November 3, 1923

# LETTER TO THE EDITOR.

Whilst cordially inviting communications upon all subjects for these columns, we wish it to be distinctly understood that we do not IN ANY WAY hold ourselves responsible for the opinions expressed by our correspondents.

# A PRESCRIBED PART FOR UNTRAINED NURSES.

### To the Editor of The British Journal of Nursing.

DEAR MADAM,—May I trespass on your space to give a short personal explanation of what I fear, from a remark in last week's B.J.N., may give my constituents cause to think that I have departed from the independent standpoint I adopted at the G.N.C. Election.

This is in no sense true.

I voted against a separate Appendix for untrained Nurses on the Register for two reasons, viz. :---

First—Strongly opposed as I am to the admission of untrained Nurses to the Register, I think it is undignified not to accept the Order of the Privy Council, and to interpret it as it was intended to be interpreted.

Secondly—I think it is less confusing to the public to have all Nurses on one list with the three qualifications stated, *i.e.*, Certificated, Trained, and Admitted under Rule 9 (r) (g), than to have two lists of names without any qualifying remarks.

#### SUSAN A. VILLIERS.

South-Western Hospital, Landor Road, Stockwell, S.W.9.

[We do not know to which remark in our last week's issue Miss Villiers alludes, but no doubt she voted as she thought right on the very important matter under discussion. At the same time, many trained and certificated nurses, strongly disagree with her opinion.

First. Nothing can be more "undignified" than the position the majority of the G.N.C. have adopted on the Chapple Modification. The Nurses' Registration Act made the Council responsible that it should satisfy itself of the good character, and of the standard of "knowledge and experience of the nursing of the sick" required from each candidate to be placed upon the Register, and the late Minister of Health, in opposing the Chapple modification of Rule 9 (r) (g), stated in the House of Commons, on June 13th last, "I am not sure whether this Motion is not inconsistent with the Statute."

We are quite sure the Motion was out of order, and if the Council had had an ounce of courage and genuine solicitude for the prestige of the Register—or the safety of the public—it would have contested the legality of this Motion, which deprived it of all authority and discretion, and would at least have attempted to keep the contract it had made with thirty thousand Registered Nurses under the Statutory Rules of 1921. We can appreciate the "dignity' of protecting the powers and prestige of the General Nursing Council, but altogether fail to appreciate anything "dignified" in its pusillanimous policy and lack of principle.

Secondly. Having failed to keep its contract for which they had paid upwards of 30,000 guineas —with the nurses, registered under the 1921 Statutory Rules, the least the Council could have done was to protect certificated and trained nurses from alphabetical association with persons posing as trained nurses, who have no training whatever, women who for years have exploited the *sick* for gain, and who now are to be permitted to exploit them under the authority of the State.

exploit them under the authority of the State. The Act provides for "prescribed parts," and there is no reason why a "Part" should not be compiled of women registered under Rule 9 (r) (g) following the General Part of the Register.

We sympathise sincerely with well trained and certificated Fever Nurses. They have genuine cause for indignation, as no class has been more seriously injured by Rule 9 (1) (g) than they have.

The Act does not provide for a Fever Nurses' Register, yet whilst they are compelled to register on a Supplementary Part as specialists, totally untrained women may now rank alphabetically as "general" nurses and assume a status—with the resulting economic advantages—denied to the most highly skilled Fever or Sick Children's nurses. We are of opinion that Dr. Goodall and Miss Villiers, both of whom have seats on the Registration Committee, should have attempted to protect trained Fever Nurses from such injustice by voting to place *untrained* women in a list to themselves.

The history of this episode is an epitome of the ignorance and ineptitude with which our Act is being administered, and which is bringing nursing in this country into contempt at home and abroad. The incapacity of the General Nursing Council for England and Wales, in managing our professional affairs, cannot fail to arouse a deep sense of injury and indignation in those of us who have given a life-time to raising nursing standards, and to striving to protect the sick from dangerously ignorant attendants.—ED.]

## **OUR PRIZE COMPETITION QUESTIONS**.

November 10th.—What first-aid would you render to a child who is burnt or scalded, and what are the dangers to guard against? State what you know about the degrees of burns. November 17th.—Define and briefly indicate the

November 17th.—Define and briefly indicate the treatment required for the following conditions :—

- (1) Vesicular mole.
- (2) Incomplete abortion.
- (3) Tubal pregnancy.
- (4) Accidental hæmorrhage.
- (5) Tonic contraction of uterus.

November 24th.—Describe the nursing of a case of Vesico-Vaginal fistula that has had an operation for closure of the fistula.



