

place, we must show what the editor of our contemporary considers the literary diet suitable for Nurses. But upon this case of Nurse Finns he has written a paragraph which we could never have believed, if we had not read it in print with our own eyes. It is as follows:—"A Brave Nurse.—We are delighted to hear that Nurse Finnis (*sic*), whose heroic conduct met with such approval lately, has not suffered from her unselfish deed, but is enjoying good health. Those captious critics who find fault everywhere, and accused Nurse Finnis of encountering unwarrantable risk, may hide their diminished heads. *On the authority of the Matron of the hospital we learn that Nurse Finnis DID NOT SUCK THE TUBE, BUT BLEW VIOLENTLY DOWN IT, AND SO CLEARED IT* (the italics are ours); nor was her devotion only momentary. For two days and nearly two nights she scarcely left the child's side, and did all she could to prolong life. Hers was the heroism which faces long days of little duties, and yet does not fall short when a great deed is demanded. There are few of whom the same can be said, and those who are disposed to cavil as to the right of facing such risk had better consider and be silent."

The matter is too serious for amusement at the grammatical errors, or bombastic nonsense of the paragraph. Here is a statement made in a journal devoted, according to its own assertion, to Medicine and Nursing, which is either true or untrue. Which is it? We presume it to be true. Then it imputes to "the Matron of the hospital" an assertion that one of her subordinates committed an action which can only be construed as being grossly ignorant. In all our experience, we never remember to have seen such an announcement made in the pages of a public paper, and we actually now turn to the article, and read it again word by word, solemnly and carefully, to assure ourselves that our powers of vision are unimpaired. "*On the authority of the Matron of the hospital we learn that Nurse Finnis did not suck the tube, but blew violently down it, and so cleared it.*" Every medical man, every Trained Nurse, every professional person, journalistic or not, must know what that means. A child, sore-stricken with a dreadful disease, lying in bed with a tube in its windpipe, through which it breathes and expels the mucus excreted from its air passages; a plug of this thick, tenacious material, partly or wholly blocks the inner canula. Instead of unhooking, withdrawing, clearing, and replacing this, what is asserted to have happened? The grossest ignorance appears to have been displayed. The Nurse "blew violently down the tube, and so cleared it." Think of it. The full force of a grown woman's expiratory power, all the impure air from her own lungs, propelled "violently" straight into a child's chest! What would happen in such a case? the child, be it remembered, being on the point of choking, from the clogging of the tube. The

mucus plug would be forced back again into the air passages, and all the other secretions in the way along with it, till it reached a division too small to allow its further progress. There it would become fixed, and would prevent, of course, any air passing into that portion of the lung beyond the plug. By so much, therefore, would the child be deprived of breathing power, that portion of the lung becoming practically useless, and dead. Imagine the "violent blowing" impure air along every air-passage, except that which it had succeeded in plugging—choking up altogether; "violently" distending every remaining air-cell; "violently" expanding the whole of both lungs; "violently" pressing open the chest; "violently" pressing outwards upon nerves, and even upon the heart itself.

But beyond the ignorance there is a graver fact. No one can for one moment hesitate to acknowledge, that such an insensate proceeding must destroy the chances of recovery, in cases of this description. Such being the case, it is our duty to ask once more, Is this statement true? If true, we commend, to the most earnest notice of every Nurse in the United Kingdom, the fact that our contemporary has, apparently airily, with an evident lack of medical and professional knowledge, allowed such an action to pass without promptly criticising its utter inadvisability. Will it be pleaded that the writer, and the editor of this "weekly institutional journal for Medicine, Nursing," &c., &c., were unaware of the danger of the fact they have narrated—were, in very truth, hopelessly innocent of the commonest knowledge of Nursing? To that we would reply, Ignorance is no excuse. They pretend to support and assist Nurses, and yet, *quite unnecessarily*, publish broadcast, a fact which reflects discredit upon the calling of Nursing. If the paragraph has been inserted in ignorance, the only recompense they can make is at once, and for ever, to abandon any future claim to the confidence of Nurses. But we cannot but hope, from the bottom of our heart, that the whole statement is simply another evidence of the ridiculous thoughtlessness so frequently displayed by our contemporary.

We most earnestly hope that "the Matron of the hospital" and Nurse Finns will take the earliest possible steps to prove that she really "sucked the tube clear," and did not "blow violently down it." In that case we should be delighted once more to congratulate her on her plucky deed.

IT is with much pleasure that we are able to announce an increase to twenty-four pages, commencing with this, our issue of to-day, and we cannot help feeling and expressing gratification at the results so far proving so practically expressive of the cordial support we have received from our

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)