

willing to devote some of it to what might appear to the Government a minor matter, but which was to those intimately concerned a most important one.

RESOLUTIONS.

The Chairman then called on Miss Beatrice Kent to move the first resolution. Miss Kent said she had much pleasure in proposing the following motion.

RESOLUTION I.

"The annual meeting of members of the Society for the State Registration of Trained Nurses desires to record its protest against the practice of the Committee of the London Hospital in sending out nurses to private cases, for gain, at the end of two years' training; because it is economically unsound that they should compete with nurses holding certificates of three or more years' consecutive training in hospital wards, and because, until such time as a Nurses Registration Act is in force, the public cannot know that the members of the London Hospital private nursing staff for whose services they are charged full fees, are not required to attain the almost universally accepted standard of three years' training before certification."

In proposing the Resolution the speaker said that she did not propose to say much at this stage of the proceedings, but she would like to say "a pair of words." You could not be sure of much in this world, but she believed two good things were going to happen soon, the enfranchisement of women, and the State Registration of Trained Nurses.

There was no Statute enforcing the three years term of training in general hospitals, which was so universally adopted as to have the force of custom. We were in the position that a small minority were flouting the well-considered opinion of the majority. She resented that as an Englishwoman, and as a nurse she resented it on behalf of doctors and nurses. The opposition of the London Hospital to the three years' standard of training was an ignoble one, and she could not imagine why the nurses at the hospital did not combine solidly and go in a strong deputation to the Committee and decline to be deprived of the third year of training, which was given to nurses in other hospitals. The competition of these nurses with their short term training in private nursing was most unfair. She further considered that every penny of public money should be accounted for and no detailed account of the receipts and expenditure of the private nursing staff at the London Hospital was available.

Miss Mary Harvey, who seconded the resolution, said that she had been a private nurse for fourteen years, and could therefore speak from the private nurse's point of view. There must be a common accepted term of training in hospitals of repute, otherwise in the sphere of private nursing there was most unjust competition. A short time ago a nurse she knew was engaged at a case with two others both insuffi-

ciently trained. The patient had to have nasal feeding and hypodermic injections every five hours, which her friend had to give, in every instance, because the other two nurses could not do so. Yet the patient had to pay the same fees to all three nurses which was most unfair to the nurse who did most of the work, and to the patient.

The public frequently thought that if they paid a high fee for a nurse's services she must be trained. She remembered once acting as night nurse to an old man, where the day nurse charged three guineas a week. She asked why, and the nurse informed her that people thought much more of you if you charged well for your services. She had had three months' training in a maternity hospital, which she said was three months wasted.

The nursing profession was a noble, and ought to be a dignified, one, but no profession could command the respect of the public, nor could it have much respect for itself, if it were invaded by shoals of insufficiently trained women. If it were not prepared to maintain a high standard of efficiency and to protest against those who refused to maintain them, it would in the long run become degraded in the estimation of those it desired to serve; she had therefore much pleasure in seconding Miss Kent's resolution.

The Chairman said the Resolution had been proposed and seconded and was now open for discussion.

Miss E. M. Waind then said that she was very diffident about opposing any word in the resolution as she strongly believed in the necessity for State Registration of Nurses, but she questioned the wisdom of mentioning the London Hospital by name; she would prefer to include the Committees of any hospitals or nursing associations which sent nurses out to private cases after two years' training. Also, the London Hospital was coming into line in a subterranean way. She had herself refused to take a nurse on to her private nursing staff who had only had two years' training in the wards at the London Hospital, and the nurse had been taken back by the hospital for a third year's work in the wards. This also operated in other directions, as there were many posts barred to London Hospital nurses who had only had two years' training in the hospital.

She proposed to substitute for the words in the resolution "the Committee of the London Hospital," the amendment "the Committees of Hospitals and other Nursing Associations," and in lines 6 and 7 for the words "the members of the London Hospital Private Nursing Staff," the words "the members of these Hospitals and Associations." This was seconded by Miss Pell-Smith and supported by Mrs. Walter Spencer.

The Chairman said the meeting had heard Miss Waind's amendment to omit any reference to the London Hospital. She knew of no other general hospital of standing, and posing as a leading training school, which persistently and most unjustly undertrained its nurses, certificated them at the end of two years, and sent them out to a defenceless public to compete with thoroughly

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)