

they stated, "We believe that any system of State Registration would be detrimental to the Public, and harmful to the best nurses themselves"! And further "A State Register of Nurses far from being a security to the public, would be an actual source of danger."

And it is at the dictation of their Committees that they now support the policy of the College of Nursing, Ltd.—ratting without a blush on the principle of State Registration if controlled by the Nursing Schools—with themselves in power.

And the 10,000 nurses "behind the College." Like a flock of sheep, thousands of these nurses have joined the College, urged, if not coerced, by their matrons to do so—never having read, or even seen, the dangerous Constitution to which they have subscribed.

Miss Cowlin lays stress in her letter on the fact that "there are upon the Council of the College 22 trained nurses." The fact is that there are 22 matrons on the Council, and not one *independent* nurse, and when one-third of these nominated potentates were timed to retire, no one of them did so to make room for independent opinion—all sought re-election! Thus "the 22 trained nurses" are under lay control, and represent their hospital Committees, and not "trained nurses."

Again, Miss Cowlin misleads her readers when she states that "With reference to the College in relation to the already organised Nurse Societies, directly the College decided to stand for State Registration, it appealed to the Central Committee for State Registration with a view to drawing up an agreed Bill, it is still negotiating with this Society with the same object in view."

The College did no such thing. The company of laymen who promoted it, actually made the suggestion that the nursing profession in this country should be organised through a *voluntary* system of registration under its lay control—a system turned down a quarter of a century ago as obsolete by the Nurses' self-governing societies.

Then these Dillys and Dallys adopted *State* Registration as a plank in their determined policy to control the nursing profession, and it was the Central Committee which took steps to elicit information from the College, and for two years, with the utmost patience, attempted to draft an agreed Bill. An attempt hopeless from the first, as the anti-registration promoters of the College movement are no more in favour of self-government for the nursing profession, through an *independent* Governing Body appointed by the State, than they were in the obstructive period of their opposition.

The fundamental principle of the College Company is to control, not only the educational, but the economic status of trained nurses, through a powerful lay Executive, and a Governing Body argely composed of, and financially controlled by, hospital officials, and to secure a supply in the future, as in the past, of cheap nursing labour. Ultimately it will be on this labour ticket that the question of Nurses' Registration must be fought

out in Parliament. "Fine words butter no parsnips."

Miss Cowlin, of course, supports the Charity appeal for the organisation of the profession, to be extracted from the public by means most reprehensible, in our opinion, and to be administered by a self-elected committee of actresses and other ladies with social ambitions! A thoroughly unsound and very demoralising basis on which to found any profession—and especially so for that of Nursing

Then, further, Miss Cowlin stigmatises the expert and irrefutable criticism of the College policy as "misrepresentation" in the following paragraph: "The College," she writes, "has been subjected to criticism and attack by the older societies through a medium of misrepresentation," but she does not support her statement with proof. As presumably from the purport of her letter to the *South African Nursing Record* Miss Cowlin is a past-mistress in the art, we may leave it at that.

By this time the nurses of South Africa have had time to digest the fact that in raking in the "tainted" cash from such devious sources as the now notorious Victory Ball, both the Committee of the Nation's Fund for Nurses and the Council of the College of Nursing, Ltd., have offered a cruel affront to the sensibilities of trained nurses throughout the world—although, apparently, Miss Cowlin has no hesitation in drawing her by no means inconsiderable salary from such a source.

We are glad to note that the Editor of the *South African Nursing Record* repeats his expression of opinion that "the College Bill is unsatisfactory from a nurses' point of view."

## APPOINTMENTS.

### MATRON.

**General Infirmary, Stockport.**—Miss Florence Goodacre has been appointed Matron. She was trained at the Royal Infirmary, Manchester, and the Leicester Isolation Hospital, and held the position of Sister in the former institution, and of Assistant Matron at the Royal Infirmary, Preston. She has had experience of active service as a member of the Territorial Force Nursing Service, and is a certificated Masseuse. (I.S.T.M.)

**Village Hospital, Dunster.**—Miss Lily Turner has been appointed Nurse Matron. She was trained at the General Hospital, Bridgwater, where she has held the position of Sister. She has also been staff nurse at the Chiswick Hospital, and has had experience of private nursing.

### QUEEN VICTORIA'S JUBILEE INSTITUTE.

#### TRANSFERS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Miss Janet Gibb is appointed to Irlam and Cadishead; Miss Florence Hemming, to Bootle; Miss Nora O'Connell, to Bootle; and Mrs. Lydia A. Palmer, to Brislington.

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)