



Letters to the Editor.

Notes, Queries, &c.

Whilst cordially inviting communications upon all subjects for these columns, we wish it to be distinctly understood that we do not IN ANY WAY hold ourselves responsible for the opinions expressed by our correspondents.

TRAINING IN CHILDREN'S HOSPITALS.

To the Editor of "The Nursing Record."

MADAM,—To the first question raised by your correspondent "Sister Louise," viz., "Can a Nurse who has been trained only in the wards of a Children's Hospital, be considered a thoroughly trained Nurse?" I should certainly answer "No."

No theoretical teaching, however excellent, can make up for a want of practical teaching and practical experience.

Another question which your correspondent's letter suggests is, "Should a Nurse, trained in a Children's Hospital and with no adult training, be made a Sister in that Hospital?" I should reply "Certainly not," and for two reasons: First, the rank of Hospital Sister is, and should be, considered to be a high one, and open only to those who have gone through a full training, both in a Children's and a General Hospital; secondly, it seems to me an unwise and undesirable system, to give even a Staff Nurse the position and authority of a Sister in the Hospital where she has lately worked as a subordinate. To promote a non-commissioned officer in his own regiment is, unless he is endowed with exceptional tact and judgment, to place him in an awkward and difficult position, and the same objection holds good, I should think, in the case of a Hospital Nurse.

Perhaps I may be permitted to offer an opinion on another point, though it does not concern the question raised by your correspondent. The rule of the Queen's Jubilee Institute is, to insist on a candidate for admission having had three, or at least two years of training in a general Hospital. This is, broadly speaking, an excellent rule, but perhaps some modification of it might be arranged in the case of a Staff Nurse in a Children's Hospital who wishes to join the Institute—I am supposing that she holds a three years' certificate from her Hospital, and also a satisfactory recommendation from her Matron. So many qualifications besides that of being a good and well trained Nurse are required to make a good District Nurse, that I think the door might be opened a little wider to admit an applicant from a Children's Hospital, provided she is thoroughly suitable in other respects. In her case perhaps one year in a general Hospital might be considered sufficient, and in order fully to test her capabilities the term of trial as a Queen's Probationer might be extended.

The consideration of this question lies, of course, with the Council of the Institute, but there is no harm in suggesting it in connection with other matters relating to Children's Hospitals.

I am, &c.,

KATHARINE M. LUMSDEN,
Hon. Superintendent, Royal Hospital for Sick
Children, Aberdeen; Hon. Secretary of the
Aberdeen District Nursing Association.

To the Editor of "The Nursing Record."

MADAM,—I do not see how opinion can possibly be divided on this question, because it seems so obvious that no Nurse can be considered trained who has had experience with children only. But I am very glad the discussion has been opened in the pages of the NURSING RECORD, because I think a little controversy on professional subjects rouses our pride and interest in our work; and it also tends to make us *think*, and after all that is the most important thing we have to learn; and women especially need to learn how to think out things *for themselves*, and not take matters for granted because somebody in authority "said so" or "thought so."

My chief argument against considering Nurses "trained" who have been only in children's wards is based on a mathematical truth—"that the lesser cannot contain the greater." The lesser is represented by the Nursing of children's diseases, and Nurses who know only the lesser cannot grasp the greater—that is, the broad general grasp of Nursing as a whole. Therefore, to be complete in her knowledge, a Nurse should have two years in a children's, one in an adult, and the final year in special Hospitals.

That the successful nursing of children requires a very special faculty, I at once grant. I have known admirable adult Nurses who seemed completely at sea when called upon to nurse children, and *vice versa*. And just because the nursing of sick children is such a very special branch I would never appoint as Sister in a children's ward any woman—however capable and clever a Nurse she might be—who had not had a special training in a children's Hospital; and in all cases Sisters should be chosen who prefer children to adults. I would go even further, and say that no one should be appointed Matron of a children's Hospital who has not had special training in a children's Hospital.

Truly yours,

SISTER MARY HOOD.

THE FOUNDLING HOSPITAL.

To the Editor of "The Nursing Record."

MADAM,—With reference to a paragraph in "Nursing Echoes" of Saturday last, may I point out that the term "Nurse," as used in the advertisement, applies only to the Superintendent of a dormitory, and it has been used in that sense since the foundation of the Hospital. The Foundling is not a Hospital for sick children, any more than is Christ's Hospital, where the term "Nurse" is similarly applied.

I may state that the trained Nurse of the Infirmary here receives £80 a year.

I am, Madam,

Yours faithfully,

W. S. WINTLE,
Secretary.

Foundling Hospital,
London, W.C.

March 16th, 1896.

[We are pleased to receive this intimation, and should advise for the future that the term "Dormitory Maid," or "Attendant," should be substituted for that of "Nurse."—ED.]

NURSING IN IRELAND.

To the Editor of "The Nursing Record."

DEAR MADAM,—I have read with much surprise and some indignation, the paragraph copied into the

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)