

their constitution, to dismiss the plaintiff without notice, and that, in any case, she was only entitled to a month's notice; (3) that, in lieu of notice, a cheque for one month's salary and one for emoluments had been sent her by the Guardians.

Miss Lloyd claimed three months' notice. She stated, in evidence, that she did not remember signing a contract. Her counsel argued that legally the power of removal of a paid official considered unsuitable was vested in the Local Government Board, not the Guardians.

The judge gave judgment for the Guardians, emphasising the fact that the plaintiff had accepted money in lieu of notice. Her proper course would have been to return the cheque. He held that the Guardians were entitled to dismiss her without notice; and that, as she was only required to give a month's notice, she could not expect to receive three months.

Nurses should remember that all their contracts with corporate bodies must be under seal, otherwise they are worthless.

HOWARD v. PLUNKETT.

In the Nisi Prius Court, Dublin, recently, before Mr. Justice Dodd and a City Special Jury, Miss Margaret M. Howard, a maternity nurse in the employment of the Guardians of the Balrothery Union, claimed £500 damages against Mrs. Plunkett (a Vice-President of the local branch of the Women's National Health Association and a member of the Committee of Queen Victoria's Jubilee Institute for Nurses for Portmarnock and Baldoyle) and Mr. Thomas L. Plunkett, D.L., of Portmarnock House, Baldoyle, for alleged libel in a letter addressed to the Clerk of the Guardians.

The Judge, after hearing the arguments on the question of privilege, said the case was one of great importance. It was the duty of any person in the community to call the attention of the proper authority to the discharge of duty by any person in a public position. But considerateness should not be lost sight of. He was satisfied that the two ladies before him in their zeal for the poor forgot their duty to the poor nurse, who ought to have received consideration from the lady of the manor and her friends. The plaintiff, according to the excellent report of Dr. Kiernan, discharged her duty with admirable care, and she had been completely exonerated by the Guardians. Her character had been cleared beyond question. If the law permitted he would certainly do otherwise than he was about to do, namely, declare the plea of privilege well founded and that the verdict should be for the defendants. He thought that, having regard to the circumstances of the case, the defendants should pay the costs of the action. This was agreed, Mr. Serjeant Moriarty saying that although the plaintiff had lodged £50 in Court as security for costs, the defendants were willing to forego them, provided the case was not carried further.

We report these cases as we consider it most important that nurses should know their position before the law.

SOCIAL SERVICE.

HOW TO LIFT THE BOTTOM DOG.

Who can remove the blot on fair England's face by bringing order out of disorder and dirt in our slums? Streets full of people half of whom are wasters, or worse living on white slaves. An unenviable position that of Clearing House for such traffic. Such is what the world says of us.

We have had a Royal Commission on the Poor Law, files of recommendations have been pigeon-holed, much water has flowed under London Bridge and over the bodies of the lost since that date, thousands are still homeless each night, a not pleasing sight to our visitors from Dominions over the sea as they told us last year, or satisfactory reflection for those in comfortable homes. Lives squandered!

For the past eight years Amsterdam has been dealing with the question of how to lift the bottom dog and his belongings to respectable citizenship. What impressed the writer on a recent visit to Amsterdam was the absence of miserable creatures wandering aimlessly up and down the streets, avoided by perhaps less deserving if more fortunate citizens. The explanation came when after calling on a friend for the purpose of getting leave to see over the Wilhelmina Hospital next day we were asked would we like to visit the Night Shelter, Wilhelmina Gasthuis, which was not far off. Such an offer was not to be refused, though we were somewhat hungry, dusty and weary after a day's travel. Accompanied by our two kind friends, we were taken by a short but dark route across the Park and wood. Being pitch dark we stumbled at times, but eventually came in sight of a large and lighted building which gives food and shelter to 500 and upwards every night.

An old building, some years ago discarded by the hospital authorities, has been, by the energy of one man and the contributions of many others, with the help of willing women workers, turned into a haven of refuge without the grating key and grunt of Bumble and his successors.

Doors are opened at seven in the evening, and until eleven. When they are closed the staff is fully occupied in receiving, registering, bathing, feeding and putting to bed 500 of Amsterdam's homeless. As we walked up, a little girl with a baby in her arms stood in front of the gate, behind her the mother of both, with two others, little more than babies. These five passed to the Reception Room, where a kindly Sister took down particulars and then passed them on to bath, food and bed.

Later on, when looking into a bathroom, we saw a nice, clean little person being dried, and smiling. One of our party observed, "Why, Sister, whenever I come round you seem to be always washing children." The cheery reply, "Yes, I spend a large part of the night here," indicated benefit to the community as well as the child.

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)