

decided to attack the British Nurses' Association, it would, in our humble judgment, have been wiser if they had done it well. Probably nothing will assist the Association so greatly as this feeble onslaught upon it. But beyond this series of conundrums certain statements are made, and these are followed by other statements, but in the whole of this pamphlet not one single fact is adduced to substantiate them.

The chief statements are these : (1) The scheme of Registration would hinder rather than advance a high standard of Nursing, and would tend to prevent the progress and development of the work on its present lines. (2) It would inevitably injure the position which a well-trained Nurse now holds in the estimation of the public, by rendering it increasingly difficult to distinguish between first and second-rate qualifications ; and it is obvious that those who have most to lose will suffer most by an attempt to reduce all qualifications to a dead level of uniformity. (3) Of the minor objects of the British Nurses' Association, the establishment of Convalescent Homes for Nurses, and of offices to facilitate the obtaining of engagements, are not needed, and, if instituted, would not be conducive to the welfare and advancement of the best Nurses.

We propose to consider these official statements of the authorities of the London Hospital *seriatim*. We are prepared to prove that they are untrue, and, what is more, that they are ridiculous. Then we shall criticise a few of the other absurdities contained in this pamphlet, and finally ask the Governors of this great Charity whether they approve of this official action. Because, however infantile the attempt to stem a great professional movement, however illogical, ungrammatical, and utterly nonsensical the pamphlet may be, everyone will understand one thing—that the London Hospital has by the mouth of an official distinctly objected to the Legal Registration of Nurses—desires, if it can, to prevent the sick public of the United Kingdom securing that measure of protection which the leaders of the Medical profession consider to be essential, and which Parliament many years ago ordained for other professions. This action has, of course, been taken advisedly, in the full knowledge of the enormous responsibility involved, in defiance of the teaching of history and experience in the case of other professions, in defiance of deep public feeling and the strongest professional wishes, in defiance of the opinion expressed by every respectable organ in the English Press.

1. "The scheme of Registration would hinder rather than advance a high standard of Nursing, and would tend to prevent the progress and development of the work on its present lines."

Of course this at once raises the question as to what "the scheme of Registration, proposed by the British Nurses' Association," is. We were not acquainted with it. We had believed that the managers of the Association were most wisely keeping their proposed scheme to themselves until its details were completely elaborated. But we have made inquiries, and are informed on the best authority that "Miss Lückes has not been consulted in the matter. She can know nothing about the scheme of Registration proposed by the Association." So it would actually seem that the authorities of the London Hospital have authorised their Matron, who does not even know what "the scheme of Registration" is, officially to denounce its injurious tendency.

For the sake of an amusing argument, however, we will presume that Miss Lückes, with prophetic eye, has discerned the "scheme of Registration," which will in due course be revealed to less-gifted mortals. Then in editorial—or rather, regal—language she writes, "The scheme of Registration is, in *our* judgment, calculated to lower rather than to raise the present standard of Nursing by concentrating the attention of Nurses on the theoretical examination, the passing of which is ultimately to get their names placed on a public Register."

So it appears further that in prophetic vision it has been revealed to Miss Lückes that there is to be a "theoretical examination" for Nurses, which they must pass "ultimately to get" themselves Registered.

But then comes this dark saying, "In the first place *we* (the italics are ours) do not see that any exact uniformity of theoretical knowledge is needed to enable a Nurse to be justly described as *trained*, and in any case the authorities of the best known Training Schools for Nurses are not agreed nor likely to agree as to the required standard." The prophetic visions have evidently been complete, if somewhat confusing. But it is really very difficult for poor mortals not behind the prophetic scenes, nor blessed with second sight, to understand what can be the connection between "theoretical examinations" which "ultimately get" Nurses registered, and an "exact uniformity of theoretical knowledge," which "enables them to be justly described as *trained*." We dimly glean that something serious is involved in this assertion. We will think about it carefully and recur to it next week. Meanwhile we are quite safe and truthful in saying that we agree with Miss Luckes, that we also do not see "that any exact uniformity of theoretical knowledge is needed to enable a Nurse to be justly described as *trained*." To be quite frank, we do not see any sense or meaning at all in the sentence.

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)