administrative ability; and, although the former is most essential, the importance of the latter must not be ignored, as some Boards know to their cost. Nor can they rely solely on testimonials. Such being the case, they have to fall back on personal knowledge, which is always dangerous, or the teachers of the applicant's medical school. To whom are the teachers most likely to be most explicit—to the members of the Board, of whom they have no knowledge, or a member of their own profession occupying a recognised responsible position? I quite admit the possibilities of nepotism, but even Boards and Trustees would not be quite free of that. However, personally it is a responsibility I could very well do without; but, with the exception of patients, there is no single individual in the Dominion more concerned in the appointment than the man who holds my position. If there is a skilful, straightforward, tactful, conscientious medical superintendent in charge of a hospital, there will be no trouble there; and I am more likely to get such men than you are, because the information I receive will be more reliable.

While I am on this subject I would like to refer briefly to the honorary staff of your hospitals. Speaking generally, I am not in favour of honorary staffs except in our larger centres, but in the latter places they are essential, for the public and profession alike, and, considering how freely they give their services to the public, I think that the members should be put on a sounder footing and their interests better secured. A Board could do this in two ways—(1) by preventing hospital-abuse, and (2) by re-electing those surgeons and physicians who have best studied the interests of the institution. At present some Boards do neither. Now, it is very hard to say where hospital-abuse begins and where it ends, but care should be taken that hospital-beds are not taken up by those who can afford to pay for treatment in a private hospital, to the exclusion of their poorer but equally ill neighbours. It is not fair that those who can well afford to pay should avail themselves of the gratuitous services of the honorary staff. A lot of people say that a member of an honorary staff gets recompensed in other ways—and that is more or less true; but the chief gainers are the public (poor and rich alike) who have in their midst a number of physicians and surgeons specially skilled in their art—an art in which of all others experience and constant practice are everything. It would indeed be a bad day for New Zealand if the best men did not seek election on the honorary staffs of our hospitals. They should not, therefore, be discouraged when, conscious of having done their duty faithfully and well, they fail to be re-elected, as happened the other day to a member of the profession who had done more disinterested and devoted work in the interests

of his local hospital than any other member of his profession in the land. It is urged by some that members of the honorary staff should be represented on the Hospital Boards. With this I do not in a measure agree, and I certainly think that the teaching staff of a hospital attached to a medical school, such as that of Dunedin, should be represented on the Board, either on the nomination of the honorary staff themselves, or by the University. The paramount importance of having the best medical teachers possible at the only medical school in the Dominion is so apparent that it should require no argument.

As regards the appointment of matron, there is also every reason why this should be vested in departmental control. Many of you know that a Nurses' Register is kept, in which is recorded the training-school and general-hospital record of each nurse. Now, in going about the Dominion, who is better calculated to ascertain and find out the capabilities and character of a nurse than my assistant, Miss Maclean. She gets the individual expressions of opinion of those under whom the nurse serves, and she can draw her own deductions. But in these appointments it is possible to guard against abuse in this manner: In going about the Dominion I have been at some pains to discover the reasons of the difficulty in obtaining nurses for our public institutions. One of the chief reasons is the little prospect of advancement held out to a nurse if she remains in our public-hospital service. If at the completion of her training a nurse remains in a public hospital, and proves herself a capable and conscientious officer, and one whom it is hard to replace (though I do not for a moment suggest that either the hospital surgeon or matron would do anything to blight that nurse's prospects), yet if she was found to be a thoroughly capable person would they be likely to go out of their way to get her a better position in the hospital world? I know of just such cases in point, and, again, of excellent matrons who hold responsible positions in some of our smaller hospitals, with very little chance of promotion under the present system. If we want to staff our hospitals with suitable nurses, we must hold out better prospects. This can be done to a certain extent by a classification of hospitals, and getting the matrons to work up from the bottom. For instance, say our hospitals are classified according to their beds into six distinct classes. A nurse should begin in a sixth-class hospital as matron; on the occurrence of vacancy in a fifth-class hospital the Board should apply to the Department to recommend the best matron in the sixth class for promotion, and so on. Under such circumstances matrons could ever have a prospect of advancement in their profession, with corresponding increase of salary, and the varied experience obtained would be very useful to the institutions they would serve. A system such as I have outlined could hardly be open to abuse, and I certainly commend it to you for your consideration. Of course, in conjunction with the above the hospital would have to be classified as to scales of matron's pay, &c., as well—another very important matter.

The difficulty of getting nurses for our public institutions is every day becoming more apparent, and, as the question is a vital one, it may not be altogether inopportune to refer briefly to the cause or causes of the present dearth of nurses, and the measures which it is proposed to take to increase the supply. In the first place, it must be remembered that, comparatively speaking, a few years ago there were few avenues of employment open to women other than of nursing. Such is not the case nowadays, and it is not to be wondered at, especially in a country like this, that we should soon feel the fluctuations consequent upon the popularity or non-popularity of any particular employment or profession. Under the Private Hospitals Act it is very wisely ordained that no private hospital can be registered unless a certificated nurse is placed in charge, and as there are, roughly speaking, some two hundred private hospitals, one of the chief causes of this dearth can easily be seen—in fact, there has also been so much difficulty in getting certificated nurses for these private hospitals that to avoid hardship to settlers in country districts, we have had to throw the responsibility of the license on the nearest medical man. When a nurse in due course passes the State examination, she has two alternatives open to her—either to remain in the public service, or to go out private nursing. Now, it must be confessed that the emoluments to be derived from private nursing are greater than the managers of the public hospitals are at present disposed to give, so the nurse can hardly be blamed for doing the best she can for herself. But this is not all: many nurses at the expiration of their training are for a time only too glad to get away from the very necessary restraints of a public hospital. It is true that many go back to the public hospitals later, but a great many more marry, and this is a cause that we would not remove if we could, as they can serve the country splendidly in other ways. In a measure we can remedy the present dearth of nurses by allowing some of the better private hospitals to train probationers, so that some of their time can count towards registration; but that is a matter that will have to be very carefully handled, or New Zealand nurses would not be taken at the same standard in other parts of the world, as is the case at present. But I feel confident that, if nurses are assured a definite prospect of promotion, reasonable pay, and a chance of a pension at the end of so-many years' service in our public institutions, it would go a long way towards remedying the present deficiency. I certainly consider that the time is now opportune to discuss some scheme for pensioning nurses, so that those who have grown grey in their honourable calling need not feel the pinch of poverty in their declining years. I would therefore strongly recommend members of this Conference to consider the question, and especially would I recommend it to those misguided but doubtless well-meaning people who plume themselves on the interest they take in the nurses of their respective institutions. Such gentlemen would find a better field for their energies in this direction than by inquiring of the nurses what they think of the doctor, and what they think of the matron, and by generally assuming towards the nurses an air of patronage which is as repulsive as it is ludicrous. To such misguided efforts are due those breaches of discipline which from time to time bring our institutions into disrepute and occasion the only too popular demand for a hospital inquiry.

I now come to a provision in the Bill which I fear has not a single supporter in this room—that is, the proposal to gradually reduce the subsidies. This proposal is directed at the expendi-

ture on outdoor charitable relief rather than at expenditure on hospitals. Generally speaking, as I have said before, our hospitals are well and economically managed; and I think it would be a bad economy to try any reform that might tend to impair their efficiency. But I wish I could say the same of charitable aid, especially the way in which outdoor relief is given. Unfortunately I have not the pen of my predecessor, with which, year in and year out, in vigorous and picturesque language he denounced the system which is gradually weakening the moral fibre of the people of these Islands. Outdoor relief is to be had for the asking, in many instances after a brief and often perfunctory inquiry. Often no inquiry is made. There are some who doubtless would make a boast of this, but they hardly realise what indiscriminate outdoor relief means to the nation at large. My predecessor strongly and repeatedly advocated that to stem this ever-increasing expense to the country no money should be paid out of the Consolidated Fund "towards the permanent degradation of the people." Look at the facts: In 1898 the Old-age Pensions Act became law. It was then considered that with the giving of pensions there would be a corresponding decrease in the amount expended in charitable aid. The following will show how little that hope has been justified, and how the poor-law expenditure has increased despite the wave of prosperity that has extended over the Dominion during the last ten years. And are we not beginning to feel the moral effect of this indiscriminate charity? Can it be truly said that we have the splendid enterprise and self-reliance that characterized the early settlers on these shores? Far from it: we see the lack of self-reliance in the constant stream of deputations to the Government for assistance in the way of subsidy for all sorts and conditions of things. One of the cardinal principles of poor-law relief is to insure that the recipient of charitable aid is not placed in a better position as regards the comforts and general condition of life than his self-reliant neighbour, who is struggling to keep off the rates. Can any one say that the condition of many of the recipients of poor-relief is not much better than that of those on the verge of pauperism, but who have so far maintained their self-reliance? Are not many of the inmates in our old peoples' homes living under better conditions as regards the comforts of life than they have ever before experienced? The duty of the State is to see that no one starves, but there is a wide difference between this and a system that allows some charitable-aid recipients to buy chocolates and other luxuries denied the family of the struggling working-man. The deserving poor should receive their extra comforts from organized private philanthropy, which fortunately has established many excellent institutions in these Islands, and there is abundant evidence that it only needs organization to bring those private charities together on the lines of the Charity Organization Society of the United Kingdom, so that public and private charity can go hand in hand in restricting the insatiable demands of an undeserving poor, and in providing all that can reasonably be provided for those who have fallen on to evil times through no fault of their own.

If some such scheme could be arranged we might continue to grant a certain amount of outdoor relief before resorting to—what we must ultimately adopt—a workhouse system. For the able-bodied pauper, however, a workhouse test seems absolutely essential. I am naturally reluctant at this stage to make any definite recommendation, but would rather wait until I had further inquired into the problem—a problem that cannot be settled on eighteen months' experience. Doubtless many of you have valuable suggestions to offer on the subject, but I would very much like to hear the opinions of this Conference on the Elberfeld system, a modification of which appears to me to be particularly adaptable to this country. The system seems to have worked well in some parts of Germany, and, provided we can get the right men to come forward to our assistance, I can see no reason why—in fact, I have yet to learn that what can be done by a patriotic German cannot be better done by a public-spirited and patriotic Briton.

I am well aware that many of your Boards recognise the evils of the present system, and the dangers into which we are drifting. In the Conference of Charitable Aid Boards held here in 1904 there was not a recommendation that would not appeal to a sensible man, and chief of these was that the Boards should be relieved of the responsibility of the children in the industrial schools, and that such should be handed over to the State. Personally, I would extend such advantages to all children sooner than that they should be placed under Charitable Aid Boards, and so in a measure start life handicapped. We all know that pauperism is contagious, and that the sooner a child is removed from its fell influences the better citizen he is likely to turn out. In fact, in the words of M. Thiry, Professor of Criminal Law in the University of Liège, "If you would succeed in diminishing vagrancy and begging, as well as crime, give more attention to the children." Nor can the Government be accused of having been wanting in this respect. The Infant Life Protection and other Acts were framed on the principle that it is only right and fair to give the children a good start in life, and to try and relieve them as soon as possible from the evils of a bad environment.

The charitable-aid question is the greatest of all problems before you, and we should allow no false feelings or sickly sentimentalism to draw us into depths—financial and moral—from which there will be great difficulty in emerging. Now is the time to act: the chance is now with you. You have come here conscious of your power to make or mar this Bill, and very possibly you can do so, but if you are the men I take you to be, you will divest yourselves of the cloaks of parochialism and the politics of party, and, at any rate, cause a Bill to be framed that will not only redound to your credit, but will make for the betterment of the sick and needy, whilst preserving the moral fibre of the people of these Islands.

On the motion of Mr. PAYLING, it was resolved to admit the Press to the deliberations of the Conference.

The CHAIRMAN intimated that each Board or institution should have one vote irrespective of the number of delegates representing Boards or institutions. The votes would be very carefully recorded, so that the significance of each vote might be readily assessed by the Minister.

PROCEDURE.

On the motion of Mr. GALLAWAY (Otago) the following were appointed a committee to draw up a scheme of procedure: The Hon. Mr. C. M. Luke, Messrs. J. P. Luke, Cranby, Burns, Bellringer, Payling, Scantlebury, Kettle, and Galloway.

On resuming at 2 p.m., Mr. GALLAWAY (Dunedin) said the committee had arrived at the following conclusions: (1) That the delegates agree amongst themselves who shall record the vote of his Board or institution; (2) that the voting be recorded on the voting-paper; (3) that the following questions be considered *seriatim*—(a) whether hospital and charitable matters be administered by one Board; (b) election of Boards—who to elect; (c) election of Boards—basis of representation; (d) continuity of office; (e) abolition of separate institutions; (f) reduction of subsidies; (g) Government control.

ONE BOARD.

Mr. J. P. LUKE (Wellington) moved, "That, in the opinion of this Conference, the functions of hospitals and charitable aid should be administered by one Board."

Mr. BELLINGER (New Plymouth) seconded.

Mr. VAUGHAN (North Auckland) asked how that would affect those districts where hospital and charitable-aid districts were not coterminous. In some instances the districts overlapped.

The CHAIRMAN replied that under this they would be coterminous.

The Hon. C. M. LUKE, M.L.C., thought this was a question of large policy. Probably in some districts there had been a waste under the existing system, and the purpose of the Bill was to remove the possibility of that waste. He recognised the splendid service the separate institutions had rendered to the Dominion. He was in this position: that he was elected twenty-four years ago as a trustee of the contributors in the City of Wellington, and he had been for the past five years Chairman of the Wellington Hospital Board. He did not think there was any institution in the country that could claim to stand superior to the Wellington Hospital, either in efficiency or in economical administration. He was thoroughly in agreement with the focussing of the two forces of hospital and charitable aid into one, because it would remove the possibility of conflict between the two bodies. While recognising the possibility of the larger districts having some disadvantages, he believed that by means of the subdistricts and the subcommittees provided for in the Bill they would achieve exactly the same results as they were achieving to-day.

Mr. MAXTON (Wairarapa) said that at present the Wellington Charitable Aid Board administered charitable aid practically in the Wairarapa, but with regard to hospitals the Wairarapa was separate. What they wished to maintain was a distinct body in the Wairarapa and Pahiatua. If amalgamation took place they would work in the Wairarapa independent of the city. He hoped that before they finished they would so divide the district that they would come to an amicable understanding as between the city and the country.

Mr. O'BRIEN (Mercury Bay) asked what would be the position of a separate institution under a united Board?

The CHAIRMAN said separate institutions were scheduled under the Act. The Mercury Bay Hospital had an independent income, and did not come on the rates. This amendment would not affect it in the least.

Mr. O'BRIEN said he wanted to know if the Board would have any control over the hospital with which he was connected?

The CHAIRMAN said a combined Board under the Bill could have no control over such an institution.

Mr. GALLAWAY desired to speak in favour of the two functions being combined under the one Board. Since he had taken an interest in these matters it had been made very clear to him that they were at the present moment losing an immense amount of force owing to want of organization. It would be the simplest thing, it seemed to him, to have the functions combined under one Board—a large Board, and strong committees might be appointed from that Board. He thought it would strengthen the hands of the Government very much if it came from a Conference of that sort that they were almost unanimous in asking for one central Board of Control.

Mr. LOUDON (Dunedin) said that in Dunedin they had three Boards—The Charitable Aid Board, the Benevolent Trustees, and the Hospital Trustees. Each of those Boards had a separate staff of officials, and he was quite satisfied that it would be very much in the interests of economy if all those Boards were amalgamated. In dealing with this question, no parochial or town *versus* country spirit should be raised. A great deal had been said about voluntary contributions, but he thought that before long there would be no such thing as voluntary contributions for hospital needs. Public opinion had altered, and it had become an obligation of the State, and the Government had affirmed the principle. He intended to support the motion, and he hoped it would be carried unanimously.

The resolution was carried by sixty-three votes to four.

ELECTION OF BOARDS.

The Conference then proceeded to consider the question, "Election of Boards—who to elect."

Mr. J. P. LUKE (Wellington District Hospital Board) moved the adoption of the following remit from that Board: "That the Board consist of members elected as follows: One or more members to be elected by each parliamentary electorate. That, as long as the Government contribute the same amount of subsidy as at present, they be represented by one or more members on each Board." He anticipated that there would be some opposition to this proposal, but he

trusted it would be adopted. It might be said that some other mode of election would be less cumbersome. What better means of electing members could be adopted than the parliamentary representation area? It might be that some people would say that the functions of the local authorities should not be co-terminous with the parliamentary electorates. He had considered this question thoroughly, and the more he thought of it the more he thought the franchise for hospital and charitable aid should be on the most popular basis they could put it. Under this system they would get a very good selection of men—men who would give their heart and sympathy to this particular work. He thought they would all agree with him that the present method was cumbersome; that it did not give satisfaction, nor did it bring about the most efficient administration and work. In Wellington, for instance, in view of the increased amount of the Government contribution, they were distinctly entitled to some representation on the Board. There was no doubt that the bringing-in of the Public Health Act had brought about an increase in the cost of administration. Then there was the open-air cure in the treatment of consumption. He gave every credit to the Department for the work it had done in certain directions.

Mr. BELLINGER (New Plymouth) moved as an amendment, "That the present representation be the representation under the new Act."

Mr. TAPLEY (Dunedin) had much pleasure in seconding the amendment. He did not think there was any necessity for any change in the mode of election. In his opinion the present mode of election was much better than that proposed, and he thought it should remain.

Mr. MOORE (Wellington) thought the present method of election was entirely unsatisfactory. This was particularly the case in respect to the election of the Hospital Board of Trustees for the City of Wellington. He considered that the motion moved by Mr. Luke was the proper one, and was the only one that should be countenanced in a democratic country.

Mr. WEBB (Northern Wairoa) said the cost of the elections would come out of the Charitable Aid Fund, and it would mean so much less for the sick and needy.

Mr. HORRELL (North Canterbury) supported the motion.

Mr. MAXTON (Wairarapa) thought members would find that the majority would support the present system, which was much simpler than the parliamentary system. He would support the amendment in favour of retaining the present system.

Mr. TAPPER (Dunedin) said he would support the amendment, with a slight alteration. He thought that if they introduced politics into charitable aid they would make a mistake, and it would mean much additional cost. The present system had stood the test for twenty-three years. Would they get as good a class of men under the proposed system as those who attended the Conference? He did not think so. The slight alteration he wished to make was this: to add the words "and that the names of those who wish to be elected should be published over a week or a fortnight before the election."

Mr. GALLAWAY (Dunedin) said he intended to vote against both the amendment and the motion. He quite agreed with Mr. Tapper that it would be a great mistake to introduce politics into charity. He did not think it really mattered from that point of view whether the franchise was universal or whether it was not. It seemed to him that there was an equitable basis upon which the representation should stand in matters of this sort—in the meantime, at any rate. It did not follow that because a man was a first-class man on a local body he would be a first-class man on a Charitable Aid Board.

Mr. PAYLING (Christchurch) said he would support the amendment. If they adopted the parliamentary franchise they would not get so good a class of men on Charitable Aid Boards as they had now.

Mr. PEARCE (Patea) would support the amendment. He was entirely against voting under the parliamentary franchise. In his address the Minister had alluded to the increased cost of charitable aid. If they were to reduce the expenditure, they should adhere to the present system.

Mr. EATON (Wairarapa) thought that those who had the raising of the funds should have the spending of them. If they had men sitting on the Boards representing the ratepayers, they would naturally guard the ratepayers' money.

Mr. MARX (Hawera) said that under the present system it did not necessarily follow that members of local bodies were elected to the Hospital and Charitable Aid Boards. As to the parliamentary franchise and districts, he might point out that there was not a single hospital within the newly created electorate of Egmont. His colleague and himself both supported the amendment.

Mr. DAVISON (Ashburton) said that if the proposed change were carried out it would mean very great expense to the local bodies. He had been asked to oppose such an alteration.

Mr. RITCHIE (Wanganui) said he would support the amendment. He was satisfied that the mode of election at present in vogue was the best. He was perfectly satisfied, from his experience, that they would get a very undesirable class of people elected under the proposed idea.

The Hon. Mr. C. M. LUKE, M.L.C., thought the Conference should devise some basis that would give more representation to the contributories. He hoped there would be a further amendment: that local bodies would be represented in proportion to the funds they contributed, and that the Government would be represented on the Board.

Mr. COOPER (Christchurch) said he would like to strike the happy medium. He thought they would get good Boards under the municipal franchise. The question of cost was not worthy of consideration. Women could do excellent work on Charitable Aid Boards.

Mr. MANHIRE (Christchurch) said he did not see why the cost of the elections should be large. There was no reason why the elections for the Charitable Aid Boards and the elections for other local bodies should not take place on the same day. He would move later on an amendment to the effect that the members of the Board be elected from those entitled to elect other local authorities in the district.

Mr. BROWN (Masterton) said that if they went on multiplying elections it would lead to great confusion.

Mr. BAGNALL (Auckland) said this was an important matter, and ought not to be disposed of in too much of a hurry. It was one of the most important questions that the Conference had to decide. In Auckland there was a feeling that there ought to be an extension of the franchise; but it was a difficult question to decide what was the best way to do it. What appealed to him most was the question of cost. There would have to be a separate returning officer for these elections, and there would have to be separate deputy returning officers at each polling-booth. That would mean a greatly increased cost. He would like to see the franchise extended.

Mr. DAVIS (Ashburton) said he was opposed to having the Hospital Board elections on the same day as the parliamentary elections. The multiplying of elections would result in confusion, and there would be many informal votes. He would rather support the retention of the present system of election for Hospital and Charitable Aid Boards.

Mr. SCANTLEBURY (Reefton) said it was his intention to vote for the amendment, although he sympathized to a great extent with the resolution. If the change provided for in the motion were carried, he was afraid that in some districts it would result in the election of most undesirable men, and the charitable-aid expenditure would go up by leaps and bounds.

Mr. R. C. KIRK (Wellington) said, having had experience of the three Boards in Wellington for many years past, he failed to see anything wrong with the present system, other than in some details. The proposed change in the method of election would mean a great deal more expenditure, and he failed to see any advantage it would have over the present system. Some of the objections that were urged against the present system were, he thought, owing to mistakes that had been made and that had been perpetuated under the present Act—particularly in regard to separate institutions. If some of the little anomalies under the present system were abolished, he thought they could get along very well.

Mr. O'BRIEN (Mercury Bay) said he would support the motion. The present system stood condemned. He thought they could get real good men under the proposed system of election.

Mr. McGRATH thought the people generally should have a voice in the election of these Boards. He would oppose the amendment.

Mr. CARSON (Wanganui) said he did not think they had heard one suggestion that would, if carried out, mean an improvement on the present position. His sympathies "went out" to the system of popular election. Still, he did not think an election under the parliamentary franchise would be an improvement. First of all, he did not think the people themselves would take sufficient interest in the matter. There was not quite sufficient at stake, and people would not take the trouble to vote. Candidates for certain local bodies—those who were not interested in public works—were not necessarily the men who were most interested in the question of charitable aid and hospitals. He could not support the motion; and as to the amendment he was prepared to vote against it if another amendment that had been suggested were brought forward.

Mr. CRANBY (Napier) said he was not at all in sympathy with the proposed parliamentary system of election for Hospital Boards.

Mr. HOGG, M.P. (Masterton), said, looking at the provisions of the Bill with regard to the mode of election of Committees and members of Boards, he was at a loss to see that they were any improvement whatever on the conditions that now existed. He could understand a radical reform or improvement, but this seemed to him to be a case in which they ought to judiciously "leave well alone" until they could think of something better. The Bill, instead of being democratic, was bureaucratic from beginning to end. What powers were the committees going to have? It seemed to him that it would be immaterial who the members of the committees were. He was of opinion that the principle of the Bill was bad from beginning to end.

The CHAIRMAN said they would deal with the question of committees later on. He believed that was a weak point in the Bill.

Mr. HOGG said the Boards would have all the powers, and the committees would have none. His sympathies were entirely with the amendment. If they could not discover something to improve the present system, then they should allow the present system to remain.

Mr. BAIN (Southland) said his sympathies were more in favour of the amendment than of the resolution. He would suggest that, instead of each local body sending a delegate, nominations should be received, and the names should be sent to the various local bodies, and every Councillor should vote for a particular candidate. He thought that would be more satisfactory and would be extending the franchise in a proper way. It would also avoid any chance of "points" being worked in connection with elections. As far as Southland was concerned, the representation there had worked very well indeed, with one slight exception. The whole district was fairly well represented in accordance with the amount contributed, and he thought that was the basis they ought to work on.

Mr. BURKE (Westland) said that as far as Westland was concerned the present charitable-aid arrangements had been quite satisfactory, and he had no fault to find with them. He might point out that the county and the borough elections took place at different times and in different years. If a change in the constitution of the Board was considered necessary, it might go in the direction of the Government nominating two members on the Board.

Mr. TALBOT (South Canterbury) said he also intended to support the amendment. He did not think any objection that had been raised to the present system could not be similarly raised against any of the other systems that had been mentioned; and a great many more objections could be raised against them. It had been stated that it was necessary to become a member of another local body in order to be elected to a Hospital and Charitable Aid Board. He might point out that the local body could appoint whom they liked: it was not necessary for the person appointed to be a member of the local body itself. He sincerely hoped the Government would let well alone: that until they saw an absolute necessity for altering the present system they would let it remain.

Dr. BATCHELOR (Dunedin) said his experience had been that not enough interest was taken in the elections to Charitable Aid Boards. There were many men who did not care to become members of local bodies such as County Councils, yet who would make very good members of Hospital Boards. He would vote against both the motion and the amendment, but he was prepared to support the amendment indicated by Mr. Gallaway.

Mr. CRAWFORD (Wellington) said it seemed to him that the feeling was very much against the original motion and in favour of the amendment. He submitted that the question of principle was whether the members of Hospital and Charitable Aid Boards should be elected municipally or on the parliamentary franchise.

Mr. MULVHILL (Westland) said the present system was working very well.

Mr. J. P. LUKE (Wellington), in reply, acknowledged the very kindly way in which the Conference had received the resolution. The question of the ratepayers had been imported into the discussion. In his opinion, people who were not ratepayers had just as much right to have a voice in these matters as ratepayers had. He thought it would be better to adopt the parliamentary roll in connection with these elections rather than the municipal roll.

The amendment—viz., "That this Conference is of opinion that the present mode of representation is the most equitable to all the contributing local authorities, and recommends that clause 6 of the Act of 1886 be a clause in the amending Bill"—was carried by a large majority.

Mr. MANHIRE (Christchurch) moved, "That the members of the Board shall be elected by the ratepayers for the time being entitled to elect members to a local authority within the district."

Mr. GALLAWAY (Dunedin) moved, "That the method set forth in the Bill be adopted." Neither the ratepayers nor the local bodies were properly represented under the present system.

Mr. LONDON (Dunedin) seconded the amendment. He thought the provision in the Bill was a step in the right direction. He was not in favour of extending the parliamentary franchise to the election of these Boards, but he thought there should be some alteration. He thought if the clause in the Bill were adopted it would create an interest amongst the ratepayers; and it would be the means of their having desirable men to administer hospital and charitable-aid matters.

Mr. BELLRINGER (New Plymouth) said the amendment was the most iniquitous thing he had heard. He asked the Conference to allow the amendment to go to the vote without further discussion. The present system of election had produced very good results, and he asked the Conference to support it.

Mr. STEAD (Invercargill) thought the proposed system would be a great improvement on the present system of election.

