

in the future the better housing of the working classes. The difficulties connected with work at school are made easier when something is known of physiology, especially in so far as it relates to the special senses.

The prevention of small-pox by vaccination raises the question of the vaccination laws and their administration by Boards of Guardians. Similarly, too, the necessity for the isolation of the sick in cases of infectious illness involves the question of isolation hospital accommodation on the part of local authorities.

But all these questions appeal to a far wider public than the experts immediately concerned in their execution. Many women now take a prominent place on Boards of Guardians, on School Boards, in charity organisation work, and in parochial work generally.

There cannot be a doubt that some scientific training on the points which present themselves at every turn in their work would be of immense assistance to them. The course in hygiene provides this training, and it is greatly to be desired that its possibilities in this direction should become more widely known. The educational value of the course alone is high, and should appeal to those who are anxious to obtain a wide culture. A definite object, namely, the knowledge of the laws governing personal and public health, is kept steadily in view, and every path leading up to that end is conscientiously pursued.

The Course of Scientific Instruction in Hygiene at Bedford College is now recognised by the Examination Board which alone can grant Sanitary Inspectors' Certificates in the Metropolis, and is the most efficient course at present organised.

The Royal British Nurses and the Midwife Question.

What nurses and midwives want to know is what have Mr. Fardon and the Executive Committee of the R.B.N.A. done with the resolution he thrust through the special Council meeting of June 13th to expunge the certificate of the Obstetrical Society from the Midwives' Bill as a qualification for registration?

This resolution was not rescinded by the General Council—the so-called governing body of the Association—prior to the discussion of the Bill by the Lords.

We can only conclude, therefore, that it has been quite illegally suppressed. By whom? is the question.

If the members of the Council, and, failing them,

the general body of members, do not demand to know who has acted in this high-handed and illegal manner, they are even more blameable than the men who treat them and their rights under the Royal Charter with such insolent contempt.

It goes without saying that the official organ of the Association suppresses the whole matter in the current issue in its report of the recent Council meeting. But as the *Nurses' Journal* is edited by the Secretary, with the help of the hon. officers, one can hardly expect the nurses' interests to be worth consideration.

The official organ of the Midwives' Institute—*Nursing Notes*—remarks:—

“We naturally looked attentively for the amendment when the Midwives' Bill was discussed in the House of Lords, but none appeared. What was the reason for this complete collapse? There are two explanations, both equally untenable. One is that no peer could be found to undertake so unreasonable an amendment. This is not likely; there were other amendments put down, some of them not of the wisest, and a diplomat who could get the Bill first ably opposed in the Commons and then obtain representation for his Association as the Bill progressed, would have easily persuaded one of the peers to take charge of what looked quite an innocent little amendment to the unknowing; the other explanation is that wiser counsels in the Association prevailed, and Mr. Fardon was desired not to push the amendment. We think this is the most likely, but we now want to know how it was done. A representative of *Nursing Notes* was refused admittance to the next meeting of the Council of the Royal British Nurses' Association, at which presumably some explanation of this change of front on the part of the Executive must have been given, although so far as may be judged from recent proceedings the Council and Executive of the R.B.N.A. are not governed by any of the ordinary rules of business, and follow or ignore the resolutions passed at their Council meetings in a manner surely unprecedented in any other legally constituted Association. The exclusion of all but members of the Council is a most unusual proceeding on the part of this Association, if a very significant one, and it must be a great matter for regret to the friends of the Association that such tactics should find a place in the administration of a public body. We can hardly believe that the R.B.N.A. can calmly permit its Executive to override resolutions of Council. [We can.—Ed.] In this case it was so foolish a resolution that it certainly was a good thing for the repute of the R.B.N.A. that it never saw the light of the House of Lords, but it is a still more serious matter to shake the faith of members of an Association in its Executive, which, if such high-handed action has been taken, will certainly be the case, at least if the members of the R.B.N.A. notice in the least what is done at headquarters.”

We should advise the editor of *Nursing Notes* to study our criticisms of Mr. Fardon's administration in last week's issue; she will not then wonder at the silence of intimidated nurses.

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)