

working for legal registration in increased numbers since the College Scheme was started. If Sir Henry Burdett wished to quarrel he must quarrel with the nurses of Scotland, not with him. He represented 2,000 nurses. Whom did Sir Henry Burdett represent?

The question was, Should they act by promoting the College or the Bill? He thought nurses and Matrons confused what was meant by registration by the Bill and by the College. The College proposed to get recognition of its own Register. The Bill was applicable to the nurses of the Kingdom. The question was, Should they have State registration, or registration of the members of the College? He was prepared to support Dr. Chapple's resolution, the meeting was there to express an opinion.

MAJOR CHAPPLE said he would make one other offer. He asked Mr. Stanley if he would accept his Bill and promote it if he retired, or if not that Bill in its entirety, then any Bill he liked to draft loyal to the central position of State enactment. He could not say fairer than that.

MR. STANLEY said he would agree to that at once. The Council would have to go through the Bill, but, in regard to the cardinal principles, he agreed to that at once.

DR. CHAPPLE said then why in the name of all common sense should they not set up a Committee from that meeting to draft a Bill? If they were going on with the College they must face the hostility, indifference, or support of the Central Committee. There was no other way of defining the position of the trained nurse except by crystallising her title and qualifications in a Bill.

MR. COMYNS BERKELEY said that Major Chapple was speaking only for himself. A certain number of those present had come to support the College because it was their firm conviction that it was the shortest way to Registration.

MR. STANLEY said that was the reason why he looked upon Major Chapple's resolution as out of order. They were there that day to discuss the formation of the College of Nursing—(no, no!)—one of the ultimate objects of which was to obtain Registration.

DR. MCGREGOR ROBERTSON said he did not come from Scotland for that.

MR. STANLEY said he came to discuss the College, surely.

MRS. BEDFORD FENWICK said she did not.

DR. MCGREGOR ROBERTSON said he came to see how far the views of those promoting the College could be reconciled with the views of those promoting the Bill.

MR. STANLEY thought that was a longer way round of saying the same thing.

DR. MCGREGOR ROBERTSON said "No," he did not come to support the College.

MR. STANLEY said he did not say that he did. He came to discuss the College.

DR. MCGREGOR ROBERTSON said he did not.

PROFESSOR GLAISTER said that he did. In connection with the Articles of Association of the

College (w) at present ran "To promote a Bill in Parliament for any object connected with the interests of the Nursing Profession, and in particular with their education, organisation, protection, or for their recognition by the State," he asked that "or" might be changed to "and."

This was accepted by Mr. Stanley.

MRS. BEDFORD FENWICK said she had been asked to bring the two documents which she held in her hand before the meeting by the Society which she represented, and she wished to ask whether or no the Memorandum of the Incorporated Society for Promoting the Higher Education and Training of Nurses, and the present Memorandum of the College of Nursing were not practically identical. She thought, with the exception of about 100 words they were the same document. In 1905 the Memorandum of the first mentioned Society, emanating from Guy's Hospital, as did also the present scheme, was submitted to the Board of Trade. Among the Societies which then opposed it were the British Medical Association, the Matrons' Council, the Society for the State Registration of Trained Nurses, the Royal British Nurses' Association, the Committee for Promoting the State Registration of Nurses in Scotland, the Irish Nurses' Association, and a number of others. Each of these appeared before the Board of Trade by its appointed representatives and gave the most excellent reasons why the scheme was an extreme danger to the nursing profession. In her opinion it had not altered one iota. It was a most dangerous scheme. It professed to give the nurses something which they wanted, while it gave them nothing. It took absolute powers to keep things from them. They might have neither titles nor diplomas nor an elected Council. She protested against it in the name of all the nurses she represented; as they had not been permitted to discuss the details of an agreed Bill as arranged upon her proposition at the last meeting, they intended to protest against this subjugation of the nurses, for that was what it amounted to. There was one significant difference. In the former scheme the word "Limited" was omitted, but on application being made for leave for the former Society to become incorporated, without the word Limited, those opposing the scheme before the Board of Trade had the opportunity of giving their reasons, and those reasons prevailed.

When the Nursing College was first launched notice was given that the promoters intended to apply for leave to become incorporated without the word Limited, but now that it was to be merely a Limited Liability Company the nurses would have no opportunity of opposing it before the Board of Trade. The scheme gave nurses no legal status, no protected title, nor anything they had been working and paying for all these years. It was a subterfuge, and it must be opposed.

MR. COMYNS BERKELEY said Mrs. Fenwick had appeared to think that because the Royal British Nurses' Association had objected to the scheme in 1905 they were in a false position in supporting it

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)