

Annotations.

FAD-MAD FEMALES.

THERE is a brisk correspondence going on in the columns of the *Daily Mail* concerning the propriety of sending nurses who have been "trained in England, and at English expense," to nurse the wounded in Greece. A letter, which appeared over the name of Arthur F. Hopkirk, M.D., advanced this extraordinary and insular notion, and was promptly answered by Dr. McNaught, who hopes for the credit of the medical profession that there is not another Hopkirk! We entirely agree with Dr. McNaught. One thing is certain, that whether Dr. Hopkirk approves or no, the nurses have gone, and will go to Greece, should need arise, despite his displeasure. Dr. Hopkirk further expresses his disapproval of the humanitarian humbug and "fad-mad females" who instigate nurses to a dereliction of duty. Presumably Dr. Hopkirk's objections apply equally to his medical colleagues who recently left for the seat of war, but he is a bold man if he ventures to suggest that Sir William MacCormac, the President of the Royal College of Surgeons, who selected these gentlemen, is a humanitarian humbug, or a fad-mad male. The fact remains, however, that Mr. Abbott, Resident Assistant-Surgeon at St. Thomas's Hospital, was only able to accept the responsible post of Chief Medical Officer of the *Daily Chronicle* National Fund in Greece by the special permission of the Treasurer of St. Thomas's Hospital. Presumably, therefore, he left many patients to lament his departure. A nurse, in writing to the *Daily Mail*, pertinently remarks, "I repudiate Arthur Hopkirk, M.D.'s assertion that 'nurses in England are trained at English expense,' unless he means that the nurse, being an Englishwoman, is trained at her own expense; this being so, she has a perfect right, as an Englishwoman, to be a free agent as to whom, where, and when, she will serve." We may draw attention to one other fact concerning Arthur F. Hopkirk, M.D., namely, that his name does not appear in this year's "Medical Directory." It would, therefore, be somewhat interesting to know whether Arthur F. Hopkirk is a medical man at all.

IRISH LUNACY ADMINISTRATION.

THE announcement which we make in another column, that the Irish Board of Control in Lunacy has been reconstituted, will be received with universal satisfaction after the facts which have recently come to light concerning the lunacy administration in Ireland.

We learn from *Truth* that the Board of

Control recently sent down two inspectors to investigate a case at the Belfast District Asylum, with reference to the death of a girl named Jane Beggs. The facts are briefly these:—The girl died after being an inmate of the Asylum for sixteen days. At the inquest, it appeared that the sternum and eleven ribs were fractured, and in addition she had scars and bruises. She was also suffering from pleurisy, congestion of the lungs, and pericarditis. The authorities admitted that they did not discover the fractures till the day of her death, and that no complete examination was made during the sixteen days she was in the Asylum. This unfortunate woman was kept in a refractory ward, where there were upwards of eighty other noisy and violent patients. The authorities attempted to prove that the injuries were sustained by the patient before her removal from home, but the coroner's jury returned a verdict that "the injuries were *not* caused at the deceased's residence," though they had not sufficient evidence "to show where or by whom they were inflicted outside the said residence." We cannot see that the authorities would have improved their position had they established their plea, as the state of things in an asylum where a patient could remain for sixteen days in the condition described is almost inconceivable.

Another aspect of the case occurs to us. Presumably the certificate of the Belfast and District Asylum would be considered sufficient to qualify for registration by the Royal British Nurses' Association. We are strongly of opinion that the training received by nurses in this Institution must leave much to be desired, but the officials of the Royal British Nurses' Association may think otherwise.

NURSE, HOUSEMAID, OR ?

WHAT next? The "travellers" in nursing uniform; the creatures who disgrace it in many ways; are known and recognised frauds. But the advertisement columns of the *Standard*, of April 23rd, contained an announcement which we must confess, surprised even us. We have heard of housemaids being sent out by private nursing institutions as trained nurses, but, what the particular duties of the following post are to be, must be left to the imagination. The remuneration shows the person engaged is not expected to be worth anything as a nurse, and little more as a housemaid; and that she is expected to combine the duties of passing a catheter and sweeping the stairs, to our mind speaks volumes of the fate which awaits the unfortunate inmates of this "private hospital."

NURSE-HOUSEMAID for private hospital; age 25 to 30; wages £20; knowledge of catheter an advantage.

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)