

general expression of approval from the Conference on the substance of the Bill. Although the Bill was at present a local matter, it was indirectly of interest to other States. He would not speak on the general subject of State Registration. He thought they were all agreed that good State Registration was better than voluntary registration, but it must be good. Dr. Blackburn then read the chief provisions of the Bill, and said that he thought the Board, as fixed by the Bill, was a satisfactory one of modern doctors and modern nurses, and that a Board so composed would not be likely to lower the standard.

Dr. McLEAN (Queensland) thought the main object was gained in the Bill, as it provided for the proper representation of nurses on the governing body, but they were not likely to have the same Bill in every State, and then what became of the Association, the Journal, and the branches? It was all very well for New South Wales, which had gained its main object in having the nurses represented on the Board.

Dr. BLACKBURN did not think that the Association would cease to exist when State Registration came into force, but New South Wales had no option in the matter. A Bill would be introduced, and it was for the Association to see that the Bill was a good Bill, and kept up the standard for which it had worked. If one State led the way with a good Bill the others were then more likely to get good Bills also. For New South Wales the matter was made more urgent by the fact that a Private Hospitals Act had been passed which gave the Government power to keep a register of hospital nurses. This meant that there would be two registers—a State Register and a Voluntary Register—and it would be difficult for the A.T.N.A. under such circumstances to keep up its standard. There was no alternative but a Bill.

Dr. CUMPSTON (Western Australia) thought State Registration a distinct advantage. It would assist in the education of the public and teach them to discriminate between trained and untrained women. Registration was as certain to come as the sun was to rise to-morrow.

Dr. WILSON (South Australia) heartily congratulated New South Wales on its Nurses' Registration Bill, and only wished South Australia had a similar one. He realised how important it was that the first Bill passed in Australia should be a good one. A Bill was about to be introduced into Parliament in South Australia. He did not think it would go through. From the point of view of the A.T.N.A. it was a bad Bill.

Dr. McLEAN said he believed Registration was bound to come, and was glad that New South Wales seemed to have gained its chief object—the good representation of nursing interests on the Board.

Dr. RAMSAY (Tasmania) added his congratulations; he thought the strongest feature of the Bill was that the controlling body was professional.

#### RESOLUTION.

Dr. WILSON then moved:—"That this Conference approves of the principle of Dr. Mackellar's Nurses' Registration Bill, and would be glad to see such a Bill passed."

This was seconded by Miss GOULD, and carried unanimously.

#### SECOND SESSION.

The Conference continued to discuss State Registration at its second Session, Dr. CUMPSTON explaining the position in Western Australia, where, he said, the question was of recent date. In the Health Bill, then before the Lower House, a clause was embodied stating that the Registration of nurses was a function of the Board of Health which should have power to state the qualifications necessary to enable nurses to be registered. That meant that the control was in the hands of the Department. To his mind this was not a good principle. He held this opinion strongly, although in his official capacity he was one of the administrative officers of the Board of Health.

#### RESOLUTION.

A Resolution, moved by Dr. CUMPSTON, and seconded by Dr. BLACKBURN, was carried unanimously as follows:—

"That the Association is in favour of a uniform Registration Act in all the States under a Board on which nurses have adequate representation, rather than under the Central Boards of Health."

#### REGISTRATION OF OVER-SEA NURSES.

Another question which came up for discussion was the Registration of over-sea nurses. Mrs. CHENNELL (South Australia) said her Council found it difficult to get English nurses to sit for their examination.

Dr. BLACKBURN said they had found no difficulty in New South Wales. The rule was very distinct. All nurses trained outside Australia were subject to the same rules as those trained in Australia, and must sit for examination prior to registration, except in the case of nurses coming from countries which had a final examination of their own, like Victoria and New Zealand, with which they had a reciprocal treaty. He did not see why, if a nurse trained in the Perth or Sydney Hospital had to sit for examination, a nurse trained in the London Hospital or Guy's should not have to do the same thing.

Dr. McLEAN referred to the term of training required to become a certified midwife in England, and said that it was not just to register nurses who had had only four months obstetric training when their own nurses on the general register were required to have six months.

#### RESOLUTION.

"That all over-sea nurses who hold a general certificate entitling them to registration by this Association shall have completed a six months' training in an obstetric hospital, recognised by the Association, before being entitled to membership of the Obstetric Section with or without examination."

This successful Conference terminated after the discussion of many other questions of importance to the nursing profession and the community at large.

We commend to the earnest attention of the opponents of Registration in this country, the unanimity shown by the medical and nursing profession in Australia, on the subject.

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)