

now. They objected in 1905 because those who were promoting it were against registration. Now that most of the promoters had turned round the R.B.N.A. were supporting the scheme.*

MR. STANLEY said he really did not know whether the scheme were the same or not.

MRS. FENWICK said that it was, word for word, and she thought he ought to know it.

MR. STANLEY said he daresay it was. In the old scheme there was not the clause "To promote Bills in Parliament for any object connected with the interests of the nursing profession, and in particular with their education, organisation, protection, and for their recognition by the State." He thought Mrs. Bedford Fenwick would agree that was an important difference.

If no one had anything else to say, they might bring the proceedings to a conclusion. He was glad to find they had got so far in agreement. In regard to the opposition Mrs. Bedford Fenwick had announced he was very sorry for it. He wished they could all work together. When they got to work on their Bill, he believed it would be one they could ask Major Chapple to introduce in the House. They were all working for the good of the nursing profession.

In the discussion which followed, in which Mrs. Andrews, Miss Cancellor and Miss Cox Davies took part, Miss Cox Davies urged that the Committee asked for, to draft a Bill, should be appointed. In connection with the exception taken to the Articles of Association, she asked might not the Bill which was going to be introduced somewhat alter the matter. It would give legal status, and, therefore, surely those Articles would scarcely stand in their present form.

MR. STANLEY said that they would. He also mentioned that he would shortly meet the representatives of the hospitals, and he hoped out of that meeting to form the Consultative Board of the College.

MISS MUSSON asked whether the nursing associations were to have no opportunity of criticizing the Articles of Association, or did the promoters intend to proceed with the College?

MR. STANLEY said they did intend to proceed with it. The sooner they got to work the better.

MISS CANCELLOR thought some opportunity should be given to the societies to voice their objections. There were certain points to which the N.U.T.N. took exception.

SIR CHARLES RUSSELL said they could be altered at any time.

MISS MUSSON asked what was the distinction

between certificates of proficiency and certificates of training and proficiency.

THE CHAIRMAN said it was meant by those who put in that clause that there would be, or might be, at all events, two different certificates. One would show exactly what training the nurse had had, and another exactly the state of proficiency she had achieved.

MISS MUSSON was afraid the bulk of the profession would be against them.

MAJOR CHAPPLE asked which Mr. Stanley would register?

MR. STANLEY said that was a question for the Council to determine.

MISS BODLEY (Midland Matrons' Association) asked whether there would be different certificates.

MR. STANLEY said that would be determined by the Council, who would have to show exactly what the certificates were worth.

MISS MUSSON said it appeared as if the College would give a certificate of proficiency without any training.

MR. STANLEY said that the regulations might all have to be laid down by the Council after consultation with the Consultative Board.

MISS MUSSON did not know what was meant by "all branches of women's work."

MR. STANLEY said his idea was this: He was quite as anxious as anyone could be to see a definite line of demarcation drawn between the trained nurse and the woman who was partly trained. The best possible way to do that was by allowing a College of Nursing, such as this, where the Council would be entirely elected by the votes of the trained nurses themselves, to settle what should be the examination and certificate, not only in their own branch of the profession, but in the lower branches—the untrained women. They particularly wanted such power in the case of things like the First Aid Certificates—which were given very loosely in some places—they wanted them under the control of a College like this, and then it would know exactly what they were worth.

MISS MUSSON asked whether Mr. Stanley proposed through the College of Nursing, to lay down the education of such people as the V.A.D.'s.

MR. STANLEY said that if the Council itself, acting on the wishes of the members of the College, chose to do that, it was exactly what he wished them to do, it would be the best possible thing.

DR. MCGREGOR ROBERTSON pointed out that in Clause (E) of the Articles the College took power to grant certificates of proficiency in nursing to persons trained, not by the College, but in outside schools. What right had the College to grant certificates of training to persons trained elsewhere?

MR. STANLEY said the answer to that was, first, that the College did not propose to train at present. If it so decided later it could do so. Secondly, if they did not take the power to grant certificates to nurses trained elsewhere, not a single nurse working now, who had been trained previously, could be put upon its Register.

* Beyond the financiers who signed the Articles of Association in 1905, the only promoters of the scheme whose names could be ascertained were Miss Swift, Miss C. J. Wood, and Sir Henry Burdett. Lord Knutsford, who opposed, appealed in vain before the Board of Trade for further information. The R.B.N.A. opposed the scheme as "vicious in principle," which in our opinion it continues to be.—ED.

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)