

I beg to state that I have *not* resigned from the staff of the Nurses' Co-operation. If you will be so good as to give this fact publicity in your Journal, I shall feel grateful.

Yours faithfully,
MARY HILLIARD.

KERNELS FROM CORRESPONDENCE.

SHOULD PRIVATE NURSES BE INCLUDED IN THE HOURS OF EMPLOYMENT BILL?

We have again received a large number of post-cards from private nurses objecting to inclusion in the Hours of Employment Bill, to be considered by Parliament at an early date, and one approving of inclusion.

Miss C. T. Everest, Ryde, writes:—"I should very strongly urge that nurses in private should be included in the eight hour per day system. Why should we not have something besides our work to live for? In my opinion the result would be healthier nurses, better work, longer life. Where is the advantage to slave for a few years, to save a few pounds, and die at an early age, before the harvest is half reaped?"

(The majority of nurses in private practice, who are sensible women, come to terms, more or less satisfactory to both parties, with their private patients, and continue in the work for many years, without apparent injury to health. Nurses should take a stand against any form of "slavery," and decline to serve people who would enforce it.—ED.)

Many nurses write to agree with the opinions expressed by their colleagues last week.

Mrs. Balstone, President Victoria and Bournemouth Nurses' League:—"With reference to the paragraph in THE BRITISH JOURNAL OF NURSING of April 3rd, regarding the hours of employment for Private Nurses, I beg to state that I am decidedly against an eight-hour day for private nurses for the following reasons:—

"(a) In acute cases the fewer changes the better. I may be old-fashioned, but I consider that for the first week after an operation, or at least until the crisis is well passed, no good nurse would wish to do less than a twelve-hour day.

"(b) An eight-hour day would press very hard on middle-class people with fixed incomes—a class which is already very hard hit. Only the rich could afford to employ private nurses who work an eight-hour day.

"(c) Although an eight-hour day is practicable in hospital, where many nurses are available and on the spot, it is not practicable in private nursing."

Miss H. E. Sadler, London:—"I shall do all I can that is best for the patient before I study any unions or bills."

Miss H. E. Smith, Warrington:—"I have been a nurse forty-four years. I am opposed to only eight hours daily, as I could not attend to my patient as I should wish to."

Miss Maud Tucker, Havestow:—"I have been

a private nurse twenty-eight years, and am quite sure that eight hours is quite impracticable for a private nurse. My patients, with two exceptions, have made up to me for loss of rest when they got better."

Miss F. Sheppard, Tunbridge Wells:—"I do not approve of the eight-hours' system; it would upset the patient, and the nurse could not take very much interest in the patient, being on duty so short a time."

Miss E. Horton, Glasgow:—"I consider an eight-hour day for private nurses would be unworkable. It would be unsatisfactory to patient and employer, and would result in loss of many a serious case, unless three nurses were in attendance. Briefly put, it would not be nursing. A nurse having had the benefit of an eight-hour day during training, would not enter the sphere of private work with her system undermined, and her energy flagging. Having had the chance of broadening her mind and enlarging her sympathies, she ought to be more likely to benefit all concerned than under the present system."

(We find nurses are strongly in favour of an eight-hour day in the wards during training, when the theory of their profession has also to be studied. When in the future they have to study for their State Examination, it will not be possible to do more than eight hours practical training daily in the ward. We claim that nurses in administrative positions and in private practice, should not be legally restricted to eight hours' work daily, as it would interfere with the efficient performance of their duties.—ED.)

Miss M. Trevor, Cardiff:—"Competition is quite keen enough already between the trained and untrained private nurse; unless we want to be eliminated from this branch of work altogether, we must oppose any such folly. I have written my M.P. as you recommend."

Miss Mary Farmer, Manchester:—"Half a loaf is better than no bread, and, of course, an attendant who can wait on a sick person under doctor's directions would be of more use than the most highly skilled nurse who was prevented by law from doing so. The whole suggestion appears to me suicidal for private nurses."

Several nurses notify that they have written to their M.P.'s on this question. We hope many have done so who have not notified us.

OUR PRIZE COMPETITIONS. QUESTIONS.

April 17th.—How would you recognise perforation in a case of enteric fever? What immediate action would you take, and how could you temporarily relieve the patient?

April 24th.—What is meant by (a) cross infection, and (b) concurrent double infection? How may cross infection arise? What measures are adopted in hospital for its prevention? Give some examples of concurrent double infection.

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)