

Miss Sparshott and Miss Vincent's detailed objections on this point seem very unimportant, but I will answer them as far as my own Society is concerned. The register of our members is kept at our central office in London. The question of publication is merely a question of expense. Whether our members belong to one or more Societies seems to me beside the mark, and might apply to the College as well, but, as a matter of fact, I think a very small proportion of nurses join more than one Society, because of the expense. If they do, it is very much to their credit, for, in the case of the Societies federated with a Central Committee, they do so of their own free will, in order to promote the good of the profession. A large number of those who have joined the College, however, have done so under pressure from Matrons, or owing to the erroneous belief that the College register was practically the State register.

Then Miss Sparshott and Miss Vincent admit that Sir Arthur Stanley has based his scheme on the training school; in other words, upon the employers. They cannot at the same time maintain that it is based on the nursing profession. Therefore, they are committed to acknowledge that it is an employers' movement. That the nurses on their register will, ultimately, after some years, elect two-thirds of the Council, will not alter the fact that the College will necessarily remain biased by the interests of the training schools, which will have so much power over the economic existence of the electors.

Miss Sparshott and Miss Vincent state that the Medical Council is an independent and representative body, basing itself upon the Universities and Colleges and (though they do not make this quite clear) on the British Medical Association. This is really an argument on my side. The Medical Council is representative both of the colleges and of the organised society of the rank and file. The College of Nursing, on the other hand, has refused all representation of the latter class of organization, and has made the administration of the Act centre round itself. Does any one think that the medical profession would have submitted to the ignoring of the British Medical Association and the handing over of the register to one of the colleges?

The statement made by Miss Sparshott and Miss Vincent that Sir Arthur Stanley offered the societies representation under the Bill, is only misleading to those who do not understand legislation of this kind; nevertheless, it requires emphatic contradiction. Mentioning the names of an individual in a Bill is not granting the right of representation to societies. For the sake of the future status of the profession and for the sake of freedom of criticism and hope of progress, we demand this right persistently refused by the College.

The College correspondents ask why I described the honorary officers of the College as definitely employers. This question hardly seems to require an answer. They are employers. The Chairman of the Joint War Committee and Treasurer of

St. Thomas' Hospital represents employers on a very large scale (not to speak of V.A.D. interests). Both Sir Cooper Perry and Mr. Comyns Berkeley are doctors—namely, those on whom nurses are dependent for a livelihood. Any one who has worked on a Committee with both doctors and nurses, or even with matrons and nurses, knows that their weight as employers is overpowering, and that it takes a very strong-minded rank and file to oppose them. One does not blame either side for this, it is just human nature; but the organisation of the College is branded as undemocratic in consequence. It is not only sympathy from outside that is wanted to raise a profession, but internal independence of thought and freedom of action.

I feel I cannot trespass on your space sufficiently to answer the statements concerning the advance made in forming public opinion, but I am ready to do so at any moment if required. I will only say, shortly, that it was the war that made it clear to the public that State registration was required to rescue nursing from chaos, in the same way as it made it clear that women's suffrage was a necessary measure for the good of the public."

We might add that our Legislators have long been convinced of the necessity for State Registration, but after the Nurses' Registration Bill was passed by the House of Lords in 1908, it was consistently blocked in the Commons, before the War, with the connivance of the Government. Now we have votes, we must permit no further trifling with this question of national importance.

NURSING OPINION AND THE "TIMES."

We congratulate Mr. Herbert J. Paterson that after three weeks delay his reply to a letter from the Honble. Sir Arthur Stanley on the "Status of Nurses," which reflected on the action of the Royal British Nurses' Association, has at last been published by the *Times*. We have called attention to the boycott of nursing opinion on the State Registration of Nurses and other questions by the London press, against which nurses have recently drawn attention by a Poster Parade. The manner in which the press has found space for columns of advertisements from the British Women's Hospital Committee, pushing their detestable appeal for charity for the "Nation's Nurses," and the suppression of the Nurses' opinions on their own affairs, has brought this scandal to a head. Influential people have promised their aid in support of a public meeting to protest against this treatment by a subsidised press if it continues. In the meanwhile we call upon Viscountess Cowdray and her Committee to publish the amount of money spent in advertising this War Charity in the press.

On Tuesday, Viscountess Cowdray attended a meeting in Manchester to push forward the Nation's Fund

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)