

## Professional Review.

THE REGISTER OF TRAINED NURSES OF  
THE ROYAL BRITISH NURSES'  
ASSOCIATION.

THIS publication is just issued for 1898, and is extremely discreditable to the Royal British Nurses' Association, and especially to those members of it who, by the decree of the Medical Hon. Secretary, Mr. Fardon, have been elected on to the so-called Registration Board.

In 1896 Mr. Fardon—with that incapacity for which he has become notorious—proposed that the system of sending out verification slips to the members, by which they could correct, if necessary, the entries against their names, should be discontinued. Of course, the nurse members were at once deprived, without their consent, of this means of keeping their Register correct and up-to-date.

Then, in 1896, "our only organizer" proposed to deprive all the *ex-officio* members of the Registration Board of the seats they had held for seven years, and these ladies and gentlemen—the founders of the Register—were of course all swept off the Board, leaving a clear course for Mr. Fardon's disintegrating policy. He promptly nominated to seats on this important Sub-Committee "loyal supporters"—amongst them we find the names of four ladies—Miss Thorold, Miss Medill, Miss Ambler Jones, and Miss Robin (Lady Superintendent of Princess Christian's Nursing Home, Windsor)—whose sense of professional responsibility has not prompted them to place their own names on the Register, so that we have the anomaly of certificated nurses being registered by unregistered persons. What greater proof of Fardonian foolishness is necessary?

• The new Register is before us, and has, this year, for reasons of economy, been brought out in entirely a new form, and it is as near as possible, without infringing the copyright, a copy of the Nursing Directory; it bears no resemblance to a Register. For instance, the names, and addresses, and qualifications are not given in separate columns as of old, but merely a list is issued.

But nurse members may be thankful for small mercies, as the late Nurse Hon. Secretary, Mrs. Dacre Craven, proposed to *omit the addresses of nurses from the Register*, and this was agreed to by the facile Committee. This ridiculous step has, nevertheless, not been taken, for it perhaps glimmered on the Committee that, without the nurses' addresses, the Register would be the most farcical work of its kind.

The fact remains that the Register has not been corrected by reliable information and brought up to date for two years, and that it is, therefore, an unreliable and misleading publication (as Sir Henry Burdett has found to his cost in copying its entries into his so-called Directory). But the gross carelessness with which it has been passed for press—we presume by the Registrar, Miss Marion Bunnett—greatly aggravates the inaccuracies.

A new Preface has been inserted in the Register, containing the following unwarrantable statement:— "It aims (the Royal British Nurses' Association), in the first place, at securing, for the advantage of the public and the best interests of the Nurses, a high standard of training by means of a *voluntary* system of registration."

According to the President's signed statement, made with the approval of the Executive Committee in 1894:

"It is the hope of the Corporation that the time is not far distant when the State will see the importance of recognizing a definite diploma of nursing, and of giving its official sanction to the maintenance of the Register of Trained Nurses"!!

In the Vice-Presidents' list, Sir Thomas Smith and Sir John Williams have both been deprived, by Miss M. Bunnett, of their baronetcies. Miss M. G. Smith still appears amongst the *ex-officio* members of the Executive Committee, although all the world, with apparently the exception of the Registration Board, is well aware that she has resigned the post which entitled her to the seat! Opposite the office of Nurse Hon. Secretary is a significant blank—How typical of the management of the Royal British Nurses' Association!

Quite one-third of the addresses are incorrect, and nearly two hundred are "uncommunicated." Poor Margaret Pocock, who has been dead for years, again appears in the Register—though a wise reticence is maintained as to her present abode! We called the Registrar's attention to this inaccuracy *last year*.

Georgina Barlow, Lena Beecraft, Ellen Mary Cross, Mabel England, Mary Ponsford, Agnes Clifford Smith, all still appear under their maiden names, although all are married—several, for years. We also called attention to some of these mistakes *last year*.

The following entries are an example of the ignorant carelessness with which the Register has been compiled:—"Greenfield, Katherine A. Registered Nov. 25th, 1890. *Tudliana, Punjab, India*. St. Thomas's Hosp., 1885-86; Children's Hosp., Great Ormond Street, 1886-88; Charlotte Hosp., *Ludiana*, 1889 to date of Registration."

"Betty, Rachel A. Registered May 2nd, 1890. *Sisters' Quarters, Umtatta (Umballa, we presume), India*. Cert. St. Bartholomew's Hosp., 1880-88; Indian Nursing Service, 1888 to date of Registration"!

About a hundred nurses entered their names on the Register last year (and as more than half of them are now Members of the Registered and Chartered Societies, their action cannot be taken as a guarantee of disinterested professional aspiration). Of these it is interesting to note that Middlesex Hospital supplies twelve; St. George's, eleven; West London, seven; London Temperance, six; Guy's, four; St. Mary's, four; London Homoeopathic, four; Royal Infirmary, Bristol, four; Sussex County, Brighton, four; St. Bartholomew's, two; St. John's House, two; Bridgewater Infirmary, two; Brownlow Hill Infirmary, two; Addenbrooke's, Cambridge, two; Royal Infirmary, Dundee, two; New Somerset, Cape Town, two; and about forty other Institutions supply one nurse each.

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)