

PRESS PARTISANSHIP.

We note, and are not surprised to do so, that at a time when newspapers look forward to release from the iron rule of the Press Censor, the Electrical Trade Union threatens the Newspaper Proprietors' Association that unless the papers controlled by the latter are more fair and sympathetic to trade unionists in newspaper offices, they will be called on to act as censors, and "deal with" articles which give offence.

If such a threat came to fruition some novel effects would result, which we need not pursue for the moment; but the righteous indignation which the unfair conduct of many leading newspapers has aroused, is sure sooner or later to find a mode of expression, which the plutocrats who own them, and the autocrats who conduct them, may have reason to regret. Let us take what is known as the Nursing Question—that is, the Thirty Years' struggle of a class of women workers, second to none in their value in any scheme of civilisation, to attain legal status—organisation and protection by the State—and just consider the manner in which their justifiable aspirations, for the public benefit as well as their own, have been treated by the Press.

We have no hesitation in saying that nothing in the history of the evolution of women has been more disgraceful than the partisan injustice, with which the Press has treated trained nurses.

Why? Simply because an oligarchy of rich and powerful hospital governors—misnamed philanthropists—keen for cheap labour, and extensive advertisers, have had it in their power to exploit to the verge of dissolution, the labour and the lives of thousands of women, whose altruistic temperament, inspired with a love of humanity, has made them easy victims of oppression.

Hand-in-glove with titled magnates, the plutocratic owners, and the autocratic editors, of subsidised newspapers have united for years to keep the public in ignorance on the vital social question—the safety of sick people through a system of State Registration of Nurses.

The Northcliffe Press is the most culpable, but the *Daily Telegraph* has played a good second in this game of bluff.

As an instance of the unfairness to nurses and public alike of which we complain, read what follows:—

The College of Nursing, Ltd., governed by a Council of hospital officials, who have drafted what is known as an Employers' Bill, in opposition to the Nurses' Registration Bill, without consulting its nurse members, ventured recently to hold an open meeting in London to discuss this measure, at which nurse after nurse arose and criticised and protested against its provisions.

The *Daily Telegraph* found no space to report these expert opinions, but devoted close on two columns practically in support of the College

Company's programme and policy, of which Sir E. Cooper Perry, Medical Superintendent of Guy's Hospital, is the real promoter, and which is attempting to secure a very dangerous monopoly over the whole Nursing Profession.

Naturally, the Nurses' Organisations objected to this unfairness, and in an admirable letter Miss Isabel Macdonald, the Secretary of the Royal British Nurses' Association, expressed their irrefutable opinions. The insertion of this letter gave great satisfaction to the nurses, but this modicum of justice was, of course, objected to by their opponents, and Sir E. Cooper Perry replied with a personal note as follows:—

THE NURSES' CHARTER.

To the Editor of the *Daily Telegraph*.

SIR,—Will you allow me to deal with Miss Macdonald's letter under the above heading, so far as it concerns myself? I am alleged by her to have "stated to your representative that the Bill of the College" for the training and registration of nurses "is not contentious." I have had no communication with any representative of yours, and in no case should I have made a statement so inaccurate and foolish.

It is further alleged that, but for my opposition and that of "others sitting upon the boards of hospitals," a Nurses' Registration Bill would have been passed many years ago. I have never been opposed to the principle of State registration, though, I own that as regards the methods adopted at times by some of its advocates I have felt "non tali auxilio."—Yours truly,

E. COOPER PERRY.

It is an open secret in nursing circles that there has never been a more determined enemy where the emancipation of trained nurses is concerned, than the autocratic Medical Superintendent of Guy's Hospital, and that the reprehensible constitution of the College of Nursing Company is the expression of his reactionary policy.

Miss Macdonald naturally objected to the tone of the above letter, and sent a reply, which it is to be regretted, the Editor of the *Daily Telegraph* "could not find space to insert," so leaving the public under the false impression that she had made statements which she could not prove—a position in which no editor has any right to place a correspondent who has supplied him with irrefutable evidence to the contrary. We, therefore, insert Miss Macdonald's reply in extenso:—

To the Editor of the *Daily Telegraph*.

SIR,—I am glad that Sir Cooper Perry makes the admission that it is foolish to say that the Bill of the College is not contentious for, from the report of his statements, and from his remarks and those of other speakers at the College meeting last week, I and others were assuredly led to the conclusion that he regarded the College Bill as absolutely harmless and non-contentious. Large numbers of nurses have joined the College under the impression that it is so when, as a matter of fact, it is opposed to those vital principles upon which the whole fabric of the State Registration movement is founded.

I am pleased to learn that Sir Cooper Perry has never been opposed to the principle of State Registra-

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)