

own funds and its income, received, he supposed, from payments in the ordinary course, had supplied what had been lacking. He thought anybody who looked at the condition of things as they were would see what an immense boon was conferred upon those who were in cottages and out-of-the-way villages. Then, in addition to this outside work, a departure, he understood, had been commenced which would result in the provision of accommodation for at least three patients who required a quiet home, a skilled nurse, and appliances and proximity to medical men. He was assured that every consideration was given to the nurses, and the plan was adopted of securing that all the profits made by the Home should go to the advantage and benefit of the nurses themselves. There was nothing reserved out of the profits for the Home itself. We are glad that no profit is to be made out of the Home, because it appears that the nursing of patients who are unable to pay for the services of the nurses is undertaken partially at the expense of the nurses themselves. This principle is, as we have often pointed out, an indefensible one. Nurses are entitled to full remuneration for their work, and nursing on a charitable basis should be supported entirely out of the contributions of the charitable, not by the earnings of women who have to maintain themselves and provide for their old age.

The nurses of the Glasgow and West of Scotland Co-operation of Trained Nurses are under an obligation to Mr. J. Stewart Bannatyne for the somewhat thankless task which he has taken upon himself of pointing out the deficiencies of their new constitution. In the *Lancet* of April 11th appears an able reply by Mr. Bannatyne to Dr. David Newman's letter to which we recently alluded, in the course of which Mr. Bannatyne says:—

“The new constitution, which had not previously been circulated amongst the members, was neither read nor explained to the annual meeting, which was therefore asked to adopt it with shut eyes, and the result was that an amendment for delay was proposed, and, although strenuously opposed by the Executive, supported by the votes of their officials, was carried. Yet Dr. Newman's letter bears that the constitution was ‘submitted’ and that delay was ‘agreed to.’ Some weeks later explanations of the constitution, which were, as above stated, refused by the Executive to a public meeting partly composed of business men, were made privately to four of the 168 nurses.

“At the annual meeting I pointed out, in the presence of the Co-operation's solicitor, that the effect of the new constitution, according to Scots law, was to put the nurses in the position of ‘servants’ and so to render them liable to dismissal without any reason, without any character or reference, and without any share in the Co-operation's funds. The truth of that statement the solicitor did not deny, yet Dr. Newman says that the rights of the nurses have in no way been altered. The ‘comma’ in Rule 2, Clause (o), to

which you refer does not affect the law on the subject of ‘servants,’ but even if it did Rule 5, to which I direct your and Dr. Newman's attention, provides that in the event of the Co-operation being wound up the funds are *not* to be distributed amongst the nurses, but are to be given to some other similar institution. Dr. Newman omits to mention that the nurses who at the annual meeting voted for delay in adopting the constitution subsequently made a written apology to the Executive for doing so. Will he disclose the terms of that apology and whether it was made voluntarily? As the nurses had a right to vote as they chose no apology was necessary, and if the apology was compulsory it throws light upon the ‘unanimity’ with which we are told the constitution was latterly adopted. It seems strange that Dr. Newman should praise so highly an Executive of which he is chairman and also that he should do so in the *Lancet* instead of in the nursing journals which at the time dealt fully with the questions at issue from the nurses' standpoint.

“In conclusion, as I do not wish to trespass further upon your space, I would invite the Executive, if my statements are untrue, to deny them.”

We await the action of the Executive Committee with some curiosity. If it does not refute Mr. Bannatyne's statements, most people will certainly regard them as irrefutable.

A meeting of friends and supporters of the Monkstown Hospital, Co. Dublin, was held in the Barton Ward of the institution on Saturday evening for the purpose of presenting Mrs. Norman, the Matron, with a testimonial of the high appreciation which her services as Head Nurse and Matron have earned during a long period of twenty-five years in those offices. The presentation consisted of an enlarged framed photograph of Mrs. Norman, by Lafayette, an illuminated address, a purse containing a cheque and gold to the amount of £160, and a handsomely-bound album containing names of the 250 subscribers to the testimonial. Dr. Joseph Beatty, F.R.C.S.I., presided, and, addressing Mrs. Norman, said it afforded him the greatest pleasure to be the medium of conveying to her the congratulations of those present and represented there. A service of twenty-five years, during which her duties and responsibilities had steadily grown and increased from day to day, but only to be undertaken and discharged with readiness and efficiency, surely called for some recognition and acknowledgment at their hands, and confident he was that all present would join in tendering her not only on their own behalf, but on that also of very many grateful patients, their warmest and very heartiest thanks. On behalf of those whose names were attached he asked her acceptance of the accompanying purse, portrait, and address as small tokens of their regard and esteem.

An extraordinary case is reported from Vienna of a nurse who was engaged to tend a child who was very ill with typhus fever. While she was putting on a poultice the patient, who was delirious, bit her

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)