

Miss Martin Leake, who has held the position of Secretary to the Queen's Institute since February, 1896, has been appointed Secretary of the Royal Holloway College for Women, Inglefield Green, Surrey. The Council of the Queen's Institute received her resignation with great regret, and showed their appreciation of her long and able services by presenting her with an illuminated address and a handsome cheque. The Office Staff, past and present, presented her with a revolving bookcase.

We are sorry to note that the Committee of the Yeovil Hospital will in the future run a private nursing department in the hope of making money out of the labour of the nurses. Committees composed of men never appear to realise the fundamental injustice of this system to working women. Dr. Flower and Dr. Hunt both notified their approval at a subscribers' meeting of the principle of this commercial undertaking. Surely as professional men they would be the first to indignantly protest if the Committee notified their intention of exploiting their work in the name of charity!

Hospitals were intended for the care and treatment of the indigent sick, and it is a sure sign of degeneration that they must bolster up their finances with the scanty earnings of working women. The system is fundamentally rotten and indefensible. One is indignant that in the name of charity men are permitted to sweat nurses, and that nurses have no more self-respect than to submit to it. There appears to be some unwholesome unwritten law that a trained nurse is *not* worthy of her hire.

Sooner or later there will be a revolt on this unsound economic attitude of irresponsible hospital managers towards nurses, which will probably bring hospitals under municipal control.

The following letter appears in the *Liverpool Courier*:—

"SIR,—In the Local and District News in your issue of to-day's date, reference is made to an arrangement between the Committee of the Royal Southern Hospital and Messrs. Elder, Dempster, and Co., whereby stewardesses will receive instruction in nursing in the wards of the hospital. The paragraph states, however, that passengers 'will be able to obtain the services of practical, trained nurses, and, moreover, those who are experts in the treatment of tropical diseases.'

"In the interests of the nursing profession I must point out that this is erroneous and misleading. Nurses are required to train for a period of at least three years before they are qualified 'trained nurses,' whereas the intention is to give elementary instruction only to stewardesses for a period of two or three months. This instruction will doubtless be of much benefit to the stewardesses and passengers

alike, but it cannot be too clearly understood that the terms of the arrangement are that 'it will not be competent for stewardesses to style themselves "trained nurses," nor for shipowners to engage them in that capacity.'—Yours, etc.,

"ALLEN NALDRETT, Supt. and Sec.
"Royal Southern Hospital, Liverpool."

Two questions arise—one, is it wise for the authorities of the Royal Southern Hospital, Liverpool, to co-operate with Elder, Dempster and Co. in creating this species of hybrid stewardess nurse, who, we believe, wears the trained nurse's uniform, and poses as such, thus misleading sick passengers into the erroneous belief that they are being provided with "trained nursing"; and two, is it fair to those nurses who are compelled to spend three years in qualifying for their professional duties? To both questions we unhesitatingly reply in the negative. Here are conditions which would at once be suppressed by State Registration—to the benefit of sick persons on liners—and would at once prevent steamship companies exploiting the nursing profession. We ask Elder, Dempster and Co. this simple question—Are you prepared to foist male stewards upon your passengers in the capacity of doctors and chemists, and if not why not? The answer is simple—*The law prevents the subterfuge!*

From time to time the occurrence of cases of cross-infection in fever hospitals give rise to great anxiety on the part of parents who have children in these hospitals. A correspondent of a paper draws attention to two cases which occurred within his own knowledge. In the first a child recovering from measles contracted diphtheria in hospital and died; and in the second a child about to be discharged convalescent from scarlet fever developed measles, thus necessitating a much longer stay in hospital. The moral for nurses from such cases is to omit no precaution whereby the danger of cross-infection may be minimised. If the patients suffering from different diseases are treated in separate pavilions, as they always should be, it is difficult to understand how infection can be conveyed, except by members of the medical or nursing staffs.

In this connection, Mr. A. K. Paterson Wingate, Hospital Nurses' Legal Protection Association, writing to the *Glasgow Herald*, asserts that cross-infection at Ruchill Hospital has been traced to the nurses having to change and disinfect in the dark. He writes: "The cross-infection was an aggravating feature of the case, but even apart from that it is surely intolerable that a body of grown-up, intelligent people should be compelled to surrender the

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)