

believed in Macclesfield that the patients in the Infirmary are only ill during the daytime.

We based our comments upon the published facts, and commented upon the grave errors involved in the suggested scheme. Our observations have naturally excited considerable attention, and our contemporary, the *Macclesfield Courier and Herald*, is seriously exercised in consequence. It is kind enough to consider that we are "a comparatively youthful organ," a soft impeachment which our seven or eight years of life permit us to accept with equanimity. We are unable truthfully to repay the compliment, for our contemporary's comments are characterised by a querulous incoherence which is most frequently associated with senility. For example, it describes our comments as "a malevolent article," "with a malicious object," that it "bristles with inaccuracies and misrepresentations," "with a wicked object." We venture to suggest to our contemporary that abuse is not argument, and that such violent language is neither usual in well-conducted journals, nor does it carry conviction to unprejudiced persons. Quite the reverse, indeed, because a strong case does not require such language, and it is an ancient axiom that the cause must indeed be a weak one if it is necessary to "abuse the plaintiff's attorney." Our previous comments were written by a member of our staff, and solely upon letters and statements in the local press. She knows no one in Macclesfield, and simply expressed, with our approval, the view which any trained Nurse of any experience would take upon the new Nursing arrangements at the Macclesfield Infirmary. Our contemporary, therefore, has evidently discovered some mare's-nest, for it portentously exclaims that "anyone reading the article carefully cannot fail to be convinced of its wicked object, and will without much difficulty affix its authorship. The voice is Jacob's voice, but the hands are the hands of Esau." We venture to doubt whether the Biblical knowledge of our contemporary is equalled by its acquaintanceship with the members of our staff—or, in other words, whether it clearly comprehends its own meaning.

Our contemporary attempts to traverse our statements, and asserts that "it is not true to state that the post of Night Superintendent has been abolished." We made the announcement upon the assertion made by Mr. Whiston at the Macclesfield Infirmary meeting, and reported in our contemporary's own columns, that the new scheme involved "not having a Night Superintendent." We are glad to hear, however, that this grave error has now been remedied, and that a Night Superintendent has been appointed. Our contemporary appears to

think that it has answered our objections to the one-year's training when it placidly remarks that if a Nurse only serves for one year, the value of the certificate granted is not as great as if she had served for two. But therein our contemporary displays its total lack of knowledge of the subject. When a Nurse has gained the certificate of the Macclesfield Infirmary—however little that may be worth—she is palmed off on the public as a trained Nurse, and therein the Macclesfield Infirmary is not treating the public fairly. It is the general experience of Hospital Matrons that it is impossible, at the present day, to thoroughly train a Probationer in less than three years—a conclusion at which the Select Committee of the House of Lords also arrived; and that is why the great majority of the leading Hospitals, and even of the smaller Institutions in this country have, during recent years, adopted the three-years' standard. Not only is that term of training necessary for the Nurse, and necessary for the safety of the public who will thereafter utilise her services, but it is also necessary in order that the patients in the Hospital, which trains her, shall receive the best possible care and attention. When there is an endless procession of inexperienced Probationers passing through the wards, as is inevitably the case when the one-year's system is in vogue, it is manifestly impossible to afford the patients the skilled attendance which they should receive. If the Macclesfield Infirmary considers that its patients do not deserve the skilled Nursing which they obtain in better-managed Institutions, that is a question for its Committee to settle with its subscribers; but experience of other Institutions leads us to predict that it will not be long before the sick poor themselves discover, and amongst themselves express their opinions concerning, the care which they receive in the wards of the Hospital.

After the comments to which we have alluded, we are not surprised to find our contemporary relying upon information given in publications compiled by unprofessional people, and the untrustworthiness of which has been on various occasions exposed. Our contemporary, for example, is totally erroneous in its statements concerning Addenbrooke's Hospital, Cambridge. The term of training there was raised many months ago from two to three years, so as to bring that excellent Hospital into line with the leading Nurse Training Schools of the country. Macclesfield may prefer to be behind other Hospitals and Nursing schools, but it certainly has no right to disparage the advance made by other schools, in its efforts to excuse its own shortcomings.

The *Macclesfield Courier and Herald* should certainly be careful before making statements con-

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)