

Dear Shailesh Vara, MP.,

Thank you for forwarding the response from Ann Keen, Parliamentary Under Secretary of State, dated 1st Feb 2010.

In noting the use of the past tense in her report of progress, I now find myself wondering if the letter jointly signed by the HPC and PLG Chairs dated 9th November 2009 was a falsehood? In this clear letter to colleagues, they explain the postponement of the PLG work due to "unprecedented response" to the consultation, and the need for further time and attention to ensure such responses would be included (future tense) in further PLG workings prior to any recommendations being made at the end of the process.

In using the past tense to report the HPC has "considered the outcome of that consultation" and already "made its recommendations to the Secretary of State", it would appear that the PLG has continued its work in secret and neglected to consider the responses that the HPC and PLG Chairs reported would be necessary. The Chairs reported that they anticipated the reconvening of the PLG in order to revise the standards of proficiency as a result of their having received detailed responses to the draft standards, and also in order that in due time "the HPC Council is in an informed position to make its recommendations in light of the responses".

This would appear to have not happened if Ms Keen is correct and the recommendations have been made (past tense) without the HPC or PLG taking the time to consider the 1,000 plus responses.

Further, the HPC and PLG Chairs' statement, in that they anticipated there would be planned events through 2010 to engage widely and feed this engagement into the further working of the PLG, is also now null and void? If recommendations have been made without any revision of the Standards of Proficiency, where such draft SOPs bear no resemblance to my work as a counsellor, then there will be no possible way the Government can properly regulate me in my work. I failed to recognise my profession in the draft standards. I continue to fail to see how my work as a counsellor will be suitably regulated when such drafts include the farcicle standard of my having to demonstrate knowledge of and \*use\* of medical diagnostic tests! That is akin to asking an equine vet to know about and be able to complete the wiring diagram for an LCD television, and if he or she doesn't do that, they'll not be able to register as a vet.

Has the Government ordered that the consultation process be abandoned at this point to allow for decisions without discussion?

We at the NCP would be pleased to have answer to this apparent disbandment of the democratic process.

I further notice the continued lack of attention to the main key point of the White Paper, the question that asks whether statutory regulation is required. The White Paper sets out that this question requires answer, yet I can find no answer or evidence of the question having been given consideration. It appears the Government has continued regardless of this, and regardless of international legal questions being asked - I would refer you to the Amicarelli Report, copy has been submitted to Government, for details of such international legal questions. To aid your work I attach the Report here for your information.

I look forward to a further more explanatory reply from Ms Keen on this matter of her report of completed work, which appears to contradict other information from the HPC. I would also offer to save Ms Keen's time, in that the stated aims etc of the HPC/PLG are already well-known to the NCP and it's membership, and are available on their website.

Thank you for your time, I look forward to hearing from you.

I have copied this letter to the NCP Head Office for their information, and also to Michael Guthrie at the HPC as I would welcome the HPC response to the report of their having already completed the consultation work and made its recommendations to the Secretary of State.

Mrs Rosalyn Young  
RMN, MNCP, GQHP, PICT APT, BSc(Hons)