

It is sometimes urged in objection to the Registration of Nurses that such a system would deprive the public of the services of a useful class of workers, namely, attendants with some nursing knowledge. The Bill, already alluded to, expressly provides that the measure shall not affect or apply to any person who nurses the sick for hire but does not in any way assume to be a registered nurse. There is room for all grades of workers, but employers should be able to ascertain which grade they are actually employing.

It is only right to call attention to the fact that there is in this country a well-organised opposition to the Registration of Nurses. This emanates chiefly from some of the general hospitals in London. It may, however, be fairly argued that the primary object of such hospitals is not the education of nurses, but to nurse the sick in their own wards in the most economical manner.

Further, it is obvious that these hospitals, which are practically unaffected by the present disorganised condition of nursing outside their walls, have no right to prevent the public being protected from existing evils, or to prevent organisation amongst thousands of nurses whom they neither control nor employ.

But, in view of the attitude assumed by some of the hospitals, and of the public and professional importance of the subject, we are of opinion that it is desirable there should be an independent inquiry into the whole nursing question. By such means the reasons for and against legislation could be elicited before legislation was attempted. Therefore it is strongly urged that a Select Committee of the House of Commons should be appointed to inquire into the whole matter, and to consider the two Bills for the Registration of Nurses which are now before the House.

THE ANTI-REGISTRATION MANIFESTO.

We printed in our issue of March 26th the Manifesto of the opposition to State Registration; we now publish a full list of the names appended to it, which has reached us since that date. We understand that this document is being sent to the secretaries of all the principal hospitals asking them to invite their committees to pass resolutions, presumably in its support, and to secure the signatures of their Matrons in its favour. It would be unwise to attach too much importance to these signatures, because a small amount of experience proves with how little consideration they are often inscribed. The point is not so much how many signatures can be obtained to this or that petition, but who is right and who is wrong.

Are the advocates of State Registration working for a reform which will benefit the community, including the nurses of the United Kingdom, or are those who are attempting to stem progress in the right? Those who have considered and

answered this question are on firm ground, and will be unaffected in their belief by an array of names. Moreover, what weight can be attached to the signatures to the Anti-Registration Manifesto of persons who have for years belonged to societies formed for the purpose of obtaining Registration? They are merely indications of the irresponsibility and frivolity with which some of the signatories are treating this vital question.

Thus the names of Miss Thorold, Matron of Middlesex Hospital, and Mr. Fardon, Medical Superintendent of that institution, are amongst those found attached to the Manifesto against Registration. Yet the former has for many years been a Vice-Chairman, and the latter is a Vice-President, and until recently was Medical Hon. Secretary, of the Royal British Nurses' Association, founded to obtain Registration, and which has at present a Bill before Parliament with this object. Such action on the part of their officers can only be regarded as contemptuous to the nurse members. The only course which Miss Thorold and Mr. Fardon can now adopt with any dignity is to resign their membership of the R.B.N.A., and, if these resignations are not tendered, we hope the Association will have the courage to call for them.

We hear that Mr. Sydney Holland has announced his determination to oppose the Registration movement by every means in his power, in view of the opposition which he terms "uncompromising." We cannot but regret that a man in his position has assumed this attitude. If he cannot sympathise with the aspirations of the modern nurse, and finds himself in accord with those of the last generation afflicted by what he has himself once aptly described as "Matrons' Chronic," he has no right to dictate to nurses, in no way under his control, as to their course of action. We underline he will not find the nurses of the United Kingdom quite as plastic as those trained under the London Hospital system, from whom he presumably takes his estimate of nurses in general.

The list of signatures to the Anti-Registration Manifesto includes the following names:—

Chairmen of Hospitals and Others.—Mr. Sydney Holland, Chairman of the London, Poplar, and Tilbury Hospitals; Mr. Charles Burt, Chairman of the Royal Free Hospital; Lord Sandhurst, Chairman of the Weekly Board, Middlesex Hospital; Lord Methuen, Chairman of King's College Hospital; Mr. Henry Lucas, Chairman of University College Hospital; Mr. J. Danvers Power, Chairman of the National Hospital for the Paralysed and Epileptic; Mr. Arthur Lucas, Chairman of the Hospital for Sick Children, Great Ormond Street; Mr. J. G. Wainwright, Treasurer of St. Thomas's Hospital; Mr. H. Bonham-Carter, Secretary to the Committee of the Nightingale Fund; Mr. J. G. Talbot, M.P., Chairman of Westminster Training School; Colonel R. W. Sparks, Chairman Royal Hospital, Richmond; Mr. W. L. Saunders, General Superintendent of the Man-

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)