

on the Nurse Training Schools to provide the training for its examinations.

The Amendment was lost, 5 voting for it and 12 against.

MOTION TO REFER BACK REPORT.

SIR JENNER VERRALL moved that the Report be referred back in order that the Council might get a considered view. If necessary, he considered this should be done again and again.

THE CHAIRMAN pointed out that the Council had been asked to return an answer within twelve months; if they waited until after the next meeting of the Council, they could not send one within that period.

MISS COX-DAVIES protested against deferring the answer.

SIR JENNER VERRALL'S proposal that the Report be referred back was seconded by MISS BUSHBY.

MISS BREMNER expressed herself as greatly in favour of the proposal.

DR. GOODALL hoped the Report would not be referred back. He was one of those who thought the scheme a very excellent one. It had occupied the first Registration Committee and Council for about eighteen months, and he had never heard any serious objection to it before the Election.

The Council were entitled to ask why they were asked to reconsider a scheme under which a very successful election had been held—successful both as regards numbers and as to the way in which it was conducted.

The modification of the scheme was proposed in the House of Commons on March 14th by Major Barnett, at the instance of a body which he thought was called the Registered Nurses' Parliamentary Committee. He was perfectly right in objecting when he did, though he might not have had sufficient information, as he could not have done so later; but there was not the faintest doubt that this was the body which put Major Barnett up. The debate was in print in THE BRITISH JOURNAL OF NURSING of March 23rd, 1923.

His speech was full of inaccuracies. The poor old gentleman did not know what he was talking about. It certainly did convey suggestions that the Council was neglecting its work. A man of his standing would not have made such serious blunders if he had been well informed.

It was a curious thing that THE BRITISH JOURNAL OF NURSING should have disapproved the scheme, considering that it was proposed by the first Chairman of the Registration Committee, though he believed she did not entirely agree with it afterwards.

When people got defeated in elections, they did not appreciate the reason why they were defeated, and if what came out of a machine did not come out exactly what they hoped, then they considered the electors ignorant or the machine defective. ("Order, order.")

He believed that the nurses would vote for their Matrons because they were their Matrons. The above was, he thought, part of the question why these amendments had come about. He hoped this amendment would not be carried.

MISS BUSHBY objected to the way in which Dr. Goodall had spoken of an honourable member of the profession, who was not present to reply—Mrs. Bedford Fenwick—she protested.

MISS COWLIN expressed the opinion that, if the scheme were sent up as drafted it would not be passed by the present House of Commons.

MISS SEYMOUR YAPP wished to know whether the sentence imposing the three years' limit of active service in the case of the election of Matrons occurred in the original scheme, and received a reply in the negative. She considered that the scheme should be referred back to the Committee.

MISS COX-DAVIES believed that Miss Cowlin was a member of the Committee which drafted the Scheme. This MISS COWLIN denied.

MISS DU SAUTOY said she would like it referred back so that the Press might take notice of the discussion.

On the motion to refer the Report on the Election Scheme back to the Registration Committee, eight voted for the motion and ten against.

It was, therefore, lost.

REVISION LATER PROPOSED.

DR. BEDFORD PIERCE moved an amendment, which was lost by nine votes to five, providing that the number of nurses allotted to represent the various departments of nursing may be revised two years before the next election, so that it might correspond as nearly as possible with the members represented.

MISS COX-DAVIES said that the Council was instituted not so much to represent the interests of the nurses as to organise nursing education.

MISS E. SMITH thought it a pity not to leave three of the remaining places open without restriction. If it was desired to include a Sister-Tutor why not have five Matrons and one Sister-Tutor.

MISS SPARSHOTT'S MOTION.

MISS SPARSHOTT moved that a letter be sent to the Minister giving the Council's Report, including 3 and .., and stating that at present they saw no reason to change the Scheme for the election for representation on the Council. This she ultimately withdrew.

MISS COWLIN, seconded by MISS BREMNER, moved that two places be reserved for Registered Nurses who neither are, nor have been, Matrons of Hospitals with Training Schools attached.

MISS LLOYD STILL pointed out that the effect of this Resolution would be to prevent any retired Matron from serving on the Council.

DR. GOODALL opposed the amendment, on the ground that it would cut out those retired Matrons from whom experienced Chairmen might be drawn.

The amendment was lost by nine votes to four.

MISS SEYMOUR YAPP moved, in reference to the provision for the election of Matrons, that the words "within three years past" be omitted.

MISS BREMNER, who seconded, expressed the opinion that there should be ex-Matrons on the Council.

The Amendment was lost.

PROPOSITION FOR AN OPEN ELECTION.

MISS VILLIERS proposed, and MISS DU SAUTOY seconded, That the whole of the eleven seats for representatives of nurses on the General Part of the Register be thrown open.

This was lost, six voting for and nine against it.

MISS COWLIN proposed and MISS BREMNER seconded that three of the total number of Matrons either are, or within three years have been, actually engaged in teaching.

This was lost, 3 voting for and 10 against the proposition.

MISS SEYMOUR YAPP then proposed in relation to the election of Matrons to add the words,

"Three of whom at the time of the election must be actively engaged in the education of nurses."

This was carried by 8 votes to 7.

THE CHAIRMAN said he did not see how the Amendment could be carried out.

The Recommendation of the Committee was then put to the vote:—

That a report in the foregoing terms be submitted to the Minister of Health, in reply to his letter of March 19th, 1923.

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)