Mr. FRASER (North Otago) said he had great pleasure in supporting the amendment. He thought that if the franchise were extended as suggested in the amendment it would be a step in the right direction. It would give the people a vote who had a right to it. Another reason why he thought the Conference ought to support the amendment was that it provided for all parts of a charitable-aid district being represented on the Board. The Bill provided for the district being subdivided, and each district having one or more members. Then, as to the question of cost, that objection had been raised in the case of almost every new election proposed during the past twenty years. Although it might cost a little more money, it would probably be money very well spent.

Mr. RHODES (Coromandel) did not favour the amendment now proposed. He thought another amendment going a little further than the motion would meet the position. The principle was whether every contributor should have some say in the election of the Board or not.

Mr. J. G. WILSON said that if the election day had happened to be wet, very few people would vote in the country districts. The centres of population would be represented much too largely on the Board.

Mr. Gallaway's amendment—viz., "That the members of the Board shall be elected by those who are entitled to elect members to a local authority within the district"—was negatived by fifty-two votes to fifteen.

Mr. RHODES (Coromandel) moved, and Mr. O'BRIEN (Mercury Bay) seconded, "That the contributory local authorities and subscribers elect the representatives to the Board in proportion to the amount contributed, the representatives to be elected under similar conditions to those which govern the election of members of Boards of Education."

The resolution was negatived.

Mr. Bellringer's motion—viz., "That the Conference is of opinion that the present mode of representation is the most equitable to all contributing authorities, and recommends that clause 6 of the amended Act of 1886 be a clause in the amending Bill"—was agreed to on the voices.

The Conference then adjourned.

SECOND DAY (WEDNESDAY, 10th JUNE, 1908).

BASIS OF REPRESENTATION.

The CHAIRMAN said that by the carrying of Mr. Bellringer's resolution the previous day it had been agreed that representation should be based on the contributions from local authorities and the population, which was the present system exactly. This basis had been worked out actuarially, and had apparently given satisfaction for the past twenty-three years. An apportionment was made between the contributions of the local authorities and the population; the mean was taken between the two, and the basis assessed accordingly. It was a difficult problem to arrive at a perfectly satisfactory basis, and his recommendation to the Conference was that they should adhere to the present basis.

Mr. J. G. WILSON (Palmerston) was quite satisfied with the Chairman's explanation, and he therefore moved, "That the present basis of apportionment and representation be adopted."

Mr. QUIN (Hawera) seconded the motion.

Motion agreed to.

CONTINUITY OF OFFICE OF BOARDS.

The CHAIRMAN thought the Conference would be unanimous in arriving at the conclusion that the present system of election for only one year was unsatisfactory, and he hoped the Conference would agree that both as regards members of Boards and Chairmen there should be continuity of office to the extent of three years.

Mr. MARX (Hawera) moved, "That the period of office be extended to three years."

This was seconded by Mr. J. G. WILSON (Palmerston North), who thought it would be better that a certain number of members should retire each year. This would give continuity of knowledge and experience and at the same time provide new blood.

A DELEGATE asked how this would work in cases where a district was represented by only one man on a Board.

The CHAIRMAN thought that could be arranged.

Mr. COOPER (Christchurch) was opposed to the election of the Chairman for three years. At the end of one year it might be more satisfactory to have a new Chairman.

Mr. O'BRIEN (Mercury Bay) was in favour of the annual election of Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the resolution if carried did not necessarily affect the Chairman.

Mr. MARX (Hawera) by leave substituted for his previous motion the following: "That continuity of office be secured by the election of one-third of the members each year, those to retire to be decided by ballot, thus giving three years maximum of office."

Mr. NORRIS (North Canterbury) pointed out that this would necessitate the holding of an election every year.

Mr. WALKER (Otago) moved, "That members of Boards be elected every three years."

Mr. STEVENS (Dunedin) seconded the motion.

Mr. LOGAN (Maniototo) said the mode of election was merely a matter of detail. All the Conference was called upon to do, he held, was to affirm the principle of continuity of office. He moved as an amendment, "That the principle of continuity of office be affirmed."

The amendment was duly seconded.

Mr. LOUDON said, if it were decided that a certain number of members should retire annually, it was desirable that the question of who were to retire at the end of the first and second years should be decided by ballot. After that he thought those who had been longest in office should retire in rotation.

Mr. Logan's amendment, "That the principle of continuity of office be affirmed," was put to the Conference and agreed to.

Mr. BOLTON (Wellington) rose to a point of order. He objected to Mr. Logan's amendment being put when there was a prior amendment before the Conference.

The CHAIRMAN said the opinion of the Conference had been arrived at, though possibly by an indirect route.

ABOLITION OF SEPARATE INSTITUTIONS.

Mr. SCANTLEBURY (Reefton) moved, "That this Conference protests against the combined districts as set out in the Bill under discussion, and that the separate institutions be allowed to continue in operation."

Mr. WEBB (Northern Wairoa) moved, "That the system of separate institutions as at present in force be approved and continued." He believed the opinion expressed by Sir Julius Vogel many years ago, that the establishment of these institutions would encourage people to provide hospitals and would tend to relieve the rates, had been amply justified by the results. In the Northern Wairoa, for instance, they had a hospital with fourteen beds, which in the five years of its existence had put through between five and six hundred patients, who had been treated, in the great majority of cases, with marked success. Should such a hospital as that be abolished? It had not been entirely self-supporting. They had to come on the rates for a moderate amount, but the amount was being gradually reduced: it had fallen in the last three years from £365 to about £200. If the Board had to take over this institution it would be at considerable cost. And he would point out that the Boards were represented on the management of these separate institutions according to law. In the case of the Wairoa Hospital the North of Auckland Board elected three members, who sat regularly with the Trustees with most satisfactory results. It would be a great mistake to endeavour to wipe out these separate institutions.

Mr. COOPER (Christchurch), in seconding the motion of the last speaker, desired to speak on behalf of the Samaritan Home in Christchurch which had been founded by a number of people in Christchurch. Those ladies and gentlemen had contributed liberally towards the institution, and of course they had the Government subsidy. The Home was open for a class of cases which few institutions in the Dominion would take. In fact, it was a sort of link between charitable aid and the gaol. It was held by the Stipendiary Magistrate and other authorities that such institutions should not be closed. In keeping outcast women off the streets they saved many a youth from possible contamination. It was one of the very few institutions which provided for those maternity cases where a woman had fallen more than once. The Christchurch City Council and the Selwyn and Ashburton County Councils were represented on the management of that institution.

Mr. FRASER (Oamaru) did not at all approve of the Chairman's somewhat sweeping condemnation of these separate institutions, and he hoped the Conference would see its way to recommend

their retention. In the Oamaru district there were two separate institutions whose management had been as good and economical, if not more so, than that of the Board itself. At a Conference held recently in Oamaru of members of the Board and the Trustees of the separate institutions it was resolved to urge that separate institutions should be continued only as in the past. This had reference more particularly to hospitals, but in his opinion it would apply with still greater force to the distribution of charitable aid. A Board which only sat occasionally could not find the time to go thoroughly into many of the matters that might come before it, nor would they know the circumstances of each case as would smaller committees or bodies existing in different localities.

Mr. CHAPMAN (Waikato) said some of the speakers appeared to be under the impression that there was an intention to absolutely abolish separate institutions. He understood that the intention was simply to place them under the control of the Boards.

The CHAIRMAN said there was no intention to abolish those separate institutions that could maintain themselves with the help of the Government subsidy of 24s. Nor was it the intention to abolish those institutions which came upon the rates, but it was considered they might very properly be taken over by the Boards.

Mr. MANHIRE (Christchurch) moved the following amendment: "That this Conference affirms the principle that the Boards which have charge of charitable aid should have control of the expenditure." This was the substance of a resolution which had been arrived at by a Conference held in Christchurch some four or five years ago, the Conference being practically unanimous on that point. He could not agree with Mr. Cooper's remarks in reference to the Samaritan Home in Christchurch. He had resided close to that institution for a number of years, and he considered it a blot on the district. It was simply a refuge for a lot of loafers. If men broke the law there was the gaol for them to go to; and as for the old women, most of them preferred the gaol. The treatment of maternity cases at the Home had been referred to. All he could say was that there was many a poor ratepayer whose wife did not fare nearly as well in her time of trouble as did the women who were received into this home and who were kept there for six months.

Mr. DARTON (Gisborne) thought members were wandering away from the question of control. The question they had to consider now was whether hospital Trustees should be compelled to meet together and vote away large sums of money which the Charitable Aid Board had to provide.

Rev. Mr. KEMPTHORNE (Nelson) asked if the St. Andrew's Orphanage, which was a separate institution but which did not draw anything from the rates, would be affected by the present proposal.

The CHAIRMAN said that institution, being one which was maintained by contributions with the Government subsidy of 24s., came under the Second Schedule of the Bill and would therefore probably continue as at present.

Mr. TAPPER (Otago) considered the control of these institutions was better under separate committees than under a larger general body. He doubted if men elected to committees from a larger general body could devote the same amount of time and labour to conducting the affairs of the different institutions as could separate boards or committees appointed for that purpose. He felt sure the Otago Benevolent Institution could be worked as well and economically as at present under general control.

Mr. LYLE (Wallace) said the institution he represented was at one time working with the general Southland body, but there was always friction between the two bodies. Since they had been given separate control there had certainly been better and more economic administration.

Mr. RAYNER (Charleston) was strongly in favour of the administration of these institutions under the old Act. In a mining district such as his district there were numerous accidents, and as they were in an isolated position it cost about twelve guineas to get a doctor down there. The Charleston institution at the present time was doing a most useful and necessary work.

Mr. MILLIGAN (Oamaru) moved to add to Mr. Webb's motion the following words: "In cases in which the majority of the contributing authorities desire it." He thought if the contributing bodies expressed a desire for the continuance of these separate institutions, power should be given to keep them in operation. When really good work was being done, as in the case referred to by Mr. Fraser, he thought it would be a great mistake to step in and interfere.

Mr. J. P. LUKE (Wellington) hoped the Conference would not agree to the continuance of these separate institutions. He believed it was the general opinion in Wellington that the sooner they abolished the present system of dual control as between the Wellington Hospital Board and the Wellington Hospital Trustees the better. The Board had to hand over to the Trustees about £7,000 every year, and yet they had only one representative on the latter body. That was not right. He admitted that the Trustees were for the most part able and experienced men, but he would point out that there was already provision in the Local Authorities Act which gave to City Councils and other local authorities power to have associated with them in their work any person or persons they might desire to co-operate with. He felt sure the Chairman of the Benevolent Institution (the Rev. Mr. Evans) would agree that the sooner that body was abolished as a separate institution the better. It was quite possible that some of these separate institutions were being administered with advantage in the country districts, but so far as the cities were concerned they should be abolished.

Mr. KIRK (Wellington) said that for nearly twenty years he had been a member of a District Hospital Board or a Hospital Trustee, and from his long experience he could say that what Mr. Luke had stated was correct. Though the District Board collected something like £20,000 a year, the bulk of that money was expended by the Wellington Hospital Trustees, and well spent, no doubt. The District Boards had practically no control. All they had to do was to pass estimates. The District Board had no representative or direct control in the management of the Wellington Hospital. He maintained that the District Board ought to control all the main hospitals, and he had proposed a remit to that effect, and in order that the District Board might have the advantage of outside aid he proposed that in regard to special institutions in any district they should have power to appoint

from among themselves or from outside—in addition—separate committees to manage the separate institutions under them. He thought a scheme such as that if adopted would meet the whole difficulty.

The Hon. Mr. C. M. LUKE said, if the Conference required an argument in favour of separate institutions, he had only to point to the management of the Wellington Hospital, the success of which was proverbial. He did support the proposition for the amalgamation of benevolent aid and hospital administration, because he knew from experience that each body was inclined to shirk its responsibilities towards the suffering poor who were turned over from one institution to the other and back again; but with regard to the Wellington Hospital, if administered by a Board which had many other interests, such an institution would be liable to suffer. The management of such institutions as the Wellington, Auckland, Christchurch, and Dunedin Hospitals should be largely in the hands of the men whose time was not occupied with multifarious other local-government and other duties.

Mr. BOLTON (Wellington) said, as a member of the Wellington Hospital Trustees and of the Benevolent Trustees as well, he knew something of the administration of both institutions. He was quite in accord with the principle embodied in the Bill, which provided for a central Board composed of the chairmen of the various committees. The committees would report through their chairmen to the main Board. By this means some direct control over the various institutions would be vested in the central Board. The principle, he thought, was admirable, though the details might want adjusting. As to the question of whether one body should control both hospital and charitable aid, he was somewhat in a difficulty. For his part, he thought five men on a committee would have too much to do to look after both hospital and charitable aid, and he thought the best solution would be for one central Board to have control of the expenditure, and that there should be separate committees dealing with hospital and charitable aid in detail.

Mr. GALLAWAY (Dunedin) said, so far as he had heard, no reflection whatever was cast upon the work of the separate institutions, though he and others considered that better work might be done under central Boards. The fact that they had been accustomed to go on working in one groove was no argument that these institutions could not be more effectively administered under a different system. Having affirmed the principle the previous day that hospital and charitable matters should be administered by one Board, it was only logical, he thought, to assent that separate institutions had had their day.

Mr. TALBOYS (Dunedin) said he had been connected with the Dunedin Benevolent Institution for the last eight years, and he had come to the conclusion that better work could be done by a central Board. There had been great trouble between the Hospital and Benevolent Institution as to which should take certain classes of cases, and the Benevolent Institution was simply the dumping-ground for cases which the Hospital refused to take. If the principle of a central Board were affirmed, that Board could appoint one committee from its number to act as a hospital committee and another to act as a benevolent committee. He agreed that in the past the separate institutions had done good work.

Mr. TAPLEY (Dunedin) believed that the majority of those connected with the separate institutions in Dunedin would concur in the opinions expressed by Mr. Gallaway and Mr. Talboys. He was confident that under a central Board the administration would not only be more smooth, but more economical.

Mr. SCANTLEBURY (Reefton) spoke of the good work done by the Reefton ladies' society, which did not come upon the rates at all, but which was maintained by voluntary contributions with the Government subsidy.

The CHAIRMAN said that society would still maintain its existence as a separate institution.

Mr. SCANTLEBURY would be sorry to see separate institutions abolished in the country districts. On the West Coast there was a central Board at Greymouth, and how could a Board like that be expected to manage an institution a hundred miles away as well and as economically as a separate body constituted locally.

Mr. EVANS (Wellington Benevolent Trustees) submitted that if all the separate institutions in the Second Schedule of the Bill (those not assisted out of rates) were left out of consideration, the Conference was in favour of abolishing the separate control of the others. He felt certain that if the separate institutions already existing were abolished, and brought into more direct relation with the Charitable Aid Boards, it would be alike in the interests of economy and efficiency. He referred, of course, only to separate institutions as distinct from those in the Second Schedule of the Bill.

Mr. KNIGHT (Auckland) thought that if the Conference simply affirmed the principle of doing away with separate institutions they would have done good work. Although there was a multiplicity of institutions in Auckland, the Hospital and Charitable Aid Board as one body administered the whole of them. For example, they had a Charitable Aid Committee, a Costley Home Committee, and an Alexandra Home Committee. Each of these committees reported once a fortnight to the Board, and their reports were indorsed or otherwise as the case might be. Administration under that system had proved exceedingly simple.

Mr. POWER (Waihi) appeared as an advocate for the retention of separate institutions. After listening to the remarks of many of the speakers that day he could quite understand that in the larger centres it was desirable to have centralisation of control, but so far as the country districts were concerned he held that the proposals contained in the Bill now before them were not at all workable. In the district he represented they had only one contributing body, that was the Waihi Borough Council. The amount contributed to the Hospital was about £1,800. This Bill would take the control of this institution completely out of the hands of the present Board and remove it to a greater distance. The management of the central body would then extend over 130 miles. What did the people at the south end of the district know about the distribution of charitable aid,

for instance, in the north? If this proposal was to be carried he hoped a proviso would be inserted to the effect that it should apply to the cities only.

Mr. MOORE (Wellington) was against the continuance of dual control in the large cities, and he felt sure the Hon. Mr. Luke would agree with him if he were a member of the District Board. At the present time, although the District Board were finding the whole of the money, less the amount contributed by the Government, they had no voice whatever in the constitution of the committee or Board of Trustees that had the expenditure of that money. That surely was an anomaly that should not be permitted to continue, and he thought the Government would fail in its duty if it did not put an end to it. He hoped that when the vote was taken on this matter the votes would be analysed, and when it was found that members of the Conference had voted for a continuance of the present state of things simply because they felt their own position might be jeopardized a note would be made of it for the information of the Minister.

Mr. RHODES (Coromandel) said that for about thirty years the Coromandel Hospital was controlled by the District Board, with the result that it was a considerable tax on the local body. Two years ago, however, it was incorporated as a separate institution, the result being that the tax on the ratepayers was reduced by more than one-half, and from present indications, if they continued as they were going now, in a very few years it would be entirely self-supporting. If, then, this Bill were passed as it stood, they would have no opportunity of coming in as one of the institutions that were not affected. But he contended that practically all the separate institutions were affected by this Bill, because they were mostly in districts where the population was continually changing and it might become necessary for them at any time to make a call on the rates, and their right to manage their own affairs would then be taken away from them.

Mr. WEBB agreed to the words of Mr. Milligan's amendment being added to his motion. The motion would now read, "That the present system of separate institutions as now in force be approved and continued in cases in which the majority of contributing authorities desire it."

Mr. MORRISON thought it would be better to put a clause in the Act giving power to the large cities to abolish separate institutions if they so desired.

Mr. LONDON (Wellington Hospital Trustees) was in favour of the motion now before the meeting. He pointed out that the Wellington Trustees were more representative of the local bodies and of the contributors than was the District Board itself. There were seven representatives of the boroughs on the Hospital Trustees, while there were not more than five or six on the District Board. The same applied to the Benevolent Institution, and it was a very good thing, as it tended to foster the spirit of benevolence in the district. The work of one of these institutions was as much as any one man could attend to satisfactorily, and if the District Boards were saddled with further duties he believed the efficiency of administration would suffer.

Mr. CHAYTOR said the size of the districts was largely involved in this question. It was desirable that there should be no overlapping of authority. The country people were strongly opposed to placing the outlying hospitals under the complete control of a central Board.

Mr. EATON (Masterton) said this was a most important matter to his district. If there was to be centralisation of authority it was impossible that the administration could be as successful as it had been in the past. The Board represented Pahiatua, Carterton, and Masterton, and he believed the taking-away of local control would be a great misfortune to the hospitals. He would oppose the motion.

Mr. PAYLING (Christchurch) said this question of separate institutions did not affect his district so far as hospitals were concerned. The people there were quite satisfied to have the main hospital under the control of the District Board, though he quite recognised the country people would fight hard against the abolition of separate institutions. It was said the Christchurch people were well satisfied with the management of the Samaritan Home, but he contended that it could be quite as well managed by the Benevolent Institution, and probably better. At present it was a harbour for those who misconducted themselves. Those people should be sent to some place where they would have to work and pay for their keep. If such institutions were under the control of the State they could be carried on at far less expense. Well-meaning people went about collecting money on which they could claim the Government subsidy in order to keep these institutions open, but he felt sure the work could be very much better done under a central authority and at less cost.

Mr. BAGNALL (Auckland) said that in Auckland the Hospital, the charitable aid and benevolent institution, and the Old Men's Home were all run by the one institution, while in Wellington it appeared there were four or five separate institutions. He agreed with the last speaker that a multiplication of institutions meant additional expense. He also agreed that the easier they made it for people to get into such institutions as the Samaritan Home the greater the number they would have in them, and the more difficult they made it the more likely would the people be to help themselves. In Auckland, if a case came before the Board they made arrangements with one of the institutions under its control until the case was done with. If a case became chronic the Board sent it to the Home, because it could be looked after at less expense, and thus in the management there was no friction. He would support the motion, although it seemed to convey the idea that where the local bodies contribute rates the representatives of those local bodies would be the controlling body, which he did not think was quite what was intended.

Mr. TALBOT (South Canterbury) thought that after hearing the discussion the Conference must come to the conclusion that some alteration was necessary. The placing of separate institutions under a different system was, he considered, one of the most important of the proposals of the Government. He would give his vote in favour of the amendment, which meant that those bodies which were able to find the money would have control over their respective institutions.

Mr. BAIN (Invercargill) said the difficulty his district was placed in with regard to the vote about to be taken was that he represented more than one institution. If the vote was to be a fair one each institution should have a vote.

The CHAIRMAN said due regard would be paid to the significance of each vote recorded. From the remarks which had fallen from some of the speakers it would appear that in his opening address he had cast some reflection upon the Trustees who controlled the various separate institutions, and had implied that they had not in the past administered their institutions with due regard to economy. The remarks he made were not directed at the institutions, but at the system. He maintained that the system obtaining at present under which they had one body of men providing the money and another body of men spending it was altogether wrong in principle. He did not intend to reflect in any way upon the excellent administration of the Trustees of those institutions throughout the Dominion. Not one speaker had recognised that the original intention in establishing separate institutions had failed. When Sir Julius Vogel introduced his Bill in 1885 he believed that in due time all the separate institutions would be independent of any support from the local authorities and would with the Government subsidy be self-supporting. At the present time only eleven institutions in the Dominion were in that position, while there were forty-one which derived their money from the rates. That, he thought, was a proof that the separate-institution system had been a failure.

Mr. WEBB (Northern Wairoa) wished to say, in reply, that almost every speaker throughout the discussion had borne testimony to the splendid work done by the separate institutions throughout the Dominion. The Chairman himself had admitted that they were well managed. Even if an institution had to go to the Boards and ask for a little money, was that an argument that the Board should have sole control of that institution when it was being thoroughly well managed? The North of Auckland Board did not want to wipe out the Wairoa institution simply because they claimed from the Board £246 in support of that institution. They should take care that nothing was done to discourage the good work that was being done by the people who had banded themselves together for such an object, even though they had been assisted by the rates to some extent.

On the question of the amendment—viz., "That this Conference affirms the principle that the Boards which have charge of charitable aid should have control of the expenditure"—the voting was as follows: Ayes, 29; noes, 43; majority against, 14. Amendment negatived.

The motion, "That the present system of separate institutions as now in force be approved and continued in cases in which the majority of contributing authorities desire it," was then put and carried on the voices.

GOVERNMENT SUBSIDIES.

Mr. BELLINGER (Taranaki) moved, "That this Conference protests against any reduction of the Government subsidies to hospital and charitable aid."

Mr. QUINN (Hawera) seconded the motion.

Mr. TAPPER (Otago) moved as an amendment, "That the whole cost of hospital and charitable administration should be borne by the Consolidated Fund." In support of this proposal he said that a man, after spending the best years of his life in the South, might leave for a warmer climate. He might go to Auckland, and if he needed hospital treatment or charitable aid in his old age he would under the present system come upon the Auckland ratepayers. If there was one charge that should be made against the Consolidated Fund it was the ordinary upkeep of benevolent institutions.

Mr. PAYLING (Christchurch) seconded the motion *pro forma*. There was a good deal to be said both for and against the amendment proposed by Mr. Tapper, and he was afraid a discussion on the subject would only be a waste of time. It would be better to come to a decision on the question of the reduction of subsidies.

Mr. MARX (Hawera) said, though much might be urged in favour of the amendment, he thought on the whole if they continued to receive the present subsidy it would be a fair thing. He regarded the subsidy as a right. The little more than half they received by way of subsidy provided for the national part of the institution. That was to say, it made provision for those people from whom they derived no benefit, and who required treatment or care in their time of affliction. He could not see his way to support the amendment.

Mr. BAGNALL (Auckland) did not think the Government could seriously ask that the subsidies be reduced. He would like to hear what the Chairman had to say in support of it before entering upon a discussion of the question. So far as the amendment was concerned, he felt that while the Boards claimed the right to control the expenditure they could hardly go to the length of saying that the Government ought to find all the money.

The CHAIRMAN at this stage asked that the discussion of this question might be postponed, as after the luncheon adjournment he hoped to be in a position to make a statement on the subject.

After the luncheon adjournment, the CHAIRMAN said he would ask the leave of the Conference to postpone the discussion on the question of subsidies until he had some authoritative statement from the Minister as to the proposals which he (the Chairman) had put before the Conference. He wanted particularly to postpone the discussion, because he could not but think that the proposal suggested might meet in some measure with the approval of the Conference. He hoped to be able to make the statement that afternoon.

The discussion on the question of subsidies was postponed.

ELECTION OF COMMITTEES.

The CHAIRMAN said they would now take the question of the election of committees. Personally he thought he could say, without being in any sense disloyal to any one connected with his Department, he did not at all approve of the proposals in the Bill in regard to the election of committees. He shared the opinion with a good many members of the Conference that an election in the way proposed would result in a good deal of friction. He maintained most emphatically that the com-

mittees should be elected by the members of the Board—not necessarily that they should be members of the Board, but that the Board should be allowed to nominate the members of committees who had not a seat on the District Board. He would like to see that carried particularly, because, as he mentioned in his opening address, he thought some modification of the Elberfeld system might be adopted in New Zealand. There were many men who did not wish to face the hurly-burly of elections to local authorities who nevertheless would be admirable men to sit on committees of our hospitals and charitable institutions. There was growing up in this colony every day a larger leisured class—retired business men and Civil servants—who he believed would be very glad to undertake the duties of administering a system such as the Elberfeld system. Under that system in Germany the districts were put under the control of a person who occupied a very responsible and honourable position in the eyes of the public. He thought, if the committees were elected by the Board in that way—not necessarily of their own members, but also to consist of persons outside who were likely to take a particular interest in charitable-aid work—it would tend very much towards efficient and economical administration of charitable aid. He would like to hear the opinion of the Conference on this subject.

Mr. CHEPMELL said it was proposed in the Bill that the Governor should divide the district into subdistricts, and each of those subdistricts was to have a committee elected for them. Many members of the Conference objected to the division of districts into subdistricts; but there would be no objection to the Board being allowed to appoint committees for management of branch hospitals. What they objected to was the compulsory division of the district into subdistricts without really any object. If he was in order, he would move that that provision in the Bill be struck out.

The CHAIRMAN said they could consider that point when they were discussing the Bill. He wanted a general expression of the opinion of the Conference on the subject of committees. With respect to the boundaries of the districts, he proposed to confer with the members affected.

Mr. NORRIS (Christchurch) moved, in lieu of the provision in the Bill with respect to committees, "That any Board may appoint standing or select committees of its own members for the purpose of dealing with the several departmental matters in relation to the management of hospitals or institutions, financial matters, or the distribution of outdoor relief, such committees to report to the Board." His idea was that the Board should appoint its own committees. It had been suggested that the membership of committees might be extended to some persons outside who might be eminently qualified to assist the Board in carrying out the provisions of the Act. What they would have to guard against would be the appointing of committees of what might be termed outsiders, who would get into their hands the distribution of the Board's finance. He thought that ought to be carefully guarded against. What he suggested was that the Board might appoint committees of its own members for the purposes stated. The committees would hold office for a year, and any vacancies that might arise in the course of the year should be filled up by the Board. This question was very much involved with the question of the constitution of the Boards as regarded numbers. He would like to see an increase in the number of members of the Board. What he had in his mind was that the Board should consist of a sufficient number of members to enable it to constitute departmental committees, such as a Hospital Committee, an Old Men's Home Committee, a Finance Committee, &c. If the Board consisted of a larger number of members than was proposed it would have a much wider selection of members. There were remits on the agenda paper providing that the committees should be appointed from the Boards themselves.

