

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.

Whilst cordially inviting communications upon all subjects for these columns, we wish it to be distinctly understood that we do not in ANY WAY hold ourselves responsible for the opinions expressed by our correspondents.

"THE STUPENDOUS MAJORITY."

To the Editor of THE BRITISH JOURNAL OF NURSING.

DEAR MADAM,—In common with all those who have the cause of Registration at heart, I have read with pride and joy the account, in the last two numbers of your Journal, of the triumph that cause has won in the House of Commons. It is a great thing to feel that in these days a cause which bases its claims for recognition on pure professional pride and a keen sense of justice and right towards others as well as ourselves, should be capable of calling forth such support from all parties in Parliament. Whatever happens at the second reading—win or lose—that "lies on the knees of the gods"—we have gained a great moral victory for a great principle. As one of the oldest fighters, I hope you will allow me to express in the name of the many, living and dead, who have worked and fought with you for a cause "that we held to be just and true"—our appreciation of the untiring zeal, unquenchable enthusiasm, and firm tenacity of purpose with which you have led us to victory. You have devoted your life and your talents to our service, and we should be sorry if you thought us ungrateful or unmindful of the debt we owe you. It is you we have to thank for our present success, and I earnestly trust that success may only be a forerunner of one still greater that will place the coping-stone on your noble work for our profession.

Yours sincerely,

M. MOLLETT

(Late Matron Royal South Hants and Southampton Hospital).

Rose Cottage,

Three Cross, Wimborne.

[Whilst thanking Miss Mollett for her very kind letter, we would, however, remind her that a General can only command victory through the courage and loyalty of his rank and file.—Ed.]

DEAR MADAM,—Thank you so much for giving those of us far from the seat of Government such accurate and detailed accounts of the wonderful first reading of our Bill in the House of Commons on the 3rd inst.; if it had not been for the *B. J. N.* we should have known little about it, and that only from a garbled and anti point of view. In studying the support given by Government officials, I note that the Treasury, the Home Office, the Foreign Office, the Colonial Office, the India Office, the War Office and the Admiralty, all of which Departments employ trained nurses, were represented by voters in support of the Nurses' Registration Bill; but, to my surprise, found that the Local Government Board was not.

This is the more surprising, as this Department is responsible for more nurses than all the others put together. Indeed, thousands of nurses in Poor Law Infirmaries and in the great Metropolitan Fever Hospitals are under its jurisdiction. Moreover, the shortage of nurses in institutions for which the Local Government Board is responsible is costing the tax-payer thousands of pounds, which many Poor Law Matrons think might be saved if Registration were in force and the nursing profession properly organised. The late President and some of the permanent officials opposed this reform, but let us hope his successor will study the burning question, and take a more intelligent and progressive view of the question. If the public knew how many private nurses at a weekly salary of £2 12s. 6d. have lately been (and still are) employed in the Fever Hospitals, they would realise it was high time that the opinions of Poor Law Matrons should be invited and considered. A large majority are in favour of organisation by the State. I am glad to see you continue to advocate a Nursing Department at the Local Government Board, with a Matron-in-Chief at the head. In country places it is impossible to get nurses, and the shortage gets worse day by day.

Yours, &c.,

A POOR LAW INFIRMARY MATRON.

A CRUSHER.

To the Editor of THE BRITISH JOURNAL OF NURSING.

DEAR MADAM,—It is very much to be hoped that women will make use of the opportunity now offered to them by *The Times* in appealing for their custom in its new form of a penny paper. My reply will be that if it is proposed to give the same opportunities for expression of opinion to women as to men in all questions that concern and interest them, I will support it, but not unless. The recent action of *The Times* in refusing to publish any reply from Registrationists to Lord Knutsford's most misleading letter on the 5th inst. is another flagrant example of the tyranny of the press.

My reason for alluding to Lord Knutsford's letter is to support that of Miss E. B. Kingsford, who emphasises the injustice done to nurses in general by discounting their opinions in this matter, and assuming that the opinion of one matron (even if not trained at the London) stands for the opinion of the whole nursing staff. By a curious process of reasoning—or rather the lack of it—the signature of one woman—the Matron of St. Bartholomew's Hospital—against State Registration, must override the "conscientious convictions" of the 700 (I am told it is 760) members of the League of St. Bartholomew's Hospital Nurses.

By this insolent disregard of the opinions of the majority, Lord Knutsford seeks to mislead the public, and with a lamentable disregard for their responsibility towards the public, the proprietors of a great newspaper make such injustice possible. This scandalous state of affairs seems incredible. But they cannot have

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)