

attempt to divert them in support or condemnation of the Nurses' Bill is a bit of discreditable trickery. We can assure Sir Henry Burdett that these reprehensible tactics calculated to mislead Parliament will not be permitted to pass unchallenged.

Except from the London Hospital and its dependencies the anti-registrationists can hope to secure but little support, in England and Wales; and Scotland and Ireland are solid in favour of the Registration of Nurses. The following résumé will show how from week to week the time for receiving voting papers has been extended, and, at the eleventh hour (when voting papers had been returned) the issue altered by the organisers of the Plebiscite.

Briefly the history of this futile Plebiscite is as follows:—

SERIES OF LECTURES PROPOSED.

In the *Nursing Mirror* of January 2nd each one of the readers was invited "to think and act for herself," and it was intimated that the expression of a desire on the part of these readers to attend a series of lectures would be welcomed. They were invited to cut out a coupon published in the same issue, and forward it without delay to the Editor. The paragraph for signature ran: "I desire to attend a series of lectures on Nurse Registration during 1909." Evidently there was not a rush for the lectures.

PLEBISCITE PROPOSED.

The next week, January 9th, a Plebiscite of nurses was demanded. The readers of the above paper were still implored to think and act for themselves. "Don't delay," the Editor pleaded, "and please note that those who have not yet formed a definite opinion may record the fact by writing the word 'neutral.' Every nurse should vote."

"Someone in authority . . . in each hospital or institution where nurses are employed" was invited to collect votes under the following headings:—

Nurse Registration.			The Series of Lectures.	
For	Against	Neutral	For	Against

The forms were to be returned to the Editor of the *Nursing Mirror* not later than Friday, January 15th.

PRIZES OFFERED FOR LARGEST NUMBERS OF VOTES.

On January 16th the appeal was still issued "let every nurse vote," and a mean little bribe was offered, to encourage them to do so. The following significant offer was made: "Nurses are working women, and we have therefore determined to offer a prize of one guinea to the nurse who sends in the greatest number of authenticated names of voters, with

the particulars in regard to each, as set forth in the coupon."

HIGHER PRICE FOR MATRONS.

The bribery of Matrons is put higher. The paragraph runs: "in addition to the prize of one guinea already referred to, we offer a first prize of two guineas and a second one of one guinea to the Matron or other accredited official" (presumably hospital secretaries are eligible) "who sends in the most complete voting list from any hospital or kindred institution." Again, every reader is begged to cooperate, and the time for sending in the lists extended to February 13th.

In the issue of January 23rd it is announced that marks will be given in the competition for those whose lists furnish the fullest and completest answers to the questions, and are returned most promptly."

In the heading suggested for signature in this issue "(a) Length of Training, and (b) Nursing experience since" are inserted.

On January 30th it is announced: "There will be no disclosure by us of the way in which any of our readers have voted. So far as we are concerned, the identity of each voter will be concealed as carefully as if she were voting by ballot." That is to say, the public is not to have an opportunity of scrutinising the signatures of this very questionable Plebiscite; nevertheless, signatures are being recorded by nurses under the eye of superior officers known to be hostile to Registration.

In the issue of February 6th, the Editor of the *Nursing Mirror*, who reminds his readers that the latest date for voting lists to be sent in is February 13th—and states, "we continue to receive voting sheets," so that some of the returns had already been sent in—makes the following statement: "In reply to inquiries, we have further to state that each Matron or poll taker should record *whether the votes given on the question of Registration are for or against (a) The Bill which passed the House of Lords last Session; or (b) the principle of Nurse Registration when truly representative of the nursing profession and those responsible for the training and education of nurses throughout the country.*"

Even had this point been included in the issue placed before the voters, a return would have been valueless unless it could be proved that they had read Lord Amphyll's Bill. For instance, how many nurses at the London Hospital have done so?

Not content with advertising the so-called Plebiscite in the principal anti-registration organ, the hospitals and nursing institutions in the United Kingdom have been flooded with literature relating to it.

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)