Mr. CHEPMELL (Waikato) seconded the motion.

Mr. LOUDON (Dunedin) supported the amendment. The size of the Board would have a great bearing on the question of committees. The question had been raised about the Board getting the assistance or advice of outside persons. The Municipal Corporations Act had a provision which would govern that exactly; and he thought if such a clause were imported into this Bill it would meet the position. He would certainly support the proposal, and he believed it would work well.

Mr. WEBB (Northern Wairoa) thought the Board should be enabled to appoint persons other than its own members. He moved that the words "of its own members" be left out.

Mr. McMAHON (Nelson) seconded the amendment.

Mr. NORRIS said he was quite prepared to accept Mr. Loudon's suggestion with reference to including in the Bill the clause in the Municipal Corporations Act that he had alluded to.

Mr. TAPPER (Dunedin) asked, if the motion was passed, how the Government was to be sure they would be represented on the committees? Then there was the case of the voluntary contributors, who were people who took a great interest in the institution—how would they be represented on the committees?

Mr. CHEPMELL (Waikato) said the proposal was not to appoint committees with power to act. It was not even compulsory on the Board to appoint committees. It simply gave the Board power to appoint committees for certain purposes, and the committees were to report to the Board: they were not to have any power of administration.

Mr. J. P. LUKE (Wellington) said they would have to be careful that they did not open the doors to the Board or the committees too wide. The Government should be represented on the Board. The Government contributed half the money. As long as half the money came from the Consolidated Fund he maintained that the people as a whole had a right to be represented on the Board.

Mr. HORRELL (Christchurch) said he quite approved of the proposal that the Board should have power to elect its committees. He took it that Boards having charge of institutions at a distance would appoint committees of men residing in fairly close proximity to the institution.

It was agreed to strike out the words "of its own members."

Mr. R. C. KIRK (Wellington): Is it intended that the committees shall consist simply of members of the Board?

The CHAIRMAN: They are to be not necessarily members of the Board.

Mr. MILLIGAN suggested that a resolution be passed to the effect that if the Government did not adopt the recommendation of the Conference, they be recommended to adopt the provision in the Municipal Corporations Act that had been mentioned.

Mr. GALLAWAY (Dunedin) suggested that the resolution read as follows: "That the Board may appoint committees, not necessarily from its own members, to carry out the functions of the Board; and may delegate to each committee such of its powers as may be deemed expedient."

Mr. MILLIGAN said that was precisely the provision contained in the Municipal Corporations Act. He begged to withdraw his proposal in favour of Mr. Gallaway's amendment.

Mr. NORRIS said he agreed to accept Mr. Gallaway's amendment.

Mr. Gallaway's amendment was adopted.

GOVERNMENT CONTROL.

The CHAIRMAN said he dealt with the question of Government control in his address the previous day. He would not, therefore, weary the Conference with any arguments that might be adduced with respect to giving the Government more control with regard to the extension of buildings and the control of appointments. He would ask Mr. Wilson to move a resolution on this subject that he had tabled the previous day.

Mr. J. G. WILSON said he was glad the Chairman had given him that opportunity to move the resolution, because, while he quite realised that the Government had a large stake in the matter of hospitals, the nominees of a person were rarely as good appointments as those elected by the people themselves. If the Conference adopted his resolution, a trial could be made in the direction he suggested. He thought it was quite right that the Government should have some say in the matter. If the resolution were adopted, the Inspector-General would have a legal right to attend the meetings of Boards. That would give the Government some control, and it would be of assistance to the Boards. The Inspector-General would not be able to attend many meetings; but there might be occasions when he might desire to attend meetings, and when his attendance would be of very great service to the Board. He was sure that any recommendation the Inspector-General made to the Board would receive the fullest consideration. Members of Boards did not like the power of veto proposed to be given in the Bill. The Inspector-General ought to have some assured position as far as the Boards were concerned. At the present time he could go to the Boards as a visitor. He could go through the hospitals, but he was practically a visitor. He ought to have some further power which would enable him to have some say in the conduct of the business of the Board. It could be seen how the suggestion worked. If it was not found to be satisfactory it could be altered. His proposal would be more acceptable to the Boards than the Government having the power of veto. He moved, "That the Inspector-General shall be *ex officio* a member of all Boards in the Dominion."

Mr. WILLIAMS seconded the motion.

Mr. HORRELL hardly thought it would be right to appoint the Inspector-General a member of all Boards. If that were done, the Inspector-General would be both Inspector-General and a member of a Board, and he would be virtually inspecting his own work. The Inspector-General's duty was that of inspection.

Mr. CARSON (Wanganui) asked the Chairman if the Government was likely to accept such an appointment in lieu of the power of veto.

The CHAIRMAN said he did not think the Government would.

Mr. WILSON said that in that case he would not press the motion.

Mr. J. P. LUKE (Wellington) moved, "That as long as the Government contribute the same amount of subsidy as at present, they be represented by one or more members on each Board." He thought that would be better than Mr. Wilson's resolution. He thought that very few members of the Conference would accept the power of veto on the part of the Government in respect to the administration of local affairs.

Mr. DAVIS thought it was only right when the Government contributed so largely that they should have special representation.

Mr. TAPLEY (Dunedin) said he was in favour of Mr. Luke's motion, but he thought the number of members to be nominated by the Government should be limited.

The CHAIRMAN said he wanted it to be thoroughly understood that as far as he knew there was not one medical man who had been appointed as a resident stipendiary surgeon of our hospitals that would not meet with approval at the present time. He thought that for the most part the appointments had been excellent. Now and then, however, appointments were made which were not altogether satisfactory; but they were very few. In the past some unsuitable appointments had been made, and he certainly thought the Minister ought to have the right of veto in this matter. It would be his duty as Inspector-General to advise the Minister. They might be quite sure that the power of veto would not be exercised except on very good grounds. The power of veto would be very cautiously exercised. With regard to the appointment of matron, Miss McLean was likely to know more as to the qualifications of nurses suitable for appointment as matron than any member of a Board would know. Miss McLean kept a register of qualified nurses. He had endeavoured to show in his address how a system could be adopted by which nepotism and abuse could be avoided. He certainly thought occasions did arise when the power of veto should be possessed by the Department.

Mr. McMAHON (Nelson) said he would like to hear some good reason given why the Government should be represented on the Boards.

Mr. R. C. KIRK (Wellington) suggested that it would be better to adopt a resolution to the effect that no appointment of medical officer or matron should be made until the expiration of, say, twenty-one days after the Minister had been notified of the intention to make such appoint-

ment. That would enable the Board to secure the advice of the Inspector-General. He begged to move accordingly.

Mr. SCANTLEBURY (Westland) seconded the amendment.

Mr. LOGAN said he would support Mr. Luke's motion that the Government be represented on the Board if the number was limited to one representative on each Board.

The Hon. Mr. C. M. LUKE (Wellington) thought that, considering the large amount of subsidy contributed by the Government towards charitable aid, they should have direct representation on the Board. He might point out that the Government had representation on Harbour Boards, to whose funds they did not contribute anything. He would support Mr. Kirk's amendment.

Mr. LYLE (Westland) said his experience had been that the Government-nominee system had not been satisfactory.

Mr. KNIGHT (Auckland) said he could indorse the statement that the Government did not always make wise appointments. While he very much respected the Inspector-General, he would very much object to his attending all the meetings of the Board. He did not approve of dual control, and he was strongly opposed to the Government appointing the matrons of hospitals. That power should remain in the hands of the Board.

Mr. F. T. MOORE (Wellington) said he would support Mr. Luke's motion. He thought the Government should be allowed two representatives on the Board. He was opposed to the Minister having the power of veto. He had seen too many instances where that power had been exercised disastrously. Let them give the Government the right to appoint two members to the Board; but they should resolutely oppose the proposal to give the Government the power of veto of administrative acts of the Board.

Mr. POWER (Waihi) said his Board had recently benefited by taking the advice of the Inspector-General in regard to two appointments. He thought that if the Government had one representative on each Board they would be amply represented.

Mr. RITCHIE (Wanganui) said he was opposed to the Government having a nominee on the Board at all, and he was of opinion that the Board should make the appointment of the medical superintendent and matron.

Mr. O'BRIEN (Mercury Bay) said his observation and experience had shown the wisdom of consulting the Inspector-General when Boards were making appointments to the position of resident surgeon or matron. When he left Mercury Bay he did not think he was coming to attend a Conference of men who would propose a vote of no-confidence in themselves; but that was exactly what they were doing—or what some gentlemen were doing—in trying to get a Government nominee on the Board.

Mr. NORRIS (Christchurch) wished to say that he was not in favour of having a Government nominee on the Board. He heartily approved of the suggestion thrown out by Mr. Wilson that the Inspector-General should be *ex officio* a member of every Board; but as that did not seem to be approved of, it was useless dilating upon the subject. He wanted to point this out: that even if the Government had no nominee on the Board, it was keeping a good whip in its hand in connection with the subsidies, because under another provision in the measure the Minister was empowered to withhold the payment of the whole or any part of any subsidy to the Board.

Mr. CARSON (Wanganui) said he had no objection to the proposal that the Inspector-General should be a member of all the Boards. If, however, the Conference approved of the principle that because the Government supplied a subsidy therefore they must be represented, and if they expressed their approval by passing a resolution, it would tend to cause that principle to run through all our administration. The great question was the power of veto sought to be possessed by the Government. Would the Conference have a resolution dealing with the power of veto?

Mr. J. G. WILSON said he was willing to put before the resolution the words "in lieu of the power of veto which is contained in the Bill."

Mr. CARSON (Wanganui) thought Boards should take advantage of all the advice and knowledge they could get to assist them in coming to the best decisions; but he did not think they should give away their powers, as would be the case if the power of veto was given.

Mr. LOUDON (Dunedin) said he would oppose Mr. Wilson's motion, because he thought it would be injudicious for the Inspector-General to occupy a seat on the Board. With the other powers given him in the Bill it was absolutely unnecessary for the Inspector-General to have a seat on the Board as an ordinary member. With regard to Government representation on the Board, he did not greatly object to that; but, as far as they could gather from the Bill, the Government did not seek it. Why put two Government nominees on the Board if the Government did not seek it? It was not the Government that found the money: it was the people of the Dominion. In the case of Harbour Boards, the Government did not contribute to the funds of those Boards, yet they had nominees on the Boards. He did not think they need take the money question into account at all in considering this question of representation. If in the opinion of the Government the Board did not discharge its duties properly, the Minister had the power to withhold the subsidy. Unless the Government wished to have representation on the Boards, he did not think the Conference should make any representation on the subject. He hoped Mr. Wilson's motion would be lost, because he thought it would place the Inspector-General in a wrong position—one that would not be satisfactory to himself or to the members of the Board.

Mr. J. G. WILSON asked leave to withdraw his motion in favour of that moved by Mr. Kirk.

Leave given, and motion withdrawn.

Mr. KIRK's resolution was carried in the following form: "That in lieu of the provision giving the Minister the power of veto in regard to appointments, the following provision be made: That no appointment of a medical officer or matron shall be made until the expiration of twenty-one days after the Minister has been notified of the intention to make such appointment."

The resolution was carried by 50 votes to 14.

Mr. J. P. Luke's resolution—viz., "That as long as the Government contribute the same amount of subsidy as at present, they be represented by not more than two members on each Board"—was negatived on the voices.

DISTRICTS.

The CHAIRMAN then made arrangements to meet and confer with the representatives of districts who objected to the boundaries of districts as set forth in the Bill.

The Conference then adjourned.

THIRD DAY (THURSDAY, 11TH JUNE, 1908).

Mr. GALLAWAY (Dunedin), as chairman of the committee appointed to simplify the agenda paper by striking out duplicate remits and those which had been rendered superfluous by resolutions already passed, submitted an amended and very considerably curtailed agenda paper, which he read to the Conference. The thanks of the Conference, he said, were due principally to Mr. Kirk and the Secretary to the Conference, Mr. Killick, for the able and painstaking manner in which the work had been carried out. If there was any fault to be found, he was prepared to take the responsibility upon his own shoulders.

On the motion of the CHAIRMAN the agenda paper as revised by the committee was adopted.

DEFINITION OF "CONTRIBUTOR."

The Conference proceeded to a consideration of the following remit from the St. Andrew's Orphanage: "Interpretation, clause 2, line 20: That the words 'one pound' be struck out, and the words 'five shillings' be inserted."

Mr. BAGNALL (Auckland) moved that the words "ten shillings" be inserted in lieu of "five shillings."

Mr. MAXTON (Greytown) thought it was better to make the amount "five shillings." The institution he represented was supported to a great extent by voluntary contributions. The great object was to get the small people interested, and if a larger amount was fixed a great number of people would be debarred from becoming contributors.

Mr. O'BRIEN (Mercury Bay) seconded Mr. Bagnall's amendment.

Amendment to insert "ten shillings" negatived.

Mr. DARTON (Gisborne) hoped the Conference would agree to the words "five shillings" being inserted.

Mr. BELLRINGER (Taranaki) thought the clause should be allowed to remain as it stood.

Motion to insert "five shillings" agreed to.

It was further resolved, on the motion of Mr. TAPPER (Otago), "That voluntary contributors to separate institutions be allowed to elect a member of the Board."

INCLUSION OF TOWN DISTRICTS IN COUNTY.

Remit from the Ashburton Hospital Board: "That the words 'and town districts' be inserted after the word 'borough' in the first line of clause 4, subclause (1)."

Insertion of "town districts" agreed to.

DATE OF ELECTION.

Remit from the Coromandel Hospital Board: "That the 'month of April' should be substituted for the 'month of January,' so that the report and accounts could be dealt with at the end of the financial year."

"Month of April" agreed to.

EXPENSES OF ADMINISTRATION: SALARY AND TRAVELLING-EXPENSES OF CHAIRMAN.

Remit from the Wairarapa District Hospital Board: "Clause 25B: The Committee is of opinion the position of Chairman should be maintained as an honorary one."

Remit from the Wellington District Hospital Board: "That the Chairman when away from place of residence be paid travelling-allowance, and, in addition, one guinea per diem."

Mr. J. P. LUKE (Wellington) said that personally he was not in any way interested in this matter, but he trusted the recommendation of the Wellington District Board would be adopted, as there were many Chairmen of hospital institutions in different parts of the Dominion who had to travel over a wide area, and were thus put to considerable expense.

Mr. TAPLEY (Dunedin) agreed with the last speaker. He was aware that the Chairman of his institution ever since he had occupied the chair had been considerably out of pocket when travelling on the service of the institution, and it was not right that he should be in that position. The suggestion of the Wellington Board was a very fair one, more especially as any idea of granting a stipend had been abandoned.

Mr. BAGNALL (Auckland) thought some provision should be made so that the Chairman would not be out of pocket when travelling. At present the auditor would not allow the Board in Auckland even to vote reasonable expenses.

Mr. EATON (Masterton) thought the Chairman should be allowed travelling-expenses only. He was no more out of pocket than any other member of the Board.

Mr. KIRK (Wellington) thought the Chairman and any member of the Board when away from place of residence should be paid actual travelling-expenses and an allowance of 10s. a day.

Mr. J. P. LUKE said the other members of the Board were not put to the same expense as the Chairman. The enlargement of the districts would greatly increase the work of the Chairman, and they would have some difficulty in getting Chairmen unless they were paid some reasonable allowance when travelling.

The CHAIRMAN quite concurred in that view.

Mr. DARTON (Gisborne) contended that unless some allowance was paid the institutions would lose the services of able and energetic men who were not in a position to find their own expenses.

Mr. TAPPER (Otago) moved and Mr. LOGAN (Manawatu) seconded an amendment, "That the words 'and one guinea per diem' be deleted from the remit of the Wellington District Board."

Amendment negatived.

Mr. MILLIGAN (Oamaru) moved, and Mr. COOPER (Christchurch) seconded, "That the Chairman when away from his place of residence be paid actual travelling-expenses and an allowance of 10s. per diem."

Amendment negatived.

Mr. NORRIS (North Canterbury) said it was laid down that the Board might pay actual cost of locomotion, but at the same time there was warrant under the Public Revenues Act for the payment of any necessary expenses in addition.

Mr. CARSON (Wanganui) moved the following: "That the actual cost of locomotion and 12s. 6d. a day be paid to the Chairman and members of the Boards when away from their homes on the business of the Boards."

This amendment was agreed to.

Remit from the Ashburton Hospital Board: "Clause 25, subclause (1), paragraph (c): "That the words 'or of its committees' be inserted after the word 'Board' in the fourth line."

Agreed to

Remit from the Ashburton Hospital Board: "That the word 'twenty' be inserted in place of the word 'ten' in the first line of subclause (3) of clause 28."

Agreed to.

Mr. BAGNALL (Auckland) said the Auckland Board wished to introduce certain appliances for a new ward in the hospital, and those particular things could only be obtained in England. He thought that in a case like that a Board, instead of being compelled to call for tenders, should have power to indent the articles and get them out at the actual cost of manufacture.

The CHAIRMAN said he saw the point, and would recommend that provision be made for it.

POWER TO SELL REAL PROPERTY.

Remit from the Waitaki Hospital and Charitable Aid Board: "That, in the event of any small properties coming into the hands of the Board, power be given to sell."

Agreed to.

POWER TO LEASE.

Remit from the Nelson Hospital and Charitable Aid Board: "That it is desirable that some uniform system of leasing trust lands be introduced similar to the Nelson and Westland Native Reserves Act."

Negatived.

BORROWING-POWERS.

Remit from the Ashburton and North Canterbury Charitable Aid Board: "Boards, as well as Trustees of separate institutions, should be empowered to borrow for certain purposes (*vide* section 32 of 1885 Act, and sections 2 and 3, 1907 Act)."

Mr. NORRIS (North Canterbury) said that a provision such as this should certainly be incorporated in the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN said it would be provided for.

Agreed to.

APPORTIONMENT OF EXPENDITURE AMONG CONTRIBUTING LOCAL AUTHORITIES.

Remit from the Patea District Hospital Board: "That section 37 is not considered sufficiently explicit to protect leaseholders from solely contributing towards the contribution assessed, as provision is only made for recovery from owners of half the rates levied for hospital purposes by the local bodies, so that where a separate rate for hospital purposes is not struck by local authorities the leaseholder would be solely liable for the full contribution as paid by local authority out of general funds without the possibility of recovery of any portion by the owner."

Mr. PEARCE (Patea) said, under the Bill, unless a separate rate for hospital purposes was not struck by the local authorities, this clause allowed of the rate being taken off the owner of the land. He thought the owner of the land ought to be made to pay instead of the leaseholder for charitable and hospital purposes.

Mr. BROWN (Masterton) said, if they released the leaseholder from payment of rates for charitable aid, why not release him from other rates as well?

Negatived.

Remit from the Nelson Hospital and Charitable Aid Board: "Section 37, subsection (2): Strike out all the words after 'shall be,' and in lieu thereof substitute the following: 'Collected by way of a rate struck by the Board over the whole district upon the rateable value of all the rateable property within the district, due notice of such rate having been struck (together with the amount due from each) shall be given to all the local authorities within the district. Each local authority shall collect the rate so struck upon the rateable property in the district represented by it "in the same manner and at the same time that it collects its own rates," Each local autho-

city shall be responsible to the Board for the collection and payment of the amount so struck, without any deduction.' ”

The CHAIRMAN thought it would be a great pity to insist upon a rate being struck, because it might tend to bring down the voluntary contributions. If the money came out of a general fund, the ratepayers were not so conscious of being rated. He therefore moved that the remit be deleted.

Mr. NORRIS (North Canterbury) said that in the Act of 1886 it was provided that the Board should declare what local authorities were liable to pay, and so on, and it further provided that all such contributions should be based on some uniform scale. That would be found in sections 26 and 27. There was no such provision in the new Bill.

The CHAIRMAN said he would make a note of that.

Mr. STEVENSON (Otago), as a country representative, thought the present mode of rating was inequitable, and he thought it was the duty of the Government to endeavour to devise some better method of rating. At present the land had to provide all the rates, although there was other property besides landed property. He felt inclined to move that the principle of charging land only with charitable-aid rates is inequitable, and that such rates should fall equally on all property. A person who had £20,000 in debentures did not contribute a penny.

Mr. TAPPER (Dunedin) said the time was fast approaching when charitable aid would be a charge on the Consolidated Fund.

Mr. STEVENSON hoped the Chairman would make a note of the point he had raised.

The CHAIRMAN said he would do so.

APPEAL BY CONTRIBUTING LOCAL AUTHORITY.

Remit from the North Canterbury Hospital Board: “ Clause 39, subclauses (1) and (2): This Board considers that appeal should be made to Supreme Court instead of to Commissioners or the Minister.”

The CHAIRMAN thought the method suggested would be too expensive.

Mr. GALLAWAY (Dunedin) said this was a very important matter. Contributing bodies had been put to large expense when quite a small amount was in dispute between two bodies. Under the law a strong body could go to a smaller body and say “ If you do not take it as we wish, we will go to law, and appeal.” There ought to be power to negotiate.

Mr. LOGAN (Maniototo) hoped some provision would be made to meet disputes of that kind.

The CHAIRMAN promised to place the matter before the Minister.

Mr. J. P. LUKE (Wellington) thought the less they had to do with the Courts the better. When there was a dispute between two local bodies he thought it would be a good thing for the matter to be referred to a Commissioner like Mr. Short, whose duty it was to apportion the cost of roads and bridges between the different local bodies which received the benefit. Mr. Short's decisions in that connection had given the greatest satisfaction. He could not understand a remit of this kind coming down.

Mr. CRAWFORD (Wellington) had had considerable experience of the work of Mr. Short, and knew that his decisions as Roads Commissioner had been extremely satisfactory. It would be a good thing if these appeals also could be referred to him. He certainly did protest against such matters going to the Supreme Court.

Remit struck out.

MAINTENANCE AND ESTABLISHMENT OF SETTLEMENT.

Remit from the Stratford Hospital and Charitable Aid Board: “ That provision be made in the Act giving Boards power to recover cost of hospital maintenance out of the sums due to patients under the Workers' Compensation for Accidents Act and its amendments.”

Agreed to.

The following remits were then taken into consideration together:—

(1.) *Waitaki Hospital and Charitable Aid Board*.—Section 74: That this clause be amended to provide that, where relief is granted to a person who has resided less than twelve months in that particular district, the Board or Trustees may recover from the Board of the district in which such person has last resided for twelve months the entire cost of such relief.

(2.) *Waitaki Hospital and Charitable Aid Board*.—Section 75: That the last clause be altered to read, “ That the cost of maintaining such inmate (not exceeding a rate of eight shillings per week) shall be defrayed by the Board of the district in which the parent or guardian has resided for twelve months.”

(3.) *Stratford Hospital and Charitable Aid Board*.—That provision be made in the Act for recovery of cost of maintenance from the persons treated by the Board which is liable.

(4.) *Ashburton and North Canterbury Charitable Aid Board*.—Section 74, relating to relief to persons from beyond a Board's district, should be recast on the lines of a suggestion submitted to the Inspector-General in October, 1907, somewhat as follows: “ Where any person who receives relief at the hands of a Board or the Trustees of a separate institution has not at the time of first receiving such relief therefrom resided for the period of one year in the district within which such Board or Trustees control the administration, the Board or the Trustees, as the case may be, may recover the whole cost of such relief from the Trustees or the Board of the district in which such person last resided for one whole year: Provided that during the time any such person is in a hospital or other institution or separate institution, or in receipt of outdoor relief in the district within which such person has taken abode, no such person shall be deemed to have been resident therein for the purpose of establishing settlement within the meaning of this section.”

(5.) *North Auckland Hospital and Charitable Aid Board*.—That patients treated in an institution beyond the district in which they reside shall not be a charge on the Board of the district in which such patient had resided prior to entering such institution, unless admitted on an order signed by the Secretary or a member of the said Board

The CHAIRMAN wished to call particular attention to remit No. 4 of the above—that from the Ashburton and North Canterbury Charitable Aid Board. It was a suggestion propounded by Mr. Norris, the Secretary of the North Canterbury Charitable Aid Board, and he would like to take this opportunity of thanking Mr. Norris for the very great assistance he had rendered the Department in regard to charitable-aid matters. Mr. Norris's experience of charitable-aid administration extended over a long period of years, and the above remit was based on that experience. He hoped it would be adopted by the Conference as it stood.

Mr. KIRK (Wellington) said, for the purposes of recovery the suggestion of the Wellington Trustees was that submitted in the supplementary agenda paper, as follows: "Clause 74, line 15: After 'resided' leave out words 'for at least six months.' Line 18: Add after 'resided' the words 'for the longest consecutive period.'"

Remit from the Ashburton and North Canterbury Board agreed to.

Remit from the Wellington District Hospital Board: "That this Board considers provision should be made in the new Bill whereby Harbour Boards should be placed as a medium for purpose of liability for the cost of all accidents occurring about shipping."

The CHAIRMAN understood the shipping authorities in Wellington paid maintenance fees for the patients.

The Hon. Mr. C. M. LUKE said they paid up to the time of discharge. It was difficult after discharge to make a collection from a shipping company.

Mr. J. P. LUKE said there was a difference of opinion on his Board on this matter, and he now asked that the remit be deleted.

Remit struck out.

INCORPORATION OF SEPARATE INSTITUTIONS.

Remit from the Nelson Hospital and Charitable Aid Board: "That when a separate institution is to be established, the promoters shall once a week for four weeks advertise in some local paper their intention of making application to the Minister for the purpose."

Agreed to.

Remit from the Wairarapa District Hospital Board: "Clause 51: The committee is of opinion that no separate institution should be incorporated without the sanction of the Board of the district in which the proposed institution will be situated."

Agreed to.

Remit from the Oamaru Hospital Trustees: "Section 51: Subsection (1) to be altered to read, 'any institution that is not or is not intended to be maintained wholly or in part out of the funds of any Board, but is or is intended to be maintained wholly or in part by the voluntary contributions from the public, who have signified their intention to contribute thereto (in sums of not less than five shillings) a yearly amount of not less than one hundred pounds, and who have paid one year's subscription in advance, or a donation of not less than twenty pounds, may be incorporated as hereinafter mentioned as a separate institution under the Act.'"

Negated.

VOTING-POWERS.

Remit from the Coromandel Hospital Trustees: "Clause 56, subclause (3): That 'three months' be substituted for 'one month.'"

Agreed to.

On the motion of Mr. LOGAN (Maniototo) the following remits were struck out as being matters of policy and beyond the scope of the Conference:—

"*Ashburton and North Canterbury Charitable Aid Board.*—Some provision should be inserted in the Bill for setting apart Crown lands as endowments for the purposes of the Act."

"*Westland Hospital and Charitable Aid Board and Westland Hospital Trustees.*—That it be a general recommendation to the Government to set aside as special endowments for hospitals and charitable-aid purposes portions of the Crown lands of the Dominion."

The CHAIRMAN said there were in different parts of the Dominion little hospital reserves from which the hospital districts were drawing no revenue. They were mostly in localities where it was unlikely any hospital would be erected, and he was endeavouring to get those hospital reserves or the revenue accruing therefrom transferred to the Hospital Boards of the district.

EXPENDITURE.

Remit from the Stratford District Hospital Board: "That the words 'Expenditure up to £100 be exempt' be added to the last words in clause 21."

