



Letters to the Editor.

Notes, Queries, &c.

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 ROYAL BRITISH NURSES' ASSOCIATION.

To the Editor of "The Nursing Record."

DEAR MADAM,—May I be allowed, through the medium of the NURSING RECORD, to point out to the members of the Royal British Nurses' Association the important fact that it is *officially stated* in the *Nurses' Journal* that the matters referred to in the resolution put upon the agenda for the Annual Meeting by Miss Margaret Breay "are now ancient history." It is "ancient history," namely, that "pledges given by the Association have been broken," that "the expenditure of the Association has been allowed so greatly to exceed its reliable income," that "the provisions of the Charter have been violated," and that "a member of the Association has been compelled to appeal to the Court of Chancery for protection against the Executive Committee." It appears to me that the importance of this admission cannot be over-estimated, and that those who have the best interests of the Association at heart will be glad to see such a frank acknowledgment of its errors in its official organ. At the same time I cannot agree with the Editor that because these matters are ancient history they should be "allowed to pass into oblivion." *When they have been rectified* by all means let them do so, but until then we should surely be repudiating our responsibilities as members of the Association, and acting wrongly, if we allowed these irregularities to pass without protest.

I am, dear Madam,
Yours faithfully,
MABEL M. S. HARDY.

Colston House,
Fairford, Gloucestershire,
August 27th, 1896.

THE GENERAL COUNCIL LIST.

To the Editor of "The Nursing Record."

DEAR MADAM,—As a Member of the Council of the Royal British Nurses' Association, I should like to draw the attention of the members to the statement made by the Medical Hon. Secretary at the Annual Meeting concerning the removal of the medical men from the Council.

Mr. FARDON said: "It is untrue to say that a single medical man has been removed from the Council. Names come off in the ordinary way every year, and it is quite open for any voter to erase any name of a candidate who may be proposed for election on the Council. No voter has any more power than another. It is open for any and every member alike to erase any names."

Now this is a very misleading statement upon the part of the Medical Hon. Secretary, firstly, because

the Bye-Law constituting the Council gives no power for the removal of medical men from the Council—once they are elected—and, secondly, I can prove from past voting papers which I have in my possession that the names of the medical members have never been thus removed in rotation—*until this year.*

BALLOT PAPERS.

General Council List, 1893-94-95.—

Ninety-six Medical men on the General Council Ballot Paper, *not one name italicised for removal.*

General Council List, 1894-95-96.—

One hundred Medical men on General Council Ballot Paper, *not one name italicised for removal.* One name—Mr. A. Pearce Gould, F.R.C.S.—was placed on List for Election, making 101 names, which was a most irregular proceeding.

General Council List, 1895-96-97.—

Ninety-nine Medical men on General Council Ballot Paper, *thirty-four names italicised for removal*, and thirty-four *new* names proposed for election, leaving one vacancy, which was filled up at the Annual Meeting.

Yours truly,
M.R.B.N.A.

"THE NEW NURSE AND THE OLD."

To the Editor of "The Nursing Record."

MADAM,—Under this heading, the Editor of the *Nurses' Journal* gives us a description of those Nurses who, she says, "think that they should take a more 'advanced' position; that they should study anatomy and physiology, and other subjects, far more than has hitherto been thought necessary to enable a Nurse to efficiently discharge her proper duties." I am no admirer of the Nurse who is so theoretical as to forget that her knowledge of these subjects is to her a means to an end, and makes it the end itself, but, given that her patients are her first consideration, and that she plans her life, and arranges—so far as is left to her to do it—her courses of study, with a view to enable her to nurse them in the most intelligent manner possible, I do not see why she is to be blamed if she wishes to know more than her predecessor of ten years ago. The laws of Nature demand that everything shall move on, and I fail to understand why Nurses should be expected to violate them. I heard the other day of a Nurse who said, "When *she* was trained there were no such things as microbes." Are we all, therefore, to strive after a present condition of ignorance of their existence? I know, also, of a Nurse who made a remark to her ward Sister (one of the "old" school) upon the condition of a patient's pulse, and the answer she received was: "If any Nurse in this ward goes taking patient's pulses, I'll go straight down to the Matron; the next thing will be the Sister will have to chart them, as if there wasn't work enough! It is just because some Nurse interfered with what didn't concern her that now the Nurses have to take temperatures. In *my* time the students always came in and took them." Does the *Nurses' Journal* desire that we should return to things as they were twenty years ago?

We are further told that "the aim and object of this movement (*what* movement is not very apparent) is to obtain, if possible, a position for the Nurse independent of ordinary medical control; we hear now and again of such Nurses allowing themselves to speak contemptuously of the general practitioner, and trying to be-little him in the estimation of his patient." If this

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)