

ditch), Miss Minter (Bethnal Green Schools). A vote of thanks was moved to Mr. Eustace Miles by Dr. Moore, Medical Superintendent of Chelsea Infirmary, seconded by Miss Wesley, Matron of the Infirmary of St. George's-in-the-East.

The strong consensus of professional opinion is in favour of some form of preliminary training for nurses. We should divide the education of a nurse into three defined stages: preliminary, in central colleges for the sake of economy; clinical, in hospital wards; and a post-graduate course, again in a central school, for those nurses who wish to qualify for teaching and superintending posts in hospitals and nursing schools.

But lack of funds blocks the way; parents apparently have a rooted dislike to pay the necessary educational fees for qualifying daughters to earn their bread, and the training-schools for nurses have thus been overcrowded in the past with applicants, as hospitals have without fee "taken them in and done for them." All this is radically wrong; but until such time as parents are compelled to realise their responsibilities to daughters as well as sons, things are likely to "muddle along."

We regret to learn from Miss Maud Banfield's monthly report of the Hospital Economics Course at Teachers' College, New York, that the good work is cramped for want of funds. One admires the pluck of the American Matrons in organising and so far financing this most valuable educational course, but without a just endowment we fear progress cannot be made. It will be the same if such work is attempted in this country; funds must be forthcoming to give the work a start.

The tenth annual conference of Affiliated Benefit Nursing Associations for the supply of cottage nurses on the Holt-Ockley system was last week presided over by Lord Ancaster. One of the evils which has arisen in connection with nursing during the last ten years is the inauguration of "nursing" associations in connection with which the standard of professional education demanded is fixed by committees of aristocratic persons, who work these so-called nurses for pittance which they would not dream of offering to their own maids. These committees also accept women with little general education; they, indeed, would find it difficult to get others. That women of this class are useful in cottages to scrub and clean and cook we do not for a moment wish to deny. They are useful cottage helps. But they are a source of danger to the sick when they assume the title and the uniform of trained nurses, and those who give them the name without requiring of them the necessary knowledge are not only doing an injury to the sick of the working classes, but are disregarding the honour

due to the women who have conscientiously qualified themselves for the responsible work of nursing. The lives of the sick poor are too valuable to play with. Let society women adopt a less dangerous pastime.

Dr. Dabbs, the editor of *Vectis*, dealing in that journal, under the heading "The Sick Room," with the various persons concerned in it, devotes a chapter to "The Nurse." In this connection he says:—

"It is true that with the multiplication of nursing homes, surgical homes, central nursing establishments for the supply of nurses—the demand and supply for ever shifting and variable—it is true, I say, that the risk of incompetent people being sent out is, at least, not lessening, but there is gradually 'arriving' a legitimate system of what may be called scheduling nurses, and this will be more and more a custom as it is recognised as a protection and necessity. For the honour and glory of the great profession of nursing, the names, antecedents, qualifications, characters, references, special talents, and specific tendencies of work must come to be more and more a systematised record. We ought to be able—just as in the case of a doctor—to turn to a directory and ascertain something about those we employ. The information may be crystallised brevity, but it may be also the condensation of accuracy. And not only that, but the very fact of a kept and published record being the custom of the nursing cult would be a satisfaction to those who have to administer in the sick-room, and a guarantee as to the desire of the great and glorious Sisterhood to keep their ranks 'well dressed.' A doctor who practised—and practised in a large way—in the year 1842, and at Woolwich—that was his zenith-date, or about then—told me that in his day, when you could get a nurse to come at all, you always sought to ascertain 'if she drank much'; it never occurred to you to ask 'if she was strictly sober.' The formula often seals the fact, and if this interrogatory be a true version of the medical past, its changed form to-day is an eloquent testimony to sick-room 'betterment.'"

Dealing further with the need for scrupulous conduct and a sense of honour in the trained nurse, the writer says:—

"Nobly, as a rule, as her precaution part of honourable silence is observed, the guarantees are, at present and without a system of proper registration, insufficient. There is too large a loop-hole by which abuses may creep in. And the good modern nurse deserves too well of us to be left—as to her future—to the cold 'chance of chance.' The plain purpose and duty of those who respect her and her work is to back up those who are seeking to make her profession a registered calling, and heighten the tests of knowledge and the claims of professional erudition, and to place upon a proper basis alike the increment of her wage and possible results of saving habits in the financial protection—by pension—of inevitable and perhaps premature old age. . . . Registration is becoming imperative, for there has arisen in the land in the last few years a pseudo-development of so-

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)