

apparently dumb and futile when serious attacks are promoted in their name.

Take, for instance, the proposal of Miss Cox-Davies, supported by College colleagues on the G.N.C., to deprive Registered Nurses of the record of their certificates on the published State Register. What did the 20,000 College nurses do to prevent this disastrous proposition, which would have resulted in depreciation of status and professional ruin, in the near future, of thousands of our most highly qualified women? They did nothing.

Why did they take no action to protect the recognition and evidence of their professional knowledge and status? Why, because they are governed by an executive of unprofessional men, supported by a small clique of Matrons working in London, and because they were never consulted.

Again, we are now faced with another most serious injury.

For two whole years the Education and Examination Committee of the G.N.C. has devoted upwards of fifty meetings (imagine the cost to the nurses—who sustain the entire financial responsibility of administering the Registration Act—of these meetings) to drafting the Syllabuses of "Prescribed Training" which the Act makes compulsory. These Syllabuses have been unanimously approved by the General Nursing Council, and yet at its last meeting, Miss Lloyd Still, the Chairman of the Education Committee, Miss Cox-Davies and others actually supported a suggestion made by the Chairman of the Council, Lady Hobhouse, Miss Seymour Yapp and Dr. Goodall, to indefinitely postpone the use of the Syllabus for General Training, and substitute a skeleton Syllabus of Examination!

We presume none of these persons have taken the trouble to study the Registration Act, or at least to realise that Section (3) (2) (a and b) prescribes that Rules under this Section are *compulsory*, and states that they "shall contain provisions" requiring as a condition of admission of any person to the Register that that person *shall* have undergone the prescribed training, and *shall* possess the experience, in the nursing of the sick . . . and further "requiring that the prescribed training *shall* be carried out in an institution approved by the Council." Yet, in spite of the unanimous agreement by the Council, and the huge expenditure of time and money in preparing these Syllabuses, the Matrons of the largest training schools on the Council are quite prepared to deprive the Nursing Profession of the right of a scheme of "prescribed training" as pro-

vided in the Act, and eagerly accepted by hundreds of hospitals and infirmaries throughout the country who are training their nurses on the Syllabus.

What action have the 20,000 College nurses taken on this betrayal of their professional interests, and those of their colleagues, by members of the College Council?

So far as we can gather, none whatever!

We ask fair-minded members of the College how they can reconcile their inaction with any sense of professional responsibility? The record of their qualifications was saved by the group of free nurses on the General Nursing Council, supported by groups of nurses who are not members of the College. The resistance to the present attempt to deprive the general members of the Profession of a Syllabus of "prescribed training" (the absurdity of the situation is emphasised when it is realised that the Male Nurses and the Sick Children's Nurses are to be granted an almost identical Syllabus, and Mental and Fever Nurses excellent and suitable curricula) is, as usual, being left to the independent members of the G.N.C. to fight; and that brings us to the question of the value of "independent" members in comparison with those who apparently owe first duty to College Council policy and not to their Profession as a whole.

#### THE VALUE OF INDEPENDENT MEMBERS.

In another column our readers will find a report of a meeting at St. Thomas's Hospital, held last Saturday, with the Hon. Sir Arthur Stanley, Treasurer of the Hospital and Chairman of the College of Nursing, Ltd., in the chair, summoned to consider a list of Matrons and nurses approved by the College and the Associations of Hospital and of Infirmary Matrons as candidates for election on the G.N.C. The list makes no pretence of the direct representation of the Nursing Profession as a whole, which the Act was passed to secure, but of one group of nurses associated under lay control (every signatory of the College Company is a layman, and five out of the six executive officers are laymen and medical men), and from the list agreed it will be found that those Matrons who agreed to deprive the Profession of their qualifications, and who most weakly assented to scrapping the Syllabus, are placed first on the list!

The list provides a candidate for every seat, in the hope, no doubt, that through the iniquitous Rule 9 (A), which provides a preferential system of placing College members on the State Register, the College will capture the

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)