

# THE BRITISH JOURNAL OF NURSING

WITH WHICH IS INCORPORATED  
**THE NURSING RECORD**  
EDITED BY MRS BEDFORD FENWICK

No. 1,279

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 5, 1912.

Vol. XLIX.

## EDITORIAL.

### TRAINING AND SERVICE.

In our reply to a correspondent last week who desired to know the minimum term of *training* required by a candidate in the Army, Navy, and Territorial Nursing Services, and referring to the standard demanded for Queen Alexandra's Imperial Military Nursing Service, we expressed the opinion that "it is high time that the term of three years' training, and the value of a certificate for such, was protected by making it compulsory for those admitted to this Government Service, to possess it."

At present a candidate is required to have "a certificate of not less than three years' training and service in medical and surgical nursing in a civil hospital recognised by the Advisory Board."

This cuts at the root of the three years' standard of *training*.

We added "that the unfortunate inclusion of the words 'and service' makes it possible to admit nurses with certificates of two years' training only, but who may have served a hospital, presumably as a private nurse for profit, as at the London Hospital."

Miss Keer, a former Matron-in-Chief, in a letter to be found in another column argues that such a contingency is not "possible," "as although the certificate of the London Hospital is *nominally* a two years' one, yet, all candidates from that Hospital for the Q.A.I.M.N.S., must be certified to have a third year (out of four years) training in the wards of the Hospital."

Our contention is that the term of training for which a certificate is awarded at the London Hospital is two years, as stated in the regulations, and that the third and fourth years exacted by contract are years of service only, and as the term "service" is not

defined in the regulations of Q.A.I.M.N.S., it is possible, even if not probable, to include private nursing, clerical and domestic work, in all of which certificated nurses at the London Hospital are employed, at the discretion of the Advisory and Nursing Committees.

So important is this question to the status and quality of military nursing—that we may well consider it at some length.

When the re-organization of the Army Nursing Service took place after the South African War—a reform we had publicly advocated for many years—justifiable disappointment was felt by the Matrons' Council, that an important recommendation embodied in the Memorandum it had been permitted to present personally to the then Secretary of State for War—viz., that the qualification for the Army Nursing Service should be a certificate of Three Years' Training in the wards after examination, was not adopted; and, in its stead, the present ambiguous standard was substituted. Further, that there was absolutely no definition in the regulations of the term "service."

The London Hospital, the only large hospital in the Kingdom which certifies its nurses as "trained" after a two years' course, had, it was found, undue representation and power on the Nursing Committee of the reorganized Army Nursing Service, in comparison with other hospitals of like standing. Mr. Sidney Holland, Chairman, and Sir Frederick Treves were both members, whilst St. Bartholomew's Hospital was excluded from representation; and it became well understood throughout the nursing profession that the wording of the qualification for military nurses opened the door to women trained at the London Hospital, who did not, and do not,

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)