

6. Was a letter dated "*Princess of Wales*, Cape Town, 21st January," sent to the *Isle of Man Examiner*, containing the following statement:—"We have been aboard now since November 21st, and in Cape Town for a fortnight, but owing to a number of repairs, which, we understand, will occupy another ten or twelve days, we have been unable to do any hospital work yet. This one trip will probably cost between £15,000 and £20,000. It is a big sum for bringing home 180 odd patients." And has this statement been proved true, or untrue?
7. Did the *Princess of Wales* arrive at Southampton on Sunday, 25th of February, with her first contingent of wounded, thus taking *ninety-six days*, or close on fourteen weeks, to accomplish the voyage to and from the Cape, or not?
8. Does Lord Wantage consider "that those who have generously contributed to the Red Cross Society, and who are, doubtless, anxious to be assured that their money has been, and is continuing to be, well spent," are justified in feeling any degree of satisfaction in paying for the salaries and for the maintenance of the enormous staff of this hospital ship for *fourteen weeks*, when the work could have been accomplished by an up-to-date steam ship in *five weeks*?

Now, as Lord Wantage has "authoritatively contradicted" our statements in the public press, all that remains is for him to disprove them, in his answers to our simple questions. Can he?

The American Nursing World.

It seems a pity that the Army Nursing Bill now pending before Congress should be discussed with so much excursiveness into side issues. Women, they say, do mostly bring the personal element into their arguments, and, perhaps, this criticism cannot always be refuted.

I heard, the other day, a young sage of sixteen (a boy) proving the existence of Platonic friendship. His arguments were founded on broad basic principles, impersonal and vast. His judicial soul was filled with contempt because "the girls only argued from their own personal experience, and kept on saying the same thing over and over again!"

What, in fact, is the impersonal and abstract truth at the bottom of our splashing sea of words? Just this simple proposition, that a trained nurse should have charge of the work of trained nurses in the army.

Is not this a rational proposition? If not, what is wrong with it?

Let us state some similar propositions and see if they sound equally sensible.

A physician should be in charge of the work of physicians in the army.

A soldier should be in charge of the work of soldiers in the army.

These also sound rational.

Let us turn them about a little, and see if they sound just as well.

A nurse should be in charge of the medical work in the army.

A physician should be in charge of the military work of the army.

A soldier should take charge of the nursing work in the army.

In this form our propositions sound queer. Would there not be a smile of derision if they were urged in serious earnest?

The supporters of the Army Nursing Bill believe that nursing the sick is a piece of work sufficiently specialized, sufficiently technical and exact, sufficiently dignified and important, to warrant its being looked upon as a definite department and to have a nurse at its head. Naturally it would, in some respects, be subordinate to the medical staff, as the medical department is, in some respects, subordinate to the military staff, and as the military staff is subordinate to the Civil Government.

This is the whole issue at point.

The personalities, individual likes and dislikes, prejudices and animosities which have arisen in connection with the Army Nursing Bill, are but incidentals. They have no importance. They will be forgotten.

The principle, on the contrary, will survive. The struggle for right and just organization is not a new one. It has been going on in hospitals, here, in England, and in other places too. It will be kept up.

The Army Nursing Bill may be defeated, but the nursing profession will continue to urge its claims for a rightful share of administration, responsibility and dignity.

L. L. Dock.

The Malarial Microbe.

THE second malarial expedition promoted by the Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine left Liverpool on Wednesday for Old Calabar and South Nigeria. The object is to study the cause, spread, and the treatment of malaria and tropical diseases generally. The expedition consists of Doctors H. E. Annett Elliott (Toronto) and J. E. Dutton. Investigations and experiments will be made in accordance with the mosquito theory of Major Ross. In encouragement of the expedition, the Colonial Secretary wrote, saying he would do all in his power to secure the assistance of Government officials in the West African settlements.

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)