

## NURSING ECHOES.

\*\*\* Communications (duly authenticated with name and address, not for publication, but as evidence of good faith) are especially invited for these columns.

I HAVE had letters this week from nearly every part of the United Kingdom, telling how the proposals of the British Nurses' Association for the Registration of Nurses have been received. There seems to have been much surprise that the Association has quietly organised and successfully launched its scheme despite the virulent opposition which has been made to it; because few are



aware of the hollowness of the said opposition, nor of the immensely strong case which the Association has worked up. But pleasure at the commencement of the system is more generally expressed than surprise. Mr. Editor will answer some of the inquiries made by our readers, so I need not do so. But I congratulate my correspondents upon the resolution so many have expressed to persuade all their nursing friends to make application for Registration as soon as possible. Meanwhile, who has been hoaxing our contemporary, the *Echo*?

It is so carefully conducted that one is astonished to see that it has been beguiled into trotting out once more the fabulous paragraph on the Registration of Nurses, which appeared once or twice last year in a fabulous number of journals throughout the country, and like the equally wide-spread effusions from a "Hospital Superintendent" clearly came from the same active pen. The *Echo* would be wise to decline any further communications from this source, after finding that while it was being made to prophesy that the B.N.A. would give up all idea of Registration, the final papers on the subject were being sent out to one quarter of the whole Nursing profession in these islands, and that its other assertions are entirely opposed to the well-known facts of the case.

A KIND correspondent sends me the following from the *Liverpool Mercury* of last week:—"Another union is being formed. It will probably have more public sympathy than is bestowed upon some recently formed combinations. The Nursing Sisterhoods are preparing to combine in a single body, in order that they may better their condition and prevent a great injustice, under which they allege they suffer. A Nurse entering

some of the Institutions is soon worth some two guineas a week. This money is taken by the Institution. She herself receives less than a moiety of the sum that she earns. If she is a good Nurse, and in demand, she may earn more than £100 a year, yet she receives only some £30. The unfairness of the arrangement is so obvious to the Nurses themselves that they are forming a 'Mutual Association,' which will probably soon be the largest Nursing Institution in the world. A guarantee has been given by an advocate of Trained Nurses for the preliminary expenses, and we may at any moment expect the Nurses to strike against the more grasping of the Homes to which they belong. It is a shame that women should be underpaid, but that when women's institutions are formed the women should permit themselves to be underpaid is absurd. The Nurses' Mutual Association is to be publicly launched immediately."

I CANNOT believe that such a movement is probable. Every Nurse knows how fallacious the facts are, and how erroneous the figures. When a Nurse's holidays and her occasional illnesses and necessity for rest from overwork are counted in, and the fact that very few Nurses are now-a-days paid two guineas a week, a considerable slice has to be taken off the "£100 a year." On the other hand, when her board and lodging, uniform, &c., are considered, a large addition is necessary to the "£30." Besides all this arises the great practical question, Will Doctors send for their Nurses to a Trade's Union? The idea is ridiculous of course, and the only result of the attempt would be that the "advocate" would speedily lose his money.

WHAT an utterly low opinion our weekly contemporary has of Nurses and their reasoning powers! In January it was announced to the world that a number of other gentlemen had been persuaded to believe that the National Pension Fund would benefit Nurses, and had, therefore, followed the example of the merchant princes who founded it, and given £10,000 to it. Now our contemporary week by week, with a tremendous flourish of trumpets, doles out the names of these gentlemen and their donations at about £1,000 a week, as if these were just received; in fact, as if they had been promiscuously dropped into the Editor's letter box during the previous week. If our contemporary is short of matter, of course it makes a good "fill-up paragraph"; but parading such stale news in small instalments every week as a startling novelty is simply absurd. Some Nurse, it appears, is cross with Mr. Editor for expressing his views

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)