

implies an "examination conducted by an outside body, who at best would only be in a position to judge of the theoretical attainments." And herein lies one of the mysteries of this erudite composition. For we hesitate to believe that Miss Lückes is so completely ignorant of the subject as this particular sentence would imply.

We do not pretend to know, nor even to guess at, the particular "scheme of Registration" to be proposed by the British Nurses' Association, but of one fact we feel confident: Registration is one thing; examination is entirely and totally another matter; and we have completely misunderstood the objects of the British Nurses' Association—and we even venture to add that the Association has completely misunderstood the meaning of Registration if it proposes to undertake the examination of the Nurses of the United Kingdom. We are informed on the best authority that such an idea had never even crossed their minds, but that "Registration—simply Registration and solely Registration—is what the British Nurses' Association has always and only advocated."

Times without number we have, in these columns, explained what Registration means—the registering in a special book—kept and published by legal authority—of the names of those women who have proved themselves competent to tend the sick efficiently, and the removal, by legal authority, from the same book of the names of those women who have shown themselves to be unworthy of their calling. What the certificate or diploma may be which the Nurse holds is quite immaterial. If it be obtained from a recognized Training School, it is evidence of the opinion in which that Nurse was held by her teachers—that she was qualified by character and skill to be called Trained. Registration does not mean examining that woman afresh as to her capabilities. It means registering in a public book her name, and the title of her certificate—nothing more, and nothing less. We cannot, for one moment, believe that the British Nurses' Association intends to do more than this.

We have carefully examined our verbatim reports of every meeting of the General Council, and confidently affirm that nothing has been said by the governing body of the Association, which lends the smallest colour to the assertion that the Association contemplates any interference of any kind with the Nurse Training Schools. We would, as earnest well-wishers of the Association, suggest that it would be well for some official statement to be made upon this subject, because, however palpably ridiculous a falsehood may be, there will ever on this earth be found someone foolish enough to believe it to be Gospel truth.

But to return to the pamphlet, which, after our

last quotation, rambles on in a troubled stream of a few statements, which are not proved, and many inane questions, which are not answered by the writer, and most probably can never be either proved nor answered by anybody else. Finally, we are abruptly introduced to "real spiritual unity," and are informed how "it is attained," but "can never be secured," with which conundrum the first part of the pamphlet concludes. Then we read this:—"II. Would any real benefit accrue to less well Trained Nurses, if those who have nothing to gain and much to lose by being classed with second and third-rate Nurses, sacrifice themselves by doing so?" a sentence which, for literary lucidity, may fitly stand as typical of the entire pamphlet.

But next we meet a more serious statement. "At present there is every opportunity for anyone requiring a Nurse to ascertain her personal qualities and the extent of her training." That is entirely contrary to facts of every-day experience, and known probably to every Medical man in the United Kingdom. Cases do not occur now and then, but they are of daily frequency, in which, when a Trained Nurse is required in haste, there is not time or any other "opportunity" of ascertaining her character and skill. But in the very next paragraph this assertion is flatly controverted by Miss Lückes herself, because she admits that certain "persons pass themselves off for Trained Nurses, when they have no claim to the title," and "sometimes injure others in the eyes of the public." And more completely still is the contradiction carried in the subsequent paragraph. "It is true that some difficulty exists in distinguishing well trained from inefficient Nurses." We would humbly express our opinion that, although Miss Lückes does not answer her questions, she does most assuredly completely confute her own statements.

But now we take the next assertion which is brought forward. "The idea that the public cannot protect itself from incompetent Nurses cannot be seriously entertained, when nearly all the Metropolitan Hospitals and very many large Provincial Hospitals keep highly-trained Private Nursing Staffs." And this actually follows directly after the writer has distinctly admitted that there are women without any claim to the title of Nurse who are now working as such, and that "difficulty exists in distinguishing well-trained from inefficient Nurses." Once more we say we have never, in the course of a somewhat wide journalistic experience, read such an extraordinary production as this pamphlet. For it not only contains assertions which every-day experience disproves, but, in the same page, complete contradictions of these statements by the writer herself! Small wonder that from one end of the kingdom to the other it has

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)