

[DECEMBER 31, 1891.



358

HOME HOSPITALS.

To the Editor of "The Nursing Record."

Sir,—I have read, with considerable interest, the correspondence to which you have recently opened your columns on the subject of Home Hospitals. It needed the light of day for various reasons; and the discussion which followed "Sister Catherine's" and "W. S.'s" letters has impressed two or three points upon me, with special distinctness. I have known both patients and Nurses in more than one Nursing Home—in one or two, the patients and Nurses were treated with equal justice—and it has not yet occurred to any of the Nursing Staff in the one which is certainly under the best management, to fit on any of the comments and descriptions hitherto given, to their own special establishment. If any be satisfied with the organisation of their own Private Hospitals, why should they conclude that a deservedly severe reflection from a patient could apply to them? if not, it is difficult to understand how conscientious women could remain as Nurses where such mismanagement was possible and probable.

It is far more difficult to regulate the organisation of Private Nursing Homes than Public Hospitals for obvious

reasons. The latter are under the care of the public themselves for the benefit of the sick poor. Committees and. visitors have the right to judge for themselves (faultily sometimes, and sometimes not, according to the spirit in which it is undertaken) how the funds and appliances for the relief of suffering and sickness are used to the best advantage. A Private Hospital is a personal investment, and like any other investment, should produce a reasonable profit. To carry on an arduous undertaking creditably and properly for a year, and at the year's end to be not one pound richer or poorer, is expected of no one. Nursing, and organising nursing work, is an employment which of all others should give a fair day'swage for a fair day's work. Every business person can realise *that* point, but where the cost of nursing operations and all needful appliances are in an inverse ratio to the value of the nursing and the care bestowed upon the patient, then "W. S." has cause to write her opinion of the case. "Common Sense's" letter, in yourissue of November 19, expresses views which I can hardly imagine would be unanimously received as the opinion of the profession in general. I should have thought, for instance, in reference to "W. S.'s" long silence, after her experiences, that anyone skilled in the care of the sick would have understood how, after the complete failure of the operation at first, and the long and careful nursing she required in her second more fortunate venture in the unknown land of Private Hospitals, that her tedious convalescence was hardly an active inducement to rush into print. Nor can I see in what particular "W. S.'s" Surgeon has brought obloquy on a noble profession, by daily attending to his patient's comforts by making her bed, a task which, though not beyond the care of a sensible Probationer of three months' standing, was evidently not to be expected from "W. S.'s" attendant, without incurring more discomfort and lack of attention than before, which was so obviously probable, that





