

of requirements was drawn up to come into force January 1st, 1915. The Council do not think that you can have any objection to co-operate, with other teachers, in enforcing this minimum training for the masseuse.

The reduction in the weekly hours of instruction allowed for nurses training in their own hospitals was sanctioned in consideration of the additional instruction in anatomy and physiology they would naturally be receiving from the medical staff of the hospital, and the regular daily work on patients in the wards carried out (under supervision) was considered as forming part of their training. London and provincial nurses are treated alike in this matter, the rule having been formed for the benefit of all, and no distinction has been made, as you seem to imply in your letter.

The resolution against the granting of private certificates by teachers who hold the Society's certificate was passed in the interests of the profession and in order to preclude the masseuse of short training from entering the field in competition with those fully qualified by virtue of the Society's certificate. This injustice was forcibly brought before the Council at the outbreak of the War, when an epidemic of short training seemed imminent in response to a demand by many women who wished to rush into the profession with the sole object of giving treatment to the wounded.

As a practising masseuse you will agree that the profession is not one to be entered into without a thorough training and some clinical experience, and, as a teacher, you must realise that the minimum training laid down by the Society for nurses and others is the least in which an intelligent woman, giving full time and study to the various subjects, can hope to qualify. If this training is taken from an accepted teacher the student is eligible for the Society's examination and certificate, and there is no reason for granting a private certificate which can be of little or no advantage to the masseuse in her professional career. The Council has not prohibited the granting of private certificates, but only requires that they should not be given "except in addition to the Society's certificate." This is in the interests of the masseuse and the teacher, and for the welfare of the public employing "certificated masseuses."

In reply to your objections to compulsory inspection of all schools from which pupils are accepted for examination by the Society the Council instruct me to point out that if inspection, which was voted for by the majority of teachers at both meetings in 1914 at which you were present, is to be of any avail, it must be extended to all schools preparing pupils for examination.

It may interest you to learn that, with one exception, most kind co-operation in the matter of inspection has been extended to the Society by all schools in London and the provinces accustomed to prepare their students for the Society's examination. Miss Gibson, who is known to you, is a certificated masseuse, and

was selected by the Council as being in all other ways fully qualified to visit and report on schools of massage for the information of the Council, who did not anticipate that the hygienic conditions of any school would call for inspection by a sanitary inspector.

The Council note and accept your resignation as a certificate-holder and member of the Society. There is no objection to your making this correspondence public, but the Council stipulate that it shall be published in entirety.

Yours faithfully,

(Signed) E. M. TEMPLETON
(Secretary).

Training School of Massage,
1, Thorncliffe Grove,
Oxford Road, Manchester,

Feb. 25th, 1915.

DEAR MISS TEMPLETON,—I am in receipt of your letter of the 18th inst. You say the Council regret I have declined to meet members of the Council known to me personally to discuss in a friendly and open manner the various points I have raised, and you insinuate that I am considering the matter from a personal point of view. This is precisely what I am *not* doing; it is decidedly an impersonal matter, and as such I saw no use in my meeting three or four members of the Council in a private manner. There is so much that wants thorough ventilation, and in order to obtain this, I have protested by resigning, not only as a member, but as a certificate holder of the Society.

One does not resign a certificate lightly, which has cost both time and money to gain.

I note the Council do not refute the allegations in my letter of Dec. 9th, as to the "list of recommended teachers" and "Election of the Council," and, therefore, I take it, the allegations are correct.

I challenge the Society to show any printed notice to members, asking them to propose members for the Council, *previous to January, 1915*. I am well aware of the paragraph you inserted in the January, 1915, number of *Nursing Notes*, but the chairman had already received my letter of Dec. 9th, and the inspector had already been sent by the Society to see me!

I think I am right in saying that for some time previous to 1912, no voting papers were sent to members, but members desiring to vote were requested to send to you for the "Voting list." Since 1912 a "Voting list," prepared by the Council, has each year been sent to the members (without a request from them), and the only privilege the ordinary members have had was to affix a X opposite the names of those *on the list*; but that is not giving the members the opportunity of nominating candidates for the Council. The names on the "Voting list" have always been *proposed and seconded by the Council*, so that the Council have virtually elected each other while the members have been invited merely to look on. Is it any wonder, then, that so few of the lists

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)