

paring their recommendations to the General Council.

As the hospitals will doubtless desire to know on what scale assistance from the King's Fund may be anticipated, the Management Committee further RECOMMEND

(d) that the assistance offered by the King's Fund should be on the following scale, viz: a maximum sum for 7 years of £20,000 a year, or 25 per cent. of the expenditure of the hospitals on the approved Scheme, whichever is the smaller; this amount to be provided as far as possible by means of contributions obtained by a special appeal in selected quarters, and to be increased if sufficient funds are realised by such appeal.

The Management Committee further RECOMMEND

(e) that this report be circulated to the hospitals which have received invitations to the Conference on May 19th, and published.

For the Management Committee,
May 4th, 1926. DONOUGHMORE, *Chairman*.

The following letter was sent by us to the Hon. Secretaries of the Fund for presentation to the Conference on May 19th:—
To the Hon. Secretaries,

King Edward's Hospital Fund for London.

DEAR SIRs,—I have received the proposed Scheme of Pensions for Hospital Officers and Nurses, kindly sent by King Edward's Hospital Fund for London, for which I beg to thank you.

Having carefully read the Report I shall be obliged if you will inform me who is to administer this Fund, in regard to nurses who are not working in hospitals, such for example, as private nurses in connection with a Co-operation, who receive their own fees less a small percentage for Office expenses—usually from 5 to 10 per cent. Is it proposed that the Committee of such a Co-operation shall be required to pay the suggested amount towards the pensions of these nurses which could not possibly be covered by a reasonable percentage on their fees?

Is the College of Nursing, Ltd., to have the sole control of the proposed Scheme in relation to independent nurses? I may point out that there are thousands of Registered Nurses who are not members of this institution, and who would resent being compelled to make their contributions, and receive their pensions through this medium.

It would appear just that the organisation of the proposed scheme in this connection should be upon a wider basis, and that the Royal British Nurses' Association, which is a Chartered Body, and others, should be associated in a conjoint Council for administering the Pensions of Nurses who are not associated under Hospital control.

I shall be obliged if you will place my letter before the Conference to be held on May 19th, in the hope that it may recognise the inexpediency of recommending any monopoly of control over the money of independent nurses.

I am, Dear Sirs, Yours faithfully,

ETHEL G. FENWICK, *Editor*.

British Journal of Nursing, 431, Oxford St., London, W.1.

We have received the following reply:—

To Mrs. Bedford Fenwick,

Honorary Editor, BRITISH JOURNAL OF NURSING.

DEAR MADAM,—In reply to your letter of May 19th, I enclose a copy of the Memorandum K.F. 1825 published in December last, containing the details of the Draft Scheme referred to at the Council Meeting last Friday week, of which we sent THE BRITISH JOURNAL OF NURSING an official report.

Your letter did not arrive until the Conference had begun, and raises questions which, if then to be raised, should have appeared on the Agenda Paper, and which will certainly demand and receive very careful consideration before the Scheme comes into full operation.

Yours faithfully, H. R. MAYNARD,

7, Walbrook, E.C. 4.

Secretary.

NURSING IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE SELECT COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS ON NURSING HOMES (REGISTRATION),

On May 19th Dr. F. N. K. Menzies, Medical Officer of the London County Council, attended before the Select Committee of the House of Commons on the Registration of Nursing Homes. Sir Cyril Cobb, Chairman of the Committee, presided.

The Chairman asked the witness why, under the L.C.C. scheme of 1916 nursing homes under medical control were exempt from inspection. (This scheme referred to Maternity homes, &c.) and Dr. Menzies replied that he believed it was owing to the strong pressure brought to bear on the Council, and on Parliament, by the medical profession. He stated that, in London, Lying-in Homes were inspected by women inspectors, who were responsible for the administration of the Midwives Act.

Dr. Menzies expressed himself in favour of the Registration of Nursing Homes other than Lying-in Homes, and thought that most of the proprietors of such homes favoured their registration. So far as London was concerned those persons conducting Homes in a manner which they knew would not be approved had, for the most part, moved to other areas.

Dr. Menzies was interrogated as to the registration of Homes where a single patient was received, practically as a paying guest, and the witness expressed the opinion that the house should be registered, but the extent to which it should be inspected was a matter for the registering authority.

Replying to a question from the Chairman the witness said that there had been some cases in London of the closing of Lying-in Homes. Amongst the causes were trafficking in infants born in the home, structural defects, the bad characters of the women who ran them, and the neglect of newly-born infants.

POOR-LAW EMPLOYEES AND TRADE UNIONS.

In the House of Commons on May 20th, Mr. H. Williams asked the Minister of Health if his attention has been drawn to the decision of certain Boards of Guardians to compel all their employees to join trade unions; and under what authority such Boards of Guardians claim to deprive their employees of freedom of choice in the matter of joining a trade union?

Major Ruggles-Brise: Before the right hon. gentleman replies, may I ask whether his attention has been called to the action of the Greenwich and Deptford Board of Guardians who are reported to have issued an order requiring all their officers and employees to join the appropriate trade unions in or before the week ending on the 5th June, and that, in the case of those who do not do so, their engagements will be terminated. Is the Minister, further, aware that this action affects 780 employees and is *ultra vires*, and what steps does he propose to take?

Mr. Chamberlain: In reply to my hon. and gallant friend's question, I have seen in the press a notice to the effect stated by him, but I have no official knowledge of it at present. In reply to my hon. friend the Member for Reading (Mr. H. Williams), I am aware that decisions of this kind have been taken by certain Boards of Guardians, who, I understand, make this condition part of the terms on which officers are employed by them. The matter is at present receiving my attention.

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)