Mr. LIARDET (Stratford) hoped this would be agreed to. It would be absurd to refer to the Minister every little alteration which might cost a few pounds.

The Hon. Mr. C. M. LUKE (Wellington) did not think £100 was sufficient in the case of the larger institutions.

Mr. TALBOYS (Otago) said they had recently in Dunedin gone to the expense of £300 or £400 in the erection of a room for incurables, and if they had to go through the form of getting the approval of the Minister it meant loss of time.

The Hon. Mr. C. M. LUKE (Wellington): Could there not be some method of differentiating between the small and the large institutions?

The CHAIRMAN thought something in that direction might be done.

Mr. BAGNALL (Auckland) suggested that a percentage of annual income might be taken as a basis.

The CHAIRMAN: I will take that as a recommendation.

Remit agreed to.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Bequests, Application of Money received for Specific Purpose, and Subsidy thereon.

Remit from the Stratford Hospital and Charitable Aid Board: "That in subclause (3) of clause 33 all the words after 'devise' be deleted."

Mr. BELLRINGER (Taranaki) asked what would be done in the case of an amount devoted for a specific purpose—what would be done with the balance of the money left on hand when the specific object had been carried out.

Mr. GALLAWAY (Dunedin) pointed out that subclause (1) of clause 33 laid it down that all bequests were to be applied strictly in the manner directed by the testators. The next subclause said, "Pending such application as aforesaid, all proceeds from any such bequest or devise shall be invested in securities issued by the Government or by any local authority under any Act, or on mortgage of land in New Zealand held in fee-simple, and the interest accruing from year to year in respect of such investments may be applied towards the maintenance of the institution." He thought that was altogether wrong. They surely had no right to propose a clause of that nature. The interest should be applied to the same purpose as the bequest was applied.

Dr. BATCHELOR (Dunedin) said there had been great complaint in this connection under the old Act. As long as people felt that donations went to reduce the rates they were disinclined to give. If, however, the appeal was for some special building, or operating-room, or something of that nature, donations came in freely. They had had this difficulty with regard to the Hospital Saturday Fund, which fund was supposed to be for a certain purpose. When the Hospital Trustees spent the money on ordinary maintenance the feeling was so strong that it was likely to considerably affect the contributions. They should refrain from doing anything that would tend to discourage voluntary contributions in the future. All donations or bequests should be applied to the objects for which they were given.

The CHAIRMAN: I quite agree with Dr. Batchelor in that.

The Hon. Mr. C. M. LUKE (Wellington) pointed out that if money was bequeathed or donated for some specific purpose the Government subsidy was not forthcoming. He thought moneys collected or donated for a specific purpose should carry the Government subsidy, if that specific purpose was approved by the Government.

Mr. GALLAWAY (Dunedin) asked leave to move that subclause (2) of clause 33 be amended so as to provide that the interest accruing be accumulated and applied to augment the bequest, and not applied towards the maintenance of the institution.

Mr. BAGNALL (Auckland) said it would be tying the hands of the Boards to a very great extent if they had money lying idle and could not use it.

Mr. STEVENSON (Dunedin) said that in connection with the Dunedin Hospital they could not spend their money as they would wish. He thought more discretion ought to be left to the Trustees.

Mr. NORRIS (North Canterbury) said his Board was in the fortunate position of being legatee of a very considerable estate. This estate was left to three separate institutions, each of which happened to be under the control of his Board. The income derivable from the real and personal property in that case amounted to £700 a year towards the maintenance of those three institutions. What were they to do with it if it were allowed to accumulate? There was no distinct direction by the testator that it was to be applied in a particular way. It was simply given for the maintenance and benefit of those three institutions.

Mr. GALLAWAY (Dunedin) said what he objected to was the Trustees taking upon themselves to interpret in their own way the bequests of testators.

Mr. J. P. LUKE did not believe in the maintenance of bequests being a charge on the rates.

The CHAIRMAN said he would endeavour to have the Bill altered so that the Government subsidy would be paid on donations or bequests for specific purposes, provided the object was approved by the Government.

Departmental Inquiries and Inspection.

Remit from the North Canterbury Hospital Board: "Clause 77, (1), with the following addition: 'and that copies of any report be forwarded to the respective Boards interested.'"

Mr. PAYLING (Christchurch) said that occasionally Inspectors came to the Hospital when the Chairman did not happen to be present, and if there was anything that did not meet with his approval the Board was not made aware of it until the annual report came down. There was sometimes a tag to the report which would not have been necessary if the Inspector had mentioned the matter to the Chairman or Secretary at the time. His Board therefore asked that these words should be added.

The CHAIRMAN did not think it was necessary to insert the words embodied in the remit. He, as Inspector, if he saw anything not quite as it should be in a hospital, would call attention to it in writing before reporting upon it.

Mr. HARPER (Ashburton) thought it was necessary to make provision for this in the Bill. In the past the Board had been left in ignorance as to where the fault lay until the Inspector's report was presented to Parliament.

Mr. DUNLOP (Christchurch) agreed that it was necessary. The present Inspector-General had stated that he would always communicate with the Board, but Dr. Valentine could not be in office for ever.

The CHAIRMAN: If you wish to have it in the Bill, by all means have it.

Remit agreed to.

Training of Probationers.

Remit from the North Auckland Hospital and Charitable Aid Board: "That probationers in small country hospitals, after two years' service, be taken on to the staff of the larger hospitals in preference to new candidates, in order to qualify for certificates."

The CHAIRMAN said, although it was only fair that a probationer after serving a time in a smaller hospital should finish her training in a larger one, after discussing the question with the Boards of the larger hospitals, they had found there were so many difficulties in the way under the present system that such a suggestion could not be carried out without causing great confusion. He thought the training of probationers should be put on a better footing. He was of the opinion, most emphatically, that the training of probationers should obtain only in the large hospitals, otherwise it was hard on the girls who wished to qualify, because, although registered in New Zealand, a girl had not the same status in Australia or elsewhere as she would have if trained in one of the larger hospitals. He could assure the Conference he had this very much in his mind at the present time.

Mr. MAXTON (Greytown) said the trouble was that the smaller hospitals would suffer if they lost the services of probationers, as they could get the services of a probationer at a very much lower rate of pay than would be required by a professional nurse.

The CHAIRMAN said that for the first year a probationer was practically of no use to the hospital so far as nursing was concerned, and it would tend to economy and efficiency if they had none but registered nurses in the hospitals.

Mr. O'BRIEN (Mercury Bay) said that at the present time there were two probationers in the Mercury Bay Hospital under one of the most efficient matrons in the Dominion. Owing to the nature of the employment in that district a probationer learned more in the first six months than she would in two years in one of the larger hospitals. If they were to be told that the time they spent in a small hospital amounted to nothing as regards their status they were simply wasting their time. He hoped a definite system of training would be laid down.

The CHAIRMAN promised that the whole question would have his most careful consideration.

Children and Charitable Aid.

Remit from the St. Andrew's Orphanage: "Appointment of guardians: That a clause similar to clause 4 of the Act of 1886 be inserted providing for the appointment of guardians."

Mr. TALBOYS (Dunedin) thought some power was required to take children away from their parents when the parents had proved themselves unfit to look after them.

Agreed to.

Superannuation.

Remit from the North Canterbury Hospital Board: "This Board is of opinion that provision should be made whereby employees of the Hospital and Charitable Aid Boards should be allowed to participate in the benefits of the Civil Service Superannuation scheme."

Mr. HORRELL (Christchurch) said his Board felt the time had arrived when all public servants should participate in the superannuation scheme. As he understood the Government was already proposing a comprehensive scheme, it was not, he thought, necessary to discuss the matter at any length.

Agreed to.

Treatment of Patients from Districts in which there is no Hospital.

Remit from the Bay of Plenty Hospital and Charitable Aid Board: "That we strongly object to the Auckland Hospital authorities admitting people from the Bay of Plenty District into the Auckland Hospital without in the first place having some permission or instruction from our Board."

The CHAIRMAN said this was entirely a local matter, and he hoped to arrange a proper adjustment until there was a hospital in the district.

Police Cases in Hospitals.

Remit from the Napier Hospital Trustees: "That cases sent to the hospital by the gaol authorities or police should have an attendant provided at the expense of the Government."

The Hon. Mr. C. M. LUKE (Wellington) said there were in the institutions at the present time many cases, more especially of delirium tremens, which came from the gaols, and there was no means of collecting the expenses. He thought the Government should pay for all such cases.

The CHAIRMAN said the Commissioner of Police had promised to send a constable to assist in cases of delirium tremens.

The Hon. Mr. C. M. LUKE thought the Government should recognise their responsibility in all cases which came from the gaols.

Mr. CRANBY (Napier) said that in cases of suicide or attempted suicide his Board had repeatedly applied to the Police Department for assistance, and the request had invariably been refused. The entire cost was thrown on the Hospital Board. It was declined on the ground that the Government already contributed by way of subsidy to the institution. There was one woman who had been twenty times in gaol. As soon as she was released the Police Inspector asked that she should be taken to the Home, and when she left the Home she got drunk again and was again put in gaol. He hoped some provision would be made in this Bill to deal with such cases.

Mr. BELLINGER (Taranaki) thought the Government should at any rate pay operation fees, as the Boards had no means of collecting them. Even if they did not pay for keep they should pay operation expenses.

Mr. RUTHERFORD (Palmerston North) also thought some provision should be made by the Government for attendance on such cases. One of the staff of an institution, while attending to a delirium tremens patient, had received injury the effects of which she would carry to her grave.

The CHAIRMAN said provision had been made for attendance on delirium tremens cases at the expense of the Government. With regard to refractory inmates of old men's homes, they could be dealt with for a breach of the by-laws with a penalty of £5. Failing payment, he supposed they could be committed to gaol. Also, under the Police Offences Act a man could be arrested as a vagrant when he left the institution. However, it was a matter to which he would give consideration.

Mr. BELLINGER (Taranaki) pointed out that if an old-age pensioner were committed to gaol he lost his pension, and thus the whole of the maintenance fell on the institution.

Old-age Pensioners.

Mr. BAGNALL (Auckland) said there were two points in connection with the Old-age Pensions Act upon which he thought the Conference might make a representation to the Government. The first was the difficulty many old people had in obtaining sufficient guarantee of their age. The Magistrate must have some authentic testimony or certificate as to age, otherwise he would not allow the pension. There were in Auckland people of seventy-five to eighty years of age who were barred from receiving the pension because they could not prove their age. In the Old Men's Home there were five or six people in that position. They could satisfy the authorities in regard to everything except the question of age. Then there was the case of a man who took a glass of beer on his way home to the institution and who sat down and went to sleep. If a policeman came along and took him in charge for drunkenness he lost his old-age pension. That amounted to practically a fine of £130 for taking a glass of beer. He thought some more reasonable penalty should be imposed.

Mr. SCANTLEBURY (Reefton) said that if a man in his district could place before the Magistrate reasonable evidence of his age the pension was granted.

Canon JORDAN (Tauranga) referred to the case of a woman whom he knew as a girl fifty-two years ago. She was then to his knowledge eleven or twelve years of age. He wrote to the Registrar stating that he was quite prepared to make a sworn declaration to that effect, but the Registrar declined to receive such affirmation, although a certificate was produced showing that she was over twenty-one years of age at the time of her marriage, which would go to prove that she was now about sixty-five years of age.

Mr. HORRELL (Christchurch) said the homes which provided for old men and women were to a large extent filled up by old-age pensioners. When these people gained admission to a home they regarded themselves as boarders. They demanded the best of everything, but they could not be got to do anything. Owing to the crowding of the homes by old-age pensioners they were unable to admit many old people who were really indigent. He thought the Government, instead of giving a pension of 10s. a week, which was quite inadequate for a man to live on, should establish some institution where the old pensioners could go and live for the remainder of their days.

The Chairman.

On the motion of Mr. TAPPER (Dunedin) the Hon. Mr. C. M. Luke and Mr. Gallaway were appointed a committee to draw up a motion expressing the high appreciation of the Conference of the able manner in which Dr. Valentine had presided over and controlled its deliberations.

The CHAIRMAN thanked the members present for their kindly expressions. He was afraid he had not proved himself a model Chairman, but it was regarded as a part and parcel of his duties to act in that capacity. He had felt when taking the chair that the position would be a difficult one for him, but he found that owing to the forbearance and courtesy of the delegates his task had been a most pleasant one, and for this he most heartily thanked the members of the Conference. Since he had occupied the position of Inspector-General he had met with extreme courtesy from one end of the land to the other. Chairmen, Secretaries, and members of Boards had been always most anxious to give him all the assistance in their power. With regard to hospitals, naturally, by virtue of his profession, he had been able to keep himself fairly well up to date; but when it came to such problems as the administration of charitable aid and many others which cropped up in the various districts, they were quite new to him, and he took this opportunity of thanking those gentlemen who had so materially assisted him, and who had contributed so much to the success of this Conference. The decisions which had been come to by the Conference would, no doubt, for the most part be embodied in a new Bill which would be drafted for the consideration of Parliament. Even if the Conference had been productive of nothing else, it was a good thing that the representatives of the various districts should meet together and exchange views, and it was so much more satisfactory for him to discuss matters with men who were present than with men who were at a distance. He hoped to be able to continue to serve the Dominion and to retain the confidence of those who had so kindly expressed their confidence in him to-day.

Mr. GALLAWAY asked that a short account of the proceedings be prepared and sent to each delegate. In asking this he wished to refer to the admirable manner in which Mr. Killick had carried out his duties as Secretary to the Conference.

The CHAIRMAN stated that such a document was already in course of preparation, and would be circulated.

Old-age Pensioners.

Mr. TALBOYS (Dunedin) thought the Conference should express some opinion with regard to the regulation by which the pension was taken away from men who had been the worse for liquor, thus throwing the cost of maintenance of those men on the ratepayers.

Mr. BAGNALL (Auckland) moved, and Mr. KNIGHT (Auckland) seconded, "That in the case of applicants for the old-age pension who are unable to produce documentary evidence as to age the Magistrate be given power to satisfy himself as to age by such means as he shall think fit."

Motion agreed to.

Application of Funds.

Remit from the Wellington Hospital Trustees: "Clause 19, subclause (a): That the following words be added, 'either by proceedings under the Public Works Act or other methods.'"

Mr. KIRK (Wellington) said it was sometimes necessary for a Board to acquire land as a site for an institution under the Public Works Act, and he moved that this recommendation be agreed to.

Mr. RUTHERFORD (Palmerston North) asked that the words "or any addition to any site" be included in the clause.

Mr. KIRK, having agreed to amend his motion in that direction, the motion was agreed to.

Election of Chairman.

Remit from Wellington Hospital Trustees: "Clause 14: Chairman to be elected on the second Wednesday in May. Subclause (2) to be altered to read 'If unable within one month to appoint a Chairman, the Governor to appoint one.'"

Agreed to.

Vacancies on Board.

Remit from the Wellington Hospital Trustees: "Clause 15: Vacancies on Board or Committee to be filled by Board itself as at present."

Agreed to.

Honorary Staff.

Dr. BATCHELOR (Dunedin) moved, "In any base hospital where there is an honorary medical staff of not less than six members, they shall annually elect one of their number to represent them on the Hospital Board, and he shall be an *ex officio* member thereof." The motion, he said, was a very vital one in the interests of our large hospitals, and he was sure its importance was not appreciated at its true worth. He thought he had had a unique experience which no other member of the Conference had had. He had been a member of a Hospital Board partly as a member of the medical profession, sometimes as a Trustee, and sometimes as a Trustee and on the staff of the hospital. From holding those positions he was able to look at this question from both aspects—from aspects which no one else present was able to command. He did not think that any one in the room had spent so much time in hospitals as he had done, nor had any one present been more keenly interested in the welfare of our hospitals than he had been. It was for those reasons that he proposed to ask the Conference to allow him to try and bring home to them the change suggested in his motion, which if carried out would, he thought, have a most excellent effect in regard to our hospitals. Of course, the resolution concerned only the larger hospitals. If they looked at a hospital generally, what was it for? Its object was to provide the best medical and surgical attendance possible for the patients. There were two great factors in connection with the hospital—(1) the medical staff, and (2) the Board of Trustees. If a hospital was to be run successfully and do its best work, those two bodies must be on the most friendly terms and must work harmoniously. Had that been so in the case of the large hospitals in New Zealand? The medical staffs and the Trustees had been on occasion after occasion at daggers drawn. Possibly the only exception in the case of the larger hospitals had been the case of Wellington Hospital. That had been the experience in New Zealand, and that had also been very generally the experience they had had all over the world. In conservative old England the hospitals in the old days were managed very much as they had been in this radical country. The medical profession—who must necessarily know more about medical matters and hospital management than laymen—had been excluded altogether from having any voice in the management of the hospitals. That must result seriously to the detriment of the hospitals. During the last twenty-five or thirty years in the case of all the large hospitals in Great Britain a representative of the medical staff had invariably held a position on the Board of Management. That system had been found to work most excellently. The only trouble that had arisen for some years at Home occurred in 1900—in the case of the Bloomsbury Square Hospital. The experts resigned as a body because they considered that they had not sufficient voice in the management of the institution. A Royal Commission was appointed to inquire into the trouble and report. The result was that matters were put on a satisfactory basis. Hospital-management dealt with matters which were highly technical, and it was almost impossible for a layman, however cultivated, to grasp all the points. They must have expert advice to guide them. At the time of the inquiry by the Royal Commission in England the matter was thoroughly discussed. He held in his hand a paper on hospital-management. All the authorities of the large hospitals at Home were asked their views on hospital-management, and they gave them, and those views were contained in the article. The replies were to the effect that the services of the representatives of the medical staff were most valuable. That had been the experience at Home. He was convinced that the presence of one or more members of the medical staff on the Hospital Boards of the larger hospitals in the Dominion would be most valuable. The trouble was this: that recommendations came from the medical staff to the Board, and those recommendations were not appreciated at their true value. The medical men were not present at the meetings of the Board to explain matters. If there was a representative of the medical staff at the meetings he would make matters clear to the other members of the Board. In that way irritation would often be avoided, and difficulties would be cleared away at once. Speaking from his knowledge as a Trustee and as a member of the medical staff, he was sure that in nine cases out of ten in which such difficulties arose there had really been very little difference, and such difference could usually be removed by an explanation by a represen-

tative of the medical staff. He believed the medical staff of hospitals were just as proud of the institutions and were as keen for the welfare of the hospitals as any member of the Hospital Board was. Looked at from a common-sense point of view, the position was this: Here were men—members of the staff—who had been trained nearly all their lives to hospital-work. They were experts in the work, and they must certainly know more about the work than laymen who had not got the same training. The management of a large hospital required an enormous amount of experience. He did not ask that the medical men should have anything approaching a preponderating weight. All he asked was that they should have one representative to put clearly before the Board the voice of the staff when any difficulties did arise. He could appeal to his colleagues on the Hospital Board as to whether his presence on the Board had been the slightest drawback; and he thought he could claim that on several occasions he had helped them when difficulties arose. They had a large body of medical men who gave a large amount of valuable service to the hospitals gratuitously, and at very great loss to themselves—because the senior men derived very little advantage from hospital practice. He could not see that one medical man on a Board could be in the slightest degree objectionable. So far as he could gather, the Trustees as a rule had no objection to the proposal. He had not yet heard one solid argument against the proposal. If there was an argument against it he would like to hear it.

Mr. HORRELL (Christchurch) said he had always thought that the chairman of the hospital staff should have a seat on the Board.

Mr. J. P. LUKE (Wellington) said it seemed to him that the proper method to adopt was to appoint a good man as medical superintendent, and he could advise the Board, and the Board could act accordingly. He hoped the Conference would not adopt the resolution.

Mr. DARTON (Gisborne) said this question only affected the cities, but he took it an opinion was desired from the smaller Boards as well. He thought members of the Conference would agree with him that doctors as a class were just about as hard a class of men to get on with in the management of hospital matters as any other class. From what he could gather, that had been the experience of many places. As to the present proposal, he thought they might just as well ask the teachers to assist in the business of the Education Boards. The Education Boards had their Inspectors of Schools to advise them; Hospital Boards had their medical superintendent or house surgeon to advise them, and if the Boards were in doubt they could apply to the Inspector-General. He was not in favour of the resolution.

Mr. R. C. KIRK (Wellington) said the Wellington Hospital was perhaps the only large hospital in the Dominion that had escaped trouble or scandals during the past twenty-three years, and he thought the reason was this: that they had an exceedingly good doctor to advise the Trustees—an able man and a man of great tact. No important meeting of the Board was held unless they had Dr. Ewart present to give them advice; and they had taken his advice on innumerable occasions. If they looked at an allied system of administration they would find that the Boards of our university colleges were composed of laymen or men who paid some attention to education. The Chairman of the Professorial Board was glad to advise the members of the Board concerning expert matters that had to be dealt with. He thought the analogy was a proper one, and he saw no reason why in the case of the four large hospitals the honorary staff should not elect their chairman to attend the meetings of the Board and advise the Trustees.

The Hon. Mr. C. M. LUKE (Wellington) said he was thoroughly in accord with Dr. Batchelor's resolution, but he thought the representation of the medical staff should be limited to one.

Mr. TAPPER (Dunedin) said he would support the resolution. Dr. Batchelor's services had been most valuable to the Dunedin Board.

Mr. BAGNALL (Auckland) said, as representing one of the larger hospitals he would like to say a word—not in opposition to Dr. Batchelor's resolution, because it seemed to him that on the whole it was not unreasonable; but he did not think it would do away with the difficulties which had existed in connection with our hospital management. Difficulties had arisen before, and he thought they would arise again. He thought it was a good thing to have a man competent to give advice within reach of the Board. He was sure that men of the stamp of Dr. Robertson, of Auckland, would be of great advantage to a hospital. It was rather anomalous to appoint a doctor in the way it was proposed to do. It would sometimes be of advantage if the chairman or some other member of the honorary staff were present at meetings of the Board to advise and assist the Board. He was not prepared to vote against the motion, but at the same time he was not enamoured of it as being the right thing to do—although it might work out thoroughly well, notwithstanding that it was an anomaly.

Mr. CARSON (Wanganui) said that if there was any danger of the Board being dominated by the medical profession he would vote dead against the motion, but he could not conceive what harm or disadvantage there would be to have a medical gentleman at the Board table who could be asked for advice on questions he would be specially capable to give advice upon. Surely, it was not thought that one medical gentleman would browbeat the other members of the Board. It had been pointed out that the method was not quite regular, but they were altering all the old methods, and were doing what was best in the public interest.

Mr. MAXTON (Wairarapa) said that if a member of the honorary staff wanted to be a member of the Board he had a perfect right to present himself for election like other members of the Board. Although he would vote against the resolution, he would like to see an expert present at every meeting of the Board to give advice if necessary.

Mr. PAYLING (Christchurch) thought that if the Board required advice they could get it from the house surgeon or medical officer. He would oppose the motion, although he believed it had been moved with the best intentions. He failed to see what good object would be secured by passing the resolution.

Mr. GALLAWAY (Dunedin) thought one of the objects of the motion was to have a man on the Board who could tell the members of the Board when they wanted expert advice. Members of the Conference must not overlook this point: that a representative of the honorary staff, being a member of the Board, would share responsibility with other members of the Board in the resolutions they came to. He hoped the resolution of Dr. Batchelor would be carried by a large majority.

Mr. LOUDON (Dunedin) said he would support the motion. If the resolution were adopted the Boards would have everything to gain and nothing to lose.

Mr. KNIGHT (Auckland) said that the Auckland Hospital Board at present obtained the advice of the honorary staff on all matters in regard to which they required their advice. They now had all the benefits that could be obtained under Dr. Batchelor's proposition.

Dr. BATCHELOR (Dunedin) said he had not heard one solid argument against the proposition he had made. An honorary staff would be careful whom they sent as their representative to the Board. Doctors did not like to be misunderstood, and they did not like to be criticized and their best motives sometimes brought to naught because they were really not understood. He could give instances of most extraordinary mistakes that had been made by Boards in connection with hospital matters that could have been avoided if the Board had had the advantage of the advice of a representative of the medical staff. He also knew of great waste and useless expenditure that would have been avoided if a medical man had been a member of the Board. The suggestion that the honorary staffs should be elected by the members of the profession in the large centres was a valuable one, and he commended it strongly to the consideration of the Conference.

The CHAIRMAN said that before putting the motion he would like to state that he sympathized with Dr. Batchelor's suggestion. Speaking generally he was not in favour of honorary staffs, especially in the smaller hospitals; but in the larger centres he thought honorary staffs were absolutely essential, and he thought especially that the honorary staff should be represented on the Dunedin Board of Control, as it was the only Medical School in the Dominion. It was most essential from that point of view that the very best medical opinion should be available to the Trustees of the Dunedin Hospital. He congratulated the Trustees of the Dunedin Hospital, and appreciated their recognition of the very valuable services they had received at the hands of Dr. Batchelor since he had been a member of the Board. He was also glad to hear Mr. Bagnall pay a special tribute to Dr. Robertson for his very valuable services to the Auckland Hospital. He thought the suggestion that the honorary staff should be elected by the members of the profession in the large centres was most valuable—they would in that way get the very best men; and he commended the suggestions very strongly to the consideration of the Conference.

The resolution was carried by 27 votes to 16.

Subsidies.

The CHAIRMAN was sorry to say he had not anything definite to tell the Conference on the subject of subsidies. He had been hoping for the last two or three days to be able to make some authoritative statement on the question. He might say frankly what he hoped to accomplish, and that was a reduction absolutely of any subsidy on outdoor relief. As he had said before, speaking generally he did not see that there was any need to make any reduction in the subsidies to hospitals. For the most part they were well administered. There was in respect to them very little suggestion of undue extravagance. The same could be said of charitable institutions, except that he thought that some of them were providing appliances and comforts which were rather in excess of what was absolutely required for their inmates. As regarded outdoor relief, and our institutions for the reception of charitable-aid inmates, we were putting them in a better position in regard to the comforts of life than the struggling labourer who managed to keep off the rates. The struggling man assisted to keep these people in better circumstances and in better conditions of life than those in which he and his family lived. As he had said before, he wished he had more eloquence to denounce the system of outdoor relief—the indiscriminate way in which outdoor relief was being given. In order to emphasize his point, he would read an extract from Aschrotis' review of the English poor-law system. Dr. Aschrotis was a Judge in the German Court who made it a special study of this subject, and he had written a review of the English system, for which he had, take it all round, a very great admiration. He said, "The fundamental principle with respect to the legal relief of the poor is that the condition of the pauper ought to be on the whole less eligible than that of the independent labourer. The equity and expediency of this principle are equally obvious. Unless the condition of the pauper is on the whole less eligible than that of the independent labourer, the law destroys the strongest motives to good conduct, steady industry, providence, and frugality among the labouring-classes, and induces persons, by idleness or imposture, to throw themselves upon the poor-rates for support; but if the independent labourer sees that a recurrence to the poor-rates will, while it protects him against destitution, place him in a less eligible position than that which he can attain by his own industry, he is left to the undisturbed influence of all those motives which prompt mankind to exertion, forethought, and self-denial. On the other hand, the pauper has no just ground for complaint if, at the same time that his physical wants are amply provided for, his condition should be less eligible than that of the poorest class of those who contribute to his support." Moreover, "The function of the Guardians is to relieve destitution actually existing, and not to expend the money of the ratepayers in preventing a person from becoming destitute—that is to say, they can only expend the poor-rates in supplying the destitute persons with actual necessities." He felt that they had a great deal to learn from that. Could it be said that the inmates of some of our Homes and the position of some of those persons who were receiving outdoor relief was better than that of their struggling neighbours? He felt perfectly certain that no substantial reduction could be made in the cost of outdoor relief until the Government subsidy was withheld; and it was in that direction he would move as long as he held his present position.

