

Hitherto, practically any patient who was the possessor of a certificate from a doctor to the effect that he was likely to benefit by treatment was admitted. This practice was neither fair to the patients nor to the institution. The forms for admission were altered accordingly, making it clear that only those patients would be admitted who, in the opinion of the Medical Superintendent *alone*, were likely to derive benefit from treatment, and that they would only be admitted for a period of three months, so that they might be educated as to how to look after themselves. The latter stipulation was necessary, as in the past some patients had remained in the institution for months, if not for years, to the exclusion of those in the early stages of the disease to whom the educative methods of sanatorium treatment would have been of the utmost value.

The Medical Superintendent very rightly pointed out that to be of any value the institution should be immediately available for early cases for educative rather than curative treatment, and with that end in view the institution is now conducted. Under existing conditions a patient can be admitted to the institution at once, provided that in the opinion of the Medical Superintendent he is a fit case for admission.

Another defect as regards the admissions was due to the fact that many Hospital and Charitable Aid Boards sent their consumptives to the sanatorium, where they were admitted free of cost. That was scarcely fair to those Hospital Boards who had faced their responsibilities with regard to the consumptives of their district, and had at considerable cost erected sanatoria for their treatment; consequently, it was intimated that no indigent case would be admitted unless the Hospital Board responsible would guarantee the patient's fee of £1 per week.

Economics.

For the year ending 31st March, 1910, the cost of this institution was £7,269 (*vide* table in appendix). Of this amount £5,337 was contributed by the Government, £1,604 by payments made on account of patients, and £328 by the sale of produce, &c.

The total cost per bed was £164 8s. 8d.—viz.,—

	£	s.	d.
Provisions	49	19	11
Surgery and dispensary .. .	5	18	0
Domestic and establishment .. .	43	18	9
Salaries and wages .. .	56	17	2
Administration .. .	7	14	10
	£164	8	8

We hope to do better next year. Considerable economies have been effected, but none that will militate against the efficiency of the institution or the comfort of the patients.

From Dr. Roberts's report will be seen the return the country is getting for this expenditure. It will be noted that, of 105 patients admitted, some 50 were discharged in a condition to obtain their own livelihood. So far this is satisfactory, but that we can do better yet is my sincere belief.

During the year the institution has lost the services of Miss Rochfort, who, as Matron, has devoted six years of her life to the services of the institution. In the exercise of her duties she was severely handicapped by the fact that there was no resident medical man to help her in her work; but she did all that could possibly be done to enhance the comfort and general content of the patients and staff committed to her care.

After four years' service Dr. Roberts is also relinquishing his post—not only on account of the demands of an increasing practice, but also from the fact that he recognizes to the fullest extent the need for a resident medical officer if the administration of the sanatorium is to be conducted on duly recognized methods.

It is hoped that his services as a consulting medical officer may still be retained.

INSPECTION OF SCHOOL-CHILDREN.

The necessity for the above has been referred to in previous reports, and every year becomes more apparent.

A scheme has been submitted, and only awaits the approval of the Government, as practically no special legislation is required to put it into force.

VACCINATION.

The events that transpired subsequent to the arrival at Melbourne of the s.s. "Otway" with a case of small-pox on board should be a sufficient warning as to the need for a more vigorous enforcement of the laws governing vaccination.