

### Well-Earned Success.

The annual meeting of the stockholders of the *American Journal of Nursing* Company was held at 299, Henry Street, New York City, on Thursday afternoon, January 15th, at two o'clock. Miss M. E. P. Davis, Miss S. F. Palmer, Miss L. L. Dock, Miss M. M. Riddle, and Miss A. D. Van Kirk were the five directors elected for the ensuing year. A 4 per cent. dividend was declared to all stockholders holding stock before the closing of the books on January 6th, and made payable on April 6th. We congratulate the Company on the financial, literary, and professional success of the Journal.

### Legal Matters.

#### "NEITHER HONOURABLE NOR DELICATE."

At the Brighton County Court, last Friday, his Honour Judge Martineau delivered judgment in the case of *Harley v. Went*, to which we referred last week. His Honour said he did not think he could treat the plaintiff as having assisted the defendant as a professional nurse, as shortly after entering defendant's service she gave up her uniform to the Nurses' Institution, and said she was no longer engaged in that capacity. He had come to the conclusion that he ought to treat her as a domestic servant, when she would be entitled to a month's notice. His Honour then referred to the action of the plaintiff in inducing the defendant to make a will in her favour when she had been in the defendant's service about six weeks. He did not like the conduct of the plaintiff, which was neither honourable nor delicate. A painful feature of the case was that it was alleged the plaintiff had misappropriated a cheque; the money was, however, forthcoming when asked for by the defendant's solicitor. He did not think she had directly or indirectly put a shilling into her own pocket, but believed her assertion that her mistress had given her the cheque. The true cause of her dismissal was that she had obtained the solicitor's dismissal. He had some doubt whether that was not a breach of plaintiff's duty to her mistress, but he had come to the conclusion that there was no active misconduct on the part of the plaintiff to justify her dismissal, and that she was entitled to recover damages. In determining the notice to which she was entitled, he should treat her as a domestic servant, not as a companion, and give her a month's wages in lieu of notice. He also gave her the costs of the action, because there was an imputation of stealing which ought never to have been made.

The s.s. *Sardinia*, which left Cape Town on February 7th, had on board Nursing Sister A. P. Carruthers. She is due at Southampton on March 1st.

### Nursing Echoes.

\* \* \* *All communications must be duly authenticated with name and address, not for publication, but as evidence of good faith, and should be addressed to the Editor, 20, Upper Wimpole Street, W.*



We beg to acknowledge with much gratitude the receipt of a cheque for £5 5s., as a donation to the Sir Julian Goldsmid Nurses' Home of Rest at Brighton, from Mr. C. H. Harrison. We hope Matrons and nurses visiting Brighton will make an opportunity to visit the Home, as we feel sure the Matron, Mrs. McIntyre, will be only too pleased to show them the house—No. 12, Sussex Square—which is so charmingly appointed, and deservedly popular under her régime.

In a supplementary list of signatures to the memorial projected by the Workhouse Infirmary Nursing Association sent to the President of the Local Government Board, protesting against the institution of a semi-trained "qualified nurse," we notice that of Miss Louisa Stevenson, President of the Society for State Registration of Nurses and member of the Board of Management of the Royal Infirmary, Edinburgh; Miss E. S. Haldane, of Edinburgh, is also amongst the signatories.

We are glad to note that the Romford Guardians have decided to present gold watches to two nurses in recognition of their courageous services during the outbreak of small-pox in the district. The epidemic broke out in the workhouse, three cases being treated in the lying-in ward. The watches will cost £15.

After deliberating for two hours the jury sitting on the case of the fifty-one victims of the Colney Hatch Asylum fire returned a verdict condemning the London County Council, the Lunacy Commissioners, and the Home Office, as they considered the building, both in construction and in materials used, was unsuited for the purpose even as a temporary building, and they considered that the authorities named were greatly to blame for sanctioning such plans, especially as the building could have been constructed of non-combustible materials in an equally short space of time.

The jury also made the following recommendations:—

2. That all emergency doors should be made to open outwards.

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)