

her to come and vote." She said she was not. He then said "But you are Nurse." She said "Yes, if I can vote as Nurse." He said "Yes, it will be alright." They then went to the polling-booth together.

\* \* \*

Nurse Nicholls further states that when she was placing her paper in the ballot-box she was asked her name and she did not answer. She was asked again and she said "District Nurse," and she was about to add her name when Kenyon called out from the door "Martindale." She states "that she was so thunderstruck that she walked out of the room without saying anything else."

\* \* \*

Now the error of this Nurse's ways are very easy to trace. To begin with she ought to have known that being a district Nurse did *not* give her an *ex-officio* vote at an election. Next, there does not seem any apparent reason why when asked her name she "did not answer," and further it was a very strange proceeding when Kenyon—a man she declares was a perfect stranger to her—shouted out that her name was "Martindale" she was so "thunderstruck" that she had to leave the room. It would have been infinitely better if the thunder had struck her in another way and induced her to tell the polling-clerk what her name in reality was, and to denounce Kenyon's falsehood.

\* \* \*

The magistrates before whom the charge came decided to dismiss the charge. They considered that one of the essential parts of the case was to prove corrupt motive and the majority of them had come to the decision that that had not been proved to their satisfaction. The moral of the case is this. If Nurses feel impelled to take part in the election of Councillors for their district, let them be quite sure they are on the Register!

\* \* \*

WE quote the following paragraph from an article in the *Medical Times* of last week dealing with "Legislation for Midwives":—

"During the time that midwives have been making futile efforts to obtain legislation, trained Nurses have been steadily advancing, not only in knowledge and usefulness, but also in public and professional estimation. They are now an important and organised body, and, with the assistance of medical men, have commenced a voluntary system of registration under the authority of a Royal Charter. It would be manifestly for the advantage of everyone concerned that, if obstetric Nurses are to be separately registered at all, this work should be carried on as part of a general system of Nurses' Registration legalised by Parliament. And we, therefore, suggest that medical men would be wise to oppose the registration of midwives by a

counter-proposal for the registration of all Nurses and especially those engaged in obstetric work. Such an Act might fairly claim the support of the Government, and it is, indeed, possible that, with the influential support which it could obtain, the Government might be induced to add it to their programme. It would not need a complicated Act to secure all that is desired or desirable; the formation of a Nursing Council, composed of medical men and leading members of the Nursing profession, the assignment of representatives, on such a Council, for example, to the chief Nurse training schools and to the leading Nursing societies, together with representatives of medical organisations, and a certain number of members appointed by the Crown; the powers of admission to, and of removal from, the Register and the conditions of Nursing education necessary to obtain admission to this Register. All this could easily be drafted on the lines of the Medical Acts. It would be necessary only to secure that such provisions were sufficiently stringent to ensure a marked and immediate improvement in the training, education and efficiency of obstetric, and of all other Nurses. The benefit of such protection to the public would be immediately secured, because there would not only be a greater efficiency obtained, but there would be greater control over those who were enrolled upon the Register. All the benefits proposed to be obtained by the Registration of Midwives would be thus gained without any of the manifest disadvantages of the present Bill, and it would certainly seem advisable that this opportunity should be seized for setting at rest the question which has frequently been raised and which has caused so much dissension and controversy."

\* \* \*

WITH regard to the somewhat unique experience of which "Private Nurse" complained in our issue of last week, that her application to a Nursing Institution had been refused on the ground that "she wore spectacles," it seems to us that it is imposing an additional hardship on women's work if such tyrannical restrictions are to be enforced. It is quite intelligible that the loss of sight in an eye, or a defect which could not be overcome by glasses, might be an impediment to a Nurse's work by lessening the keenness of her observation, but when her glasses are properly adjusted to overcome shortsightedness it seems a stretch of officialism to debar a Nurse from following her work. It has sometimes been suggested that a Nurse with spectacles is not the best to choose for work among children, who sometimes evince an inexplicable terror of any stranger wearing glasses; but we can recall some splendid Nurses, both among children and adults, who were under the necessity of using *pince-nez*. We very much sympathise with our correspondent, but we think with her qualifications she will find her glasses will not handicap her in her further pursuit of work. We shall be glad to hear if any other of our readers have met with a similar obstacle to employment.

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)