

THE REGISTERED NURSES' PARLIAMENTARY COUNCIL.

RANK FOR SERVICE NURSES.

The following letter from the Army Council has been received by the Hon. Secretary of the Registered Nurses' Parliamentary Council, in reply to that enclosing a copy of the Resolution in support of Rank for Service Nurses, forwarded to the Secretary of State for War and Air, on the 13th October last:—

War Office,
London, S.W.1,
8th November, 1920.

MADAM,—With reference to your letter of the 13th ultimo, addressed to the Secretary of State for War and Air, I am commanded by the Army Council to inform you that the resolution of the Registered Nurses' Parliamentary Council regarding the grant of relative rank to Members of the British Military Nursing Services has received most careful consideration, and it is regretted that it is not practicable to grant such rank to the ladies in question.

I am,

Madam,

Your obedient servant,

H. J. CREEDY.

In taking the initiative in placing the just claims of Service Nurses before Government Departments, we of course expected a *non possumus* attitude upon their part—it is habitual. That it is not "practicable" to grant relative rank to nurses, is not quite accurate. That such a reform is feasible has been proved by granting rank to Canadian and American Military Nurses.

We received a charming letter this morning full of helpful information on the subject, from Capt. Sayers L. Milliken, Assistant Superintendent Army Nurse Corps, Washington, in reply to one addressed to "Major Stimson" "who is on an extended inspection tour of our various hospitals throughout the United States." Nothing "impracticable" about that!

It remains to organise as our American colleagues have done, and the first thing to do is to ascertain what Queen Alexandra's Army Nursing Board is doing in the matter. Here they are:—*President*, Queen Alexandra; *Vice-President*, The Dowager Countess of Airlie; *Chairman*, Director-General Army Medical Service; *Members*, Miss A. B. Smith, Matron-in-Chief, Q.A.I.M.N.S.; Dame E. M. McCarthy, Matron-in-Chief, T.F.N.S.; the Lady Ampthill, V.A.D., the Countess Roberts, the Countess of Minto, Lady Codrington, Lady Knox, Miss E. S. Haldane, Miss B. Cox-Davies (Royal

Free), Miss A. Lloyd Still (St. Thomas's), Miss A. B. Baillie (Royal Inf., Bristol), Miss H. G. Smith (Western Inf., Glasgow), Miss E. S. Innes (General Inf., Leeds), Miss M. G. Montgomery (Middlesex). Are these ladies, or are they not, prepared to help forward this just and progressive movement, or are they in favour of bolstering up the present out-of-date system of Army Nursing organisation. When we know that, we shall know where we stand.

LEGAL MATTERS.

MACCALLUM v. THE SCIENTIFIC PRESS, LTD.

We are informed that the libel action brought by Miss Maude MacCallum against the Editor of the *Hospital and Nursing Mirror* and The Scientific Press, Ltd., is down for hearing at the High Courts of Justice on Tuesday, November 16th. We predict a crowded attendance of nurses, as the case is of vital importance to every member of the nursing profession.

WE WARN THE SCIENTIFIC PRESS.

We had hoped that, when the malign influence which dominated the journalistic publications issued by the Scientific Press, Ltd., had been removed by Providence, the jealous intolerance of the influence of this journal and its professional Hon. Editor would have ceased. Apparently, however, the policy of misrepresentation and attempted intimidation is to continue—to judge from the following untrue statement in last week's *Hospital*: "At a meeting of the General Nursing Council on Oct. 5th, the subject of the Hours of Employment Bill was brought forward. The Chairman having stated that the proceedings to follow were private, asked if the Press present would give their word that they should be so treated. Mrs. Fenwick, however, protested against the presence of the Press."

That statement is false.

The Report of the proceedings of the G.N.C., until it agreed to consider questions *in camera*, were reported in our issue of Oct. 23rd:

(1) A Resolution was agreed to consider the Rules, which were *sub-judice, in camera*;

(2) Business arising out of the letter from the Minister of Labour it was also agreed should be considered *in camera*.

Mrs. Fenwick did not express any opinion whatever, nor make any "protest against the presence of the Press," in connection with the Hours of Employment Bill. What she did was to inform the Chairman that she declined to discuss the amendments to the Rules—in her name on the Agenda—in the presence of the Press, as she considered them *sub-judice*, until they had been agreed and submitted for consideration to the Minister of Health, and had been approved by him, according to the provisions of the Nurses' Registration Act.

Mrs. Fenwick does not intend to tolerate further

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)