

[We should much like to give prominence to the views of others on this question of free trade in nursing. America has set a fine example in the past in this matter. Some of the leaders in American nursing are Canadians (British subjects) others of German and Dutch extraction. Our own nursing world is overcrowded, but only by free trade amongst the "unfits." With no educational standards, and no State Registration, the increasing demand for nurses is sure to result as it has in the past decade, in a decided decrease in the general efficiency. If after a few months' training a woman can command the three years trained nurses' fees, who is going to blame her for taking them? Trained nurses are themselves entirely to blame, for their apathy and selfishness in failing to demand with sufficient force that their training and conditions of work shall be just.—Ed.]

A CURIOUS COINCIDENCE.

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

DEAR MADAM,—A correspondent, whose letter (signed "A Worm who has Turned") appears in your last issue, has been misled by a similarity of names into an unintentional injustice, which I am sure you will kindly allow me to correct. She evidently believes the Miss Beatrice Mary Chamberlain, who attended the meeting of the Nurses' Hostel Company, Ltd., and spoke and voted as a shareholder, to be the same person with the Miss B. Chamberlain, who a few days later was appointed Superintendent by the Directors. So far is this from being the case that I, the shareholder, am not even, I believe, distantly related to the Superintendent; I have never met her and do not know now whether we have the same Christian name as well as a not uncommon surname.

On hearing that a namesake of mine had been working at the Hostel, I asked to see her and found that she was not in the building, having considered it right to absent herself from the Hostel during the whole time of the meeting, probably to avoid any suggestion of the offence which my presence seems unfortunately to have given. I regret that your correspondent should have disliked my manner, but am not without hopes that it may appear to her more suitable in a shareholder than in an official. At all events it is not fair that Miss B. Chamberlain should have to endorse the responsibility of my misdeeds, and I am sure you will permit me to clear her.

Thanking you accordingly,

I remain, yours obediently,

BEATRICE MARY CHAMBERLAIN.

Highbury, Moor Green,
Birmingham.

[We are glad to learn that the Miss Chamberlain, whose attitude created an unfavourable impression at the shareholders' meeting of the Nurses' Hostel Company, Ltd., is not the new Superintendent as reported by one of our correspondents. The truth is that the visitors at the Hostel have suffered so much in the past from lack of courtesy on the part of the officials that they are naturally very sensitive on this particular point.—Ed.]

IS IT TRUE?

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

DEAR MADAM,—I think we must grant that "Marssets" has some truth on her side or why should we have still so many nurses standing on one side instead of throwing all their weight against the obstacles raised against State Registration? But where does the fault lie? I say with the parents of the girls who will spend half their income to fit the boys for their struggle with the world and at the same time very often deprive their girls of even a decent smattering of education. Is it to be supposed that three years' training can not only fit these girls to act as nurses, but make up the deficiencies of their eighteen or twenty earlier years? When parents realise that their girls need as good preparation for their futures as the boys then we shall probably find as many brainy women as men, possibly more!

The absurd idea that education is wasted if a woman gets married must be swept away entirely, for education is necessary for both motherhood and nursing.—I am, faithfully yours,
"EMBER."

THE CARE OF THE DEAD.

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

DEAR MADAM,—In connection with the care of the dead, may I point out that it is quite easy for any two persons to move an average body from a bed to a shell if one stands at the head and takes the body under the shoulders (of course, supporting the head), and the other takes the feet. It seems to me the simplest method. I hardly understand how a body can conveniently be moved by means of towels placed underneath it, as described by Miss Burr, because one is confronted by the difficulty, if the shell is placed by the side of the bed, of having the bed between one of the persons holding the towels and the shell, surely a most awkward position.

Neither can one get over the difficulty by describing a quarter or half circle, a method very useful in moving a helpless patient, because, in that case, if two nurses move the patient both are on the same side, whereas if towels are used as described there is bound to be a person on both sides.

In regard to undertakers it is unsafe to generalise about any large section of the community. Some are everything that can be desired, the important point is, I think to employ a reputable firm.

That some firms hardly merit this title is evidenced by the fact that a section of the Southwark undertakers recently arranged to send a deputation to the Board of Guardians with a view to securing its co-operation in a determined effort to put an end to the touting for funerals at present practised, and at a meeting of that Board the Mayor of the Borough stated that without doubt a system of "body snatching" is practised. At the same meeting an instance was given by another guardian of an undertaker who had secured a body, and who would not give it up to a rival who had secured the funeral order. Clearly, therefore, there is room for improvement in some directions in the ranks of undertakers. It is stated that so active are the undertakers' agents in connection with hospitals and in-

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)