

regarded with distrust and disfavour in many quarters.

What nurse of good standing will place her professional good name at the mercy of the Hon. Officers of an Association, whose Executive Committee incited its paid Secretary to threaten a member through a solicitor because she had written a very mild letter to the *Nursing Record*, criticising the management of the Association? History becomes ancient very quickly, but every trained nurse should acquaint herself with the facts of the Barlow Case, related at length in the *Nursing Records* of January 25th and February 8th, 1896.

The signature of Dr. Bezly Thorne appears beneath the now memorable letter informing Miss Barlow that the Executive Committee had decided to proceed against her, in relation to her letter, in accordance with the powers conferred upon them.

The writers then proceeded to quote the by-law which provides that "The Executive Committee shall have power to direct that the name of any nurse who shall, after full enquiry, appear to a majority of two-thirds of a meeting of the Committee unworthy to remain thereon, be erased from the list," etc.

It is impossible to imagine a more unwarrantable abuse of power than that proposed in the above letter. It is well known that Miss Barlow then took the only possible course of appealing to the Courts for protection, and that the Judge held that her appeal was justified, and ordered the Corporation to pay her costs.

A meeting of the Association was then called with the object of passing a resolution condemning the action of this nurse, who had exonerated herself in a Court of Law. Sir James Crichton Browne was in the chair, and it is noteworthy of the way in which the business was conducted that Miss Barlow's solicitor was called upon to leave the Hall, though the solicitor who defended the Hon. Officers of the Association in the action taken by her was present throughout the proceedings; and that though Sir James Crichton Browne, in this connection, "ruled on good advice that those who are not members of this Association must withdraw, and I must insist on their doing so," yet he permitted Sir John Russell Reynolds, not a member of the Association, to propose a resolution condemning Miss Barlow's perfectly justifiable action.

We have referred to this case at length because both the officers of the Association above referred to are still in power. Is it possible that any nurse who values her professional good name will venture to place it at their mercy, and subject herself to two possible alternatives, the removal of her name from the

Roll of the Association for the most trivial cause, or the necessity of defending it and her means of livelihood in a Court of Law?

Furthermore, the scheme of the R.B.N.A., besides being dangerous, for the reasons above given, is also futile, as it does not attempt to go to the root of the matter, and systematise a minimum qualification of education for a nurse, so that it will only encourage useless cram.

The unrepresentative nature of the body undertaking this responsibility is demonstrated by the fact that although the General Council of the Association consists of 90 persons a quorum of 15 could not be got together for the last meeting, and it was, therefore, proposed that this should be reduced to 12. How can so unrepresentative a body, governed entirely by a few medical men of no position in relation to nursing schools, expect to make any impression on the profession? Their scheme will only make confusion worse confounded.

The fact is that the R.B.N.A. is dying of inanition, and must do something to keep alive. But a membership principally gathered from South Australia cannot dictate to the trained nurses of the United Kingdom. The position is absurd.

We know that nothing short of Registration of Nurses under State Authority will satisfy the medical profession. It has declared itself quite certainly on this point. Neither will any substitute satisfy the nursing profession, and the best answer it can give to any such panacea, when offered to it, is to throw itself more heartily than ever into the State Registration movement.

Wedding Bells.

Miss Gladys Elizabeth Duncum, youngest daughter of Mr. William James Duncum, of West Hampstead, and Sister of Casualty Ward at St. Bartholomew's Hospital, E.C., was recently married at Emmanuel Church, West Hampstead, to Mr. Walter G. Loughborough, son of the late Mr. Walter Loughborough and Mrs. Loughborough, of "Bryn Derwen," Dorking. Miss M. A. Lush, who holds the certificate of St. Bartholomew's Hospital, has succeeded Mrs. Loughborough as Sister of Casualty Ward.

ALDOUS—CLARK.—On August 27th, at All Saints', Battersea Park, by the Rev. B. Cotton, James Edward Aldous, of the Inner Temple, Barrister-at-Law, eldest son of the late James Robert Aldous, to Agnes, daughter of the late William Charles Clark.

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)