

tration, in asylums for the insane and special hospitals? The supply at present is by no means super-abundant, and a more restrictive training and longer term of service will materially decrease the supply. I have read with interest Mr. Douglas Bryan's scheme and the correspondence which it has aroused. But we must not lose sight of the practical and industrial aspect of the case.

Frankly, is it worth it? That is, is a four years' course at low pay likely to attract well-educated women at the present remuneration given to certificated nurses? I doubt it. Salaries of all classes have gone up during the last decade, and more efficient nurses means higher salaries for them as a class. One often wonders how they manage on the present scale of pay.

Yours truly,  
ECONOMIST.

To the Editor of the "British Journal of Nursing."

DEAR MADAM,—In relation to Mr. Bryan's scheme, may I be allowed to record my strong conviction that in connection with the examination of nurses there should be a certain standard required of all nurses before they are allowed to describe themselves as "trained." They should be required to produce evidence of systematic training in medical, surgical, and gynaecological nursing in institutions recognised as teaching schools by the Central Nursing Board—not necessarily in the same hospital—for a period of at least three years. If they do not satisfy the examiners in these subjects, then they should not be entitled to the diploma or certificate of a trained nurse. But I see no reason why they should not be examined in other specialties also; one nurse, for instance, might take fever nursing, another maternity nursing, another massage, and so on. One or more of these could certainly be included in a systematically-arranged three years' course, and the training-schools would be encouraged to arrange for instruction in extra subjects if acquaintance with them meant extra marks to their pupils, and consequently gained them a better position in the class lists. At present a training-school has little incentive to give its pupils anything but the minimum amount of instruction, that is to say, training in medical and surgical nursing, and partial at that, for who is competent in medical nursing who is not experienced in nursing enteric and diphtheria, and cases of this nature are drifting more and more to the fever hospitals? The consequence is that a nurse who holds a three years' certificate from a large training-school is (1) a very partially-trained person indeed, and (2) convinced that there is no position in the nursing world to which she is not equal!

Nurses who hold the minimum certificate should be allowed to go up subsequently for examinations in special subjects, and thus to add to their qualifications. In the case of those who aspire to the Honour List, a feasible scheme would be that, like undergraduates who are "reading for honours," they should defer going up for their certificate, say, for another year. In the fourth year they could take up three or four special branches of work, and, as they would receive additional marks for each paper taken, they would have a good chance of accumulating a sufficient number to entitle them to a place in the Honour List. Ah! if obstructionists did not bar the way, how efficient the training of nurses, and consequently the care of

the sick, might become in a few short years. Nothing makes one more heart-sick than to know that while we are waiting for the legislation and organisation of our profession, so long deferred, all over the country the sick are suffering needless pain, some are maimed for life, and others, again, lose life itself because of the inadequate nursing attention they receive. Longing for the day when a minimum amount of knowledge will be required by law of every woman who describes herself as a trained nurse,

I am, dear Madam,  
Yours faithfully,  
REGISTRATIONIST.

[The letters on this subject in our present issue conclude those we have in hand. We hope Mr. Bryan will be kind enough to reply to the points raised in this interesting correspondence.—Ed.]

#### SHOULD NURSES IN UNIFORM KISS IN PUBLIC?

To the Editor of the "British Journal of Nursing."

DEAR MADAM,—To the above question—certainly not! Kissing in public—it don't matter who—savours of gush, and one associates such emotional exuberance with the warm-blooded Latin races, but not with the stolid Britisher. Women, whether in uniform or not, will do well to avoid gush at all times, especially in the streets.—Yours,  
A CLUBWOMAN.

#### BRIGHTON NURSING HOMES.

To the Editor of the "British Journal of Nursing."

DEAR MADAM,—The writer of a letter signed "An Invalid," expressing opinions none too flattering of Brighton nurses—as seen on the Front—might include other fashionable seaside places in her criticisms, for untidy, flighty-looking young women in nursing uniform abound at them all. Many of these nurses are attached to so-called Nursing Homes just for the season, and as far as I can gather there is no fixed standard of training demanded. One wonders how all these uneducated girls get what training they have—surely there can be no educational standard in the majority of hospitals, or they would never be admitted. It seems to me the nursing world is going down. I don't recollect seeing about the same type of women wearing uniform, even ten years ago, as I meet everywhere to-day. Many bonnets and cloaks are a disgrace—discoloured, dusty, dirty, and only fit for the rag-bag. Cannot anything be done to inculcate self-respect in nurses? None of my maids would go out such shabby frights.

Yours truly,  
A FRIEND.

#### IS IT FAIR?

To the Editor of the "British Journal of Nursing."

DEAR MADAM,—On more than one occasion, in answer to an advertisement, I have been a selected candidate for a Matronship, taken a long journey, been inspected, and returned empty. In other words, when at the institution I have learned that the election is a foregone conclusion, as the post has been practically promised to a local candidate. Would it not be kinder to numberless applicants for hospital Matronships if the post were not advertised at all? It would save much worry and disappointment.

Yours truly,  
RETURNED EMPTY.

[This is a difficult question, as the constitution of

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)