

None of these Applications or the accompanying Certificates and References were scrutinised by me, or by any colleague, when inspecting applications. None were marked "Passed" on the List as eligible according to the existing Rules, and as they were put aside, I presume they were filed by the Registrar for future scrutiny should the Minister approve a Rule to make them eligible for consideration for registration.

On March 17th, the new Rule to reconstitute the Standing Committees primarily drafted to remove me from the Registration Committee came into operation, and I was ejected from it; and the new policy, proposed by Miss Cox-Davies, giving absolute discretion to the Registrar for the scrutiny of applications and references, came into full force.

Some twenty applications from nurses with conjoint certificates, as I have stated, were in the office, awaiting scrutiny—now the duty of the Registrar.

On April 21st, the General Nursing Council had before it a large number of applications for registration (the difficulty of procuring references had apparently been overcome). Hundreds of these applications were recommended by the Registration Committee without inspection as "in order." Amongst them were nineteen applicants holding the conjoint certificate of the Dreadnought Hospital, which in the past had exacted only six months' training at the Hospital for Women, Soho. I enquired, *before they were approved by the Council*, if these applications had been scrutinised? I was informed they were "in order." I then enquired if these Forms were in the room for reference? I was informed they were not. I then gave notice that I would scrutinise these Forms and Papers.

Miss Cox-Davies proposed that the inspection of the papers queried should be made in the presence of the Chairman of the Registration Committee (Dr. Goodall), but as this attempt to over-ride Rule 49 was out of order it was ignored. On April 24th, I scrutinised twenty Forms with conjoint certificates at the office, and found four out of that number did not conform to the new Statutory Rule. I then gave notice of the following Resolution to be placed on the Agenda Paper of the Council meeting on May 19th :—

Mrs. Fenwick to move :—

"That, as four out of twenty applications for registration, passed as eligible by the Council on April 21st, and since scrutinised, have been found not to conform to the Statutory Rules, the instruction to the Registration Committee, granting discretion to the Registrar, passed by the Council on February 17th, 1922, be rescinded, and the former instruction, passed on July 14th, 1921, directing the Registration Committee to consider applications and scrutinise testimonials before recommending them to the Council for approval, be substituted for it; so that a correct Register may be compiled, in conformity with the Statutory Rules, and the Council be saved the risk of litigation under Section 8 (2) of the Nurses' Registration Act, 1919."

On May 19th, I proposed the Resolution, which was seconded by Miss MacCallum. It was on the debate on this Resolution that the Cam-

paign of Calumny was carried a step further by Dr. Goodall and his supporters. Dr. Goodall, after acknowledging that the four applications did not conform to the Rules, stated, as an excuse, "All these particular Forms have been scrutinised by Mrs. Bedford Fenwick, put on one side, and deferred for the passing of the new Rule."

That statement is a lie.

Whether made primarily by the Registrar, or the Chairman of the Registration Committee, I unhesitatingly stigmatise it as a mean and contemptible evasion of the truth. The Registrar had been given the responsibility by the Council of scrutinising Forms without supervision. Presumably she failed to scrutinise these papers, *after the new Rule had been approved by the Minister, when for the first time they were eligible for consideration.*

Then, as on a former occasion in the House of Commons, I was blamed for the neglect of duty of others, without a shred of evidence in support of so gross a misstatement.

Then we come to the outrageous personal attack made upon me by Sir Jenner Verrall, who was not present at the previous Meeting, and who had no personal knowledge whatever of the question under discussion. But this ignorance did not deter him from accusing me of cowardice and trickery—"in the hope of obtaining a cheap triumph at the expense of an official who could not defend herself." (I have never found the lady incapable of speech or diffident in this connection.)

I have never submitted in silence to be bullied and browbeaten by any man, and I am not going to submit to such methods of intimidation in the performance of my public duty on the General Nursing Council from any member of it, male or female, without publicly protesting against it.

Sir Jenner Verrall has, with the majority of the Council, helped to thrust the disastrous bureaucratic management of the Nurses' Register upon our Profession, and is, presumably, compelled to support the system when it is proved to be a snare and a delusion. But that is no excuse for his most insulting method of debate.

Actions at Law.

And what about the four applications under discussion?

Dr. Goodall repudiated the idea of "actions at law." The reference to "risk of litigation" he scouted as a "mare's nest."

But I am not so sure.

These four applicants have been registered by the General Nursing Council for England and Wales.

The Council, on April 21st, instructed the Registrar "to place their names in the appropriate part of the Register."

It was also approved :—

"That the appropriate certificate be granted to each of these applicants, and that authority be hereby given to affix the Seal of the Council to each certificate."

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)