

qualified nurses. There were, of course, numbers of private nursing associations, which did not conform to the three years' standard, but they were not training schools, attached to responsible public hospitals, and the difficulty, if the amendment were passed, would be to know where to send the resolution.

The question was of great economic importance to well-trained private nurses, and in this connection the example of the London Hospital was a very bad one to less important institutions. Intimately in touch as she was with a large body of private nurses, she knew they resented the injustice. That it was necessary for nurses to return to the hospital for a third year's experience only proved the offence of supplying them to the public before they were thoroughly trained. Every other hospital in London and in the country of any account whatever which supplied the public with private nurses trained them for three years. The London Hospital had hindered the progress of nursing education, and by short term training, undersold the profession for a quarter of a century and gloried in so doing. In the published accounts of the hospital the balance sheet of the private nursing department was conspicuous by its absence, but she calculated from the number of nurses stated to be always employed, that the hospital received from £20,000-£22,000 for their services, and made about £10,000 profit. Presumably the Committee dare not publish these accounts.

Miss H. L. Pearse pointed out that to return to the wards for a third year's experience was not at all the equivalent of three years' consecutive training. A nurse might serve the whole of her two years without having responsible charge of a ward, and if she returned for more work after leaving the hospital, experience might be gained, but it had not the same value as systematic training.

Miss Kingsford wondered how the nurses had been employed during the period in which they became convinced of the insufficiency of their training.

Miss Breay asked the meeting to consider that if it adopted the amendment it would give the public the wrong impression that other hospitals adopted the two years' standard for their private nurses, and thus do injustice to such schools, out of misplaced tenderness for the London Hospital.

A Select Committee of the House of Lords had, in 1892, in connection with the term of training of private nurses, sent out by the London Hospital expressed the opinion that "the minimum period, after which a nurse can be advertised as thoroughly trained is three years," and that pronouncement had been flouted by the hospital authorities from that day to this.

The amendment on being put to the vote was lost.

The original resolution was then carried *nem. con.*

#### RESOLUTION II.

Miss E. B. Kingsford then proposed the following resolution.

"The Society for the State Registration of Trained Nurses, in annual meeting assembled, begs to draw the attention of the Council of King Edward's Hospital Fund for London to the following provision in the constitution of the Central Hospital Council for London, that "The constituent hospitals shall be invited to contribute equally to the annual expenses," and requests it to take such action thereon as shall restrict in future, to their legitimate use, the expenditure of charitable funds, by hospital committees receiving grants from the King's Fund.

"It desires further to point out that the work in which the Central Hospital Council for London is actively engaged is its organised opposition to the State Registration of Trained Nurses, that nurses have themselves financed, for the last quarter of a century, the movement for their Registration by the State, and that it is most unjust that hospital committees, which are opposing a reform unanimously recommended by a Select Committee of the House of Commons, and approved by the House of Lords, should take power to utilise the contributions of the charitable to support their reactionary policy, in connection with the education and status of trained nurses."

Miss Kingsford said that in support of the Registration movement not only money, but personal service, and invaluable counsel had been lavishly given both by those still devoting their best energies to the cause, and those who had passed away. They therefore came into the fight with clean hands, and had a right to demand that their opponents should be equally circumspect. The Society was therefore justified in calling the attention of the King's Fund to the provision in the Constitution of the Central Hospital Council for London that "the constituent hospitals shall be invited to contribute equally to the annual expenses," provision thus being made for financing the Council by this method.

Let the members of that Council organise a fund amongst themselves with which to finance their opposition to State Registration of Nurses, whose employers they were. The Council had no right to use charitable funds for the purpose.

Miss H. Hawkins, P.L.G., who seconded the Resolution, remarked on the irony of using money contributed for the support of hospitals to oppose the demand for standardising skilled nursing. If this were done, she considered that registrationists on the staffs of the hospitals represented on the Central Hospital Council for London might legitimately ask their Committees to contribute to the funds of the State Registration Society.

We knew that the Central Hospital Council had taken power to finance its expenditure from charitable funds. The question was not whether it expended much or little on its opposition to Nurses' Registration. The principle involved

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)