

Nursing Record.

"QUI NON PROFICIT, DEFICIT."

No. 147.

THURSDAY, JANUARY 22nd, 1891.

VOL. 6.

Contents.

EDITORIAL.—ANOTHER QUIBBLE	37
OBSTETRIC NURSING. BY OBSTETRICA, M.B.N.A....	39
NURSING ECHOES. BY S. G.	40
RESULT OF SPECIAL PRIZE COMPETITION	42
FRENCH SOLDIERS IN GERMAN PRISONS. BY CANON E. GUERS	43
WOMEN AND THEIR WORK. BY VEVA KARSLAND	45
THE VICAR'S DAUGHTER. BY GEORGE MACDONALD, LL.D.	46
LETTERS TO THE EDITOR	47
REPLIES TO CORRESPONDENTS	48
COMPETITIVE PRIZE ESSAY	48

IMPORTANT NOTICE.—Those of our subscribers who wish to notify change of address must send such notification in order that it may reach the publishers NOT LATER than the Monday morning before publishing, otherwise the change cannot be made.

EDITORIAL.

ANOTHER QUIBBLE.

THREE weeks ago we issued, in a condensed form, and as a supplement to our New Year's number, a few of the chief charges advanced against the London Hospital. We have received a very large number of letters of approval and confirmation of our statements. But we have only had one epistle which in the slightest degree attempts to traverse a single fact which we translated from the Blue Book into our columns. In common honesty we publish this letter, as we would willingly have published any other essay at defence from the London Hospital. The fact that only one solitary statement has been even called in question will be, to most unbiassed minds, clear presumptive proof that the Hospital authorities have found themselves entirely unable to contradict any of the grave charges against them. How under these circumstances they can permit

such scandals to continue is to us an unfathomable mystery.

But now let us briefly consider Mrs. ADAMS's communication. This lady, we learn upon good authority, is the widow of a late Surgeon to the London Hospital, and therefore until recently, and for many years past, she was most closely connected with the Institution; although she states that now she has "no interest in" it. In the next place, we have very good grounds for stating that Mrs. ADAMS had our Supplement sent to her, and her attention especially called to the paragraph relating to Miss POWELL. It needs no particular acumen to divine at whose instigation this proceeding was taken, nor what request was made. We have very good reasons for asking Mrs. ADAMS whether she will deny that she was told that she was the lady referred to, and that it was hoped that she would write to us contradicting the statement as to Miss POWELL's illness. And was Mrs. ADAMS also told that there has been more than one Nurse of the name of POWELL at the London Hospital?

Upon receiving Mrs. ADAMS' letter, we immediately took the only course open to us, and sent a copy of it to the Rev. Mr. VALENTINE, the late Chaplain to the London Hospital, whose evidence, given on oath before the Lords' Select Committee on July 3, 1890, was as follows: "I have known a Nurse sent away to strangers as convalescent with a temperature of 103 deg., to be seriously ill, and bring discredit on you," *i.e.*, the Committee of the London Hospital (Q. 5,668). Lord SPENCER asked Mr. VALENTINE for the name of this Nurse, and the reply was, "The name is Powell" (Q. 5,669). "When did the case occur?—That I am afraid I cannot tell you exactly. I have made no note of it" (Q. 5,670), was the only other question and answer on the subject. But we are informed upon the best authority that Miss POWELL gave the facts to Mr. VALENTINE as he stated them, and that it was not Mrs. ADAMS to whom she was sent when in the state of "convalescence" above described. Further-

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)