

should provide, therefore, that no one is eligible for registration without a specified preliminary training in a recognised training-school—one where the standards are sufficiently high. But you must not, at least at the beginning, make these standards too high. . . . You must be liberal in that respect, and consider what it is wise to require.

You have to consider exactly how to proceed to secure the State examining board. . . . Most of these laws provide that the examining board shall consist of persons chosen, or at least nominated, by the State Association, and that seems to me probably the wisest method.

These two features, then, are the ones which ensure that the registered nurse has the requisite knowledge. They ensure that she has been graduated from a recognised training-school, one with the proper standards as regards the period of study and practical training. The law provides that after the nurse has given evidence that she possesses the preliminary training she must pass an examination, not by her own training-school, where conditions come in that do not absolutely ensure the necessary qualifications, but before a separate and distinct examining board. Those are the essential features.

Now what objection can possibly be raised against this desire on the part of the nurses' profession? No real objection, but you are likely, I suppose, to encounter some opposition, and I suppose that opposition will be based upon the idea that such a law as this sets up an unjustifiable distinction; that it sets apart a certain class from others. But the distinction is one eminently desirable:—namely, that the term "registered nurse" shall mean that here we have nurses who possess certain defined qualifications. At present a diploma does not mean that of necessity, so that you require protection on account of the inflow into your profession of those who claim the same title without having fulfilled the same qualifications. Therefore this argument, which is the only one which occurs to me, is one that you will be able to meet—that you are proposing a distinction, but one based upon right and justice, and one that it is certainly eminently desirable to make. The best argument, perhaps, is that of the benefit to the whole community, because the great majority of people have at present no way of determining who are the really qualified nurses, while the institution of the title of "registered nurse" would overcome this difficulty.

From every point of view that occurs to me your movement is one which should have the support and sympathy especially of the members of the legal profession, of the members of the medical profession, and of all women who are interested in improving the opportunities for women of higher professional and practical work, for skilled nursing is a great field for women's activity. I wish you all success in your efforts.

The Minimum Curriculum of Education and Standard Qualifying for the Registration of Trained Nurses.*

By Miss M. D. FARQUHARSON,

Matron of the Bendigo Hospital, late Lady Superintendent of the Melbourne Hospital, Australia.

MADAM PRESIDENT AND LADIES,—I have had the honour to be requested to contribute a short paper expressing what I consider to be a minimum standard of education for nurses, qualifying them for registration as trained nurses.

A new era has been begun in this State (Victoria), and a sound curriculum has been set as the groundwork of our Victorian Nurses' education by the medical men and Matrons on the Council of the Victorian Trained Nurses' Association, which has to be complied with to enable the nurses to pass the examination of the independent Board of Examiners, which has almost done away with the old-fashioned system of teachers in hospital-examining their own pupils. The curriculum of the Royal Victorian Trained Nurses' Association is, I consider, not one whit above what a nurse's minimum course of instruction should be. (For convenience, I append it.)

As to standards of qualification, I am totally opposed to any nurse registering as a qualified general nurse, capable of nursing adult men or women, whose certificate of training is from a special hospital, such as a hospital for sick children, hospitals for women and children only, lying-in hospitals or women's hospitals, fever hospitals, hospitals for the insane where they get some nursing in the patients' infirmary, and incurable hospitals.

Nurses from such institutions, holding only certificates from these special training-schools, if allowed to register themselves, should do so as what they are qualified for, and not as general nurses. It is doing the contrary to this that brings such discredit on the whole body of nurses, for the public are not given to discriminating in such matters.

Three years in a general hospital of not less than forty beds is my idea of a minimum training, the nurses receiving lectures from the Matron, physician, and surgeon; then, if their age and circumstances allow, they will be well advised if they give six months each to obstetric and gynaecological nursing, as well as to the nursing of the various infectious and enteric fevers—it will greatly enhance their value.

In the Victorian Trained Nurses' Association a preparatory course is talked about; but though splendid work has been done in the last three years, I do not think that all the hospitals registered as training-schools have teaching staffs adequate for additional work such as this, and the committees will have something to say about the matter. I think myself it is always better to make haste slowly, and to do what one can thoroughly, instead of rushing ahead. Our hospitals are scarcely in position to start preparatory schools, their finances being at the lowest ebb. I am not in love with the plan

* Presented to the International Council of Nurses, Berlin, 1904.

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)