

of a debate on the new Municipal Hospitals, has been speaking in his most vigorous style against what he is pleased to call 'the intrusion of religious arrogance' into Hospital Nursing work. 'Everybody knows,' he says, 'that creeds claim supremacy in the healing of the sick; but we are profoundly interested in keeping away this conflict from the sick bed, and in permitting the spirit of humanity alone to assert itself there.

. . . . The community establishes numerous Hospitals, and thus has an opportunity of providing for the training of sick Nurses without regard to creed.' Such is the gist of Professor VIRCHOW'S characteristic deliverance on this question. We are bound to admit that the advocates of 'creeds,' as distinguished from the advocates of religion in the large, broad, human sense of that indispensable word, have fairly exposed themselves to this attack. They have often laid themselves open to the charge of using the Hospital and the accident of sickness as a means of proselytising. But whatever it may be in Germany, we cannot in England afford to divorce religion from Hospitals. They are a field on which Jews and Christians, Protestants and Catholics co-operate, and even learn to respect each other's religions. Hospitals in this country, so far, are neither State institutions nor Municipal ones, but voluntary; and religious people have been their chief founders and supporters. The 'spirit of humanity' has its chief expression and example for us in HIM whose supreme test is in the words 'I was sick, and ye visited Me.' If religion will keep on such lines, it will not be easily expelled from our Hospital service. If it does not, but worries the sick with narrow questions of sect and creed, it will be dislodged from its high position."

THE *Charity Record* is deservedly severe on the financial proposals of Mr. H. C. BURDETT, and last week published the following letter:—

"Sir, - It's very funny that the first Institution whose accounts you attack is the Seamen's Hospital, Greenwich, as Mr. BURDETT is the guardian angel of that Charity. I see he's one of the auditors of the Hospital, being the Governors' representative. That's rather hard on the Governors, I'm thinking. It's very funny, too, that Mr. MICHELLI is the Secretary of this Charity, if he it is who above all others has been lauded to the skies by Mr. BURDETT as a great authority on Hospital finance and a model accountant; and that Mr. BURDETT is one of the Council of the Metropolitan Hospital Sunday Fund who have the distribution of grants to the London Hospitals and other charities, whose accounts have been submitted to and approved by them.

"After reading your weighty arguments on the subject, I think it's high time some change should be made, for it's not fair that those who don't keep their own house in order should be allowed to sit in judgment upon those who do. But it's like 'the eternal fitness of things' in these strange times that those who do their business properly are subjected to the whims and fancies of those who upon a false reputation become Jacks-in-office.—Yours, &c.,

"J. W. R.

"Kennington, April 12, 1892."

In a book that ought to be of considerable practical utility, on "Epidemics, Plagues, and Fevers," by the Hon. ROLLO RUSSELL (EDWARD STANFORD), the author sums up "the gist of sanitary science" in two principles—cleanliness and isolation. To these he would like to add, for the purposes of efficient control in States, a third—namely, unity of administration. The chief cause of epidemic and transmissible disease are traced to the three general conditions of flooded or marshy soil, decaying organic matter, and contagion or infection from the sick to the healthy—all of them more or less preventible, if only proper arrangements are put in force. The book which deals in detail with such maladies as cholera, diphtheria, influenza, measles, scarlet fever, typhoid, and the like, is calculated to be of great service to all who are interested in or officially concerned with the promotion of health, as members of local sanitary committees, school managers, and employers of labour. Indeed, as Mr. RUSSELL suggests, we have in this volume "principles for a complete system of practical hygienic science."

* * *

ONCE more I must ask my kind readers to help our disabled sister, Mrs. SARAH DUYCK. Hope deferred maketh the heart sick, and this poor Nurse has for nearly four weary years been striving to obtain a pension from the British Home for Incurables. Her sad case has been often explained in this Journal, and owing largely to the generous assistance of my readers, she has now polled 1,163 votes. If all who can do so, will once more help her, I hope very earnestly that she may soon be successful in obtaining the valuable benefit for which she has so long been seeking. The voting papers for the May election have, I hear, now been issued.

* * *

I AM very glad to hear such a good account of the progress of District Nursing in Wakefield. Nine ladies, I understand, formed themselves into a Committee in 1890 to undertake this much-needed work. They were fortunate enough to secure the services of an excellent Nurse, and the record of their first year's work, which has recently been issued, is most satisfactory in many ways. Ninety-four patients were attended in the year, and a list of their complaints are given. Here arises the solitary criticism which I would make. Neither "Complications" nor "Internal" are, I imagine, recognised medical diseases, and "Liver" and "Ulcers" are not very definite descriptions. I would venture to suggest that future tables might be revised with advantage by a medical man. In every other way, the Report deserves much praise. Two thousand and sixty

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)