

have been returned? Doubtless members (especially those in the provinces), have been too disgusted with the farce of the elections to desire to take any part in them.

As regards the certificate holders undertaking to abide by all the rules and regulations of the Society, this is what the "Declaration" states: "I undertake to abide by all the rules and regulations of the Incorp. Soc. of Trained Masseuses *with regard to the duties and conduct of masseuses* (the underlining is my own), and three rules for the duties and conduct of the masseuse are laid down, which I have quoted in my letter of Dec. 9th.

I know of no other Society or Board which compels old members and teachers *already in practice* to come under new regulations in such an arbitrary manner. It is entirely opposed to all principles of fairness and justice. You know that the Council instituted an examination for teachers in Swedish Remedial Exercises, in 1913, and required teachers already engaged in teaching and who also held certificates for S.R. Exercises, to attend classes and to sit for this new examination, and in the case of teachers refusing to comply with these new requirements they were informed their students would not be accepted for examination. Was this not the reason for some of your old teaching members resigning a few months ago? And the Council took the first opportunity they could get to remove these old members from the roll of certificate-holders, according to the announcement in the papers—although I still see these members advertising as members of the Society.

You possibly know, when the C.M.B. Examinations were instituted, the practising midwives and teachers were exempt from the Board's examinations, in consideration of their already being engaged in *bona fide* practice.

If the Council's argument is that teachers would be incompetent to train students for the future S.R.E. Examinations, then surely the *results* of the examinations would be sufficient proof of this; always assuming that the examinations were conducted independently.

On November 13th last, the Council passed a rule prohibiting the insertion of advertisements of Schools (from whom they decline to receive candidates), appearing in their "Nursing Notes" Supplement. Against which Schools is this rule directed? Does it not throw out one of the oldest Massage Schools in England where candidates are examined by members of the medical profession, and where many of the old members and even some of the Founders of the Society were trained and certificated; and was this rule not passed because the School in question refuses to discontinue giving its own certificates (which it has done for more than 20 years I think), and declines to come under the new rules of the Society. You say in your letter "the resolution against the granting of private certificates by teachers who hold the Society's Certificates, 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." What about the hospitals that continue to grant two and three months' massage-training certificates? Has the Society refused to accept Students from them? Would these Masseuses not be entering the field of competition, and is this not against the interests of the profession, according to your own statements? No doubt the Council know quite well that the hospitals would not countenance such interference. But why then should the Society refuse candidates from a private School and especially from *old* established Schools on this score?

Now with regard to *Compulsory* Inspection. This was *not* passed by the Teachers' Conference at their meeting on June 7th last, summoned to co-operate with the Council, but was *proposed and seconded by two members of the Council at the Council Meeting on July 10th*, and it was at *this* meeting that the Council decided to refuse candidates from Schools that declined to come under inspection. How can you make out, then, that *Compulsory* inspection was passed at the Teachers' meeting on June 7th?

I have just one more point to take up and that is the "Syllabus and Time Table of weekly instruction." We were given to understand the idea of calling a teachers' conference was to give the teachers an opportunity of discussing among other matters, the drawing up of a new Syllabus that would provide a uniformity of training and a member was down on the Agenda to read a paper on the subject, but when we assembled at the meeting, we found the Syllabus *already prepared and printed AND DISTRIBUTED IN THE ROOM!* So that teachers had to accept that Syllabus and Time Table whether they found it possible to work or not. The Society may have consulted some London Teachers privately, but we in the provinces know nothing of this, and the member who was to read the paper expressed her surprise at the unusual proceeding but said she would, nevertheless, read her paper.

What was the object of inviting teachers to discuss a matter that had already been settled by the Council? It was not only a waste of time but a great expense, especially to teachers from a distance; but this, like compulsory inspection and other matters, is only another illustration of how the Council rules the Society, that is to say whilst ostensibly consulting its members, really acting on a course of action previously decided upon.

The Society whilst accepting the fees of Provincial candidates and members which have no doubt been of very material assistance to them, have put every obstacle in their way to make it difficult for them to obtain qualifications; and if they lose members and obtain a more limited number of candidates in the future for their examinations, they have only their past methods to thank for this.

Yours faithfully,
K. MARRIOTT FOX.

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)