

the Register," but placed at the end of the list of trained nurses, or in their order alphabetically in the list of trained nurses.

Recommendation 4.

"That the names of the nurses admitted under the Rules Modification Order be placed in alphabetical order among the trained nurses, but with the words 'admitted under Rule 9 (1) (g)' in the column headed 'Qualifications.'"

Recommendation 5.

"That Recommendations 2, 3 and 4 be sent to the Minister of Health for his approval."

III. The Registrar drew the attention of the Committee at their meeting on October 5th to the great increase in the correspondence which was thrown upon the office by inattention to details and delay in the filling-up of the forms of application, and the testimonials by applicants for registration and their referees. The most frequent faults of applicants are that they omit the details of their nursing careers, and that they give as referees persons with whom they are quite out of touch. Nurses frequently give as a reference the Matron of the hospital where they were trained, even though it may be many years since the applicant left the hospital. Again, nurses will refer to a person without ascertaining whether that person is willing to act as a referee. These acts lead not only to extra correspondence but to delay in the registration of the applicants. Trouble and delay, however, are not due solely to the applicants. Referees are frequently very slow in answering enquiries and returning testimonials. This remark applies not only to referees as to character and experience, but to those who are asked to give evidence of the applicant's period of training.

The Committee brings this matter to the knowledge of the Council in the hope that the Nursing Press will be good enough to take note of it, that it may be brought to the attention of all concerned.

IV. *Applications for Registration.*

The following statements have been forwarded to the Minister of Health:—

Applications received during the week ending—

September 15th, 1923.. .. .	22
" 22nd, "	22
" 29th, "	40
October 5th, "	25

V. *Registration to October 6th, 1923.*

Applications received 41,656

Applications—

Approved by the Council to September 21st	26,400
For approval at meeting on October 19th	1,370
Ineligible to meeting on September 21st ..	978
Ineligible, to be brought before meeting on	
October 19th	100
Withdrawn	121
Incomplete	12,687
	<hr/>
	41,656

General Register ..	1,054
Male " ..	8
Mental " ..	169
Sick Children's Register	25
Fever Register ..	114
	<hr/>
	1,370

VI. (To be taken *in camera*.)

Lists of 1,370 applicants for registration, whose applications have been found to be in conformity with the rules, are appended.

Recommendation 6.

"That the 1,370 applicants whose applications have been found to be in order be approved for registration, and that the Registrar be instructed to enter their names in the appropriate parts of the Register."

Recommendation 7.

"That the appropriate certificate be granted to each of these applicants, and that authority be hereby given to affix the Seal of the Council to each certificate."

Discussion.

THE CHAIRMAN said, in connection with Recommendation 3, that the Registration Committee were asking all those who applied under the old Rules and were ineligible whether they wished to apply again.

In regard to Recommendation 4, DR. GOODALL emphasised the fact that Rule 9 (1) (g) applied to the General Part of the Register. The question was, were the names of nurses admitted under this Rule to be inserted in the General Part in alphabetical order with those of the trained nurses? The Recommendation of the Registration Committee, although there was a considerable difference of opinion on this point, was that they should be inserted in alphabetical order, and he supported that view, as he was of opinion that to place them in a separate part would be to make a colourable imitation of a Supplementary Register.

MR. ROBERT DONALDSON moved an amendment to leave out the words after "alphabetical order," and adding a provision that the nurses admitted under Rule 9 (1) (g) should be placed in a separate list.

This was seconded by MISS DU SAUTOY.

In moving the Amendment MR. DONALDSON said that the Registration Committee had been equally divided, and the Recommendation (to place the nurses admitted under Rule 9 (1) (g) on the General Part of the Register in alphabetical order among the trained nurses) had been carried by the casting vote of the Chairman of the Committee (Dr. Goodall).

MISS A. M. BUSHBY, supporting the Amendment, said that the Recommendation of the Registration Committee seemed most unfair to the nurses on the Supplementary Parts of the Register. These nurses had been well trained, and yet were denied the right to have their names placed on the General Part of the Register, when nurses with no training at all were to be sandwiched between fully-trained nurses on the General Register, with the words, "admitted under Rule 9 (1) (g)" in the qualification column, which she was sure many lay persons would take as a special qualification.

Some discussion arose as to the exact wording of the Amendment, when the CHAIRMAN drafted it and Mr. Donaldson accepted it as follows:—

Amendment to Recommendation 4.

That the names of the nurses admitted under the Rules Modification Order be placed in a separate list.

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)