

nurses whose knowledge and experience were not adequate, and who were young enough to train again, and was putting a stumbling-block in the way of older nurses who could not do so.

MISS E. SMITH said that the proviso to Rule 9 (1) (b) would cut out nurses trained in cottage hospitals.

THE CHAIRMAN said that cottage hospitals were general hospitals.

MISS COWLIN said a great many cases would apply for admission to the General Register. She strongly supported Miss Musson.

On the Amendment being put to the meeting four voted for it, fifteen against it, and two did not vote.

The majority of the members of the Council thus voted against Miss du Sautoy's proposal that evidence of some experience in a General Hospital or Poor Law Infirmary should be required as a condition of admission to the General Part of the Register.

Miss Bushby asked that the names might be taken down, when there voted:—

For Miss du Sautoy's amendment.—Miss Villiers, Miss Bushby, Miss du Sautoy, Miss Wiese.

Against the amendment.—The Rev. G. B. Cronshaw, Miss Bremner, Miss Musson, Miss Sparshott, Miss Alsop, Miss Seymour-Yapp, Miss Cox-Davies, Miss Cowlin, Miss E. Smith, Miss A. S. Barratt, Dr. Bedford Pierce, Dr. Smedley, Dr. Goodall, Sir Jenner Verrall, and the Hon. Mrs. Eustace Hills.

Not voting.—Mr. Donaldson and Mr. Stratton.

DR. BEDFORD PIERCE enquired whether there was any special value in a year's training. Not being a nurse he would not like to move any resolution on the subject.

In reference to the date 1900, Miss Musson said that the Boer War brought before nurses and the public the fact that three years' training was required. So did regulations for nurses in Poor Law Infirmaries passed about that time.

MISS SEYMOUR YAPP said she was sorry the Registration Committee had made a hard and fast rule about training in Nursing Homes. She had three nurses specially in mind. They went into a hospital to train and were not strong enough to remain there. They went to a Nursing Home where they were simply invaluable. She did not think the Council was interpreting the spirit of the Act in excluding them.

MR. STRATTON said that a probationer who broke down without completing her training could not expect to register as a nurse any more than a medical student could expect to obtain admission to the Medical Register under similar circumstances.

MISS SPARSHOTT said that nurses were strongly of opinion that injustice should not be done to older nurses trained before 1900.

SIR JENNER VERRALL said that it was a nurses' question. While they were about it he would like a rule which would not only satisfy but please everybody, but the Ministry of Health were afraid of widening the scope of the Rule too much. As certain hard cases were certain still to arise, he

would have liked the Rule to be still wider, but in going to 1900 they were going as far as was likely to be accepted by the Ministry of Health, and Scotland.

MISS ELLINOR SMITH said the nurses considered the Act was not much use to them unless a certain standard were maintained.

MISS BUSHBY expressed the opinion that the letter of the College of Nursing, Ltd., should have come before, instead of after, the Election; it was too bad to send it afterwards.

THE CHAIRMAN said no one could wish that more strongly than he did.

MISS COX DAVIES said, with some heat, that the question had been ventilated at every meeting of the College of Nursing for months past.

MISS BUSHBY retorted that many nurses were not members of the College of Nursing and did not know what went on at its meetings.

MISS ALSOP said those who came on the Council as the nominees of the College were not speaking for the College, but for the profession as a whole. She had come to learn, and was learning a good deal. She herself had been trained before 1900, but without a three years' certificate she would have been nowhere. She was sorry for those who could not conform to the standard required by the Council after that date, but 1900 did not seem to her to be too far away.

DR. GOODALL advocated the date 1900 as the limit for the admission of the *bona fide* nurses. They had got to agree with Scotland. There was no time now to go squabbling with Scotland or with anyone else.

The Committee's recommendation was then put to the meeting, when eighteen members voted for it and three against it.

The Committee's recommendation was as follows:—

“Rule 9 1 (g).—In the case of a nurse who was at 1st November, 1919, engaged in actual practice, and who was also *bona fide* engaged in nursing prior to 1st January, 1900, and who does not comply with the above requirements, such special evidence of knowledge and experience as may be accepted by the Council in each individual case.”

The names for and against the Committee's recommendation to permit nurses trained before 1900 to be admitted to the General Part of the Register without giving evidence of any experience in a General Hospital were taken down at Miss Bushby's request, when there voted:—

For the recommendation.—Rev. G. B. Cronshaw, Miss Bremner, Miss Villiers, Miss Musson, Miss Sparshott, Miss Alsop, Miss Seymour-Yapp, Miss Cox-Davies, Miss Cowlin, Miss E. Smith, Mr. Stratton, Mr. Donaldson, Miss A. S. Barratt, Dr. Bedford Pierce, Dr. Smedley, Dr. Goodall, Sir Jenner Verrall, and the Hon. Mrs. Eustace Hills.

Against.—Miss Bushby, Miss du Sautoy, and Miss Wiese.

The Examination Syllabus.

THE CHAIRMAN here received a letter from the Ministry stating that the Minister would be glad

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)