

were pros and cons as to making the first year too easy. It was much better that if a nurse were to be plucked it should be in her first year rather than in the second or third. There was a good deal to be said for a stiff first year.

MR. WILLIAM DERBY (Birmingham Union) said that if the impression got abroad that they wanted to whittle down the Curriculum it would be a mistake, and they would prejudice the position exceedingly. He had put it before his hospital staffs and on the whole they approved, and thought there was very little difference to the Curriculum in the Birmingham institutions now in force. Two of their Matrons who attended the Conference in London supported the Syllabus, and, on the whole, approved it.

THE DELEGATE FROM MERTHYR TYDVIL thought that the effect might be to decrease the number of candidates, but it was sometimes an advantage to intensify evil in order to bring about reform.

He thought they should come to some understanding with the educational authority to educate girls sufficiently before they came into the hospitals.

Boards of Guardians had been too quiet; they should have taken direct action to obtain representation on the General Nursing Council.

THE DELEGATE FROM LEWISHAM said that they had adopted the Syllabus in their Infirmary. The Matron was greatly in favour of it. They found no difficulty either in the first, second, or third year. Since they had adopted it they had had more nurses applying for training.

MR. GLADSTONE WALKER (Newcastle-on-Tyne) said we had now come to the parting of the ways. That what all aimed at was standardisation of examination, and in order to have that there must be standardisation of training. Again, one speaker said, some delegates seemed to think that Poor-Law authorities were trying to whittle down standards. He had it on good authority that at the recent Conference of Matrons, convened by the General Nursing Council, the objections came not from the Poor-Law but from the general hospital matrons.

DR. BRANDER, Medical Superintendent of the Hackney Infirmary, said he had had twenty years experience of both large and small infirmaries. He would be very sorry if it went forth from that Conference that they did not wish to uphold a high standard of training, because the standard of training was an index of the standard of nursing the patients received. He thought any nurse should be able to understand the Metric System. If nurses were not well-educated and trained then the patients were going to suffer.

Criticising the constitution of the General Nursing Council, Dr. Brander said they felt very strongly indeed in the Hackney Union that Poor-Law Authorities should be represented on the Council. The Unions represented in that room controlled about 90,000 beds, probably three times as many as the voluntary hospitals. He would be delighted if they were to approach the Minister of Health and ask him to appoint at

least five representatives of the Poor-Law on the Council.

MR. CHAPPELL (Chairman, Medway Union) said they had been asking for standardisation of nursing. It was not true that Poor-Law training was inferior, but the only way to prove it was to put all nurses on the same footing. "Raise the standard and don't lower the salary."

THE CHAIRMAN intervening said that nothing practical had yet been evolved. He asked the proposer to move a Resolution he had sent up:—

"That a Committee be appointed by this Council to confer with the General Nursing Council."

A DELEGATE enquired whether it was not practicable to agree to the Syllabus in principle.

The Chairman said "No," in that case the hands of the Deputation would be tied.

MRS. H. T. WILLIAMS thought the present time, when the Syllabus was in its draft stage, the right time to send the Deputation.

THE CHAIRMAN hoped it would not go out that they desired to lower the standard of efficiency in Poor-Law nursing. They were making one continuous struggle to get to higher levels.

The only criticism he would make was that the Syllabus was too scholastic and too theoretical. He imagined a clever girl might pass the required examination with honours and yet never go inside a ward.

He reminded the Conference that as a body the Guardians had approved the principle of Registration, and that involved certain consequences, amongst them a standard of training and examination. An amendment to the resolution was then moved by Mr. Chappell (Medway) and seconded by Mr. Lee (Leeds):—

"That we endorse the Syllabus, as suggested by the General Nursing Council, and that no Deputation be sent."

Twenty-seven delegates voted for the amendment, and thirty-four against; the original motion was then agreed to.

The Members of the Deputation.

The following Delegates were then appointed to form the deputation:—

The Chairman of the Conference (the Rev. P. S. G. Propert, M.A., President of the Association of Poor-Law Unions of England and Wales); Mrs. Roberts (Matron, West Derby Union); Dr. Spurrell (Medical Superintendent Poplar and Stepney Sick Asylum); Councillor John Frater (Chairman, Tynemouth Union Board of Guardians); Dr. Brander (Medical Superintendent Hackney Union Infirmary); Mr. William Derby (Chairman of the Birmingham Board of Guardians); Mrs. H. T. Williams (Swansea Board of Guardians); and Mr. Tom Percival (Clerk to the Tynemouth Union, Secretary to the Conference).

On the motion of Mr. R. A. Leach (Rochdale), it was then decided by 40 votes to 36 to adjourn the Conference to a later date, when the result of the Deputation could be reported.

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)