

WE learn from a contemporary that "Lady William Lennox's concert in aid of the Royal British Nurses' Association was attended by few, if any, well known people, although the playing of the Ladies' Amateur Orchestra (conducted by Lady William herself) was excellent." We think that the officials of the Association would be better employed in reducing the expenses of the Association to a limit which is covered by its reliable income, than by holding it up as an object of charity to the kindly disposed. But it must be rather difficult now-a-days, we imagine, to know what is the reliable income of the Association. During the past week alone we have heard from two matrons, one being the matron of a large London Hospital, and the other of an important provincial one. The first told us that she had received a request for her subscription for the current year, and had put it into the fire. The second, that she had not paid her subscription, and so thoroughly disapproves of the present management that she does not think she shall pay another. Both ladies have been members of the Association from its inception, and have worked ungrudgingly for its welfare. The officials can scarcely expect that thinking women will pay money to enable the honorary officers to carry on the policy which they have inaugurated. Hence, we suppose, this appeal, *in formâ pauperis*.

* * *

A SOMEWHAT novel argument against the employment of district nurses was recently put forward at a meeting at Surbiton, namely, that "the poor nursed the poor, and that they did not want any trained nurse." It is greatly to the credit of the poor, who are proverbially kind to neighbours in trouble, that this argument can be put forward with any show of reason. At the same time we cannot concede that the responsibility which devolves upon those who are "rich in this world's goods" to provide *skilled* nursing, for those unable to obtain it for themselves, is in any way lessened, or that the poor should be expected to give gratuitously, services for which those in a higher rank of life would expect to be paid.

* * *

A CHARGE NURSE is required for the Birkenhead Workhouse Infirmary of 240 beds, and the Workhouse Committee recommended that one be advertised for at a salary of £30 per annum. There is a wise regulation in force in this Infirmary that no nurse can receive a certificate until she has undergone three years' training, and that then she can only become an assistant nurse, from which class, charge nurses are appointed. Upon the recommendation of the Workhouse Committee that a charge nurse should be advertised for, certain of the Guar-

dians proposed an amendment that the report should be referred back, and strongly urged the appointment of Nurse Ellis. Nurse Ellis is a probationer of less than two years' experience, and twenty-two years of age. It was stated by her supporters that "Nurse Ellis had passed an examination for the position very creditably, and that she was of exceptional ability." This may be so, but we cannot but think that, granting the exceptional ability, it would be unwise to curtail the period of training for this reason, and that it would be preferable in every way for the charge nurse of an Infirmary of this size to be an older person than Nurse Ellis, and one who has had at least the three years' experience, now universally acknowledged as being the shortest period in which an adequate training can be received. We entirely agree with Dr. Martin, who said: "Mere examinations alone were not a sufficient test of capacity. Nurse Ellis had very little experience, and was only 22 years of age. The test of practical experience was the best of all tests, and she was practically only a probationer in nursing, to appoint whom over an infirmary of 240 beds was a very serious matter. It was a duty to the patients and to the public that an experienced nurse should be appointed to such a post." Ultimately, the matter was referred back to the Workhouse Committee for further consideration.

* * *

THE following letter has been addressed to the local press by the Senior Surgeon of the Guest Hospital, Dudley:—

"Sir,—In your last issue there is the report of an inquest held on a Guest Hospital patient named Thomas Worley. In reply to the Coroner, Mrs. Worley is reported to have said, 'that the doctors did not prohibit his going from the hospital home, nor did they say that he was not fit to be taken home,' and a complaint was at the same time preferred against the hospital nurses for want of kindness. With regard to the first statement, if your representative has correctly reported what was said, it seems that Mrs. Worley must have knowingly told a deliberate falsehood. I myself saw Worley the day he went home, and he told me he would go home because he had a good wife and she wanted him at home. I told him that he would probably lose his life if he got up out of bed and went home, and so certain was I that his death would ensue from his misguided action, that I instructed our house-surgeon to see that his wife signed a paper stating that he left the hospital against our wishes and advice, thereby relieving us from all responsibility. The paper she signed contained the following words:—'I declare that I am taking my husband, Thomas Worley, out of the hospital against advice.' It appears that the responsibility for this poor man's death, therefore, lies to a great extent at his wife's door, and she naturally wishes to shift it elsewhere. After the want of truth exhibited in the first statement, and knowing, as I do, the three nurses,

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)