

forms had been scrutinised by Mrs. Bedford Fenwick, put on one side, and deferred for the passing of the new Rule.

I repudiated the statement absolutely at the time, but it was not withdrawn, and as it was made publicly in the presence of the Press, I must ask you, as Chairman of the Council, in justice to my professional reputation, to read my letter at the meeting of the Council on June 16th, and to require, upon my behalf, a public withdrawal of the statement by the Chairman of the Registration Committee.

I am, Dear Sir,

Yours faithfully,

ETHEL G. FENWICK.

THE CHAIRMAN said that had the Chairman of the Registration Committee made the statement of which Mrs. Bedford Fenwick complained, he should require him to withdraw it, but it was not his recollection of what took place. He should put it to Dr. Goodall presently that what he said was something different.

MISS MACCALLUM, who had taken part in the work of scrutinising applications, said it was not possible for the Registrar to think Mrs. Fenwick had scrutinised the applications referred to; they had all been deferred until the passing of the new Rule.

THE CHAIRMAN then asked Dr. Goodall if he had made the statement referred to.

DR. GOODALL asked for the words complained of.

THE CHAIRMAN again read the sentence in Mrs. Fenwick's letter, which stated that Dr. Goodall had informed the Council that the Forms under consideration had been "scrutinised by Mrs. Bedford Fenwick, put on one side, and deferred for the passing of the new Rule."

DR. GOODALL acknowledged that he said the Forms had been scrutinised by Mrs. Fenwick; he had not said they had been passed by her; he certainly said they had been scrutinised, and had been so informed by the Registrar, and added that if Mrs. Bedford Fenwick said she had not done so, of course he would withdraw the statement.

MRS. FENWICK, in accepting Dr. Goodall's withdrawal of the erroneous statement, said that the particular Forms should not have been placed on the scrutineers' list, as they were not in conformity with the Rules; none of these papers were scrutinised and were at once thrown out and consideration "deferred until new Rule is approved," as notified on the scrutineers' list. Rule 9 (1) a, for conjoint certificates, as drafted by the Minister, was agreed to by the Council on March 17th, and on that day she had been eliminated from the Registration Committee, and was no further responsible for its business in any particular. From that date the Registrar was responsible for scrutinising applications, and Mrs. Fenwick demanded the withdrawal of the statement that she had recommended the four ineligible candidates.

Discussion.

DR. GOODALL moved the clauses of the Report *seriatim*.

No. 1 was agreed.

No. 2. MRS. FENWICK said the proposal was not

in order. The four nurses had been "approved for registration" by the Council as candidates "whose applications have been found to be in conformity with the Rules."

Also the Council instructed the Registrar "to enter their names in the appropriate part of the Register."

The Council also directed "that the appropriate certificate be granted to each of these applicants," and authorised the Registrar "to affix the Seal of the Council to each certificate."

Rule 44 (1) specially provided that the Council "may not delegate the power of removing a nurse from the Register to any Committee."

The proper course to take to rectify the omission to scrutinise these applications, upon the part of the Registrar and the consequent breach of the Statutory Rule 9 (1) a, was for a resolution to be submitted to the Council, after notice of motion, that the registration and grant of certificates to the four nurses be rescinded, and that the Council—not the Registration Committee—should direct the Registrar as to her duty in this connection. The Council was there to do justice to the nurses; it seemed cruel to cancel applications which had been approved. The four candidates held certificates of 3 years' training, and were better qualified than many nurses already registered under the Rules. Justice might be done in two ways—either by asking the Minister to permit six instead of twelve months' training in a woman's hospital to count for a conjoint certificate, or to defer their removal until the report of the Registration Committee as to the consideration of cases of hardship had been received.

MRS. FENWICK moved that the removal of these four applications be deferred. This was seconded by MISS MACCALLUM.

SIR JENNER VERRALL said he had every sympathy with bringing the names of these nurses on to the lists, but you could not defer a thing which had already been decided.

MISS MACDONALD said these names were not eligible under the present Rules for Registration.

DR. GOODALL said that, if it could be done without going against the Rules, he was in favour of holding up the names. He agreed with Mrs. Fenwick it was hard these nurses should not be registered.

THE CHAIRMAN said the position was that four cases had been passed in error. He suggested to Mrs. Fenwick that her proposal should provide that "action" should be deferred in regard to these applications.

MRS. FENWICK agreed, and her motion "that action as to these four applications should be deferred" was then carried, 18 votes being recorded in its favour.

No. 3. In moving No. 3 (leaflet pointing out the advantage of Registration), DR. GOODALL pointed out that the Committee had recommended that the leaflet should be sent to the authorities of general as well as special hospitals.

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)