

hospital ship would have accommodated only 200. Not an officer who has come from India on board these passenger steamers, either sick himself, or with sick men as his companions on board, but will pity those 280 men. The transport hospital ship is a different thing altogether; it is a 'fast steam vessel' (par 781, Med. Reg.), and is fitted up, as is the stationary hospital ship, with beds for the sick, and is provided with a proper staff of medical officers and attendants. In the ordinary passenger ship are none of these, and every one has to do as best he can for himself. Surely a sick or wounded man on any ordinary passenger ship cannot be anything like as comfortable or so well cared for as if he were on a hospital ship, whether transport or stationary.

AND what does Mr. Wyndham tell us about the deficiency of nurses during the worst period; the attendants who work under these ladies being, it should be mentioned, the trained privates of the Army Medical Staff Corps? He practically ignores it; and he brings into his explanation some totally irrelevant matter about the difficulties in the way of placing non-commissioned officers of the service under the orders of sister nurses, or sister nurses under the orders of non-commissioned officers. What on earth has this got to do with the proportion of nurses to serious cases? Possibly this answer was prepared for Mr. Wyndham by the War Office officials for some other question, and Mr. Wyndham got hold of the wrong answer by mistake.

MR. WYNDHAM brings his explanations to a close with the passage already given—that "after the most careful consideration of the matter he is persuaded that adequate arrangements for the sick and wounded had been made, and that British soldiers were treated on this occasion as they should always be treated." For Mr. Wyndham, therefore, Cairo and Alexandria immediately after the campaign, and also P. and O. passenger ships, afford a model, a pattern, an exemplar of the way in which sick and wounded British soldiers should "always be treated." Therefore, notwithstanding personal regard for Mr. Wyndham, and the recollection of pleasant, if short, association with him in old days, I cannot but express my hope that before the next expedition leaves our shores its medical arrangements may be found not to depend on the fiat of the present Under Secretary of War, but that he may, like his predecessor, have been promoted to another sphere of ministerial power.

As to the share taken in this business by my old friends and military contemporaries, whether at the War Office or in Egypt, I do not care to

inquire; I would leave them to settle their respective shares among themselves. But I should regret to think that in coming forward in this matter, as I have felt it to be my duty to do, I have been animated by a wish for retaliation for a personal loss. Senseless, indeed, would it be to point to any one particular fatal case, and to say that to the non-employment of a hospital ship the result was due; but it seems to be plain common sense to accept the verdict of those military medical officers who, being fully acquainted with the facts, point to the whole mass of the fatal cases, and assert, as they do, that of those who were lost many by proper arrangements would have been saved.

BEING one of the very few who not only know the facts but are able to speak, I have felt it my duty not to be silent. In conclusion, I may say that I fail to find in Mr. Wyndham's involved, self-contradictory, and laboured explanations any reasons for withdrawing one word of my letter of February 17th. The public generally may perhaps be unable to decide between us; the service knows which of us is right. But, still, I am inclined to believe that the War Office will think twice before they refuse a hospital ship again."

COLONEL LONSDALE HALE, in our opinion, deserves the thanks of the public, of the sick soldier, and of the Army Nursing Service for his out-spoken comments on the Soudan "mistake."

THE fifteenth annual meeting of the South London District Nursing Association was held last Saturday at 13, Carlton House Terrace, by the kind permission of Sir Edward and Lady Durning-Lawrence. Sir E. Durning Lawrence who presided, in moving the adoption of the Report, made an earnest appeal for assistance to enable the Association to carry on its good work, which really helped the poor to help themselves. A nurse carried no doles in her hand, but she took what was far more valuable, the benefits of highly trained skill, and womanly kindness and sympathy. Bishop Barry seconded the adoption of the motion and spoke of the economical way in which the work of the Association was carried on, and of the good work done by district nurses in dispelling ignorance amongst the poor, who were frequently unacquainted with the most elementary sanitary laws, and the most elementary principles of the treatment of disease. Sir William Broadbent, Mrs. Garrett Anderson, the Rev. A. Jephson, and others also spoke in support of the work done by the Home.

AN anonymous donor in the Riviera has just sent to the Hon. Chief Secretary of the Church

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)