

Registration Bill, that: "He has now had an opportunity of giving further consideration to the question, and, finding that there is much to be said on both sides, that he is anxious to make more thorough investigation into the matter before deciding to vote against the Bill in question. In the meanwhile, he proposes to remove his blocking motion."

This is fair enough. Frankly, we do not like to have men of the stamp of Lord Robert Cecil against us, as he is sound on the Suffrage question. As an ardent Unionist nurse remarked, after it was made plain by the vote of many English Unionists against our Bill that they were the *only* group against it, "This is the sort of thing that sooner or later detaches professional women from the Unionist Party. Whenever we want anything we must go to the REAL Liberals and the Labour Party for sympathy." This lady, like Miss Lee, has interviewed her Unionist member, and has secured his promise to support the second reading of the Bill, although he went into the wrong Lobby on March 3rd.

INDEFENSIBLE EXPENDITURE.

The anti-registration Protest issued from the London Hospital is being sent far and wide, with a stamped envelope enclosed for reply. Of course, cost is of no account, as charity money may be requisitioned by the Central Hospital Council for London for this purpose. A very scandalous form of expenditure, in our opinion.

STATE REGISTRATION AND RURAL NURSING.

The current issue of *The National Review* contains an article by the Countess of Jersey on "State Registration and Rural Nursing," the main object of which is to draw attention to the reasons assigned for the introduction, by Dr. Chapple, of the Nurses Registration Bill into the House of Commons, and to the effect it might have on nursing in the agricultural and rural districts in England.

In the first place, Lady Jersey states that Dr. Chapple in introducing the Bill made "a gratuitous and unfair attack upon the London Hospital." Dr. Chapple made no attack upon the London Hospital. He made a plain statement of fact of the reasons for the opposition to the measure, and stated that the head and front of the opposition was the London Hospital, which was the only great hospital in Great Britain which actively

opposed registration, and which exploited its nurses for its own financial advantage.

This is a matter of common knowledge in the nursing world. Quite recently the last anti-registration manifesto has been sent out broadcast with stamped envelopes for its return from the London Hospital and that hospital is the only one of any repute which certificates its probationers at the end of two years, binds them for four, and uses them for the second period of two years absolutely at the discretion of the Matron, on the private nursing staff and elsewhere, making a profit of many thousands of pounds annually out of their work as private nurses, and publishing no detailed balance sheet of the receipts and expenditure, as is done in the case of the other departments of the hospital.

Lady Jersey states that the reasons put forward for advocating registration are mainly three:—

1. That women disguise themselves as nurses for nefarious purposes, thereby bringing disgrace upon uniforms of which those entitled to wear them are justly proud.

2. That there is a shortage of nurses.

3. That many women are employed as nurses who have had less than the three years' training exacted by the majority of great hospitals.

The first, she says, is an admitted evil, the second an admitted misfortune, but it has not been shown how registration would remedy either the evil or the misfortune. The third is an admitted fact, but, in the eyes of many persons interested in nursing the poor, neither an evil nor a misfortune.

That is where registrationists and Lady Jersey disagree. She appears to agree with the noble Lord who, when the Nurses' Registration Bill was under discussion in the House of Lords, assured it that there were "two kinds of nurses required—one to nurse the people who had important operations by eminent surgeons, and another to nurse the ordinary ailments of the poor." Registrationists claim the equality of rich and poor in sickness. She falls moreover into an error very usual with the amateur, in supposing that while women with inferior training are not competent to nurse "serious operations or such surgical cases as could not be properly treated in a labourer's cottage," a woman of the cottage class who will live in the cottage while required, who is accustomed to its ways, who can not only nurse the patient, but attend to the housework and cooking, can quite properly be entrusted with the care of such cases as pneumonia, diphtheria, typhoid and congestion of the lungs, and this after "a course of instruction for four or six months in dressing wounds, bandaging, poulticing, etc.; in the use of the clinical thermometer and other apparatus needed in illness, in moving and lifting the sick and preventing bedsores, in invalid cooking and general hygiene, and in the proper care of maternity cases" (not midwifery). It will be admitted that this is much more knowledge than a woman of the cottage class can be expected to

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)