

sible to stop a nurse from being registered because she was bad tempered. In regard to the London Hospital certificate, they might stop the certificate, or not give a full certificate. A good woman might be suitable in one position and not in another. To place nurses on a State Register would be to put them much more on the lines of doctors, and that the witness strongly deprecated.

Asked if the rivalry between nurses consequent upon a State examination would not be of a wholesome nature, the witness said that it would have the effect of concentrating their interest on the examination. Anyone could get a certificate, but anybody could not be a good nurse. Many could take a high place in an examination who were not practically fit. In reply to a question as to a practical part of the suggested examination, the witness said there was nothing very learned in an examination of nurses, but they were apt to feel that the difference between doctors and nurses was that it took three years to make a nurse and five years to make a doctor. An examination paper set to probationers at the London Hospital in 1904 was here produced by the Chairman, who said he would be sorry to have to answer the questions. Sir John Batty Tukey said it appeared "very complex." The witness said that she had protested against some of the questions at the time. It was understood that only those who were going in for honours need answer them.

The Chairman remarked he was a believer in having examinations quite stiff. There were many bad nurses about. The witness did not think that supervision could be maintained under a system of registration, she did not see how it would insure even technical qualities being kept up to date. She reiterated her belief that registration would make things worse for the best nurses. The training-schools should be referred to as to the qualifications of their nurses. It was a mistake for nurses to regard the training-schools as their enemies when they were their best friends.

In reply to Sir John Batty Tukey, the witness said only nominal uniformity could be attained by the establishment of a standard. It would not be of use to the public to have a Register of Trained Nurses, because in the certificates of the hospitals the public already has an assurance which it can trust that the nurse is hall-marked by the institution which trained her. The witness did not consider that the exclusion of a nurse's name from a public register would materially reduce the number of incompetent nurses, it might result in the best being passed over. A nurse might be on the State Register and yet not be suitable for a given case, mediocrity would be stereotyped, and the public deluded by a State Register.

In reply to Mr. Mount as to whether, putting the London Hospital aside, Registration would not have the effect of screwing up bad cases of education, the witness did not think this followed. In infirmaries the examination was sometimes too high. Asked if it would be possible to register two classes of nurses—Class I., fully trained, and Class II., partially trained—the witness thought it would be a mistake.

Questioned as to why she objected to an examination for nurses when one was enforced at the London, Miss Lückes said that she did not object to it as a test of ground work. The nurses in that institution were paid at the rate of £12 the first year and £20 the second, after that they were paid according to what they were worth. To require all nurses to pass a third

year in the wards would be to block the output. In the event of Registration by the State, the training-schools would have an incentive to turn out such nurses as could pass the State examination. The witness considered that the number of unsatisfactory nurses had been much exaggerated. Bad nurses would certainly be registered under a Bill. Half-trained women could do very useful work, the witness would rather have them than many who had attained to the minimum standard of training.

Again, Matrons of hospitals who were busy trying to produce candidates would not have time to take much part in the work of a Central Council. She feared the result would be that it would be handed over to the theorists. It was too early in the history of nursing to stereotype a standard; moreover, the subject of a nurse's qualifications was not one which adapted itself to registration.

Asked by Mr. Hobhouse what, in the event of the constitution of a central Board, would be her idea of its constitution, Miss Lückes replied, it was impossible to conceive such a Board being appointed. "In the event of its constitution," reiterated Mr. Hobhouse. The witness replied she had not thought out the question.

As to the three years' standard, it would entail more expense on the nurse, inasmuch as she would be held back longer from making a living. Nurses certificated at the end of two years were competent to nurse serious cases; it was chiefly for the benefit of the hospital that their services were retained for a further period of two years. The three years' standard was made a regular fetish. She never understood why the Royal British Nurses' Association had enforced it.

One reason for the restriction in the supply of nurses was that the hospitals had not more accommodation for pupils; to provide it would entail expense, but it was expense which would pay in the long run.

In reference to the contention of the advocates of registration that it would protect the public from incompetent nurses, Miss Lückes was of opinion that in only a very few cases the public needed protection, the number of such cases was greatly exaggerated. In regard to hospitals, Poor Law infirmaries, and district nurses, there was sufficient protection already, also, there were Matrons and doctors attached to private nursing homes, so the public did not need protection in relation to them. The only cases left were private nursing institutions and nurses working on their own account; the latter, if incompetent, would not be employed, so that only left the institutions to be considered. She had no objection to the registration of institutions. They could not give the Government a guarantee that all their nurses were properly certificated hospital nurses, because the supply was not sufficient. There was no danger of the wrong or immoral woman being foisted on the public under present conditions, because they have the means to protect themselves. They could inquire at the school where the nurse was trained, but they did not always inquire. She thought nurses working in connection with co-operative societies generally deteriorated very rapidly.

She objected to placing the fact that a nurse had attained to a minimum standard on public record. It was unjust to the best. Asked if she were aware it was commonly done in all professions, the witness replied that her technical qualifications were of secondary importance to a nurse. The personal qualities came first. The pseudo-scientific young

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)