

Committee for the State Registration of Nurses towards the attainment of a Bill which would place the nursing profession on a sound footing of organisation, for which they had been fighting now for nearly thirty years.

MR. JAMES BLOSSOM, on behalf of the Poor Law Officers' Association, said it had considered the Bill and was heartily in favour of it, provided that Poor Law Institutions were secured adequate representation on the Consultative Board and the Council. He said that because out of a list of the Council members placed in their hands only four represented the Poor Law. There were 94,000 beds in Poor Law Infirmaries (50,606 in Infirmaries which were training schools), and in all other general, special and infectious hospitals only 84,104.

THE CHAIRMAN, in reply, said they were most anxious to give proper representation to the Poor Law nurses. The Council to which Mr. Blossom referred was only in existence till the Bill was passed. Then there came in the Council he had mentioned for two years, and after that the matter was entirely in the hands of the nurses themselves. If the Poor Law nurses were more numerous than others then they could elect the whole Council if they liked; the matter would be entirely in their hands.

MAJOR RHODES (North Stafford Infirmary) said, on the question of the Consultative Board, that his committee was in favour of the smaller body being formed, and they suggested that at least 70 of the 100 should be representatives other than from London. (Applause.) He did not think the meetings suggested in the provinces would be analogous to those of the British Medical Association, which included all members. He saw no reason why there should not be a meeting of all members of this Association apart from the Consultative Body.

In regard to the Register, a special Register of Mental Nurses was mentioned, and his committee wondered whether amongst the Register of Nurses fever nurses and all special nurses, *i.e.* nurses having other than general training were included.

Major Rhodes also enquired as to the wording of section 10 relating to prosecution for offences under the Act, and SIR CHARLES RUSSELL said that the last line was obviously a misprint.

SIR COOPER PERRY explained the position in regard to the mental nurses. The question of fever and other special nurses would also require consideration. In the Bill which had been before Parliament no fever nurse could be registered as such (after term of grace.—ED.), but her special qualification could be added to her general training. All these branches would require very careful consideration by the Consultative Board. When a conclusion was reached it might be possible to include all these various kinds of specially trained nurses.

DR. VOELCKER (Hospital for Sick Children, Great Ormond Street, W.C.) said that Sir Cooper Perry had answered one of the questions he was

anxious to have some light upon. He expressed the opinion that a nurse for sick children could not be adequately trained in less than three years. It should be possible to grant them a special register as in the case of mental nurses, or that some arrangement might be made by which a woman did not have to work six years before being entitled to become a registered nurse, otherwise children's nurses would be at a disadvantage, and it would have a bad effect on the supply of nurses in children's hospitals.

MR. DEACON (Chairman of the Royal Infirmary, Liverpool) said that Clause 2 stated the College of Nursing should be entitled to bear the title of the General Nursing Council and College of Nursing, but the words General Nursing Council never occurred in the Bill again.

He understood it was the intention of the College to recognise certain training schools, though there was no particular clause which gave specific power to recognise training schools. Nurses struck off the register had a right of appeal. Suppose the Council decided that a particular training school should not be recognised, would they have a right of appeal, and if so, to whom?

Then it was provided that Rules made by the Council should have no effect till approved by the Privy Council. Would anybody (an individual, for instance) have a right of appeal to the Privy Council?

In regard to the Consultative Board, he favoured the larger one.

MR. STANLEY agreed that there should be a right of appeal in regard to the recognition of training schools. As to an appeal to the Privy Council regarding the Rules to be approved, Sir Charles Russell, informed him that individuals and governing bodies of hospitals would have this right.

MR. TOM PERCIVAL (Poor Law Officers' Association) emphasised the appeal made by Mr. Blossom for further recognition of the immense interests of the Poor Law. The Chairman had said that at the end of two years the Council would be an elected body, but he wanted to drive home that during those two years the foundation of this great scheme would be laid, and the plans formed, and at the end of that time any attempt to make alterations in the procedure would be a matter of considerable difficulty.

In regard to the Consultative Board, he thought the procedure of the British Medical Association should be adopted still further, and the country divided into districts which would send up representatives to the Consultative Board.

MR. E. J. DOMVILLE, M.R.C.S., associated himself with the remarks made by the Chairman of the Royal Infirmary, Liverpool, and asked the conditions under which training schools would be recognised. He further said that a good deal had been said about the British Medical Association, but he noticed that it had been entirely dropped out of the Bill, in which there was only a very vague reference to the Medical Profession.

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)