Mr. BAIN (Invercargill) said that, as the Chairman was aware, he was strongly against outdoor relief. In his district outdoor relief was very much less than it was ten years ago; but if the Chairman's suggestion was carried out the chances were that instead of a reduction it would cost more. A number of recipients of outdoor relief who were receiving now, say, 2s. 6d. or 3s. a week would be brought into the Homes, and it would cost the taxpayer a good deal more to keep them there.

Mr. BAGNALL (Auckland) took it that the Chairman's proposal would include the Homes in outdoor relief.

The CHAIRMAN: No.

Mr. BAGNALL said that if that were so, he thought the Chairman was on the wrong track. In Auckland they saved a great many people from going into the Homes by the payment of 2s. 6d. or 3s. a week to them. In that way they were able to have a room and fossick for themselves instead of going into a Home. In a great many instances, even with the payment of 2s. 6d. or 3s. a week, it meant that those persons had a great struggle to live. There was one point that the Chairman had not touched upon, and that was in connection with children committed to industrial schools by the Magistrate, and to whose support the Boards were expected to pay 7s. 6d. a week. That amount had to be paid until the child was fifteen years of age. The Magistrate took upon himself to commit a child to the Home without any reference to the Board at all. The previous Magistrate would not commit a child to the Home if the Board could make other suitable provision for it; but recently that system had been departed from. If the Government were going to withdraw anything from outdoor relief, he thought they might take upon themselves the charge of all the children sent to industrial homes by Magistrates. In Auckland during the past two years there had been a reduction in the expenditure on outdoor relief, and there would probably be a further reduction made. In the absence of any definite statement of what the Government proposed to do, he certainly submitted for their favourable consideration the taking-over of all the children committed to the schools by the Magistrates.

Mr. MACMAHON (Nelson) moved, "That it be a recommendation to the Government not to reduce the subsidies."

Mr. SCANTLEBURY (Westland) said it was with regret he heard the Chairman's remarks about the reduction of the subsidies for outdoor relief. Although he agreed with the remarks of the Minister that charitable-aid expenditure had increased out of all bounds, he was afraid that, if they knocked off the subsidy from the amount contributed in outdoor relief, it would mean serious injustice and a heavy charge on the districts. In mining districts, where the work was unhealthy, and where men often died at a comparatively early age, leaving a widow and young family, the withdrawal of the subsidy would be very much felt, because the payment of a small amount in outdoor relief enabled a widow to keep her young family together, whereas if the assistance was withdrawn it would mean that in many cases the children would have to be sent to industrial homes. He sincerely hoped the Government would take that point into their consideration.

The CHAIRMAN said it had been considered. The proposal was contingent upon certain other things being done.

Mr. TAPPER (Dunedin) sincerely hoped the subsidies would not be reduced, otherwise the poor would suffer.

The CHAIRMAN said he felt rather handicapped in this way: that his suggestions were contingent on some special treatment of the children. He was not at liberty to say anything about that.

Mr. R. C. KIRK (Wellington), speaking for the Wellington Board, said he did not know that they could carry out the work more cheaply; but even at the present cost, if they could turn these children into good citizens, he thought it was a good investment for the country. He quite agreed that care and economy should be exercised.

Mr. DAVISON (Christchurch) thought perhaps the better plan would be for the State to take over the expenditure, and provide for it all out of the Consolidated Fund—to take over the whole thing.

Mr. BELLINGER (New Plymouth) moved, "That the subsidies continue as at present."

Mr. TAPLEY (Dunedin) did not think the Conference ought to part without recording a strong protest against the Government proposing to reduce the subsidy. It was perfectly true, as had been stated, that in many districts great extravagance had been going on. He quite agreed that care should be exercised in the administration of these funds. If the suggested reduction were made, he was afraid many of the deserving poor would suffer, and if they did not suffer the local bodies would have to raise the rates in order to meet the additional expense that would be thrown upon them.

Mr. W. H. COOPER (Christchurch) said he was surprised beyond measure that the Government should propose to use the pruning-knife in connection with charitable institutions. If the Government were short of money, he was sure there were many other directions in which savings could be effected. Most of the outdoor relief was given for the support of widows and children. Was it intended that the recipients of outdoor relief should be sent to Homes? Was it intended that mothers should be separated from their children?

The CHAIRMAN said he did not suggest for a moment that mothers should be separated from their children.

Mr. KNIGHT agreed that care and economy should be exercised. At the same time, they should consider those who had come to poverty perhaps through no fault of their own. The English work-house system had been alluded to. They did not wish that system to be introduced into this country. He thought it would be very wrong if the Government reduced the subsidy.

Mr. CARSON (Wanganui) said he intended to move a resolution to the effect that, inasmuch as the Government proposal to reduce the subsidies was based on the assumption that the administration had been marked by carelessness or extravagance, or both, the Conference requested the Government to take over the management of charitable relief.

The CHAIRMAN said it was his idea—it was not the Government's idea. He had not got the Government's approval.

Mr. CARSON said they had heard the Minister's speech.

The CHAIRMAN said there was nothing concrete put before the Conference as to the shape the actual reduction would take.

Canon JORDAN (Tauranga) said the reduction or withdrawal of subsidies for outdoor relief would affect his district very much indeed. All the charitable-aid money expended in that district was in outdoor relief and in paying for patients admitted to hospitals and benevolent institutions outside the district. The amount expended in his district had been brought down to a minimum. The hospital rate was only a very small matter indeed. He sincerely hoped the abominable workhouse system would not be introduced into this country.

Mr. FRASER (North Otago) agreed that every effort ought to be made to curtail the expenditure on outdoor relief, but he did not agree that it should be done away with altogether. He did not think they had been extravagant in his district. The amounts they paid were very small, and most of them were given to widows with young children. The Charitable Aid Boards often felt they did not receive the assistance they should receive from the police in the cases where men had left their wives and families. He thought that was a point the Conference ought to express an opinion upon. Men had been allowed to escape from their responsibilities who ought not to have been allowed to get away, and the result was that the State had to maintain their families. If possible, the children should be kept with their mothers rather than be separated and the children placed in any charitable institution. He thought it would be a great mistake for the Government to withdraw the subsidies to outdoor relief, and he would oppose the proposal.

Mr. GALLAWAY (Dunedin) thought the Conference should affirm the principle that if the Government reduced the subsidies on outdoor relief they should take over the cost of the maintenance of children committed to industrial homes.

Mr. NORRIS (Christchurch) said that was exactly his point in submitting remit No. 90—viz., "The liability for cost of maintenance of all children committed under the Industrial Schools Act should be borne by the State, and not by the local Boards. This view is supported by the strong opinion expressed by the Conference of charitable-aid authorities held in Wellington in 1904." If the Government took over the children at a cost of some £20,000 a year, it would not be an unreasonable thing on the part of the Boards to consent to some reduction in the subsidies for outdoor relief. He certainly thought there should be a change made in the present system under which Magistrates committed children to industrial homes. In many cases parents were thus enabled to escape their responsibilities.

Mr. RITCHIE (Wanganui) agreed that care should be exercised in the administration of outdoor relief. Every precaution should be taken to prevent imposition. It was stated that in some parts of the Dominion there were three generations of the same family receiving outdoor relief. He knew of a case some time ago in which outdoor relief had been given to a woman, and it came to the knowledge of the Board that she had been able to take a front seat at a theatre. Payment was soon stopped in that case. He did not know how they were going to remedy the trouble. He did not think the reduction or withdrawal of subsidies would necessarily achieve the object they desired.

Mr. HORNER (Patea) said the delegates from his Board attended the Conference with the object of opposing the boundaries as they found them in the Bill. Then there was the proposed withdrawal of the subsidy. The Inspector-General had consulted the representatives of the Board with respect to the boundaries of the districts, and no doubt he would recommend the Minister to modify the proposal in the Bill in that respect. Surely a compromise could be arrived at with respect to the question of subsidies—a compromise which would make the Boards more careful in the administration of outdoor relief, and which would ease the Government of the responsibilities resting upon them. In his district they only gave rations in cases of outdoor relief. He thought that was the best course to adopt. He felt sure they would do well by attempting to arrive at a compromise with the Government in this matter.

Mr. BELLINGER (New Plymouth) said if they did not show a solid front and affirm the principle that the subsidies they had been getting were fair, and should be continued, they would be giving the Minister an opportunity of saying that they could not agree amongst themselves. They should inform the Government that they were going to insist on still receiving the subsidies they had been working under for a number of years. He ventured to say that if they did that no Government or Parliament would interfere with the subsidies. If they were unanimous at the Conference, they could surely work their representatives in Parliament to see that there was no change made in respect to the subsidies. He asked the Conference to vote on the subsidy question first, and he hoped there would not be a dissentient voice.

The CHAIRMAN said it seemed to him that he was playing rather a lone hand. He trusted that he was not altogether the heartless person that some persons would seem to think. He was in a rather unfortunate position, because he was not at liberty to tell the Conference all his scheme. He could not do so until he had the proper authority. He would not say any more about that except to emphasize the fact alluded to by a member of the Conference that there was nothing more infectious than pauperism. They had at the present time in New Zealand paupers of the third generation. It was an infectious and contagious thing, and the sooner the children were removed from the environment of pauperism the more likely they were to become useful citizens,

The resolution, "That the subsidies continue as at present," was carried *nem. con.*

Mr. NORRIS's resolution—viz., "That this meeting considers that if the Government reduces the subsidy on outdoor relief they should take over the cost of the maintenance of all children committed to industrial schools"—was then put to the Conference.

Mr. BAGNALL (Auckland) thought that matter should be left to the Government. That was a matter the Government ought to take the responsibility of. Members of the Conference could not tell how it was going to affect their districts. It was a matter of policy which should be left to the Government to decide.

The CHAIRMAN said that if the subsidies were reduced, it would mean that the local authorities would have to find £11,000 a year more—11 per cent. more. Outdoor relief last year cost £38,000. If the Government subsidy were reduced, and the children taken over, that would be £16,000, and it would mean that the local authorities would have to find another £11,000; but they would be relieved of the responsibility of the children. That was practically what it meant. He was sure the reduction could be made without hardship to any one.

Mr. CARSON said that if the resolution were carried it would be a suggestion to the Government to reduce the subsidy.

The Conference passed on to other business.

Industrial Schools.

Mr. BAGNALL (Auckland) thought there ought to be some provision by which a Magistrate could not commit a child to an industrial school unless the Board first refused to make any provision for it. He moved, "That it be a recommendation of the Conference that a Magistrate should not be empowered to commit to an industrial school any children of indigent parents until the Board failed to make provision for them."

The resolution was agreed to.

Sale of Land.

On the motion of Mr. RUTHERFORD, seconded by Mr. BELLINGER, it was agreed, "That power be given to Boards, subject to the Minister's approval, to sell any portion of land found to be unsuitable for charitable-aid purposes, the proceeds of such sale to be only applied to the acquisition of other lands for hospital and charitable-aid purposes."

Mr. TAPPER (Dunedin) submitted the following resolution: "That Charitable Aid Boards have more power to protect women and children."

Mr. BAIN (Invercargill) thought the Government should, on satisfactory evidence being given in the Magistrate's Court that the case was genuine, take action to bring back deserting husbands.

The CHAIRMAN said he would take both Mr. Tapper's and Mr. Bain's resolutions as expressing the opinion of the Conference.

Mr. STEVENSON (Dunedin) brought up the question of persons being sent to hospitals who were able to pay for their attendance and maintenance.

Dr. BATCHELOR (Dunedin) thought if hospital Trustees had power to charge for medical and other attendance it would have a good effect.

The CHAIRMAN said he would take it as a recommendation of the Conference that the word "maintenance" should be more clearly defined in the Act.

The Chairman.

Mr. GALLAWAY (Dunedin) moved the following resolution: "That this Conference places on record its high appreciation of the services rendered by the Inspector-General of Hospitals, Dr. Valentine, in the conduct of its business as associated with the consideration of the very complex questions of hospital and charitable aid. We desire to say that his comprehensive grasp of all details connected with the administration of this great Department of State has materially assisted the Conference in the findings which we believe, if incorporated in an Act and placed on the statute-book, will go a long way to solve many of the difficulties that now confront those who have the administration of these important departments. We desire, further, to add that, in our opinion, the urbanity of manner, mingled with a degree of firmness, displayed by the Chairman has been conducive materially to the success of the Conference."

The resolution was carried with acclamation.

The CHAIRMAN thanked the Conference for the resolution.

AGENDA PAPER .

FOR CONFERENCE OF DELEGATES OF DISTRICT HOSPITAL AND CHARITABLE AID BOARDS AND TRUSTEES OF SEPARATE INSTITUTIONS UNDER THE HOSPITALS AND CHARITABLE INSTITUTIONS ACT, TO BE HELD IN THE SYDNEY STREET SCHOOLROOM, WELLINGTON, ON TUESDAY, THE 9TH JUNE, 1908, AT 10 A.M.

SCHEDULE OF REMITS.

FROM BOARDS AND TRUSTEES WITH REFERENCE TO THE PROPOSED HOSPITALS AND CHARITABLE INSTITUTIONS AMENDING BILL.

VERBAL ALTERATIONS.

1. *Wairarapa District Hospital Board*.—Section 30c: It is suggested the subclauses in question be worded "Contributions from local authorities." The revenue derived from this source is in no sense a "grant" (which implies a voluntary contribution or donation), and the term is certainly misused in this case.

DEFINITION OF "CONTRIBUTOR."

2. *St. Andrew's Orphanage*.—Interpretation, section 2, line 20: The words "one pound" be struck out, and the words "five shillings" inserted. Section 51, line 19: The words "one pound" be struck out, and the words "five shillings" be inserted. Section 56, line 9: After the word "of" strike out the words "one pound," and insert the words "five shillings."

3. *Oamaru Hospital Trustees*.—Section 2, clause 2, to be altered to read, "'Contributor' means a person who in any district subscribes not less than five shillings per annum, or twenty pounds in one donation, towards the funds of an institution, or for the purposes of charitable aid within such district."

DISTRICTS.

INCLUSION OF TOWN DISTRICTS IN COUNTY.

4. *Ashburton Hospital Board*.—The words "and town districts" be inserted after the word "borough" in the first line of clause 4, subsection (1).

ALTERATION OF PRESENT DISTRICTS.

5. *Reefton Hospital*.—That the Trustees protest against the splitting-up of the present hospital and charitable-aid districts.

6. *Inangahua Hospital and Charitable Aid Board*.—The Board protests against the combined district, and desires to remain a separate district under the Act.

7. *Patea District Hospital Board*.—That this Board is strongly of opinion that section 3 should be deleted, and that the districts remain as at present under local control.

8. *Stratford District Hospital and Charitable Aid Board*.—Similar to above.

9. *Coromandel Hospital Trustees*.—That this county should be declared a separate district—viz., as Coromandel.

10. *Wairarapa District Hospital Board*.—Sections 3-5: That the strongest possible objection be taken to the proposal to unite the Wairarapa with the Wellington Hospital District, on the ground that, if given effect to, the liability of the present Wairarapa Hospital District for hospital maintenance will be nearly doubled. It is recognised, however, that probably through seaborne traffic the chief ports of the Dominion are entitled to some special provision to meet the cost of dealing with what may be designated as foreign cases. This provision should be made out of the Consolidated Fund—not drawn from the country districts in the vicinity of the ports.

11. *Ashburton Hospital Board*.—That in the opinion of this Board Ashburton County and Borough, including the two Town Boards, should remain a hospital district, as at present. That the County of Ashburton and borough, including the Town Districts of Hamstead and Tinwald, be a separate charitable-aid district to be worked in accordance with the Hospitals and Charitable Institutions Bill. That the word "Ashburton" in the second line of the First Schedule, mentioned in description of North Canterbury, be struck out.

12. *Westland Hospital and Charitable Aid Board and Westland Hospital Trustees*.—That, under clause 5, (1), in view of the special conditions existing on the West Coast, geographical and otherwise, the existing boundaries of the charitable-aid districts should not be altered.

13. *Westland Hospital and Charitable Aid Board and Westland Hospital Trustees*.—That the proposed divisions of districts in the First Schedule of the Bill are too extensive, and in particular the District of Westland is too large, the several centres being too scattered to allow of that community of interest which is necessary in the efficient control and management of the numerous institutions throughout the district.

14. *Picton Hospital and Charitable Aid Board*.—Hospital district: This Board does not approve of the Wairau and Picton Districts being merged into one, and desires the same to remain as at present.

ELECTION OF BOARDS AND SUB-COMMITTEES.

15. *South Canterbury Hospital and Charitable Aid Board*.—That the present mode of election of Hospital Boards be maintained.

16. *Wairarapa District Hospital Board*.—Sections 6–12: The committee is of opinion that the present system of election of members is infinitely preferable to that provided by the new Bill.

17. *Nelson Hospital and Charitable Aid Board*.—This Board considers that in counties the present system of voting should be the one adopted.

18. *Grey District Hospital and Charitable Aid Board*.—That this Board does not view with favour the large cost involved by an election of members to the District Boards, and recommends that this proposal be reconsidered by Government.

19. *Coromandel Hospital Board*.—Section 8: That an election is unnecessary, and an expense that can be avoided, as the local bodies who have to provide the money for the maintenance of these institutions should elect their representatives to the Board; or the committee should be elected by the ratepayers at a public meeting.

20. *Patea District Hospital Board*.—That electors under section 8 should be privileged to exercise the number of votes allowed them at local bodies' elections in proportion to rateable value.

21. *Ashburton Hospital Board*.—Clause 8: The words "each of whom shall have one vote and no more," in the fifth line, be struck out.

22. *Stratford Hospital and Charitable Aid Board*.—That local bodies who have to provide money for the maintenance of these institutions should elect their representatives to the Board.

23. *Patea District Hospital Board*.—That section 6 be amended by making the Boards elective by the ratepayers, or as at present formed by representatives from counties and boroughs. It is also thought that a smaller number of members of Boards would be more efficacious. In the event, however, of clause 3 being retained, the number of members from each sub-committee for seats on the Board should be based on valuation basis.

24. *Wellington District Hospital Board*.—That the Board consist of members elected as follows: One or more members to be elected by each parliamentary electorate. That as long as the Government contribute the same amount of subsidy as at present they be represented by one or more members on each Board.

25. *Westland Hospital and Charitable Aid Board and Westland Hospital Trustees*.—That the members of the Board be directly elected by the people.

26. *Nelson Hospital and Charitable Aid Board*.—That, with a view of avoiding travelling-expenses, the subdistricts may elect to the Board any person who is qualified to vote in any of the subdistricts.

27. *Nelson Hospital and Charitable Aid Board*.—That this Board does not approve of the creation of committees.

28. *Ashburton and North Canterbury Charitable Aid Board*.—The basis of division of districts into subdistricts and the basis of apportionment of members to represent such subdistricts on Hospital and Charitable Aid Boards should be determined by Act.

29. *Grey District Hospital and Charitable Aid Board*.—That any clause in the proposed legislation relating to subdistricts shall not apply to the west coast of the South Island.

30. *North Canterbury Hospital Board*.—Clauses 7 to 15: That the Board altogether disapproves of the proposals relating to the election of committees in subdistricts contained in clauses 7 to 15, inclusive, on the grounds that endless friction would arise between the various committees and Boards. The Board should consist of a sufficient number of members from whom to elect its own committees.

31. *Ashburton and North Canterbury Charitable Aid Board*.—The proposed formation of committees (outside the Boards) for subdistricts in which there happen to be institutions would be likely to produce less satisfactory results than the election by the Boards of committees of their own members to supervise the management of their institutions.

32. *Waitaki Hospital and Charitable Aid Board*.—That disapproval be expressed by sections 7 and 8, and in lieu of the committee suggested by the sections, the Board have power to appoint a sub-committee of its own members to manage any institution.

TERM OF OFFICE.

33. *Nelson Hospital and Charitable Aid Board*.—That members should come into office as provided by "The Local Elections Act, 1904," and not as provided in section 13.

34. *Nelson Hospital and Charitable Aid Board*.—That absence without leave for three consecutive meetings should cause any member to vacate his seat.

DATE OF ELECTION.

35. *Coromandel Hospital Board*.—That the month of April should be substituted for the month of January, so that the report and accounts can be dealt with at the end of the financial year.

36. *Nelson Hospital and Charitable Aid Board*.—That this Board is of opinion that the election of members to the Board should be held on the same day as the county and municipal elections; and suggests that the necessary amendment be made in either the Counties Act or the Municipal Corporations Act, so as to make the day of election the same.

37. *North Auckland Hospital and Charitable Aid Board*.—That the election of members be held on the same day as County Council elections.

38. *Westland Hospital and Charitable Aid Board and Westland Hospital Trustees*.—That the Conference does not view with favour the large cost involved by an election of members of the District Boards, and recommends that this proposal be reconsidered by Government so as to arrange to take the necessary poll on the date of the general elections.

POWERS OF BOARD.

FUNCTIONS OF SUB-COMMITTEES.

39. *Wairarapa District Hospital Board*.—Section 18: Giving the District Board “general superintendence and control of every institution within its district which is wholly or partly maintained out of the funds of the Board” is a provision likely to give rise to much friction. If the committee cannot be trusted to properly manage the affairs of any institution it would be better to leave the management entirely to the Boards.

40. *Wairarapa District Hospital Board*.—Section 50: The committee is decidedly of opinion that it would be impossible to get any one to act on a committee under such restrictions as are imposed by this section, and fail altogether to realise with what object it has been framed. A committee would certainly find itself in a dilemma should the orders of the Board and those of the Minister be at variance, as it does not appear which of these is to take precedence. This committee is of opinion that such a provision would be absolutely unworkable.

41. *Westland Hospital and Charitable Aid Board and Westland Hospital Trustees*.—That if, under clause 50, committees are retained, such bodies should be given wider powers and larger discretion in the management of institutions in their charge.

42. *Picton Hospital and Charitable Aid Board*.—Clause 50: That the functions required to be performed by this section are such that no self-respecting persons would offer their services.

PROCEEDINGS OF BOARD.

43. *Nelson Hospital and Charitable Aid Board*.—That all questions before the Board should be decided by open voting (section 17).

44. *Nelson Hospital and Charitable Aid Board*.—That if committees are established, it should be made clear if their chairmen are to be included when constituting a quorum of the Board.

EXPENSES OF ADMINISTRATION.

Salary and Travelling-expenses of Chairman.

45. *Wairarapa District Hospital Board*.—Section 25B: The committee is of opinion the position of Chairman should be maintained as an honorary one.

46. *Waitaki Hospital and Charitable Aid Board*.—That section 25, clause (b), providing for the payment of a salary of not more than £200 to the Chairman, be deleted.

47. *Waitaki Hospital and Charitable Aid Board*.—Section 25, subsection (c): The words in brackets “(other than the Chairman)” be deleted.

48. *North Auckland Hospital and Charitable Aid Board*.—That subsection (b) of section 25, and the words “other than the Chairman” in subsection (c), be struck out.

49. *Ashburton Hospital Board*.—Clause 25, subsection (b): The word “one” to be substituted for the word “two” in the second line.

50. *Westland Hospital and Charitable Aid Board and Westland Hospital Trustees*.—That clause 25, (c), be amended to read, “may pay such reasonable travelling-expenses incurred by any member of the Board (other than the Chairman) in going to or returning from any meeting of the Board when duly summoned, or in making any official visit of inspection when appointed to do so by the Board.”

51. *Westland Hospital and Charitable Aid Board and Westland Hospital Trustees*.—That clause 25, (b), be amended to read that each Board may pay its Chairman such reasonable travelling-expenses as his duties may demand.

52. *Picton Hospital and Charitable Aid Board*.—On the question of allowance to the Chairman, this Board recommends the same to be reduced from £200 to £50.

53. *Wellington District Hospital Board*.—That the Chairman when away from his place of residence to be paid travelling-allowance, and, in addition, one guinea per diem.

Travelling-expenses of Members of Board.

54. *Wellington District Hospital Board*.—That the members when away from their place of residence on Board business be paid travelling-allowance.

55. *Coromandel Hospital Trustees*.—Section 65: That the amount allowed for travelling-allowance is inadequate: the amount should be fixed at so-much a meeting.

56. *Nelson Hospital and Charitable Aid Board*.—That members attending meetings of the Board shall receive 10s. per diem and actual travelling-expenses.

57. *Ashburton Hospital Board*.—Clause 25, subsection (c): The words “or of its committees” be inserted after the word “Board” in the fourth line.

58. *Wairarapa District Hospital Board*.—Section 25c: The following scale is suggested as a reasonable one for travelling-expenses: Where there is a daily service by train or conveyance available for the whole or any part of the journey, the actual first-class fare both ways; where there is no such daily communication, travelling-allowance at the rate of 1s. per mile or fraction of a mile, one way only, from the residence of the member to the place of meeting, or to the nearest railway-station or coach-office; in every case hotel allowance at the rate of 10s. per day for every day during which a member is necessarily absent from home attending a meeting or meetings of the Board. It appears desirable to fix the scale by Act, so as to make the charges uniform throughout the Dominion, and beyond dispute.

TENDERS.

59. *Ashburton Hospital Board*.—The word “twenty” be inserted in place of the word “ten” in the first line in clause 28, subsection (c).

POWER TO SELL REAL PROPERTY.

60. *Waitaki Hospital and Charitable Aid Board*.—Section 46: That in the event of any small properties coming into the hands of the Board, power be given to sell.

61. *North Canterbury Hospital Board*.—Clause 46: This Board considers that any Board should have power to sell any lands vested in it not considered necessary to hold.

62. *Ashburton and North Canterbury Charitable Aid Board*.—Boards should be empowered to sell any properties which have come into their possession by way of consideration for relief granted during a recipient's lifetime.

63. *Ashburton Hospital Board*.—Clause 46: That the following words be added: "That sale of small properties falling into the hands of the Board be allowed, provided the funds so obtained are invested and expended in accordance with the approval of the Minister."

POWER TO LEASE.

64. *Nelson Hospital and Charitable Aid Board*.—That it is desirable that some uniform system of leasing trust lands be introduced, similar to the Nelson and Westland Native Reserves Act.

BORROWING-POWERS.

65. *Ashburton and North Canterbury Charitable Aid Board*.—Boards, as well as Trustees of separate institutions, should be empowered to borrow for certain purposes (*vide* section 32 of 1885 Act and sections 2 and 3, 1907).

APPORTIONMENT OF EXPENDITURE AMONG CONTRIBUTING LOCAL AUTHORITIES.

66. *Patea District Hospital Board*.—That section 37 is not considered sufficiently explicit to protect leaseholders from solely contributing towards the contributions assessed, as provision is only made for recovery from owners of half the rates levied for hospital purposes by the local bodies, so that where a separate rate for hospital purposes is not struck by local authorities the leaseholder would be solely liable for the full contribution as paid by local authority out of general funds without the possibility of recovery of any portion by the owner.

