

favour of State Registration, and regarded the nursing profession as a very important one which had not been properly recognised as the medical, dentistry and other professions had been. He thought that the women who had had three years' training in a hospital should be in some degree safeguarded from those who, to his own knowledge, went for a year or two into a hospital but never gained a certificate.

All honour to the V.A.D. nurses for the work they had done in the War, but the trained nurses should have the protection afforded by registration at once, because when the War was over we should be flooded with a large number of women with a smattering of nursing, and no practical experience of ordinary hospital work.

Mr. Lewis asked how the College would deal with examinations, and what was to be the standard of training for the nurses on its Register.

The Chairman had mentioned the London Hospital might come into the scheme. He understood their training was for two years, and he should be sorry to see the standard lowered to two years even for the sake of getting in the London Hospital. It might be a very important hospital, but three years was the minimum which should be required before granting a certificate for nursing.

MR. FRANKAU, Deputy Treasurer, St. George's Hospital, enquired whether the College would make admission to its examination conditional upon a report from the training school.

MR. STANLEY said some of the questions raised were just those upon which the advice of the Consultative Board would be taken. In regard to Mr. Lewis' first point, about registration being hurried forward, he felt so strongly about it that he believed that if, in conjunction with the societies promoting State Registration, they could only get an agreed Bill, and he saw no insuperable objection, he should be inclined to urge it forward, and see if it would not be possible to get the Government to take it up as a matter of war urgency. With anything like united opinion on the part of the nurses, he believed it would go through.

MR. FOSTER, of the London Hospital, asked if a place could be kept on the Council for Lord Knutsford.

PROFESSOR RITCHIE (Edinburgh) asked that they might have the exact constitution of the College before them before the next meeting.

SIR HENRY BURDETT thought that many hospitals would send the College the latest copies of their registers of nurses; and Miss Musson strongly affirmed that she had not the slightest intention of giving her confidential hospital register to any committee whatever.

Others who took part in the discussion were Mr. Horton Smith, K.C. (Vice-Chairman of University College Hospital); Dr. Bezly Thorne, Mr. Garratt (Royal Free Hospital); Mr. Leach (North Western Poor Law Conference); and Miss Manser, Belfast.

The meeting concluded with a vote of thanks to the chair, proposed by Lord Sandhurst.

EXPERT PROFESSIONAL OPINION.

Miss L. L. Dock writes in the *American Journal of Nursing*: "It is difficult to speak in terms of moderation of the latest attempt of the British Anti-Registrationists to bind and shackle the nursing profession by one grand sweeping *coup*, as related in THE BRITISH JOURNAL OF NURSING. At this moment of national peril for Great Britain, when Englishwomen have suspended their claims for political justice to go to her aid; when nurses have ceased for the time of crisis to press their long campaign for legal status and have with one accord offered themselves to their country's service—this moment is selected by a set of persons with the usual array of high-sounding names and titles to bring forward the old, well-known, and hitherto defeated proposals to bring the entire body of trained nurses under the domination of an autocratic outside body of rulers through a so-called 'College of Nursing' (voluntary) incorporated under the Board of Trade. This proposition, circulated on the official paper of the Joint War Committee, is signed by its chairman. It has been put forward without consulting any organisation of nurses, and cannot but throw their members into a most trying situation. They must resist it to the utmost, and their would-be rulers and masters will raise the cry, 'Unpatriotic!' which is now so direfully potent in crushing every protest against losses of civil liberty and encroachment upon human rights. The Antis have never done anything worse or taken a meaner opportunity. Slippery as they have been in the past, no one could have expected this, even from them, at such a moment as the present. . . . The various evidences of confusion in nursing and First Aid during the emergencies of war have been advanced as a reason for the proposed control of nurses. . . . As usual, there is a lesson for us in this occurrence and we are prompted to warn nurses in this and other countries to strive incessantly to gain and to hold fast to their legal professional status and standards. It may be that, if the prevailing world epidemic of insanity spreads to the United States, American nurses will meet similar questions."

The *Nursing Journal of India* says: "THE BRITISH JOURNAL OF NURSING publishes a letter from the Hon. Arthur Stanley suggesting that, as State Registration has been hanging fire for the last twenty-five years, he thinks that perhaps voluntary registration might take its place. Voluntary co-operation amongst training schools—quite a different thing. He suggests that a Nursing College be founded, a voluntary body to which hospital governors, chairmen and Matrons and physicians should belong. No doubt the gentleman means well, but this is emphatically NOT what we want. We ask for State Registration with one recognised standard of training. Nothing less will content us."

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)