

taking sides in a matter where such authorities disagreed, if we did not remember that these very authorities have been defending themselves lately for the very practice of sending out Nurses to the public who did not come up to the Association's standard. The argument that the standard is arbitrary, and that many almost untrained Nurses are better than others fully trained, which is used against the Registration scheme, was also used, if we remember right, by the authorities of the London Hospital, in defence of their own trespasses."

THE MIDWIVES REGISTRATION BILL.

WE are requested to insert the following:—
At the last meeting of the Lancashire and Cheshire Branch of the British Medical Association, the following report was presented and adopted:

"The undersigned members of the Committee appointed by the Lancashire and Cheshire Branch of the British Medical Association, 'to consider and report upon the Midwives Registration Bill,' beg to report to the members of the branch that we have considered the Bill clause by clause, and are of opinion that the Bill should be opposed, its defects being so numerous as to render its emendation impossible. We would call your serious attention to the fact that although various important amendments have been discussed, no one can give you any guarantee whatever that such amendments will be accepted by the House of Commons, or that the Bill will not be passed in a form objectionable to the bulk of the medical profession.

"We, therefore, suggest that the Lord President of the Privy Council, the Home Secretary, the President of the Local Government Board, the Members of Parliament for Lancashire and Cheshire, and the Council of the British Medical Association, be earnestly requested by the Council of the Lancashire and Cheshire Branch to use every effort to oppose this Bill."

Dr. Robert Rentoul made the following strong and somewhat startling statements:

"MR. PRESIDENT AND GENTLEMEN,—Before making any remarks upon the two reports presented by the Committee on the 'Midwives Registration Bill,' I shall call your attention to the way in which the officials of our association have failed to bring this subject before its members. And, as the statements about to be made refer to subjects of very great importance to us, I think it best to read this portion of my remarks.

"In March, 1890, I wrote to the *Journal* office asking for a copy of the 'Midwives' Re-

gistration Bill,' which had been ordered by the House of Commons to be printed on February 12, 1890. I was informed, in reply, that the Bill was not printed. In April I again wrote, and I was again informed that the Bill had not been printed. Now I wish to ask, Why was not this Bill printed at once in our journal and the attention of the branches called to it? It may be said that the Bill was not printed, but let us remember that two Members of our Association—Dr. Farquharson, M.P., and Sir W. B. Foster, M.P., one a member of the Reference Committee, and the other a member of our Parliamentary Bills Committee—"backed" this Bill, and introduced it into the Commons; therefore could not these two Members have supplied a copy to the *Journal* and so taken the opinion of our Association?

"Next, when an attempt was made, on May 21, 1890, to read the Bill a second time in the Commons, I forwarded a letter to the *Journal* on the Bill. That letter was suppressed. I next wrote to the 'Reference Committee' of our journal complaining that my letter had not been permitted to appear. I found that Dr. Farquharson, Dr. Holman, and Mr. E. Hart were members of this committee, Dr. Farquharson having been one of those who introduced the Bill, and Dr. Holman—as since shown—being a strong supporter of the Bill, he having lately accused the opponents of the Bill as being guilty of 'cupidity.' I do not complain of the mere rejection of a letter, but because several Members of the Association have written to me complaining that their communications on the same subject were suppressed, and because of the system of officialism in force. As the above letter was not inserted I again wrote, this time to the Parliamentary Bills Committee, but again nothing was done. I found that Mr. Hart, Dr. Holman, and Sir W. B. Foster, M.P.—the latter having been one of those who introduced the Bill—were Members of this Committee. At last, on June 21, my letter was inserted in small print, on the last page of the *Journal*, and not even noticed in the table of contents column.

"Next, on June 26th, 1890, I was asked to attend a meeting of the Parliamentary Bills Committee; but on the 28th I was officially informed that I was not to go, as I had been summoned by mistake. I replied that I would go, and on this I received a request to attend.

"Next, at the annual meeting of our association, in 1890, I brought forward a resolution for delay in passing the Bill. At that meeting Mr. Hart denounced my action and accused me of having 'sprung a rigmarole resolution upon the meeting.' And although the annual meeting passed a resolution asking for delay, a leaderette

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)