

"DEAR EDITOR,—Judging from the tone of several letters in the February issue there are a few wide awake women in our profession who are considering the question of a National Association. It is to be hoped many more will give the subject some thought and attention; local clubs are very good, but they of necessity include only a few members in that immediate vicinity, they undoubtedly are of benefit, both socially and mentally, but why not have an organization of broader scope and of which all clubs would form a part? As it is well known, the tendency of Nurses, after leaving school and entering upon active work, is to neglect each other and devote themselves to work; there may be a clannish feeling among some schools, but when that exists the graduates of that school ignore all other Nurses. Now, Nurses have but little time for social duties, and many say they have less time for reading and study; now, these could be combined by the aid of a good organization. There are many who object to the restrictions in both private and hospital work; many of these difficulties could be adjusted amicably by committees appointed according to the rules of an association, having power given them to transact such business. Many questions could be settled with very little friction. Union and co-operation are the powerful factors which are bringing success in all lines of work demanded by the present times. The progressive Nurse of the future will reap the benefits accruing from organization, and she will wonder why we were so slow. If much of this indifference were thoroughly and carefully analyzed the roots would be found firmly embedded in school jealousy; loyalty is due our school, but instructors should not instill into the minds of their pupils the impression that they above all others were receiving the highest grade of instruction, and they could consider all other schools inferior. A thorough education in any line never results in bigotry. Let us consider this matter as intelligent women should do, not as the pet idea of any one school, but as being a measure which will result in great benefit to graduates of all schools."

A MEMORIAL has been erected in the Chapel of St. Thomas's Hospital in loving memory of Mrs. WARDROPER, who was Matron of the Institution for upwards of 30 years. The memorial is in the form of a beautiful panel, the subject being "The Good Samaritan." The Archbishop of CANTERBURY, who performed the unveiling ceremony, made felicitous allusion to the valuable life-work of the deceased lady, and his simple and dignified eloquence touched a responsive chord in the hearts of his audience.

THE following letter appeared in the *Cambridge Chronicle* of May 5th, with the subjoined comment by the Editor:—

"SIR,—As a visitor in Cambridge I am accustomed to assume that people here would be punctilious about wearing uniform and dress denoting professional status, but I am sorry to see this point of honour disregarded by one of my own sex, and to meet with a lady masquerading in Nurses' uniform without being a Nurse, and without having any claim to the title. I travelled this day to Cambridge in the same railway carriage with a lady dressed *cap à pied* in Nurses' uniform. When she entered the carriage she closed up the window, and, as there was no other opening for ventilation, I concluded that hygiene had not been a strong point in her training. We entered into conversation and I mentioned Addenbrooke's. She had seen the outside of the building, she thought. Perhaps I looked surprised, as she hastened to say she was not a Nurse. She worked with the Wesleyans and was called a Sister. She and others worked amongst the poor, and nursed the sick. She worked for Christ, she added.

Now, Sir, as a trained Nurse, I beg to protest against the possibility of a young woman untrained and not fitted for the work, calling herself a Sister, and attempting, without the necessary qualification, to nurse the poor. "God's Poor" need nursing, alas! too badly, but they should have such nursing as is done for the love of the work, or for mere money, it may be, but certainly not such nursing as this lady tells me is "done for Christ."

I do not doubt but that these ladies are actuated by the best of motives, but I venture to question their methods, and, as a Nurse myself, to tell them that they have no more right to wear a Nurse's dress, and to call themselves "Sister," than they have to wear ecclesiastical lawn and aprons and to call themselves "Rt. Revrend."—Your obedient Servant,  
A MEMBER R.B.N.A.

"A correspondent this week draws attention to a subject which will at once strike all residents in Cambridge—the unwarrantable masquerading of untrained ladies in Nurses' uniform. Our correspondent was naturally much taken aback when she met one of these persons, and gives vent to her feelings in a letter which is none too strong in its condemnation of the practice. We can have no objection to any lady working amongst the poor, no matter for what body she labours, but we have a right to ask that such persons, "Sisters" they are called, shall don a distinctive dress and not appropriate that which belongs to another body, and that one whose members have to undergo a severe course of practical study. Sick Nursing is a thing in itself, and we cannot afford to allow amateurs to step in and possibly by their ignorance bring undeserved blame upon a body of ladies who have proved so ready to give their whole lives to the noble work of tending the sick and suffering."

FROM an excellent leader, in last week's *Queen*, on the Nursing System, we cull the following remarks, and hope that the other women's papers will take up and expose this great abuse:—

"The question now presents itself, What is the recompense that is made to Nurses for the work they perform? What adequate reward is given to them for the long drudgery of their probation and training, and for the risks of their dangerous calling? The only answer that can be given is unsatisfactory in the extreme. Trained and skilled Nurses earn, but not for themselves, considerable sums of money. The usual rate of remuneration varies, according to the nature of the case, from two to three guineas per week—every extra expense, such as washing, travelling, &c., being borne by the patient or the patient's friends. As the lower amount is more frequent than the higher, which is charged always in febrile or infectious cases, their average earnings may be taken at £120 per annum in money, in addition to board and lodging, &c. But it must not be imagined for a moment that the Nurse who earns this money, who has spent years of her life in the dangerous drudgery of her probationary training at a Hospital, for which she has to pay a heavy fee, receives a third, or, in many instances, even a quarter, of this amount. The salaries paid to the Nurses by the Institutions to which they are attached vary from £20 for the first year to £30 for those more experienced, and this is the case alike with Hospitals that sent out Nurses and private Nursing Institutions. We have no desire to attack any one of these establishments individually; it is the entire system that we cannot but regard as one of a most unjust character. It may be asked why the earnings of women in a most perilous

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)