

always irresponsible, of the *few who are doing our work*. I repeat emphatically, and wish it might be printed in red letters, *the few who are doing our work*. Are these few, or have they ever been, exempt from paying their dues too? Have they ever been women of leisure? What return have the rank and file of us ever given them but scant courtesy and scantier thanks? I have seen a letter from a member who wrote of the delay and annoyance she had experienced by a mislaid letter to the society in which she expressed herself so caustically of an overworked officer that it was an insult. Knowing the circumstances, I could not help contrasting the two individuals, one giving every spare minute from a busy life to the society, at the same time enduring endless annoyance without complaint, and the other, as far as I can learn, has never lifted a finger to do any work for the society, but cannot endure one annoyance but she must needs heap indignity upon the head of the offender. When we pay our officers for their work we may have the right to regulate them, but so long as we demand that such service and such self-denial shall be given gratuitously, we had better spend our time giving thanks that Providence has given us *a faithful few to do our work without money or without price*.

"We do not mean to do harm, but most of us offend through sheer thoughtlessness, thus making office-holding so unappreciated and thankless a task that we must fairly go on our knees to beg members to serve.

"We are just beginning a new year, with many new officers, and I believe that new leaves turned November 1st are quite as good as if postponed to January 1st. As an older woman, an older nurse, and one of the oldest members, I beg your help, your consideration, and your sympathy for *the few who are doing our work*."

Legal Matters.

IS A NURSING HOME A NUISANCE?

It will be remembered that in February last an action was brought against the Parkfield Nursing Home, Ltd., Liverpool, of which Dr. Stukes was sole director, to restrain the proposed use of the premises, which it was the object of the company to carry on as a Nursing Home for medical, surgical, and obstetric purposes, on the ground that it would be a breach of the covenant in the conveyance.

A number of the residents on the estate objected to the Home on account of the possibility of infection being brought to the neighbourhood, and because they did not like to have people suffering from serious diseases brought near to their houses or to see a number of convalescents walking about the road. The case was tried before the Vice-Chancellor of the County Palatine of Lancaster, who dismissed the action, as he did not consider the objections reasonable. From that order the plaintiffs—John Mary Ten Bosch, Harold Chaloner Dowdall, and Elizabeth Dowdall—appealed, and the appeal was heard before Lords Justice Vaughan-Williams, Stirling, and Cozens-Hardy.

Mr. Lawrence, K.C., for the respondent, argued that the Vice-Chancellor was right. Nursing Homes were carried on under the best sanitary conditions, and were much quieter than ordinary houses where there were children. Most of the plaintiffs' witnesses admitted in the witness-box that they did not know exactly what a Nursing Home was. Some thought they would see funerals go by every day, and others that there would be parades of nurses and invalids wheeled about.

Lord Justice Stirling thought there was more risk in living next door to a school full of children, liable to have infectious disease, than next door to a Home of this kind, kept under medical supervision.

The appeal was dismissed.

THE RESPONSIBILITY OF NURSES.

An inquest was held last week into the circumstances of the sudden death of a child at the Royal Alexandra Hospital, Brighton.

The mother said she was told when the child was admitted on Monday afternoon that an immediate operation was necessary. No operation was performed, and the child died on Tuesday morning.

Nurse Florence Ward said she noticed serious symptoms in the child about 5.45. She called the senior night nurse, and, when she came, went for the Sister. The child died at 6.25.

Miss Pauline Stewart, the Sister, said she was summoned to the child at 6.25. When she arrived it was dead. She tried all the restoratives she could think of, but only to satisfy herself as the child was dead. In reply to a question as to whether it was not someone's duty to summon the house surgeon when a child was dying, the witness said it was not always done.

The Coroner said it was an improper thing for her to take that responsibility on her shoulders. She should not have taken upon herself to say whether the child was dead.

Medical evidence showed that death had resulted from suffocation from an enlarged gland, which pressed on the windpipe and obstructed the breathing. He did not think the child was in a serious condition when it came in. He saw it twice on Monday evening.

The Coroner said that there had been a serious dereliction of duty on the part of the nurse in charge of the child in not informing the house surgeon when serious symptoms occurred. That ought to be done in every case, and the nurses should not take upon themselves such a responsibility. Then parents, and the public, would be satisfied in knowing that everything was done for the children that could possibly be done.

The jury returned a verdict of "death from natural causes," and added a rider to the effect that the house surgeon should be summoned at once in every case where serious symptoms were apparent.

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)