

brought about by the action of the Royal British Nurses' Association which has placed itself in direct opposition to the expressed opinion of nearly all those who know most of the subject. The report of the Royal British Nurses' Association recently issued with the accounts for the year ended June 30th, 1890, proves that Mr. Wainwright's view is shared by doctors, matrons and nurses alike. This will be seen at a glance by comparing the numbers of the three classes of members as given in the accounts for the periods and year ended June 30th, 1889 and 1890 respectively. The following table brings out the facts clearly:—

Period or Year ended 30th June.	Life Members. Matrons and Sisters.	Nurses.	Doctors and Matrons at 10s. 6d. per annum each.	Nurses at 2s. 6d. per annum each.	Total Members.
1889	28	230	452	2,746	3,456
1890	3	111	170	1,687	1,971
Decrease in 1890	282	1,059	1,341

It thus appears that the total number of members who have paid their subscriptions, and may therefore be properly deemed to belong still to the Royal British Nurses' Association, according to the last report, is 1,857 only, to which we must add 372 life members, making in all but 2,229 members, if doctors, matrons, sisters, and nurses are all included. What are we to say, then, to the statement so often made that upwards of 3,000 Nurses are members of the Royal British Nurses' Association? The hon. secretary, it is true, declared at the annual meeting that once a member of the British Nurses' Association always a member, whether you pay your subscription or not, so long as you retain the card. This is a novel doctrine, and as a calculation it is entirely upset by the large number of old members who are reported to have burnt their cards. Besides, when the members who pay their subscriptions to an association decrease from 3,198 to 1,857, the present number as shown by the last published accounts—that is to say, by 1,341 in one year—is it not fair to conclude that its objects and methods do not commend themselves to those for whose benefit it was ostensibly established? At this rate the Association must soon die of inanition!"

Finally, we give the statements made by Mr. HENRY C. BURDETT—an official of the London Stock Exchange; Miss EVA C. E. LUCKES—Matron of the London Hospital; and Mr. FREDERICK TREVES—Surgeon to the same Institution—upon oath, before the Select Committee of the House of Lords in 1890 and 1891.

Mr. HENRY C. BURDETT was questioned by Lord SANDHURST, and replied as follows—

the italics are of course our own, and our readers will at once perceive the absurdly patent inaccuracies—(Second Report, 1891, pp 737-738.)

25889. The Registration affects the Nurses after they leave the Hospital, does it not?—If it affected them only after they left the Hospital, there would not be the objection to it that there is; but *it gives a bogus complexion to an untrained Nurse, and makes the public liable to believe that she is trained when she is not.*

25890. You can put in the document if you like to do so?—All I can say is that the subject of Registration is in a nutshell. *You have at present Registration in regard to all Nurses adequately trained; that is to say, that every Nurse's training school keeps a register of its Nurses, and issues a certificate to all who have had three years' service. Well, if the public want to know if a Nurse is trained, they have only got to ask her to produce her certificate from her nurses' training school, and that is the Registration pure and simple, which is a voucher that they can rely upon. If they are dissatisfied with the Nurse they can write to the Matron of the school where she was trained, and then the Matron will go into her case, and if necessary they will call up the Nurse and deal with it. So that the public really have adequate protection in that way. The contention is that they have not, and in order to put things right an outside body, which has had nothing to do with the training of Nurses, proposes to issue, and has issued, a certificate to such Nurses as it pleases to arbitrarily select these Nurses paying 10s. per head for the privilege. So that it happens that I have seen the case of a Nurse who did not get a certificate at her Hospital, because she was discharged for having in her possession the property of a Probationer; and her certificate was refused, and now she goes out as a trained Nurse, with Princess Christian's name as her authority for what she does. I consider that to be a very great evil, and so do nurses' training schools, and we say: If the public wish to have evidence of who are trained Nurses, by all means; under the authority of a properly constituted body, namely, those who train Nurses; you may have an official directory of trained Nurses, and that will contain the name of every woman that has had hospital training, and it will state precisely where she had it, and why her name has been included in that list.*

Earl CATHCART.

25891. You do not want to destroy the Hospital *esprit de corps* but to keep it up?—Yes, we want to keep it up; and we want the public to understand that, unlike doctors, it is the character of the woman herself that is the essential matter in regard to Nurses. The difficulty now is that when you get them into the house they may be like the east wind; they may be excellent institution Nurses, but utterly unfitted for private Nurses. *Now the Matrons who trained the Nurses, knowing the character of the women from the first to the last, are able to sort the Nurses to the cases; and in that way the doctor and the public get exactly what they want. But to take a Nurse because she is entered as a Nurse on a register may be to introduce the east wind into your house. I do not think I need trouble you any further on that point because; practically, the question is really dead."*

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)