

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 "COLLEGE" REGISTRATION PLEDGED GUINEA—NURSES TAKE WARNING!

A FOOL AND HIS MONEY ARE EASILY PARTED.

To the Editor of THE BRITISH JOURNAL OF NURSING.

MADAM,—During the passage of the Nurses Registration Bill, when the College of Nursing, Ltd., wished to impress Parliament, they declared that they expressed the opinion of 16,000 odd nurses.

I clearly remember a visit to Guy's in 1916, when some of those who blindly wandered into the College compound were scandalised when I suggested the probability of things turning out as they have now.

(1) The probability of the "College" Bill being thrown out, which process I pledged myself to help.

(2) The College members being left without power of appeal—as they are at present—I wonder how that subtle professor explains this away now to guileless nurses? He used to assure them "right of appeal was allowed by the College" "only in their Bill," I was wont to add, "which may never become law," and now, thank goodness, is dead!

(3) That the "College" had no right to pledge Parliament to accept their register, and probably would be forced to refund the money. I said then, as I do now, that if such a pledge were offered and wriggled out of in commercial circles those responsible would be severely handled.

College members would do well to inquire how their money has been invested or, more likely, expended. Sir Arthur Stanley refers to the College programme being spoiled if the nurses demand their legal rights. It seems to me that a programme which opens with such jugglery might well be destroyed, and one compiled by nurses substituted, which would omit items (1) lay control, (2) sleight of hand.

It is for the nurses who have been "had" to take a firm stand and demand back money solicited, given, and received under (we now learn) misapprehension, in order to save their fellow-nurses from worse treatment in the future.

By all means let us have an educational college, but let the foundations be clean and stable, and the control in the hands of the profession.

I am, &c.,

J. B. N. PATERSON,
Formerly Sister Guy's Hospital, Member
Trained Nurses' Professional Union,
Public Health Dept., Royal Borough
of Greenwich.

A FORTY-EIGHT HOUR WEEK FOR IRISH NURSES

To the Editor of THE BRITISH JOURNAL OF NURSING.

DEAR MADAM,—The paragraph in your issue of July 17th does not quite accurately represent the position of the Dublin Corporation in regard to the introduction of an eight-hour day in the City Hospitals. The matter was not postponed for six months, but was referred to the Estates and Finance Committee, who are now in correspondence with the hospitals and with this Union concerning it.

We realise, of course, and we have no doubt that the Corporation Committee realise equally that neither an eight-hour day nor a forty-eight-hour week can be introduced by a mere stroke of the pen. But some hospitals in Dublin already work only an eight-hour day, and it is therefore not unreasonable to expect that the remainder will be able to do so sooner or later. At the same time, I should like to make it clear that this Union does not ask for an eight-hour day, but for a forty-eight-hour week, or a ninety-six-hour fortnight.

Yours faithfully,

M. MORTISHED,

Secretary, The Irish Nurses Union.

REPLY TO CORRESPONDENTS.

The Editor begs to thank her various correspondents for their letters *re* "Ranks for Service Nurses," and their offers of support. The Parliamentary Council will not meet until September, when the matter will receive first consideration.

KERNELS FROM CORRESPONDENCE.
NURSING BY THE CLOCK.

Miss Mary Simpson.—"If private nursing is to be limited by law, private nurses had better at once begin to look round for other work—the public cannot afford to pay higher fees. I have been a private nurse for twelve years—most of the time at a £2 2s. fee. I have been adding up my 'makings' before and after I raised the fee to £3 3s. I find in 1917, I was engaged forty-six weeks at £2 2s., board and lodging, and took £96 12s. Last year, at £3 3s., I was only out thirty-nine weeks and took £122 17s. but board and lodging and washing for the extra seven weeks ran away with £15, so that all I gained was £7. Another point was that I nursed nearly as many cases, but for shorter periods. If overtime has to be paid patients will keep us for still shorter periods, and this means more and more wear and tear. I do hope we shall not be interfered with by the Hours of Employment Act.

I note Miss Adelaide Murray's colleague does not include spittoons in her 'extras.' To my mind keeping them sanitary is the most repulsive duty a nurse has to perform."

[Many private nurses share the opinion of Miss Simpson. If paper spittoons are used they can be burnt without cleansing.—ED.]

OUR PRIZE COMPETITION.

August 14th.—What are the principal causes of malnutrition in the school child, and what are its effects?

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)