

known to me, and which the official letter revealed. I had intended to refer to this inconsistency in my speech in the House of Commons, and had notes on the point, but a colleague near me while I was speaking in the small hours of the morning, whispered that ten members would have to leave if the debate were prolonged, so I rapidly drew to a close, and was thus forced to leave the deputation's views unrecorded. If they think that I did them an injustice in not referring to their views as I had intended, I hasten to assure them that they need have no regrets.

Yours very sincerely,

W. A. CHAPPLE.

[We have exposed the venality and futility of the present majority of the G.N.C. and we need not further labour this point. For months, at the instigation of the College of Nursing, Ltd., they trifled with the contract Parliament had made with the nurses registered under the Statutory Rules approved by it—and finally drafted Rule 9 (1) (g), providing for the admission of Gamps up to 1900—an absurd and artificial restriction. Either *bona-fide* nurses had a right to register—or not. We maintain they could claim no such right, as the Nurses' Act specially grants the General Nursing Council discretion and directs it to satisfy itself as to the adequate knowledge and experience of the nursing of the sick, of persons placed on the Register. This responsibility the first Council realised and provided for, but the new Council packed by the College under the now notorious Rule 9 (a) and with a doctor as Chairman of the Registration Committee, in attempting to gratify the College Council, fell between two stools—as presumably it did not know of the ignoble compact made between the Chairman of the College and Dr. Chapple, M.P.]

Anyway, the prestige of the Chairman and members of the G.N.C. has entirely evaporated, and it has earned the well deserved contempt of the indignant nurses, whose rights and privileges it is too feeble to maintain.

But the statement in Dr. Chapple's letter to which we take the strongest exception is his untrue assertion that "all the nurses on the deputations (to the Parliamentary Medical Committee at the House of Commons) took a wrong and selfish view."

The deputations who placed their views concerning *their own professional affairs* before the Parliamentary Medical Committee (who were legislating for them without consultation), were the Royal British Nurses' Association, the Registered Nurses' Parliamentary Council, the Professional Union of Trained Nurses, and the College Council. The G.N.C., instead of maintaining its dignity as the Statutory Governing Body of the Nursing Profession, placed itself in the invidious position of defending its decisions before a private Committee of Medical M.P.s in the House—who have no jurisdiction over it whatever.

We placed our views before the Committee as a member of the Registered Nurses' Parliamentary Council, and the Memorandum handed in ap-

peared in our issue of May 19th. Not one line of that Memorandum supports Dr. Chapple's attack upon the integrity of the Registered Nurses. It is one long, well argued plea for the well-being and safety of the sick—by safeguarding them as far as possible from the dangerous ministrations of ignorant exploitation—safeguards of which Dr. Chapple and his supporters have deprived the sick public in their hour of need. To accuse the high-minded and altruistic women who have worked for years—and paid at least £30,000 out of their own meagre incomes for this purpose—of "wrong and selfish views" is an astounding perversion of the truth upon the part of Dr. Chapple, who, in our opinion, owes an abject apology to the leaders of the State Registration movement, whom he has so meanly attacked in his correspondence with Sir Arthur Stanley. Had he repeated such an unwarrantable statement in the House of Commons, trained nurses, to whom the public owes so much, would, let us hope, have found a champion to discredit so cruel a libel. —ED.]

## TO CORRESPONDENTS.

### NEVER RESIGN.

We have received a number of letters from certificated sisters and nurses this week intimating that they have withdrawn, or intend to withdraw, their names from the State Register. In the first flood of their natural indignation at the attack made upon their professional status by the Chairman of the College of Nursing, Ltd., and Parliamentary Medical Committee, and the miserable part played by their futile Governing Body—the General Nursing Council—we are not surprised; but we repeat once more the advice of the great Beaconsfield—"Never Resign." Of course, trained nurses will hesitate to wear the "protected" (what a farcical description) uniform and badge, fearing association with dangerously ignorant V.A.D.s and other exploiters of professional status; but, whilst deeply sympathising with the righteous indignation of honourable, well-qualified nurses, we say look ahead. Don't leave the care of the unfortunate sick to these greedy, irresponsible women. Refuse to work on equal terms with them. The attitude of Dr. Chapple and the Parliamentary Medical Committee in the House of Commons towards loyal and efficient nurses has strained the loyalty of the latter to breaking point, and will need some consideration by medical authorities, other than medical politicians, to heal the breach. Again we advise "Never Resign."—ED.]

## OUR PRIZE COMPETITION QUESTIONS.

July 28th.—What do you know of psoriasis, the constitutional and local treatment usually prescribed, and the nursing care?

August 4th.—What are the duties of a District Nurse, attending a case of illness, towards the other members of the family?

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)