

abundantly justified. We can indeed see no justification for any other course; and we would go further, and express our belief that it behoves Physicians and Surgeons to Hospitals, for their own comfort, as well as for the welfare of the patients committed to their charge, to urge upon their Committees their inherent right to a powerful voice in this matter.

The more the question is examined, the more clear and just does this right appear. We cannot believe that any Hospital Committee would elect a new Physician or Surgeon without first submitting his qualifications for the post to the most careful consideration of the existing Medical Staff, nor that it would elect such an officer at all except on the recommendation of that body. Exactly the same rule is, we believe, of universal application in the case of the elections of the members of the Resident Doctors of a Hospital, one and all of whom are elected on the sole advice of the senior staff. And so again the elections of Dispensers, and of Clinical Clerks, and Dressers, are surely always made entirely under the guidance of the professional authorities best able to judge of their respective qualifications for these several posts. It would be as absurd for a lay Committee to select these workers as it would be for it to attempt to instruct them severally in the preparation of pills, in the taking of pulse tracings, or in the application of plaster of paris bandages. Once more, in few Hospitals, we presume, would the Committee interfere with the Matron in the selection of those women whom she considered most fit to act as her subordinates. It would almost certainly ratify her choice, only reserving to itself its cardinal right of final election in each case. In every department of the Institution the same rule is in force—the selection for a vacant post by those who are best able to judge of the capacity and qualifications of the various candidates for the position. Why, then, we would ask, in the name of the most ordinary common sense, is the same rule not observed in the solitary case of the Matron? We cannot but believe that this anomaly exists because Committees have not yet realised the great professional importance of the Matron to the Medical Staff of a Hospital, and that she is now one of their most important colleagues, and no longer a mere housekeeper, whose identity and whose functions were of equally little importance to them.

We are inclined to lay all the greater stress upon this matter in consequence of reports which we have lately received from different parts of the country, which tend to show that lay managers of Hospitals are becoming aware of the difficulty of choosing a Matron without the advice of their Doctors, and yet have not ventured to break

through the ancient tradition of doing so on their own judgment. In this dilemma it appears that in more than one instance a new departure has been made, which is likely, if continued, to lead to great injustice and even harm. Rather than face the difficulty of selecting one from a large number of candidates, who might, to the lay mind, appear to be all "very much of a muchness," private application is made to the head of some well-known Hospital, who straightway recommends one of the Sisters or Nurses therein employed; and on the bare strength of this stranger's recommendation the vacancy is filled up. Now, it must be admitted by everyone that this system is radically wrong, utterly unfair to Nurses as a class, derogatory to the dignity of the Medical Staff, and very probably damaging to the best interests of the Institution and its patients. It is wrong, because jobbery of any kind is indefensible in a public Institution supported by charitable funds; and to fill one of the most important posts in a Hospital in this "hole and corner" way savours of jobbery of the worst kind, whether it be so or not. It is unfair, because it makes promotion, not the reward of merit, but simply and solely a question of favouritism. It is insulting to the Medical Staff of the Institution, as it clearly implies their incapacity to make choice of a suitable colleague, and moreover forces upon them the nominee of an outsider who may be entirely unfit for the post. It is almost certain to harm the Institution, because to beg and take whatever is given, when everyone else only accepts what he chooses after demanding a wide choice, is a species of humility only explicable by the most grinding poverty, and hopeless and helpless abasement. It is, finally, only common sense to believe that, under such circumstances as these, no Institution is likely to give to another, anyone whose services it values itself; and even if in a burst of generosity it did so, and parted with its best Nurse, is it at all certain that a free and open competition would not have produced an even better candidate? In every way, therefore, the system only needs to be mentioned, to stand self-condemned upon every ground.

FALSE friendship is like the ivy, which decays and ruins the walls it embraces; but true friendship gives new life and animation to the object it supports.

THE DAYS OF YOUTH.—These bright days of youth are the seed-time. Every thought of the intellect, every motion of the heart, every word of the tongue, every principle adopted, every act performed, is a seed whose good or evil fruit will be the bliss or bane of after life.

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)