67. *Nelson Hospital and Charitable Aid Board*.—Section 37, subsection (2): Strike out all the words after "shall be," and in lieu thereof substitute the following: "Collected by way of a rate struck by the Board over the whole district upon the rateable value of all the rateable property within the district, due notice of such rate having been struck (together with the amount due from each) shall be given to all the local authorities within the district. Each local authority shall collect the rate so struck upon the rateable property in the district represented by it 'in the same manner and at the same time that it collects its own rates.' Each local authority shall be responsible to the Board for the collection and payment of the amount so struck, without any deductions."

68. *Nelson Hospital and Charitable Aid Board*.—Section 37, subsections (1) and (2): That the following words be added: viz., "but if by reason of any unforeseen circumstances," &c.

69. *Inangahua Hospital and Charitable Aid Board*.—Section 37: That the word "unimproved" be inserted before the word "rateable" in line 40.

70. *Nelson Hospital and Charitable Aid Board*.—Section 37, subsection (3): Strike out all words after the word "funds."

71. *Wairarapa District Hospital Board*.—Section 37, (3): In view of the ever-increasing nature of the hospital and charitable-aid expenditure, contributory local authorities should be empowered to make the hospital and charitable-aid rate in addition to, and in excess of, their ordinary maximum rating-power, otherwise their finance may be very seriously hampered.

72. *Stratford Hospital and Charitable Aid Board*.—That subsection (5) of section 37 be deleted.

73. *Nelson Hospital and Charitable Aid Board*.—Section 37, subsection (5): That in the opinion of this Board, while it is desirable that landlords should bear a part of the financial burden, provision should be made for their representation in counties, the same as in boroughs.

74. *Wairarapa District Hospital Board*.—That section 37, subsection (5), be deleted.

75. *Wairarapa District Hospital Board*.—The only possible way to secure economy would be to cast all responsibility with regard to expenditure upon the contributing local authorities, both in respect of hospitals and the distribution of charitable aid. Each district should take charge of its own sick and relieve its own poor. Every district could easily distribute its own aid, while those districts which are not financially or otherwise strong enough to support hospitals of their own, could send their cases to such hospital as they thought proper, and pay for their treatment and maintenance at a schedule rate.

76. *Westland Hospital and Charitable Aid Board and Westland Hospital Trustees*.—That under clause 37 an amendment be introduced to the Bill empowering Boards to collect their own revenue by a rate to be struck over the area.

77. *Westland Hospital and Charitable Aid Board and Westland Hospital Trustees*.—That the Government be asked to make it clear whether the rateable value of mining property situated in the district of any local body and appearing on the valuation roll is liable to be included in the computation for hospitals and charitable-aid levy purposes or not.

COST OF NEW BUILDINGS.

78. *Westland Hospital and Charitable Aid Board and Westland Hospital Trustees*.—That clause 38 be struck out, with the object of relieving local bodies of the cost of new buildings, which should be provided as heretofore by Government grant and special effort in the districts requiring new hospitals.

79. *Grey District Hospital and Charitable Aid Board*.—That clause 38 be struck out, with the object of relieving local bodies of the cost of new buildings, which should be provided, as heretofore, by Government grants and special effort in the districts requiring new hospitals.

80. *Wairarapa District Hospital Board*.—Section 38: That the words "or committee" should be inserted after the word "Board" in line 2 of subclause (1) of this section.

APPEAL BY CONTRIBUTING LOCAL AUTHORITY.

81. *North Canterbury Hospital Board*.—Clause 39, (1) and (2), referring to appeal: This Board considers that appeal should be made to the Supreme Court, instead of to Commissioners or the Minister.

MAINTENANCE AND ESTABLISHMENT OF SETTLEMENT.

82. *Stratford Hospital and Charitable Aid Board*.—That in subsection (2) of section 71 (fourth line) the word "Board" be substituted for the word "Court."

83. *Stratford Hospital and Charitable Aid Board*.—That provision be made in the Act giving Boards power to recover cost of hospital-maintenance out of sums due to patients under the Workers' Compensation for Accidents Act and its amendments.

84. *Coromandel Hospital Trusts*.—That provision be made for giving an institution power to recover the cost of hospital-maintenance out of the sums due to patients under the Workers' Compensation for Accidents Act, and also that old-age pensioners' pensions should be attached for the same reason.

85. *Waitaki Hospital and Charitable Aid Board*.—Section 74: That this clause be amended to provide that, where relief is granted to a person who has resided less than twelve months in that particular district, the Board or Trustees may recover from the Board of the district in which such person has last resided for twelve months the entire cost of such relief.

86. *Waitaki Hospital and Charitable Aid Board*.—Section 75: That the last clause be altered to read, "That the cost of maintaining such inmate (not exceeding a rate of eight shillings per week) shall be defrayed by the Board of the district in which the parent or guardian has resided for twelve months."

87. *Stratford Hospital and Charitable Aid Board*.—That provision be made in the Act for recovery of cost of maintenance from the persons treated by the Board which is liable.

88. *Ashburton and North Canterbury Charitable Aid Board*.—Section 74, relating to relief to persons from beyond a Board's district, should be recast on the lines of a suggestion submitted to the Inspector-General in October, 1907, somewhat as follows: "Where any person who receives relief at the hands of a Board or the Trustees of a separate institution has not at the time of first receiving such relief therefrom resided for the period of one year in the district within which such Board or Trustees control the administration, the Board or the Trustees, as the case may be, may recover the whole cost of such relief from the Trustees or the Board of the district in which such person last resided for one whole year: Provided that during the time any such person is in a hospital or other institution or separate institution, or in receipt of outdoor relief in the district within which such person has taken abode, no such person shall be deemed to have been resident therein for the purposes of establishing settlement within the meaning of this section."

89. *North Auckland Hospital and Charitable Aid Board*.—That patients treated in an institution beyond the district in which they reside shall not be a charge on the Board of the district in which such patient had resided prior to entering such institution, unless admitted on an order signed by the Secretary or a member of the said Board.

90. *Ashburton and North Canterbury Charitable Aid Board*.—The liability for cost of maintenance of all children committed under the Industrial Schools Act should be borne by the State and not by local Boards. This view is supported by the strong opinion expressed by the Conference of charitable-aid authorities held in Wellington in 1904.

90A. *Wellington District Hospital Board*.—That this Board considers that provision should be made in the new Bill whereby Harbour Boards should be placed as a medium for purpose of liability for the cost of all accidents occurring about shipping.

SEPARATE INSTITUTIONS.

PROPOSED PLACING OF SEPARATE INSTITUTIONS UNDER CONTROL OF DISTRICT BOARDS.

91. *Coromandel Hospital Trustees*.—Second Schedule: That the name of the Coromandel Institution should be included in this schedule.

92. *Waitaki Hospital and Charitable Aid Board*.—That administration of relief by the separate institutions in this district has met with the complete approval of the Charitable Aid Board and the public, and this Conference urges that in the new Bill provision be made for the continuance of separate institutions, as defined in the Act of 1885, in districts where they have given satisfaction in the past, and where the public desire it.

INCORPORATION OF SEPARATE INSTITUTIONS.

93. *Nelson Hospital and Charitable Aid Board*.—That when a separate institution is to be established, the promoters shall once a week for four weeks advertise in some local paper their intention of making application to the Minister for the purpose.

94. *Wairarapa District Hospital Board*.—Section 51: The committee is of opinion that no separate institution should be incorporated without the sanction of the Board of the district in which the proposed institution will be situated.

95. *Oamaru Hospital Trustees*.—Section 51: Subsection (1) to be altered to read, "Any institution that is not or is not intended to be maintained wholly or in part out of the funds of

any Board, but is or is intended to be maintained wholly or in part by the voluntary contributions from the public, who have signified their intention to contribute thereto (in sums of not less than five shillings) a yearly amount of not less than one hundred pounds, and who have paid one year's subscription in advance, or a donation of not less than twenty pounds, may be incorporated as hereinafter mentioned as a separate institution under the Act."

REVOCATION OF INCORPORATION OF SEPARATE INSTITUTION.

96. *Grey District Hospital and Charitable Aid Board*.—That separate institutions under clause 51 be retained on the conditions under the existing Act, which has worked very satisfactorily in this respect.

97. *Westland Hospital and Charitable Aid Board and Westland Hospital Trustees*.—That separate institutions under clause 51 be retained on the conditions under the existing Act, which has worked very satisfactorily in this respect.

98. *St. Andrew's Orphanage*.—Section 68, line 28: That the words "or otherwise" be struck out, and all the words after "institution," in line 31.

99. *Oamaru Hospital Trustees*.—Section 68, subsection (1): The words "or otherwise" be deleted.

ELECTION OF TRUSTEES.

100. *Coromandel Hospital Board*.—Section 53: The Board of Trustees should be elected in the same manner as exists at present.

101. *Waimate Hospital Trustees*.—That the present mode of election of Trustees be maintained.

102. *St. Andrew's Orphanage*.—Section 55, line 49: Strike out the word "second," and insert the word "third."

103. *St. Andrew's Orphanage*.—Section 53, line 37: After the word "of" insert "not less than six persons, who shall be contributors, and not more than."

VOTING-POWERS.

104. *Coromandel Hospital Trustees*.—Section 56, subsection (3): That three months be substituted for one month.

105. *Oamaru Hospital Trustees*.—Section 56, subsection (2): Strike out "one pound," and insert "five shillings."

ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN.

106. *Coromandel Hospital Trustees*.—Section 58, subsection (1): That the Chairman should be elected by the Trustees.

107. *Oamaru Hospital Trustees*.—Section 58, subsection (1): Strike out this subsection, and insert one giving the Trustees power to elect their own Chairman.

PAYMENT OF SUBSIDIES.

108. *Oamaru Hospital Trustees*.—Section 63 to be altered to read, "On requisition, there shall be paid by the Colonial Treasurer out of the Consolidated Fund to each separate institution in respect of the sums received by the Trustees a subsidy of ."

MISCELLANEOUS.

109. *Coromandel Hospital Trustees*.—Section 59: That a concession to tradesmen should be made, the same as in "The Counties Act, 1886," section 85, subsection (7).

110. *Wairarapa District Hospital Board*.—Section 24: The power to make provision for supplies of medicines, &c., should be conferred upon committeemen and Trustees of separate institutions, as well as Boards.

STATE AID.

REDUCTION OF SUBSIDIES.

111. *Reefton Hospital*.—That the trustees object to the proposed reduced rates of subsidies as mentioned in clause 31 of the Bill.

112. *Inangahua Hospital and Charitable Aid Board*.—Similar to above.

113. *Ashburton Hospital Board*.—Similar to above.

114. *South Canterbury Hospital and Charitable Aid Board*.—Similar to above.

115. *Patea District Hospital Board*.—Similar to above.

116. *Stratford District Hospital and Charitable Aid Board*.—Similar to above.

117. *Waitaki Hospital and Charitable Aid Board*.—Similar to above.

118. *Waimate Hospital Trustees*.—Similar to above.

119. *North Auckland Hospital and Charitable Aid Board*.—That subsections 2 and 3 of section 31 be struck out.

120. *Westland Hospital and Charitable Aid Board and Westland Hospital Trustees*.—Similar to above.

121. *North Canterbury Hospital Board*.—Similar to above.

122. *Picton Hospital and Charitable Aid Board*.—Similar to above.

123. *Nelson Hospital and Charitable Aid Board*.—That this Board considers that real estate already bears a sufficient share of the cost of hospital and charitable aid without further increasing it by a reduction of the Government subsidy.

124. *Wairarapa District Hospital Board*.—Section 31: The proposals contained in this section with regard to the gradual reduction of subsidy during the six years following the passing of the Act meet with the unqualified disapproval of this committee. Under existing conditions a very large number of persons in the Dominion escape liability for contribution towards the cost of maintaining its hospitals and of charitable aid; one-half of the total cost is a direct cost upon the land; to increase this by 50 per cent. will inflict a very grave injustice upon landowners, and it is only right that the remainder of the people of the Dominion should, so far as it is possible to compel them to do so, through the Consolidated Fund, bear not less than one-half of the burden.

125. *Nelson Hospital and Charitable Aid Board*.—That this Board considers that separate institutions should not receive more favourable financial considerations than Boards.

126. *Coromandel Hospital Trustees*.—Section 62: That a subsidy of £1 for £1 from the Government to all moneys subscribed as at present from a District Board should be continued. Also, that an endowment should be made to institutions to avoid as much as possible contributions from the ratepayers' funds, as it is difficult to maintain an ever-increasing road service in such counties as this.

ENDOWMENTS.

127. *Ashburton and North Canterbury Charitable Aid Board*.—Some provision should be inserted in the Bill for setting apart Crown lands as endowments for the purposes of the Act.

128. *Westland Hospital and Charitable Aid Board and Westland Hospital Trustees*.—That it be a general recommendation to the Government to set aside as special endowments for hospitals and charitable-aid purposes portions of the Crown lands of the Dominion.

POWERS OF HOSPITALS AND CHARITABLE AID DEPARTMENT.

GENERAL CONTROL.

129. *Reefton Hospital*.—The Trustees recommend that the Government should take over the whole control of the Hospitals and Charitable Aid Boards throughout the Dominion, the same as is done with the mental hospitals.

130. *Inangahua Hospital and Charitable Aid Board*.—This Board is strongly in favour of the Government taking over the administration of all charitable institutions and providing for their maintenance out of the Consolidated Fund, the same as lunatic asylums, old-age pensions, and education.

WITHHOLDING OF SUBSIDIES.

131. *Picton Hospital and Charitable Aid Board*.—The words "or any" in the latter part of section 31 should be struck out.

132. *Wairarapa Hospital Board*.—That subsection (4) of section 31 be deleted.

133. *North Canterbury Hospital Board*.—Similar to above.

STAFF APPOINTMENTS.

134. *South Canterbury Hospital and Charitable Aid Board and Waitaki Hospital and Charitable Aid Board*.—That the latter portion of section 23, relative to the appointment of any medical officer or matron, be deleted.

135. *Waimate Hospital Trustees*.—Similar to above.

136. *Stratford District Hospital and Charitable Aid Board and Waitaki Hospital and Charitable Aid Board*.—That the latter portion of section 23, relative to the appointment of any medical officer or matron, be deleted.

137. *Oamaru Hospital Trustees*.—Similar to above.

138. *North Canterbury Hospital Board*. Similar to above.

139. *Wairarapa District Hospital Board*.—Section 23: The power to appoint officers, matrons, nurses, attendants, and servants should be extended to committeemen and Trustees of separate institutions, as well as Boards, and the provision that the appointment of a medical officer or matron should be subject to the approval of the Minister shall be eliminated.

140. *Ashburton Hospital Board*.—Clause 23: The words from "provided" to "Minister," at the end of the clause, be struck out.

141. *St. Andrew's Orphanage*.—Section 23, line 38: After word "matron" the following words be inserted: "to any institution under sole control of any Charitable Aid Board." Or, as an alternative, omit the word "matron."

142. *Nelson Hospital and Charitable Aid Board*.—That, in the opinion of the Board, the appointment of a matron should be left entirely in the hands of the Boards.

EXPENDITURE.

143. *Stratford District Hospital Board*.—That the words "expenditure up to £100 be exempt" be added to the last words in section 21.

144. *Wairarapa District Hospital Board*.—Section 21: The committee considers this section should be made more elastic by the insertion of the words "involving an expenditure of more than fifty pounds," after the word "alteration" in line 23.

145. *Ashburton Hospital Board*.—Clause 21: The words "not exceeding fifty pounds" be added.

146. *North Canterbury Hospital Board*.—Clause 21: After the word "institution" (second line) this Board would add the words, "involving an expenditure exceeding two hundred pounds," and read thus: "No institution shall be erected and no addition or alteration shall be made to any existing institution involving an expenditure exceeding two hundred pounds," &c.

DEPARTMENTAL INQUIRIES AND INSPECTION.

147. *North Canterbury Hospital Board*.—Clause 77, (1), with the following addition: “and that copies of any report be forwarded to the respective Boards interested.

148. *Wairarapa District Hospital Board*.—Section 81: The provisions are despotic in their nature, and, if given effect to, cannot fail to be a fruitful source of friction between all parties concerned.

MISCELLANEOUS.

REQUESTS, APPLICATION OF MONEY RECEIVED FOR SPECIFIC PURPOSE, AND SUBSIDY THEREON.

149. *Stratford Hospital and Charitable Aid Board*.—That in subsection (3) of section 33 all the words after “devise” be deleted.

150. *Stratford Hospital and Charitable Aid Board*.—That in clause (b) of subsection (2), section 48, all the words after “institution” be deleted.

151. *Reefton Hospital Board*.—The Trustees recommend that any bequests made to any particular institution should be the sole property of that institution.

152. *Westland Hospital and Charitable Aid Board and Westland Hospital Trustees*.—That any bequest left to a particular hospital be devoted solely to that institution, and not included in the general funds of the Hospitals and Charitable Aid Board.

153. *Oamaru Hospital Trustees*.—Section 33, subsection (2): Pending such application as aforesaid, all proceeds from any such bequest or devise shall be invested in securities issued by the Government or by any local authority under any Act, or on mortgage of land in New Zealand held in fee-simple; and the interest accruing from year to year in respect of such investments may be applied towards the maintenance of the institution. Pending such investment the money may be placed on bank deposit.

EXEMPTION FROM STAMP DUTY.

154. *Nelson Hospital and Charitable Aid Board*.—That, in addition to the provisions already made in section 33, it be permissible to invest money in the Post-Office Savings-Bank or any bank of issue.

155. *St. Andrew's Orphanage*.—Section 82, line 42: After the word “Board” insert “or separate institution.”

156. *Oamaru Hospital Trustees*.—Section 82 to be altered to read, “All receipts given by or on behalf of any Board or Trustees shall be exempt from stamp duty.

157. *Coromandel Hospital Trustees*.—Section 82: That all declarations and documents should be exempt from stamp duty.

158. *North Auckland Hospital and Charitable Aid Board*.—That declaration accompanying claim for subsidy be exempt from stamp duty.

BY-LAWS.

159. *Stratford Hospital and Charitable Aid Board*.—That the words “and refusal” be added after the word “admission,” in the first line of clause (a) of subsection (1) of section 69.

160. *Wairarapa District Hospital Board*.—Section 69: It is considered that committees should have power to make by-laws for the purposes mentioned in this section, in respect of the institution under their charge.

TRAINING OF PROBATIONERS.

161. *North Auckland Hospital and Charitable Aid Board*.—That probationers in small county hospitals, after two years' service, be taken on to the staff of the larger hospitals in preference to new candidates, in order to qualify for certificates.

CHILDREN AND CHARITABLE AID.

162. *St. Andrew's Orphanage*.—Appointment of Guardians: That a clause similar to clause 4 of the Act of 1886 be inserted providing for the appointment of guardians.

163. *Nelson Hospital and Charitable Aid Board*.—That the Government be requested to enlarge the powers of Charitable Aid Boards to enable them to reclaim and educate children who are living in the midst of vicious environments.

SUPERANNUATION.

164. *North Canterbury Hospital Board*.—This Board is of opinion that provision should be made whereby employees of the Hospital and Charitable Aid Boards should be allowed to participate in the benefits of the Civil Service Superannuation Scheme.

GENERAL.

165. *Westland Hospital and Charitable Aid Board and Westland Hospital Trustees*.—That the proposed Hospitals and Charitable Institutions Bill is unwieldy in its provisions, and, as the old Act has given satisfaction in the past, a few amendments to its sections should meet all requirements.

SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA PAPER.

WEDNESDAY, 10TH JUNE, 1908.

(WITH WHICH IS INCORPORATED THE SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA PAPER OF TUESDAY,
9TH JUNE, 1908.)

DEFINITION OF "INSTITUTION."

3A. *Wellington Benevolent Trustees*.—That the definition of "institution" be more clearly expressed, so as to disclose whether a building is necessarily implied, or an association of persons constitutes an "establishment."

DISTRICTS.

CREATION OF FRESH DISTRICTS.

4A. *Central Otago, Tuapeka, and Otago United Districts Charitable Aid Board*.—That, should any one or two counties desire to form a separate district, the Governor in Council shall be empowered to grant the same upon receiving a petition bearing the names of one-half of the ratepayers representing two-thirds of the rateable value.

ALTERATION OF PRESENT DISTRICTS.

14A. *Bay of Plenty Hospital and Charitable Aid Board*.—We most strongly object to be joined to Waihi, Paeroa, and Thames Hospital and Charitable Aid Board District; we prefer to remain as we are.

ELECTION OF BOARDS AND SUB-COMMITTEES.

14B. *Cook Hospital and Charitable Aid Board*.—That this Board considers that all Boards should be elected directly by the ratepayers, and not be composed of members from other bodies.

14C. *Central Otago, Tuapeka, and Otago United Districts Charitable Aid Board*.—That it is desirable for the more even running of the hospital, and also for the doing-away with the difficulties in regard to the administration, that there should be only one Board, which shall be elected by the ratepayers and contributors.

16A. *Wellington Hospital Trustees*.—Clause 6: The number of subdistrict members to be elected to be proportionate to the amount of subdistrict contributors.

That the members of the Board from each subdistrict other than the Chairman of the committee of such subdistrict shall be chosen by vote by such committee.

26A. *Wellington Benevolent Trustees*.—That where a subdistrict has more than one representative on the Board, the additional member or members shall be selected from their own body by the respective committees.

30A. *Wellington Hospital Trustees*.—Clauses 7 to 13: There is nothing to be gained by direct election of members to Board and committee.

TERM OF OFFICE.

32A. *Wellington Benevolent Trustees*.—That provision be made for members of committees and Boards to retire by rotation.

ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN.

34A. *Wellington Hospital Trustees*.—Clause 14: Chairman to be elected on the second Wednesday in May. Subclause 2 to be altered to read "If unable within one month to appoint a Chairman, the Governor to appoint one."

VACANCIES.

38A. *Wellington Hospital Trustees*.—Clause 15: Vacancies on Board or committee to be filled by Board itself, as at present.

POWERS OF BOARD.

FUNCTIONS OF SUB-COMMITTEES.

39A. *Wellington Hospital Trustees*.—Clause 50, subclause (1): All words after "Board" in line 3 to be eliminated.

Add subclause (2), (a), "For the purpose of managing an institution under the control of the Board other than a hospital the Board may appoint a special committee the members of which may or may not be members of the Board, and delegate to such special committee such powers as the Board thinks fit. Such special committee and the members thereof shall remain in office during the pleasure of the Board."

SALARY OF CHAIRMAN.

46A. *Wellington Benevolent Institution*.—That subsection (b) of clause 25 be deleted.

APPLICATION OF FUNDS.

44A. *Wellington Hospital Trustees*.—Clause 19, subsection (a): Add, “Either by proceedings under Public Works Act or other methods.”

TRAVELLING-EXPENSES OF MEMBERS OF BOARD.

54A. *Central Otago, Tuapeka, and Otago United Districts Charitable Aid Board*.—Clause 25, section (9): Board expenses for members when travelling to be paid also.

58B. *Wellington Hospital Trustees*.—Clause 25, subsection (c), subclause (1): Add, “10s. per day allowance over and above railway fare for any distance over twenty miles.”

58C. *Central Otago, Tuapeka, and Otago United Districts Charitable Aid Board*.—That members attending meetings of the Boards be paid at so-much for the day.

POWER TO LEASE.

64A. *Wellington Hospital Trustees*.—Clause 46. In lieu of “Local Bodies Act” read “the existing leasing Act.”

APPORTIONMENT OF EXPENDITURE.

65A. *Central Otago, Tuapeka, and Otago United Districts Charitable Aid Board*.—That it is desirable, taking into consideration the large increase in the cost of administration in hospital and charitable aid, that the incidence of taxation should be amended, making provision for the levying of a rate upon all classes of property, and not on land only as at present.

65B. *Wellington Hospital Trustees*.—Clause 37, subclause (1). Line 1: Alter “March” to “February.”

65B. *Central Otago, Tuapeka, and Otago United Districts Charitable Aid Board*.—That the payments of contributing bodies for the ensuing year be carried on at the rate of previous year until the new levy for the year is made.

ERECTION OF NEW BUILDINGS.

80A. *Wellington Hospital Trustees*.—Clause 38, subclause (4): Proviso to read, “£3,000” instead of “£1,000.”

APPEAL BY CONTRIBUTING LOCAL AUTHORITY.

81A. *Wellington Benevolent Trustees*.—That the right of appeal conferred by section 39 be limited to a period of one month.

81B. *Wellington Hospital Trustees*.—Clause 39, subclause (1): After “appeal” add “within one month.”

MAINTENANCE AND ESTABLISHMENT OF SETTLEMENT.

84A. *Wellington Hospital Trustees*.—Clause 74. Line 15: After “resided” leave out words for at least six months”; line 18, add after “resided” the words “for the longest consecutive period”; line 5, delete “so,” substitute “longest”; line 6, interpolate “during such period of twelve months” before “the entire cost,” &c. Amend saving clause correspondingly.

88A. *Wellington Benevolent Trustees*.—That clause 74 be amended as follows: Line 3, delete “for at least six months.”

SEPARATE INSTITUTIONS.

VOTING-POWERS.

105A. *Mercury Bay Hospital Trustees*.—Section 57, part 2: The Trustees suggest that an opportunity be given to all subscribers to vote for the election of Trustees, similar to the system in force at present for the election of members of the Board of Education.

ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN.

107A. *Mercury Bay Hospital Trustees*.—Section 58. The Trustees consider that the Chairman should be elected by the Trustees.

GRANTS FROM LOCAL AUTHORITIES.

108A. *Northern Wairoa Hospital Trustees*.—That clauses 59 and 60 of the present Act of 1885 be reinstated in the proposed new Act, so as to allow separate institutions to receive help from a Charitable Aid Board constituted under the Act.

MISCELLANEOUS.

110A. *Mercury Bay Hospital Trustees*.—Section 67: Exception is taken to the whole of the clauses which are included in this section and taken from Part I of the Act—viz., Nos. 23, 26, 29, 32, 35, 36, 44, and 48—as the Trustees consider the clauses mentioned would be detrimental to the best interests of a separate institution.

REDUCTION OF SUBSIDIES.

122A. *Wellington Hospital Trustees*.—Clause 31: Subclauses (2) and (3) to be eliminated.

122B. *Central Otago United Districts Charitable Aid Board*.—Clause 31: The subsidies to be kept as heretofore, and not altered.

POWERS OF DEPARTMENT.

WITHHOLDING OF SUBSIDIES.

133A. *Wellington Hospital Trustees*.—Clause 31 : Subclause (4) to be eliminated.

STAFF APPOINTMENTS.

140A. *Wellington Hospital Trustees*.—Clause 23 : The proviso to be struck out, and the following inserted : “No appointment of a medical officer or matron shall be made until the expiration of fourteen days after a notification of such appointment shall have been sent to the Minister.”

EXPENDITURE.

146A. *Wellington Hospital Trustees*.—Clause 21 : Line 4 : After the word “institution” the words “involving an expenditure of over £250” to be inserted, and a three-weeks time-limit inserted.

MISCELLANEOUS.

BEQUESTS, ETC.

148A. *Central Otago, Tuapeka, and Otago United Districts Charitable Aid Board*.—Clause 33 : The word “bequests” to be more specially defined. Insert “donations” and “collections.”

154A. *Wellington Hospital Trustees*.—Clause 33, subclause (2) : Add after words “fee-simple” the words “or on deposit in any bank coming under the Banking Act.”

FINANCIAL DETAILS.

