

their nurses (they do not willingly admit that they are ever "graduates" or free from school control, but like to keep this control over them for life) joining *general* societies, such as the county, city, or State groups, which Americans, in their precious freedom, have been able to build up, and which we know to be so all-important in breaking down lines of narrow separation and bringing all together in one circle, in enabling nurses to compare their views and to unite their strength for true standards and principles.

How far should we have progressed in State Registration had we not had our self-governed county and State societies?

When such matrons, then, talk of democratic management and control, it simply means that they do not understand the essence of such control, since their own nurses have never been permitted to learn it. They have taken up the popular catchwords of the day, no doubt in good faith, but do not know their actual implications.

The structure of the College of Nursing, Ltd., is essentially autocratic. The letter itself, signed by Miss Still and Miss Amy Hughes, shows this, as it is perfectly clear therein that this College Company is a close corporation.

The Leaflet issued by the Trained Nurses' Protection Committee, exposing the autocratic Constitution of the College of Nursing, Ltd., is republished in the *American Journal of Nursing* in support of Miss Dock's criticism.

We have once again to thank Miss Dock for her clear-sighted and courageous advocacy. Many years ago Miss Dock took the trouble to tour Europe, and to enquire into Nursing conditions in nearly every country. Her opinions are not formed on accounts, "biased" or otherwise, which appear in the press. She has studied "English Nursing Politics" on the spot, and is fully conversant with the antagonism with which hospital authorities and their discreditable "press" have treated the State Registration question as advanced by what she terms the "intelligentsia,"—that is, by the women who years ago had the brains to evolve a well-defined policy of reform.

#### AN HISTORICAL SURVEY.

Mrs. Bedford Fenwick has consented to repeat her address to the National Party, "An Historical Survey of the Registration Movement," as the younger generation of nurses have had little opportunity of instruction on the question.

## "THE LANCET" AND THE SOCIETY FOR THE STATE REGISTRATION OF TRAINED NURSES.

In its issue of July 6th, *The Lancet* published, in an article on "Registration of Nurses," comments on the conduct of business at the Annual Business Meeting of the Society for the State Registration of Trained Nurses, based on misapprehension, which reflected adversely on the policy of the Society.

Having pointed out that Major Chapple, who is in charge of the Central Committee's Bill, was prepared "to assist in an agreed Bill" with the College of Nursing, Ltd., *The Lancet* remarked:

"We welcome an assurance made by Mrs. Bedford Fenwick from the Chair, speaking on behalf of the Society for the State Registration of Trained Nurses, that the Society has never been obstructionist; and now is evidently the time to give practical proof of this. A resolution was passed at the Annual Meeting of the Society for the State Registration of Nurses, and sent to the Central Committee for State Registration, which contained a clause dissociating the Society from the College of Nursing. The affirmative vote was by no means a large one, but an amendment to secure freedom from 'the domination' of the College of Nursing, 'without dissociation from it' was not accepted by the chair. We find this attitude hard to distinguish from obstruction; we have every confidence in the ability of nurses to settle their own polity without help from outside . . . nothing is more certain than that the profession of nursing is likely to undergo profound changes within the next few years; and, provided that it is placed in a position to manage its own affairs, plasticity is altogether desirable."

As quite inadvertently, no doubt, *The Lancet's* statement was calculated to give a wrong impression, Mrs. Bedford Fenwick, whose conduct of business was criticised, sent an explanation to *The Lancet*, too late, she was informed, for insertion in its issue of July 13th; and upon asking that it might appear this week, she has been informed that—

"We shall, of course, be glad to insert a statement that the amendment was proposed by a person not a member of your Society and therefore not accepted by you as Chairman. I fear considerations of space will hardly permit of dealing with the other matters at length, especially as they would give rise to correspondence for which we could not possibly find room."

To which Mrs. Fenwick replied:—

"I much regret that you are unable to find space for my letter on the article which appeared in *The Lancet* on July 6th, on the 'Registration of Nurses,' as it is calculated to give a wrong impression, so far as the policy of the Society is concerned, and also of my *personal* attitude and

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)