

training three years' training, in medical and surgical nursing, and the "deal" between Mr. Fardon and the Medical Defence Union is now a matter of history, but the R.B.N.A. has done nothing to give a guarantee of efficiency. It has merely accepted the standard enforced by the London Obstetrical Society, and sundry Lying-in Hospitals, and has made no attempt to raise it.) Mr. Fardon further made the amazing statement that "all the members of the R.B.N.A. had spent three years in a well appointed hospital, and had in addition taken out their certificates in monthly nursing." (Of course, everybody, except presumably Mr. Fardon, knows that the bulk of the members of the R.B.N.A. are ignorant of the very rudiments of monthly nursing. His remark as to "spending three years" in a hospital was well chosen, as the Middlesex Hospital, where he is the Resident Medical Officer, certifies its nurses without any examination into their knowledge.

It is pertinent to enquire what the R.B.N.A. has done to enforce a high standard of nurse training since the Matrons who founded it have severed their connection with it, and refused to be associated with Mr. Fardon and his supporters. It has defined no minimum curriculum, it enforces no examination, and it still accepts as members nurses who, not having gained the certificate of the hospital which they entered for training, complete the required three years in another, and perhaps hold the certificate of neither.

THE MIDWIVES ROLL OF THE R.B.N.A.

But one point Mr. Fardon has grasped, namely that if the Midwives Bill becomes law the List of Midwives published by the R.B.N.A. will be illegal in the case of all members not registered by the Midwives Board, each of whom will be liable to a fine of £5 for describing herself as a Midwife without being registered under the Act. The Honorary Officers of the R.B.N.A. inserted this list in the Roll without ever consulting the members, and, in our opinion, outside the powers conferred upon them by the Charter. Now they will have to delete it, or land the Association in litigation, as they have done in the past, by their incompetent conduct of business.

Mr. Fardon concluded: "As an Association (when has the R.B.N.A. been consulted on the question "as an Association?") we felt that we could not give our sanction to a Bill which did not provide in some way for the training of Midwives, because we considered that if it did not do this, instead of being a blessing it would be a source of danger. We found we were unable to amend the Bill, or to get those who were responsible in any way to listen to suggestions, and as we could not give any assistance to the Bill we withdrew."

THE DISCUSSION.

Dr. Galton moved that the concluding para-

graph of the report be omitted. He hoped no such futile thing would go out to the world. It was no earthly use to the Association or anyone else, and was like children at play saying "if we can't have it all we won't have it at all." If the Association preferred an amended Bill, let it try to get it amended. But the Midwives Bill had nothing to do with the Nurses' Association.

We entirely agree with Dr. Galton in thinking that the Midwives Bill has nothing to do with a Nurses' Association, which is, or should be, concerned solely with the nursing of the sick and of lying-in women. The Midwives Board, on the other hand, will be charged with the control of a body of midwifery practitioners who need know nothing of nursing, and who may not have spent a single day in a hospital. Although a small number of the members of the R.B.N.A. have qualified as Midwives, the Association has nothing to do with their control in this capacity, and it will be well advised if it confines itself to its legitimate functions as defined in its Charter, "the improvement of the profession of Nurses, and of the promotion of their efficiency and usefulness," and refrains from meddling with the control of midwives. There is plenty of work left undone ready to its hand.

On Dr. Galton's amendment being put to the meeting, five voted for it and four against it, and the fact that so few persons could be found to vote on this question shows the lack of interest of the members in the affairs of the Association at the present time. Mr. Fardon and his confrères have effectually strangled the sense of professional responsibility and the spirit of enthusiasm which inspired it in happier days.

THE MIDWIVES' BOARD.

A resolution was then passed: "That a deputation be appointed by the Council of the Royal British Nurses' Association to wait upon the Lord President of the Council, and to claim for the Association a seat on the Central Midwives' Board." The Lord President of the Privy Council, and the House of Commons should understand (1) that the Association concerned exhibited so little interest in the matter that only nine members of the Governing Body, which is composed of over 100 persons, recorded their votes in the discussion on the Bill, (2) that though the cry is that the Nurses' Association should be represented on the Midwives' Board there has been no suggestion that it should be represented by a Nurse. It is in fact an attempt to place another medical man on the Midwives' Board, and medical representation being already ample, we hope this fact will be appreciated. (3) Lastly, it appears to us an impertinence that the Association should claim (the word is Dr. Bezly Thorne's) a seat on the Central Midwives' Board, considering it has done nothing to further the movement for the Registration of Midwives, that it only numbers some 250

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)