158A. *Central Otago, Tuapeka, and Otago United Districts Charitable Aid Board*.—Clause 36 : As to signing cheques, must the signing be confined to the two members named?

158B. *Central Otago, Tuapeka, and Otago United Districts Charitable Aid Board*.—Clause 48 : Suggest audit to be carried out every six months. Balance-sheet for year to be published after audit.

TRAINING OF PROBATIONERS.

161B. *Napier Hospital Trustees*.—That the system of compelling probationers to remain in one particular hospital for three years should be abolished, and that the hospital trustees have the power to grant a transfer to another institution to complete their period of training.

RAILWAY PASSES FOR NURSES ATTENDING EXAMINATION.

161c. *Napier Hospital Trustees*.—That provision be made to provide free railway passes to nurses undergoing their examinations.

SUPERANNUATION.

164A. *Ashburton and North Canterbury Charitable Aid Board*.—23, (2) : Every Hospital and Charitable Aid Board may, out of the district fund, either in conjunction with or without contributions from all or any of its employees, pension or make a retiring-allowance to any of its employees on or after his or her attaining the age of sixty years, and having been continuously in the Board's employ for at least the previous ten years; but such a pension or retiring-allowance shall not exceed one-third of the maximum rate of pay received by such employee during such previous ten years' service, and shall not exceed the sum of £250 per annum.

Every Board may from time to time make such regulations in the form of by-laws as may be necessary to give full effect and force to the above clause; provided, however, that such regulations shall not come into force until they have been approved by the Governor in Council.

TREATMENT OF PATIENTS FROM DISTRICTS IN WHICH THERE IS NO HOSPITAL.

164B. *Bay of Plenty Hospital and Charitable Aid Board*.—That we strongly object to the Auckland Hospital authorities admitting people from the Bay of Plenty District into the Auckland Hospital without in the first place having some permission or instruction from our Board.

TREATMENT OF MAORIS.

164C. *Bay of Plenty Hospital and Charitable Aid Board*.—That we strongly object to Maoris who pay no rates being a charge on our Board when treated and maintained in hospitals at Auckland or elsewhere.

POLICE CASES IN HOSPITALS.

164D. *Napier Hospital Trustees*.—That cases sent to the hospital by the gaol authorities or police should have an attendant provided at the expense of the Government.

DRUNKARDS AND REFRACTORY INMATES IN HOSPITALS.

164E. *Napier Hospital Trustees*.—That provision be made in the Bill for dealing with cases such as chronic drunkards and refractory inmates of Homes.

Hon. Mr. Fowlds.

HOSPITALS AND CHARITABLE INSTITUTIONS.

ANALYSIS.

Title.

1. Short Title.
2. Interpretation.

PART I.

HOSPITALS AND CHARITABLE INSTITUTIONS. *Districts and Boards.*

3. Districts constituted.
4. Boroughs deemed to be included in counties.
5. Subdistricts.
6. District Board.
7. Subdistrict Committee.
8. Elections in subdistricts.
9. Qualification for member of Board or Committee.
10. "Local Elections Act, 1904," to apply.
11. Date of election.
12. Returning Officer to conduct elections.
13. Term of office.
14. Election of chairman.
15. Extraordinary vacancies.

Proceedings of the Board.

16. Annual meeting. Chairman.
17. Voting. Quorum.

Functions of the Board.

18. Board to have control of institutions.
19. Board may apply funds for erection and maintenance of institutions.
20. Board may establish new institutions.
21. Board to submit plans.
22. Board may close any institution no longer required.
23. Board may appoint officers.
24. Board to provide medicines and attendance for the poor.
25. Expenses of administration. Declaration before payment of travelling expenses. Holders of free passes not to be paid railway expenses.
26. Board to regulate its own proceedings.
27. Board may enter into contracts.
28. Contracts, how made. Contracts above £10 to be by public tender.
29. Composition upon breach of contracts.

Finance.

30. Moneys constituting Hospital Fund.
31. Annual Government subsidy.
32. Advances may be made on account of subsidies.
33. Application of bequests. Application of annual proceeds therefrom. Subsidies for bequests to form part thereof.
34. Board to collect moneys of fund.
35. "Contributors Book" to be kept.
36. All moneys to be paid into bank and paid out by cheques.
37. Apportionment of expenditure for maintenance among contributing local authorities. Local bodies may pay contributions out of ordinary fund or levy rate.
38. Expenditure for erection of new buildings or additions.
39. Appeal. Costs of appeal. Amended requisition.
40. Contributions in arrear may be recovered as a debt.
41. Or may be deducted from subsidies.
42. Board may remit contributions in case of excess.
43. Valuer-General may levy contributions in districts where no rates levied.

Real and Personal Property.

44. Real and personal property to vest in Board. Saving of debts, liabilities, &c.
45. Reserves and endowments may be granted to institutions.
46. Board may lease lands.
47. Saving of existing leases.

Accounts and Audit.

48. Board to keep books and accounts.
49. Books to be balanced. Accounts to be audited.

Functions of a Committee.

50. Functions of Committee to be exercised under direction of the Board.

Hospitals and Charitable Institutions.

PART II.

SEPARATE INSTITUTIONS.

51. subscribers to institutions may petition for incorporation.
52. Incorporation effected by Order in Council.
53. Board of Trustees to be elected.
54. First meeting of contributors.
55. Annual election of one-third of Trustees.
56. Majority of votes to decide any question. Who may vote. Disqualification of voters.
57. Adjourned elections.
58. Chairman.
59. Vacancies.
60. Life contributors.
61. Conduct of elections.
62. Moneys constituting the Institution Fund.
63. Annual subsidies to separate institutions.
64. Trustees may borrow money.
65. Payment of expenses of separate institutions and of Trustees.
66. Annual balance-sheet.
67. Certain provisions of Part I to apply to separate institutions and Trustees.
68. Revocation of incorporation under certain circumstances.

PART III.

GENERAL PROVISIONS.

By-laws.

69. Board and Trustees may make by-laws. By-laws to be posted in conspicuous place in institution. Evidence of by-law. When by-laws void.

Maintenance of Inmates.

70. Contracts for maintenance, &c.
71. Persons receiving relief liable for same.
72. Near relation liable to contribute.
73. Public Trustee to contribute in certain cases.
74. As to relief afforded to persons coming from beyond district.
75. Maintenance of destitute children.

Inspection of Institutions.

76. Inspectors.
77. Inspection of institutions.
78. Annual reports by Inspectors.
79. Annual report by Inspector-General.
80. Powers of Health Officers saved.

Departmental Inquiries.

81. Inquiries as to organization or working of any institution.

Miscellaneous.

82. Receipts of Board exempt from stamp duty.
83. Power to sell institution and acquire new site.
84. Regulations.
85. Repeal. Schedules.

A BILL INTITULED

Title.

AN ACT to consolidate and amend the Law relating to the Management of Public Hospitals and Charitable Institutions, and to the Distribution of Charitable Aid.

BE IT ENACTED by the General Assembly of New Zealand in Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, as follows:—

Short Title.

1. (1.) The Short Title of this Act is “The Hospitals and Charitable Institutions Act, 1906”; and it shall come into operation on the first day of January, one thousand nine hundred and seven.

(2.) Nothing in this Act shall apply to institutions established under any Act for the reception and treatment of persons of unsound mind, nor, except as to section seventy-five hereof, shall it apply to any school or other institution under “The Industrial Schools Act, 1882.”

Interpretation.

2. In this Act, if not inconsistent with the context,—

“Board” means a Hospital and Charitable Aid Board constituted under this Act:

“Contributor” means a person who in any district subscribes not less than one pound per annum or twenty pounds in one donation towards the funds of an institution, or for the purposes of charitable aid within such district:

“Contributing local authority” means the Council of a borough or county, or the Board of any road or town district where “The Counties Act, 1886,” is suspended or is not in operation, liable to pay a proportion of the expenditure required for the purposes of any institution, or for charitable aid:

Hospitals and Charitable Institutions.

3

“District” and “subdistrict” mean respectively a district and subdistrict constituted under this Act :

“Institution” means any hospital instituted for the reception and care of persons requiring medical or surgical treatment, and any public establishment instituted for the reception or relief of orphans, aged, infirm, incurable, or destitute persons, or fallen women, or as maternity homes, or established for any one or more of such objects, or for the administration by any body or association of persons of charitable aid ; and includes a hospital and an annexe to a hospital erected under “The Public Health Act, 1900” ; but does not include any State institution or any private hospital :

“Minister” means the Minister of the Crown for the time being administering this Act :

“Separate institution” means an institution separately incorporated under this Act, and having its own separate managers :

“Trustees” means the Trustees of a separate institution.

PART I.

HOSPITALS AND CHARITABLE INSTITUTIONS.

Districts and Boards.

3. (1.) The divisions of New Zealand described in the *First* Schedule hereto are hereby constituted districts for the purposes of this Act, with the names set over each such description. Districts constituted.

(2.) Where the boundaries of a county comprised in a district are altered, such alteration shall operate with respect to the district, and the boundaries of the district shall be deemed to be altered accordingly.

(3.) Where a new county is at any time created, the limits whereof—

(a.) Are within one district, then such new county shall, as from the date of its constitution, be included within and form part of that district ; or

(b.) Extend into more districts than one, then the Governor, by warrant under his hand, shall appoint the district wherein such new county shall be deemed to be included.

4. (1.) For the purposes of this Act every borough shall be deemed to be included within the territorial area comprised in the description of the county wherein it is situate, or to which it is contiguous, although such borough does not actually form part of such county. Boroughs deemed to be included in counties.

(2.) In any case of doubt the Governor, by warrant under his hand, shall appoint the district wherein any borough shall be included.

5. (1.) On or before the coming into operation of this Act the Governor shall, by Order in Council gazetted, divide each district into such subdistricts, with such boundaries and names as he thinks fit. Subdistricts.

| | |
|---|--|
| District Board. | <p>(2.) The Governor may from time to time in like manner re-divide any district or alter the boundaries of any subdistrict.</p> <p>6. (1.) For every district there shall be a Board, consisting of one or more members for each subdistrict, as may from time to time be determined by the Governor in Council.</p> |
| Subdistrict Committee. | <p>(2.) Every such Board shall be a body corporate by the name of "The [<i>Naming the district</i>] Hospital and Charitable Aid Board," and shall have perpetual succession and a common seal, and shall be capable of holding real and personal property and of doing and suffering all things that bodies corporate may do and suffer.</p> <p>7. (1.) For every subdistrict in which there is any institution there shall be a Committee, consisting of five members.</p> |
| Elections in subdistricts. | <p>(2.) The Chairman of the Committee for the time being shall <i>ex officio</i> be a member of the Board.</p> <p>8. In every subdistrict in which there is any institution the Committee, and in every subdistrict in which there is no institution the members of the Board, shall be elected by the persons for the time being entitled to elect members of a local authority within the subdistrict, each of whom shall have one vote, and no more:</p> |
| Qualification for member of Board or Committee. | <p>Provided that in a subdistrict in which there is no local authority the members of the Board, or the members of the Committee, as the case may be, shall be appointed by the Governor, and shall hold office and have the same duties and functions as if they had been elected by the electors of a district under the jurisdiction of a local authority.</p> <p>9. Every person eligible for election as a member of any local authority within the district shall be eligible for election as a member of the Board or of the Committee, as the case may be.</p> |
| "Local Elections Act, 1904," to apply. | <p>10. Every election under this Act shall be held under "The Local Elections Act, 1904," all the provisions of which Act shall, so far as applicable, apply accordingly.</p> |
| Date of election. | <p>11. (1.) The first election under this Act shall be held on the last Wednesday in April, one thousand nine hundred and <i>seven</i>, and subsequent elections shall be held on the same day in every third year.</p> <p>(2.) All members of Boards under "The Hospitals and Charitable Institutions Act, 1885," in office on the coming into operation of this Act shall remain in office until the coming into office of their successors under this Act, when they shall retire, but shall be eligible for re-election.</p> |
| Returning Officer to conduct elections. | <p>12. It shall be the duty of the Returning Officer of the contributing local authority having jurisdiction within the subdistrict, or if there are more such authorities than one, then of such one as the Governor from time to time appoints, to do all such things as are prescribed by regulations, or are necessary for the proper holding of elections under this Act, as often as occasion requires.</p> |
| Term of office. | <p>13. (1.) Every member of a Committee shall come into office on the day of his election, and shall hold office until the election of his successor, but shall be eligible for re-election.</p> <p>(2.) Every member of a Board shall come into office on the second Wednesday in May next after his election, and shall hold office until the coming into office of his successor, but shall be eligible for re-election.</p> |
| Election of Chairman. | <p>14. (1.) On the first Wednesday in May after the election of a Committee the members shall hold a meeting at such time and place</p> |

Hospitals and Charitable Institutions.

5

as the Board or, in the case of a first election, as the Governor appoints, at which meeting the members present shall elect a Chairman, who shall hold office until the election of his successor, but shall be eligible for re-election.

(2.) If from any cause a Chairman is not elected at any such meeting, the Governor shall appoint some member of the Committee to be Chairman.

(3.) If the Chairman from any cause ceases to be a member of the Committee or resigns his office of Chairman, the Committee shall, as soon thereafter as conveniently may be, elect another of its members to be Chairman in his stead.

15. (1.) If a member of the Board or of the Committee dies, or resigns by writing under his hand addressed to the Secretary of the Board, or becomes bankrupt or of unsound mind, or is convicted of any crime, or is absent without leave from four consecutive ordinary meetings of the Board or Committee, or holds any office or place of profit under or in the gift of the Board, or is concerned or participates (other than as a member of an incorporated company in which there are not less than seven members) in any contract with or work to be done for the Board, his office shall become vacant. Extraordinary vacancies.

(2.) Such vacancy shall be filled by the election of a new member in the manner prescribed by "The Local Elections Act, 1904."

(3.) The member so elected shall hold office only for so long as his predecessor would have held it.

Proceedings of the Board.

16. (1.) On the third Wednesday in May in every year the Board shall hold its annual meeting, and the members present at such meeting shall elect one of their number to be Chairman of the Board for the ensuing twelve months. Annual meeting.

(2.) If the Chairman is absent from any meeting, the members present shall choose one of their number to preside in his stead at that meeting, and such presiding member shall have the same power at that meeting as the Chairman. Chairman.

(3.) The Chairman shall have a deliberative vote, and in case the votes are equal shall have a casting-vote also.

(4.) If the Chairman from any cause ceases to be a member of the Board, or resigns the office of Chairman, the Board shall, as soon thereafter as conveniently may be, elect another member of the Board to be Chairman in his stead.

17. (1.) Every question before the Board shall be decided by the votes of the majority of members present: Voting.

Provided that no business shall be transacted at any meeting unless at least a quorum is present thereat.

(2.) A quorum shall consist of half the number of members when that number is even, and of a majority when such number is odd. Quorum.

Functions of the Board.

18 The Board shall have the general superintendence and control of every institution within its district wholly or partly main- Board to have control of institutions.

tained out of the funds of the Board, and of the distribution of charitable aid within the district.

Board may apply funds for erection and maintenance of institutions.

19. The Board may from time to time apply any of the moneys in its hands, in such proportions and in such manner as it thinks fit,—

- (a.) In and towards acquiring any land required as a site for an institution ; or
- (b.) In and towards the erection and maintenance of any building or institution, with all necessary outhouses and enclosures, for the purpose of being used as an institution under this Act ; or
- (c.) In and towards repairs, additions to, or alterations of any existing or future institution or building annexed or belonging thereto ; or
- (d.) In or towards the maintenance or relief of indigent, sick, infirm, or aged people ; or
- (e.) Generally in payment of all charges and expenses incurred by the Board in carrying out this Act.

Board may establish new institutions.

20. The Board may from time to time, with the approval of the Minister, establish new hospitals or branch hospitals, or other institutions, in any part of the district where it deems them to be required.

Board to submit plans.

21. No institution shall be erected, and no addition or alteration shall be made to any existing institution, unless previous notice in writing of such proposed erection, addition, or alteration, accompanied by a sufficient plan and description thereof, has been sent to the Minister, and the consent in writing of the Minister has been previously given.

Board may close any institution no longer required.

22. The Board may, with the approval of the Minister, close any institution vested in it that it thinks inexpedient to maintain any longer, and shall provide for the distribution of the inmates thereof among other institutions in the district.

Board may appoint officers.

23. The Board may from time to time appoint a Secretary, Treasurer, and such medical and other officers, matrons, nurses, attendants, and servants to assist in the execution of this Act as it thinks proper, and may from time to time remove any of them and appoint others in their stead :

Provided that the appointment of any medical officer or matron shall be subject to the approval of the Minister.

Board to provide medicines and attendance for the poor.

24. The Board may from time to time make such provision as it deems necessary for the supply of medicines, disinfectants, and medical and nursing attendance for the poorer inhabitants of the district, either free of charge or at such rate as the Board in each case thinks fit.

Expenses of administration.

25. (1.) The Board, out of the Hospital and Charitable Aid Fund,—

- (a.) May pay such salaries and general expenses as may be necessary in and towards the due administration of this Act within its district ; and
- (b.) May pay to its Chairman such annual allowance, not exceeding *two* hundred pounds, as it thinks fit ; and

Hospitals and Charitable Institutions.

7

- (c.) May pay the actual cost of the fare by road, railway, or water conveyance incurred by any member of the Board (other than the Chairman) in going to or returning from any meeting of the Board when duly summoned, or in making any official visit of inspection to any institution when appointed to do so by the Board.

(2.) Before any member is paid any money for travelling-expenses under paragraph (c) of this section he shall deliver to the Chairman of the Board a statutory declaration, made and signed by him, that he has not been paid and is not entitled to receive any sum in respect of the same travelling-expenses from any other Board or Corporation under any other Act or otherwise.

Declaration before payment of travelling-expenses.

(3.) No person being the holder of a free pass on a railway shall be paid any money in respect of expenses for travelling on such railway.

Holders of free passes not to be paid railway expenses.

26. The Board may from time to time by resolution make rules for regulating its own proceedings and the general conduct of business, and for calling special or general meetings of the Board or of the Committee, or of the contributors to any institution.

Board to regulate its own proceedings.

27. The Board may enter into any contract with any person for doing anything that the Board is authorised to do, or that is necessary for carrying out the purposes of this Act.

Board may enter into contracts.

28. (1.) Any contract that, if made between private persons,—

Contracts, how made.

(a.) Must be by deed, then, if made by the Board, shall be in writing under the seal of the Board :

(b.) Must be in writing signed by the parties thereto, then, if made by the Board, shall be in writing signed by two members of the Board on its behalf and by its direction :

(c.) May be made verbally without writing, then, if made by the Board, may be similarly made by the Board or by any two members thereof on its behalf or by its direction.

(2.) All such contracts may be varied and discharged in the same manner respectively.

(3.) No contract the amount whereof exceeds ten pounds shall, except in case of urgent necessity, be made except after public tender, of which due public notice shall be given, but the Board shall not be obliged to accept the lowest or any tender.

Contracts above £10 to be by public tender.

29. The Board may compound with any person for such sum of money or other recompense as it thinks fit in respect of the breach of any contract, or any penalty incurred thereunder, or of any debt or money due to the Board, whether before or after action brought for the recovery thereof.

Composition upon breach of contracts.

Finance.

30. For every district there shall be a Hospital and Charitable Aid Fund, consisting of—

Moneys constituting Hospital Fund.

(a.) The rents and profits of lands and endowments vested in the Board, or set apart for the benefit of any institution the control whereof is vested in the Board ;

(b.) Voluntary contributions, including donations and bequests ;

(c.) Grants from contributing local authorities ;

(d.) Subsidies from the Consolidated Fund as hereinafter mentioned; and

(e.) All other moneys that may become the property of the Board.

Annual Government
subsidy.

31. (1.) Subject to the provisions of this Act, there shall be paid in each of the three years next after the coming into operation of this Act by the Colonial Treasurer out of the Consolidated Fund to every Board, in respect of the sums received by the Board during the preceding year ending the thirty-first day of March, a subsidy of—

(a.) Ten shillings for every pound of bequests, but in no case exceeding five hundred pounds in respect of any one bequest;

(b.) Twenty-four shillings for every pound of voluntary contributions; and

(c.) One pound for every pound of contributions received from any local authority.

(2.) Subject as aforesaid, the rate of subsidy during the next succeeding three years shall be as follows:—

(a.) Ten shillings for every pound of bequests, but in no case exceeding five hundred pounds in respect of any one bequest;

(b.) One pound for every pound of voluntary contributions; and

(c.) Fifteen shillings for every pound of contributions received from any contributing local authority.

(3.) Thereafter the rate of subsidy shall, subject as aforesaid, be as follows:—

(a.) Ten shillings for every pound of bequests, but in no case exceeding five hundred pounds in respect of any one bequest;

(b.) Fifteen shillings for every pound of voluntary contributions; and

(c.) Ten shillings for every pound of contributions received from any contributing local authority.

(4.) Where it appears to the Colonial Treasurer that any Board during any year has refused or neglected to carry out any of its duties under this Act, or to comply with any direction of the Minister, he may withhold the whole or any part of the subsidy payable to the Board in respect of that or any year.

Advances may be
made on account of
subsidies.

32. (1.) Out of any moneys from time to time appropriated by Parliament for the purposes of this Act the Colonial Treasurer may in each year advance to any Board, in anticipation of its estimated revenue for that year, any sums not exceeding in any case a sum equal to one-half of the estimated amount of its revenue from all sources exclusive of subsidy.

(2.) All sums so advanced shall be deemed to have been paid on account of subsidy, and shall be deducted from the first subsidy thereafter payable under this Act to the Board receiving such advance.

Application of
bequest.

33. (1.) All bequests and devises of property made for the benefit or endowment of any Board or of any institution shall be applied strictly in the manner directed by the testators respec-

Hospitals and Charitable Institutions.

9

tively; but in the absence of any such direction the proceeds therefrom shall be applied in such manner as the Board directs for or towards some permanent improvement of the institution, or the extension of the objects for which the institution was founded.

(2.) Pending such application as aforesaid, all proceeds from any such bequest or devise shall be invested in securities issued by the Government or by any local authority under any Act, or on mortgage of land in New Zealand held in fee-simple, and the interest accruing from year to year in respect of such investments may be applied towards the maintenance of the institution.

Application of annual proceeds therefrom.

(3.) All moneys paid from time to time as subsidy in respect of any bequest or devise shall be deemed to form part of such bequest or devise, and shall be appropriated and applied in the same manner, and not otherwise.

Subsidies for bequests to form part thereof.

34. The Board shall take all necessary steps for providing funds for the maintenance of any institution vested in it, or under its control, and may appoint persons to collect voluntary contributions or donations for that purpose, and shall receive and collect from the several contributing local authorities in the district the contributions they are required to furnish from time to time.

Board to collect moneys of fund.

35. At every institution a book, to be called "The Contributors Book," shall be kept, in which shall be entered the names and addresses of all persons contributing towards the support thereof, and the amounts contributed by each person.

"Contributors Book" to be kept.

36. All moneys belonging to the Hospital and Charitable Aid Fund shall be paid into such bank as the Board from time to time determines, and shall be paid thereout only by cheques signed by the Treasurer, and countersigned by any two of such of the members of the Board as are authorised from time to time by the Board to sign cheques.

All moneys to be paid into bank and paid out by cheques

37. (1.) The Board shall, during the month of March in every year, estimate the amount of the expenditure required for the maintenance of the institutions in the district under its control up to the last day of March in the following year.

Apportionment of expenditure for maintenance among contributing local authorities.

(2.) From such estimated expenditure shall be deducted the estimated income of the Board for the like period, and the remainder, less the amount receivable from the Consolidated Fund in respect of such remainder, shall be apportioned by the Board among the local authorities within the district in proportion to the rateable value of the rateable property in the district represented by each such local authority, and the amount so apportioned to each local authority shall be payable accordingly.

(3.) Every contributing local authority liable to pay any contribution under this section may pay the same out of its ordinary funds or may, if it thinks fit, raise the required amount by a rate to be made and levied for that purpose.

Local bodies may pay contributions out of ordinary fund or levy rate.

(4.) Every such rate shall be made, levied, and collected in the same manner, and with, under, and subject to the same powers, rights, and authorities in all respects, as general rates made and levied by such local authority.

(5.) One-half of such rate may be deducted by the occupier from any rent payable by him to the owner of the land and premises occupied by him and so rated.

Expenditure for
erection of new
buildings or
additions.

38. (1.) A similar estimate shall, whenever necessary, be made by the Board of the amount of expenditure required for the acquisition of land as a site for any institution, or for the erection of any new institution in the district, or for the re-erection of or additions to any existing institution.

(2.) Such estimated expenditure, less the amount receivable from the Consolidated Fund in respect thereof, shall be apportioned among the contributing local authorities in the manner prescribed by the *last preceding* section with respect to expenditure for maintenance.

(3.) Any contributing local authority liable to pay any contribution under this section may pay the same in any manner authorised by the *last preceding* section, or may by special order raise the amount required by way of special loan under "The Local Bodies' Loans Act, 1901," without taking the steps described in sections seven to thirteen of that Act.

(4.) The Colonial Treasurer is hereby authorised to lend money under Part II of the last-mentioned Act to any contributing local authority (including a borough) for the purposes of this section :

Provided that he shall not lend, or agree to lend, under this section in any one year to any local authority a larger sum than one thousand pounds.

Appeal.

39. (1.) Where a contributing local authority considers the amount of any contribution required of it by the Board to be unjust it may appeal therefrom by transmitting a copy of any resolution expressing its dissent to the Minister, who thereupon shall direct an inquiry to be made by some fit person to be appointed for the purpose by the Minister.

(2.) The person so appointed shall have all the powers of a Commissioner under "The Commissioners Act, 1903," and shall report his decision to the Minister, and such decision shall be final.

Costs of appeal.

(3.) The cost of every appeal under this section shall be defrayed by the party against whom the decision is given, and may be recovered by the Minister as a debt due to the Crown; or the amount may be deducted by the Colonial Treasurer from any subsidy at any time payable under this Act to that party.

Amended
requisition.

(4.) Where any such appeal is successful, the Board may make an amended apportionment in accordance with the recommendations (if any) of the Commissioner, and such amended apportionment shall for all purposes be deemed to be an original apportionment, and shall take the place of the apportionment appealed against; and the amount thereof shall be paid accordingly.

Contributions in
arrear may be
recovered as a debt.

40. If any contributing local authority liable under this Act to pay any contribution fails to pay the same for a period of one month after the time prescribed for the payment thereof, such contribution, or so much thereof as remains unpaid, may be recovered by the Board in any competent Court as a debt due by such local authority to the Board.

Or may be deducted
from subsidies.

41. If any contributing local authority fails to pay the required contribution or any part thereof, the Colonial Treasurer, on the

Hospitals and Charitable Institutions.

11

application of the Board, may deduct from the subsidies payable to such local authority under any Act or authority a sum equal to the amount prescribed as aforesaid, or such part as may be unpaid, and shall pay the same over to the Hospital and Charitable Aid Fund of the district in respect of which such failure occurred.

42. Where any contributions required from local authorities prove to be in excess of the actual necessities of the district, the Board may by resolution release such local authorities from the payment of any part of such contributions; but every such release shall be made uniformly and to the same degree to all the contributing local authorities in proportion to their respective contributions; or, if such contributions have been paid by the local authorities, the surplus remaining at the end of any year in the hands of the Board shall be carried forward to the credit of the succeeding year, in reduction of the amount of contribution to be collected for the expenses of the Board in that year.

