

This—as, indeed, are many other statements in this document—is as untrue as it is impertinent. But here we find that Miss Lückes acknowledges that complaints against nurses are heard “on every hand,” and yet by every means in her power she is attempting to prevent the public from being protected from these incompetent persons.

The allusions to “quacks” reminds us that, at the meeting of the International Council of Nurses at Berlin, will meet in conference numbers of trained nurses, many of whom from the States will be legally recognised “Registered Nurses.” Will they condescend to consult with us—the unregistered—who now must rank as “quacks” until we obtain legal status by Act of Parliament? It is an interesting question.

A correspondent informs us that official influence is being used at the London Hospital to have the nursing staff sign the anti-Registration manifesto, and that those who objected to sign, pleading that they did not understand the question, were told that as the Chairman and Matron had signed it was sufficient reason for the nurses to do likewise.

We have no doubt the majority of the staff will appreciate this form of reasoning, as they did at the time of the inquiry by the Lords Committee in 1891, when, with a few valiant exceptions, they signed a document in support of a condition of affairs which it has required £250,000 to reform.

Dr. J. H. Bryant, Lecturer to Nurses at Guy's Hospital, reported to the Bethnal Green Guardians he had examined the probationers from Bethnal Green Infirmary, and he was pleased to report a satisfactory result. Thirty-six obtained the necessary number of marks to pass the examination. Three probationers gained 75 per cent. of the possible number of marks. Eighteen probationers obtained 50 per cent., and eight obtained the necessary number of marks to pass. Three failed. Although none of the probationers qualified for the gold medal, the result of the examination was, on the whole, more satisfactory even than it was last year, for three, instead of two, obtained 75 per cent., and eighteen instead of sixteen obtained over 50 per cent. of the possible marks, and only three, as last year, were referred. Judging from the style of the papers, the examiner had no hesitation in saying the general education of the candidates was gradually improving year by year. From observations made during the oral examination, he came to the conclusion that they had been carefully and intelligently taught, that they had obtained a clear and practical knowledge of their work, and that they were well suited in every respect to enter the nursing profession.

It is presumable that the nurses in this infirmary

are subjected to a theoretical examination only, and are awarded their certificates upon the recommendation of one medical man. This does not appear to us to be thorough or fair. Nurses should be examined in *practical nursing* by a trained nurse. It is extraordinary that the anti-Registrationists in tilting at windmills appear to ignore the theoretical basis of all nurses' exams, as at present conducted. As far as we can judge, the majority of certificates are awarded after a purely theoretical examination, and all the arguments used by Miss Lückes against examination by a Central Conjoint Board of medical men and Matrons are applicable to the system at present in force. The evils she professes to anticipate would be removed, not inaugurated, by such a Conjoint Board.

At a meeting of the Long Ashton Board of Guardians the Chairman announced that he had received a letter from Nurse Fry, who has been filling the post of head nurse, stating that she was hardly inclined to take the salary of nurse for her personal use, but, in talking with her since he received the letter, she had come to the conclusion that she would like the salary to be paid, and she proposed to invest the salary in some necessary things that might be required for the comfort of the sick in the infirmary. It seemed to be a kind thought of hers. He proposed that the salary be paid to Miss Fry, to be used as she thought fit.

The circumstances of the death of a patient in the Kingston Union Infirmary, who was admitted with double pleurisy, and pneumonia of the right lung, at 4.35; and who died at 7.45 on the same day, were investigated recently at an inquest held by Dr. M. H. Taylor, J.P. In the course of the evidence, Dr. Armstrong, who saw the patient on admission, said that “on examination he came to the conclusion that the man could not live through the night. . . . In his opinion the man was quite able to walk into the ward.”

The inquest was held as the Matron, Miss J. A. Smith, told the porter who accompanied the deceased man to the ward that he should not have allowed the patient to walk to the ward; he should have been carried up. Miss Smith, in her evidence, stated that she told the out-porter that he should have carried the man to the ward, according to the orders he had received the previous week. When the porter said that the doctor and steward were present at the man's admission she replied, “I cannot help that; the order is that the patients be carried into the ward.” If this is the rule of the infirmary—and it is an exceedingly wise one—the Matron would not have been performing her duty to the Guardians or to the sick if she had not impressed on the porter that it must be carried out. Certainly the speedy death of the patient, together with the

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)