

"SIR,—Whatever the decision of the Privy Council may be as to the Charter asked for by the Royal British Nurses' Association, you will, I am sure, allow me to say that the objections to the registration of Nurses in the form and under the circumstances set out in the application are fundamental and serious. The writer of the article glazes over those objections, but neither states nor answers them. His statement of the alleged facts of the case is, moreover, in the highest degree imperfect and incorrect. The Association is described as having been formed in 1887 'in order to unite all qualified British Nurses in membership of a recognised profession, and to provide for their registration on terms satisfactory to physicians and surgeons.' Now there is only one legal way of really doing this, and that is by Act of Parliament, as was done for the medical profession, the dentists, the veterinary surgeons, and the pharmacutists, and is in course of being done for the plumbers. Anything else is a sham; the register would be a sham register, and would be a trap to the public and an injustice to the Nurses. There would be no means of protecting the title given or the word 'registered.' The register would have no legal force; any number of other registers might be created alongside of it, and there would be no penalty for any Nurse, trained or untrained, qualified or unqualified, calling herself 'registered;' and there would be no security that any Nurse 'struck off the register' for misconduct or incompetency would not continue to palm herself off upon the public as "registered." Moreover, the council which is to "make the register" is not necessarily, and will not necessarily be, a body of a truly representative character. It has always been held to be essential that the body which is to prescribe conditions for registration shall be of a definitely representative constitution, and have fixed relations with the educational bodies whose certificates form the basis of its registration. The council of this Association does not pretend to fulfil these essential conditions, and has no such relations. It is acting in direct opposition to the most influential of them. To compare the proposed nominal registration with that which Acts of Parliament have established for the professions named is to impose upon the unskilled reader by suggesting a perfectly unreal analogy in a case where there is in truth only dissimilarity in all but a deceptive name. The approval of the medical profession of the proposed register is incorrectly assumed and alleged. Only one medical representative body has, so far as I have observed, expressed an opinion on the subject—the Parliamentary Bills Committee of the British Medical Association, a committee of delegates representing an association of some 14,000 medical men. That opinion, which was duly represented by letter to the Privy Council, is wholly opposed to the creation of such a register by charter, although sympathetic with the other general objects of the Association. In that sympathy and those objections I strongly concur, and I believe that the public generally cannot fail to do so when the facts are known. The Association has not ventured to go to Parliament for powers to make a real register. The many defects in their constitution, their imperfectly representative character, and the excessive pretensions of their present claim would make such an application futile. It is certainly not in the public interest that power should be granted by charter to make what would be nothing else than a sham register.—I am, Sir, your obedient servant, ERNEST HART, Chairman of the Parliamentary Committee of the British Medical Association, 429, Strand, Nov. 22."

The "NURSING RECORD" has a Larger Sale than any other Journal devoted solely to Nursing Work.

"SIR,—In a letter published in your issue of the 23rd inst, on the question of the Charter asked for by the Royal British Nurses' Association, Mr. Ernest Hart states that only one representative body of the medical profession has expressed an opinion on the subject, and that an adverse one—namely, the Parliamentary Bills Committee of the British Medical Association. This statement is inaccurate, as at a specially-convened and largely-attended meeting of the General Practitioners' Alliance, held on April 5 last (at which I had the honour to preside), it was unanimously resolved, 'That this meeting of the General Practitioners' Alliance considers that the registration of trained nurses is a measure which is calculated to protect the sick against untrustworthy nurses, and will be of much advantage to medical men by affording them ready and reliable information as to the training and experience which nurses have received. This meeting, therefore, believes that it would be for the public welfare that the Royal British Nurses' Association should be incorporated by Royal Charter, and requests the President of the Alliance to forward a copy of this resolution to the Lord President of the Privy Council.' As to the resolution in opposition to the Charter, so gleefully referred to by Mr. Hart, it by no means represents the views of the members of the British Medical Association as a body. It was passed at a meeting of about a dozen members of one of the numerous committees of the Association, and records only the personal feelings of those present. On the other hand many hundreds of members of the Association have expressed themselves in favour of the Charter. I trust, therefore, that your readers will not imagine that Mr. Hart is authorised, as he evidently would wish them to believe, to act as the mouthpiece of the 14,000 members of the British Medical Association. The question of the Royal Charter is now *sub judice*, and rests with the Lords of the Privy Council. I shall, therefore, not follow Mr. Hart's example by entering upon a discussion of its merits.—I am, Sir, your obedient servant, GEORGE BROWN, Late President of the General Practitioners' Alliance and Member of the British Medical Association, 29, Threadneedle-Street, November 24th."

I AM asked by Mr. W. S. WINTLE, Secretary of the Foundling Hospital, to state that Miss HUNTER was not the Matron of the Hospital, but the Superintendent of its Infirmary.

I AM asked to mention that H.R.H. the Duke of CONNAUGHT has graciously accepted a copy of the Practical Treatment of Cholera, by Dr. SHERMAN BIGG, of the Army Medical Service, which is now appearing in these columns, and has been issued in book form by the Record Press.

A VALUED Correspondent writes from Darmstadt:—"I send some particulars of the opening of an establishment for Nurses in Berlin, which you may perhaps think worth a place in your paper. I hope, some day, similar establishments will be opened in England. The Empress FREDERICK commemorated her 52nd birthday by laying, in Berlin, the foundation stone of the 'Victoria Hause' (corner

The "NURSING RECORD" has a Larger Sale than any other Journal devoted solely to Nursing Work.

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)