Board may remit contributions in case of excess.

43. (1.) Where in any part of a district there is no local authority, the Colonial Treasurer shall be deemed to be the contributing local authority, and, on the application of the Board accompanied by an account of the amount of contribution required from that part of the district, shall send such account to the Valuer-General.

Valuer-General may levy contributions in districts where no rates levied.

(2.) The Valuer-General shall forthwith on receipt of such account proceed to raise, by means of rates on all rateable property within that part of the district, the amount stated in the account, together with the amount of the estimated cost of making and collecting such rates.

(3.) For the purpose of making and collecting any such rate the valuation roll made under "The Government Valuation of Land Act, 1896," shall be deemed to be the valuation roll of the rateable property in the aforesaid part of a district; and the Valuer-General shall be deemed to be a local authority within the meaning of "The Rating Act, 1894," all the provisions whereof shall apply to the making and collecting of such rate.

(4.) All rates so raised shall be paid to the Board, less the amount of expenses for collecting the same, which shall be paid into the Public Account and form part of the Consolidated Fund.

Real and Personal Property.

44. (1.) All property, real or personal, that on the coming into operation of this Act was vested in any Hospital Board or Hospital and Charitable Aid Board for the purposes of a hospital, or was vested in the Trustees of any institution the control of which is by this Act vested in the Board, or was held by or vested in any persons in trust for or on behalf of any such institution, and all real and personal property hereafter conveyed, granted, or bequeathed to or on behalf of any such institution, shall vest in the Board.

Real and personal property to vest in Board.

(2.) All such property shall be held by the Board upon and for the same trusts and purposes (subject to this Act) as are now or may hereafter be attached to the same, and subject to any contracts leases, mortgages, or other debts or charges for the time being

Saving of debts, liabilities, &c.

affecting it; and the Board shall be liable for the payment of such mortgages, debts, or other charges.

Reserves and endowments may be granted to institutions.

45. (1.) Lands now or hereafter reserved or set apart for the purposes of or as endowments for any institution may be granted to the Board, anything in "The Public Reserves Act, 1881," to the contrary notwithstanding.

(2.) This Act shall be deemed to be a special Act for the purpose of making any such grant as aforesaid.

Board may lease lands.

46. The Board may let any lands vested in it, or any part thereof, not required for immediate use, in the manner prescribed by "The Local Bodies' Leases Act, 1906," all the provisions of which Act shall extend and apply to the Board and its leases as if it were a local authority.

Saving of existing leases.

47. (1.) Nothing herein shall prejudice or affect any lease already granted or agreed to be granted under powers conferred upon any former Board or Trustees.

(2.) The Board shall, in respect of any such lease, have and exercise all the rights, remedies, and powers as though such lease had been duly made by the Board to the lessee or lessees therein named.

Accounts and Audit.

Board to keep books and accounts.

48. (1.) Every Board shall cause books to be provided and kept, and true and regular accounts to be entered therein, of all sums received and paid for and on account of this Act, and of the several purposes for which such sums of money were received and paid.

(2.) Such books shall at all reasonable times be open to the inspection of any member of the Board.

(3.) Separate accounts shall be kept—

(a.) Of the rents or profits of any land set apart for the endowment of any particular institution, and of the interest or other produce of money or property given or bequeathed thereto, or derived from any other property vested in the Board under this Act; and all such rents or profits, and interest or other produce of money, shall be applied in and for the benefit of such institution, as the case may be:

(b.) Of moneys granted, voted, collected, or received for any institution; and such moneys shall be appropriated only to the purposes for which the same were granted, voted, collected, or received.

Books to be balanced.

49. (1.) The Board shall cause its accounts to be balanced in every year to the thirty-first day of March in each year, and shall cause a true statement and account to be prepared of all contracts entered into, and of all moneys received or expended during the preceding year, and of all its available assets and of all debts then owing by the Board.

Accounts to be audited.

(2.) All such accounts shall be audited by the Audit Office, which for that purpose shall have and may exercise all such powers as it has under "The Public Revenues Act, 1891," in respect of public moneys.

Hospitals and Charitable Institutions.

13

Functions of a Committee.

50. (1.) The functions of a Committee shall be such of the functions that the Board might exercise within the subdistrict as are from time to time assigned to it by the Board, or as are prescribed, either generally or in any particular case, by the Minister.

Functions of Committee to be exercised under direction of the Board.

(2.) Such functions shall be exercised by the Committee under the direction of the Board in like manner and with the same effect as if exercised by the Board.

(3.) Nothing herein shall authorise any committee to borrow money, make rules or by-laws, or make any apportionment of expenditure.

PART II.

SEPARATE INSTITUTIONS.

51. (1.) Any institution that is not or is not intended to be maintained wholly or in part out of the funds of any Board, but is or is intended to be maintained wholly or in part by the voluntary contributions of not less than one hundred persons, who have signified their intention to contribute and have contributed thereto (in sums of not less than one pound) a yearly amount of not less than one hundred pounds, and who have paid one year's subscription in advance, or a donation in one sum of not less than twenty pounds, may be incorporated as hereinafter mentioned as a separate institution under this Act.

Subscribers to institutions may petition for incorporation.

(2.) The separate institutions mentioned in the *Second* Schedule hereto shall be deemed to have been incorporated under this Act.

52. The Governor in Council, on the receipt of a petition signed by not less than fifty of the said persons, praying that such institution may be incorporated, may cause the substance or prayer of such petition to be gazetted; and if no counter-petition, signed by at least an equal number of such persons or by the Board, has been received by the Minister within one month after the date of such publication, the Governor may by Order in Council declare the contributors for the time being to such institution to be, and they shall thereupon become and continue, a body corporate by the title named in the Order, and shall have perpetual succession and a common seal.

Incorporation effected by Order in Council.

53. (1.) Every separate institution incorporated or deemed to be incorporated under this Act shall be governed by a Board of Trustees consisting of nine persons, to be elected by the voluntary contributors as hereinafter mentioned.

Board of Trustees to be elected.

(2.) The Trustees of the separate institutions mentioned in the *Second* Schedule hereto in office on the coming into operation of this Act shall continue in office until the first election of Trustees under this Act.

54. The first meeting of contributors to any institution shall be held at such time and place as the Governor by public notice appoints, and at such meeting the contributors shall elect the first Trustees, and may transact any other business relating to the institution.

First meeting of contributors.

55. (1.) The annual meeting of contributors to the institution shall be held on the second Thursday in the month of January in every year; and at such meeting one-third part of the number of Trustees shall go out of office (but may nevertheless be re-elected).

Annual election of one-third of Trustees.

(2.) The persons to go out of office shall be those who have been the longest in office without re-election, or, where four or more have been in office for the same length of time, then those to go out of office shall be determined by lot.

Majority of votes
to decide any
question.

56. (1.) Every question submitted to any meeting of contributors shall be decided by a majority of the votes of contributors then present.

Who may vote.

(2.) Every person who during the previous twelve months has contributed the sum of one pound or upwards shall have and may exercise at any meeting of contributors one vote and no more.

Disqualification of
voters.

(3.) No person shall be qualified to vote at any meeting of contributors unless he is of the age of eighteen years, and has been a contributor to the institution for the space of one month previous to the meeting; but where a contributor has paid his subscription for the year immediately preceding the year in which any such meeting takes place, the payment of his subscription for the then current year at any time before such meeting shall entitle him to vote.

Adjourned elections.

57. If at any first meeting or at any annual or general meeting of contributors to any institution at least ten of the contributors qualified to vote do not assemble and proceed to business within one hour from the time fixed for the meeting, no election of Trustees shall be made, nor shall any business be done at that time; but in such case there shall be another meeting of contributors at the same place and at the same hour of the same day in the following week, which meeting shall be publicly notified, and at this last-mentioned meeting four contributors qualified to vote shall constitute a meeting.

Chairman.

58. (1.) At the first meeting, and thereafter at every annual meeting of contributors, the contributors present shall, after electing Trustees as aforesaid, elect one of the Trustees to be Chairman of the institution for the ensuing twelve months.

(2.) The Chairman shall preside at all meetings of the Trustees and of the contributors at which he is present.

(3.) If the Chairman is absent from any meeting, the contributors present in the case of a meeting of contributors, or the Trustees present in the case of a meeting of Trustees, shall elect some contributor or Trustee (as the case may be) to preside at that meeting, and the person so elected shall have the same power at that meeting as the Chairman would have had if he had been present.

(4.) At every meeting, whether of Trustees or of contributors, the Chairman shall have a deliberative vote, and in case the votes are equal shall have a casting-vote also.

(5.) If the Chairman resigns his office or dies, the remaining Trustees shall appoint one of their number to be Chairman until the next annual meeting of contributors.

Vacancies.

59. (1.) If a Trustee dies, or resigns by writing under his hand addressed to the Secretary of the institution, or becomes bankrupt or of unsound mind, or is convicted of any offence punishable by imprisonment with hard labour for two years or upwards, or is absent without leave from four consecutive ordinary meetings of the Trustees, or holds any office or place of profit under or in the gift of the Trustees, or is concerned or participates (other than as a member

Hospitals and Charitable Institutions.

15

of an incorporated company) in any contract with or work to be done for the Trustees, his office shall become vacant.

(2.) On the occurrence of any such vacancy the Trustees shall fill the same by appointing as Trustee some contributor to the institution.

(3.) The Trustee so appointed shall hold office for so long only as his predecessor would have held it.

60. (1.) The Trustees of any institution may elect any person who gives or has given a donation in one sum of not less than twenty pounds to the institution to be a life contributor thereof, and to have thereby all the privileges of an annual contributor thereto, with the same right of voting at any meeting of the contributors to such institution.

Life contributors.

(2.) Any person who before the coming into operation of this Act has been elected or appointed to be a life governor, director, or subscriber to any institution incorporated or deemed to have been incorporated as a separate institution under this Act shall be deemed to be a life contributor to such institution under this Act.

61. The Trustees may from time to time make by-laws in the manner prescribed by section sixty-nine hereof, for conducting any election under this Part of this Act, and for determining the validity of disputed elections.

Conduct of elections.

62. For every separate institution there shall be an Institution Fund, consisting of—

Moneys constituting the Institution Fund.

- (a.) The rents and profits of land and endowments belonging to the institution;
- (b.) Voluntary contributions and bequests;
- (c.) Subsidies from the Consolidated Fund as hereinafter mentioned; and
- (d.) All other moneys that may become the property of the institution.

63. There shall be paid annually by the Colonial Treasurer out of the Consolidated Fund to each separate institution, in respect of the sums received by the Trustees during the preceding year ending the thirty-first day of March, a subsidy of—

Annual subsidies to separate institutions.

- (a.) Ten shillings for every pound of bequests, but in no case exceeding five hundred pounds in respect of any one bequest; and
- (b.) Twenty-four shillings for every pound of voluntary contributions:

Provided that no subsidy shall be payable in any year to any institution unless the provisions of section sixty-six hereof are duly complied with.

64. The Trustees of a separate institution may from time to time borrow money on the security of their endowments and income for acquiring any land as a site for the institution, for erecting the institution, or for making repairs, additions, or alterations to the institution or to any building annexed or belonging thereto.

Trustees may borrow money.

65. The Trustees of a separate institution may, out of the funds thereof, pay such salaries and general expenses as are necessary in and towards the due administration of this Act in respect of the institution, and may pay to any Trustee the actual

Payment of expenses of separate institutions and of Trustees.

cost of the fare by railway, if he is not the holder of a free pass on such railway, or by coach or water conveyance, or by horse, incurred by any such Trustee in going to or returning from any meeting of the Trustees when duly summoned; but not more than five pounds in the whole shall be paid to any Trustee under this section in any one year.

Annual balance-sheet.

66. (1.) The Trustees shall cause their accounts to be balanced in every year to the thirty-first day of March in each year, and shall cause a true statement and account to be prepared of all contracts entered into, and of all moneys received or expended during the preceding year, and of all the available assets of and the debts then owing by the institution.

(2.) All such accounts shall be audited by the Audit Office, which for that purpose shall have and may exercise all such powers as it has under "The Public Revenues Act, 1891," in respect of public moneys.

(3.) A copy of every such account shall, when audited, be sent to the Minister.

Certain provisions of Part I to apply to separate institutions and Trustees.

67. The following provisions of Part I of this Act shall, *mutatis mutandis*, extend and apply to separate institutions and to the Trustees thereof:—

Section twenty-three;

Sections twenty-six to twenty-nine;

Sections thirty-two and thirty-three;

Sections thirty-five and thirty-six; and

Sections forty-four to forty-eight.

Revocation of incorporation under certain circumstances.

68. (1.) If at any time it appears to the Minister, on the application of the Trustees of any institution or otherwise, that the funds of the institution are not sufficient to maintain it for the purposes for which it was established, he may by order under his hand revoke the incorporation of the institution and declare that its property shall vest in the Board, or otherwise as he thinks fit, and such order shall have effect accordingly.

(2.) On the gazetting of any such order the control of the institution shall either vest in the Board or the institution may be closed.

PART III.

GENERAL PROVISIONS.

By-laws.

Board and Trustees may make by-laws.

69. (1.) Every Board, in respect of institutions vested in it, and the Trustees of any separate institutions respectively, may from time to time make by-laws in respect to all or any of the following matters:—

(a.) Regulating the admission of patients into any institution, on the nomination or recommendation of contributing local authorities or contributors or otherwise, and of their discharge therefrom:

(b.) Prescribing what shall constitute a life membership of any institution:

(c.) Maintaining order, discipline, decency, and cleanliness among the inmates of institutions:

Hospitals and Charitable Institutions.

17

- (d.) Prescribing the duties of the several medical and other officers, nurses, attendants, and servants of any institution :
- (e.) Preventing trespass or intrusion upon the premises of any institution, or the grounds attached or belonging thereto :
- (f.) Preventing disorderly behaviour in or upon the premises of any institution by any person :
- (g.) Prohibiting the introduction of any specified articles into any institution :
- (h.) Generally for all matters affecting the general management, care, control, and superintendence of any institution :
- (i.) For the affording relief by medicine and attendance to out-door patients, or the administration of out-door relief, and either directly or by means of any voluntary or other association formed for the purpose of providing or aiding in the administration of such relief.
- (2.) Any by-law may impose a fine not exceeding *five* pounds for the breach thereof.
- (3.) No such by-law shall come into force unless it has been previously approved by the Minister in writing :
- Provided that the Governor may at any time disallow any such by-law, but such disallowance shall not affect the validity of anything theretofore done prior to such disallowance.
- (4.) One or more printed copies of all by-laws shall, as soon as conveniently may be after the making thereof, and before they come into operation, be affixed and at all times maintained in some conspicuous public place in every institution to which the same relate.
- (5.) A printed copy of by-laws, purporting to be the by-laws of any Board or Trustees respectively, if authenticated by the seal of the Board or Trustees, shall be evidence of such by-laws and of their having been duly made.
- (6.) Every by-law repugnant to this or any other Act shall be void.

By-laws to be posted in conspicuous place in institution.

Evidence of by-law.

When by-laws void.

Maintenance of Inmates.

70. The Board and Trustees respectively may make contracts for the maintenance, care, or attendance of any persons in any institution.

Contracts for maintenance, &c.

71. (1.) Every person maintained in or in the receipt of relief from any institution, whether the same is supported wholly or partly only by public moneys, shall be liable to contribute a reasonable sum towards the same respectively according to his means.

Persons receiving relief liable for same.

(2.) The Board and the Trustees respectively, or any person authorised by them respectively in that behalf, are hereby authorised to sue for and may recover in any competent Court such sum as the Court thinks reasonable, as a debt due to the Board or Trustees from the person so maintained in or in receipt of relief from such institution.

72. Every person maintained in or in the receipt of relief from any institution as aforesaid who has not sufficient means to pay for

Near relation liable to contribute.

the same shall be deemed to be a destitute person within the meaning of "The Destitute Persons Act, 1894," and the provisions of that Act shall apply accordingly.

Public Trustee to contribute in certain cases.

73. For the purposes of this Act in relation to the maintenance of persons in any institution, or receiving relief therefrom, the Public Trustee shall be deemed to be a near relative of any such person in the place of his actual near relative who has died intestate; and he is hereby authorised and shall contribute, out of the estate in his hands of any such intestate person, towards the maintenance of the aforesaid persons respectively, in the same manner in all respects as the person so dying intestate would have been liable to contribute had he been alive.

As to relief afforded to persons coming from beyond district.

74. Where relief is granted by an institution to a person who at any time during the twelve months preceding the granting of the relief had resided for at least six months in a district beyond that in which the institution is situate, the Trustees or Board may recover from the Board of the district in which such person had so resided the entire cost of such relief:

Provided that this section shall not apply where the person relieved has for a period of three months or upwards prior to his obtaining relief been resident in the district in which the institution is situate.

Maintenance of destitute children.

75. (1.) Every order under subsection one of section sixteen of "The Industrial Schools Act, 1882," for the commitment of a child as an inmate of an industrial school (whether such order was made before or after the coming into operation of this Act) shall be deemed to have been made within the district comprising the place at which the order was made, and the cost of maintaining such inmate (not exceeding a rate of eight shillings a week) shall be defrayed by the Board of that district.

(2.) Any money paid by the Board under this section may be recovered in the same manner as if such inmate were an inmate of an institution under the control of the Board.

Inspection of Institutions.

Inspectors.

76. (1.) The Governor may from time to time appoint an Inspector-General of Hospitals and Charitable Institutions, a Deputy Inspector-General, one or more Assistant Inspectors-General, and such other persons as he thinks fit to be Inspectors under this Act.

(2.) The Inspector-General shall have the general administration of this Act under the direction of the Minister, and may exercise all the functions of an Inspector in any part of New Zealand.

(3.) The Deputy Inspector-General and Assistant Inspectors-General shall exercise all the functions of an Inspector, and shall, under the control of the Inspector-General, perform such general official duties as they are severally called upon to perform under this Act or by the Inspector-General; and the Deputy Inspector-General shall in case of the absence, illness, or other temporary incapacity, or of the death, of the Inspector-General act in his name and on his behalf, and while so acting shall have and may exercise all the powers, duties, and functions of the Inspector-General.

Hospitals and Charitable Institutions.

19

(4.) The persons who on the coming into operation of this Act are acting as Inspector-General, Deputy Inspector-General, and Assistant Inspector-General respectively under any enactment hereby repealed shall be deemed to have been appointed to such offices under this Act.

77. (1.) Any Inspector may, without previous notice, visit and inspect any institution at any time he thinks fit.

Inspection of
institutions.

(2.) Every person who obstructs any such Inspector in his visitation is liable to a fine not exceeding *fifty* pounds, to be recovered in a summary way.

78. (1.) Every such Inspector shall, on or before the first day of May in each year, send a report to the Inspector-General on the condition of the several institutions visited by him within the preceding twelve months.

Annual reports by
Inspectors.

(2.) Any such Inspector may make special reports to the Inspector-General from time to time as he thinks fit.

79. (1.) The Inspector-General shall prepare an annual report for each year ending the thirty-first day of March, giving such particulars as to the administration of this Act as he thinks fit or as the Minister requires.

Annual report by
Inspector-General.

(2.) Such report shall forthwith be laid before Parliament if in session, or if not, then within twenty-one days after the commencement of the next ensuing session.

80. Nothing in this Act shall affect or curtail the powers and authorities conferred by "The Public Health Act, 1900," on the Chief Health Officer or any District Health Officer.

Powers of Health
Officers saved.

Departmental Inquiries.

81. (1.) The Minister may, whenever he thinks fit, cause an inquiry, by some person to be appointed by him for the purpose, to be made touching the organization or working of any institution.

Inquiries as to
organization or
working of any
institution.

(2.) The person so appointed shall have all the powers of a Commission under "The Commissioners Act, 1903," and shall report his decision to the Minister.

(3.) On receipt of such report the Minister may give such directions to the Board or Trustees of the institution as he thinks fit, and such directions shall be complied with.

(4.) In the event of the non-compliance by the Board or Trustees with any such direction, the Minister may request the Colonial Treasurer to withhold the subsidy or any part thereof, as the Minister thinks fit, payable to the Board or Trustees.

Miscellaneous.

82. All receipts given by or on behalf of any Board shall be exempt from stamp duty.

Receipts of Board
exempt from stamp
duty.

83. (1.) Where the site of any institution is found to be unsuitable for the purpose for which it was reserved or otherwise acquired, the Board or the Trustees may, with the consent of the Minister, sell the land, together with the buildings thereon (if any).

Power to sell
institution and
acquire new site.

(2.) The money received on any such sale shall be applied in or towards the purchase of another site and the erection of an institution thereon.

(3.) Proceedings for the acquisition of any such new site shall, where necessary, be taken under "The Public Works Act, 1905."

Regulations.

84. The Governor may from time to time, by Order in Council gazetted, make regulations for the inspection and sanitary condition of institutions in receipt of Government subsidy, and generally for such purposes as he thinks necessary in order to give full effect to the purposes of this Act.

Repeal.

85. The enactments mentioned in the *Third Schedule* hereto are hereby repealed.

Schedules.

SCHEDULES.

Section 3.

FIRST SCHEDULE.

HOSPITAL DISTRICTS.

North of Auckland District.

THE Counties of Mangonui, Whangaroa, Bay of Islands, Hokianga, Whangarei, Hobson, and Otamatea, and all boroughs therein.

District of Auckland.

The Counties of Rodney, Waitemata, Eden, and Manukau, and all boroughs therein.

District of Waikato.

The Counties of Waikato, Waipa, Piako, Raglan, Waitomo, Kawhia, Awakino, West Taupo, and East Taupo, and all boroughs therein.

District of Thames.

The Counties of Thames, Ohinemuri, Coromandel, and Tauranga, and all boroughs therein.

District of Bay of Plenty.

The Counties of Rotorua, Whakatane, and Opotiki, and all boroughs therein.

District of Cook.

The Counties of Cook and Waiapu, and all boroughs therein.

District of Hawke's Bay.

The Counties of Wairoa, Hawke's Bay, Waipawa, Patangata, Weber, and Woodville, and all boroughs therein.

District of Taranaki.

The Counties of Clifton, Taranaki, Egmont, Stratford, and Hawera, and all boroughs therein.

District of Wanganui.

The Counties of Waitotara, Wanganui, Waimarino, Patea, and Rangitikei, and all boroughs therein.

District of Palmerston North.

The Counties of Kiwitea, Pohangina, Oroua, Manawatu, and Kairanga, and all boroughs therein.

District of Wellington.

The Counties of Pahiatua, Akitio, Castlepoint, Eketahuna, Mauriceville, Masterton, Wairarapa South, Featherston, Horowhenua, and Hutt, and all boroughs therein.

District of Marlborough.

The Counties of Marlborough and Sounds, and all boroughs therein.

Hospitals and Charitable Institutions.

21

District of Nelson.

The Counties of Collingwood, Takaka, and Waimea, and all boroughs therein.

District of Westland.

The Counties of Westland, Buller, Inangahua, and Grey, and all boroughs therein.

District of North Canterbury.

The Counties of Kaikoura, Amuri, Cheviot, Ashley, Akaroa, Mount Herbert, Selwyn, and Ashburton, and all boroughs therein.

District of South Canterbury.

The Counties of Geraldine, Mackenzie, Levels, and Waimate, and all boroughs therein.

District of Waitaki.

The County of Waitaki, and all boroughs therein.

District of Central Otago.

The Counties of Vincent and Maniototo, and all boroughs therein.

District of Otago.

The Counties of Waibemo, Waikouaiti, Taieri, Peninsula, Bruce, Tuapeka, and Clutha, and all boroughs therein.

District of Southland.

The Counties of Lake, Fiord, Wallace, Southland, and Stewart Island, and all boroughs therein.

SECOND SCHEDULE.

Section 51.

SEPARATE INSTITUTIONS DEEMED TO BE INCORPORATED UNDER THIS ACT.

Hospitals.

Dannevirke Hospital.
Mercury Bay Hospital.
Northern Wairoa Hospital.
Oamaru Hospital.
Wellington Convalescent Home.

Charitable Institutions.

Jubilee Institute for the Blind, Auckland.
Ladies' Benevolent Society, Reefton.
St. Andrews Orphanage, Nelson.
Society for Relief of Aged Needy, Wellington.
Wellington Ladies' Christian Association, Wellington.

THIRD SCHEDULE.

Section 85.

ENACTMENTS REPEALED.

1876, No. 80.—“The Napier Hospital Site Act, 1876.”
1877, No. 60, Local.—“The Waikato Hospital Reserves Exchange Act, 1877.”
1885, No. 46.—“The Hospitals and Charitable Institutions Act, 1885.”
1886, No. 36.—“The Hospitals and Charitable Institutions Act 1885 Amendment Act, 1886.”
1886, No. 49.—“The Counties Act, 1886”: Section 290.
1887, No. 10, Local.—“The Christchurch Hospital Act, 1887.”
1887, No. 16, Local.—“The Sounds County Hospital Representation Act, 1887.”
1888, No. 12, Local.—“The Nelson Hospital Reserve Act, 1888.”
1889, No. 20.—“The Requisitions Validation Act, 1889.”
1890, No. 1, Local.—“The Auckland Hospital Reserves Act, 1890.”
1890, No. 8, Local.—“The Timaru Charitable Aid Institution Vesting Act, 1900.”

- 1891, No. 47.—“The Hospital Trustees Act, 1891.”
 1891, No. 9, Local.—“The New Plymouth Hospital Act, 1891.”
 1891, No. 10, Local.—“The Palmerston North Hospital District Act, 1891.”
 1891, No. 14, Local.—“The Palmerston North Hospital Land Sales Validation Act, 1891.”
 1892, No. 1, Local.—“The Wanganui Hospital Board Vesting Act, 1892.”
 1892, No. 29, Local.—“The Palmerston North Hospital Vesting Act, 1892.”
 1893, No. 9, Local.—“The District of Palmerston North Hospital and Charitable Aid Board Empowering Act, 1893.”
 1893, No. 11, Local.—“The Lyttelton Orphanage Lands Vesting Act, 1893.”
 1893, No. 15, Local.—“The Christchurch Hospital Act 1887 Amendment Act, 1893.”
 1900, No. 25.—“The Public Health Act, 1900”: Sections 37 to 41.
 1900, No. 35.—“The Hospitals and Charitable Aid Boards Act, 1900.”
 1902, No. 58.—“The Waihi Hospital District Act, 1902.”
 1902, No. 20, Local.—“The Hawera Hospital District Act, 1902.”
 1902, No. 25, Local.—“The North Canterbury Common Hospital Reserve Act, 1902.”
 1903, No. 74.—“The Waihi Hospital Board Act, 1903.”
 1903, No. 82.—“The Public Health Amendment Act, 1903”: Sections 4 to 7, 12, and 13.
 1903, No. 30, Local.—“The Taranaki and Hawera Hospital Districts Apportionment Act, 1903.”
 1903, No. 31, Local.—“The Waiapu Hospital District Act, 1903.”
 1904, No. 37.—“The Public Health Amendment Act, 1904”: Sections and 4.
 1904, No. 11, Local.—“The Stratford Hospital District Act, 1904.”
 1905, No. 12, Local.—“The Wallace Hospital District Act, 1905.”

Approximate Cost of Paper.—Preparation, not given; printing (1,000 copies), £29 7s. 6d.

By Authority: JOHN MACKAY, Government Printer, Wellington.—1908.

Price, 1s. 6d.]