

an accomplished fact. The only possible construction which we can put on the important documents referred to is that we retain our Charter but enlarge the influence and Membership of the Corporation. Further we quite fail to understand why it is assumed that mutual help and co-operation must cease because we have decided to expand into an educational and collegiate body.

We fail to see any serious objection to the inclusion of a limited number of laymen as Members of the Council, as their advice will prove very helpful in matters political and financial. Moreover we would point out that, in the proposed Council, they are to have seats in proportion of two to forty-three, and, if we find it expedient, in two years we can eliminate the lay element altogether.

Much has been made of the fact that, at the Special General Meeting of our Association, Mr. Paterson did not read the correspondence which has now been published. Doubtless he would have had we requested him to do so. Our critics continue deliberately to ignore the fact that Mr. Paterson referred, in his speech, to the several points in the correspondence.

We consider that our Executive Committee had every right to ask for certain promises from the Hon. Arthur Stanley and Sir Cooper Perry, as representatives of the Council of the College of Nursing, and it must be assumed that these pledges were given with the knowledge and consent of those who form that Council. They referred to points about which we felt very strongly, and, through our nurse representatives on the Executive Committee of the R.B.N.A., we pressed that we should be satisfied in regard to them before we would decide in favour of amalgamation. We all agree with our Medical Honorary Secretary that the undertaking given is as good if not better than any formal document signed, sealed and delivered. Is it not the pledge of two honourable men of undoubted standing and probity? We would ask THE BRITISH JOURNAL OF NURSING how it has arrived at the conclusion that half-a-dozen men in a Council composed of forty-five individuals are to have governing powers over 60,000 nurses? Also, why is it assumed that only a minority of the nursing profession are to be regarded as intelligent and by what means are this "intelligent minority" invited to express their considered opinions?

In conclusion, we offer to Mr. Paterson our sincere thanks for his able speech at our Special General Meeting, for the frankness which characterised it throughout and for the admirable clearness with which he dwelt on every point. We have all felt that what he has done for us must have meant the sacrifice of much time and thought which has been given gratuitously and generously. Our regret is that we fail to read into the correspondence, as is suggested in THE BRITISH JOURNAL OF NURSING, any "security of tenure" for the Honorary Officers of the R.B.N.A. on the Council of the Royal British College of Nursing and

equally do we fail to understand what they could have to gain from this beyond, as in the past, our gratitude.

We are, &c.,

MARY C. GOOD,	INA MACDONALD,
CECILIA LIDDIATT,	A. SCANTLEBURY,
E. S. DIXON,	K. BLAKE,
L. J. STEPHENS,	H. MACWILLIAM,
S. FENWICK	E. GARNER,
HUTCHINSON,	L. E. LEE,
E. SWABY SMITH,	A. M. HOOD,
MARY HOWARD,	L. THORNTON SMITH,
F. W. CARVER,	F. E. A. SENDALL,
M. C. DEMPSTER,	J. PLANT,
R. WILLIAMS,	E. M. DAVIS.
E. A. CATTELL,	

Members of the Royal British Nurses' Association.

The communication in no way alters our opinion on the "Mysterious Pact," the correspondence concerning which we published and criticised in our issue of April 7th.

Facts are facts, logic or no logic. For the benefit of the signatories we repeat our conclusions, though we feel convinced they prefer delusion.

By the grant of the "Supplemental Charter" as drafted, the original Charter will be almost entirely superseded.

1. The R.B.N.A. ceases to exist. The College of Nursing Ltd., does *not* become amalgamated with it, although that is possible under the original Charter. Both Associations are *absorbed* into the proposed Royal British College of Nursing, which incorporates almost in its entirety the Constitution of the College of Nursing, and *not* that of the R.B.N.A., and retains in office the whole of its Council.

2. The New Bye-Laws do not provide for the expansion of the R.B.N.A. The Supplemental Charter does *not* enlarge the influence and membership of *that* Corporation, which, as we said before, ceases to exist.

3. The professional status of the R.B.N.A. is sacrificed, the new Corporation provides for the extension of Membership to the laity, at the will of the Council, without exacting from them any financial responsibility! The only persons who pay are the registered nurses. They pay, but do not govern. This is most unjust.

4. They do not govern because they have no means of controlling the Council. The Council can remove a nurse's name from the Register without appeal to any higher power. This cannot be done under the original Charter. The President or the Council may call a special General Meeting. The nurses, who pay, may not call a meeting, and thus express an opinion, without the consent of one-fourth of the Council. This is not self-government; it provides for a very dangerous form of autocratic control by Executive Officers.

In the R.B.N.A., six out of seven Hon. Officers are medical men, three of whom have clung to office for twenty-five years! The Hon. Officers

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)