

## THE LONDON HOSPITAL AND THE COLLEGE OF NURSING, LTD.

### ANOTHER LETTER FROM OLYMPUS.

Miss Eva C. E. Lückes, Matron of the London Hospital, has issued an eleven-page pamphlet of "Reasons against the London Hospital becoming affiliated with the College of Nursing." It is headed "London Hospital," and it would be interesting to know who has paid in war time for the superfine quality of the exquisite paper on which this "Letter from Olympus" has been printed. Not the subscribers to the charity let us hope! We must defer reference in detail to the arguments advanced; let it suffice that there is only one Training-School for Nurses of any real excellence in the United Kingdom which produces the right "type" of nurse, and if the London were compelled to use the same "machinery" "which prevails at St. Thomas', St. Bartholomew's and other training schools . . . what is known as the 'special brand' of London Hospital Nurses would be entirely lost." . . . "It is clear that if inferior Electro-Plate is to be distinguished by the same hall mark as that hitherto reserved for Silver, it is the Silver, not the Electro-Plate, that suffers!"

Miss Lückes states that "to extinguish the type of nurse trained at the London Hospital, which is so widely acknowledged to meet human needs and to drag the training down to an ordinary level (Bart.'s, St. Thomas', Guy's, we presume) is a grave responsibility," and she gives the hon. medical staffs of these hospitals a neat little back hander when she states that "it is a well-known fact that doctors attached to St. Bartholomew's, Guy's and St. Thomas', &c., employ 'London' nurses whenever they can obtain them, and many of these say openly that they never apply to their respective hospitals for nurses until they find that a 'Londoner' is not to be had."

We have heard "Bart.'s" nurses complain of this "disloyalty" to their three years' standard by "Bart.'s" men.

"The 'London' has not remained behind in any way" Miss Lückes writes, "and unless its progress is arrested by our affiliation with the College, there is no reason why it should do so." . . . "Any risk of the diminution in candidates owing to the mere fact that the 'London' does not belong to the College may be ignored with confidence." But should such splendid isolation "ultimately prove detrimental—a condition of affairs very difficult to imagine . . . when it is deemed necessary for the 'London' to capitulate, there is no reason to doubt that it would be able to make as good—or as bad!—terms as would be possible at present." "Such a tribute to the success of the College would always insure a welcome for the 'London' and inspire a hope in the College authorities that a larger list of names than any other hospital can provide would be added to its Register."

Miss Lückes is quite consistent. She has

opposed "outside" interference with the "absolutism" which prevails in the Nursing Department of the London Hospital; Uniformity of Curriculum, One Portal (Central) Examination, and State Registration of Nurses mean a certain amount of "outside" interference—and Miss Lückes does not intend to "capitulate" until she is starved out and the enemy has scaled the ramparts. This the promoters of the College cannot do until they can wave on high the State Registration banner, when Miss Lückes realises the "London" will have to make terms.

We hear that the "London" considers that St. Thomas', Guy's and King's have not played the game in apparently going over to the enemy after "successfully" helping to obstruct State Registration for thirty years, and also that Miss Lückes feels very keenly the defection of those "Londoners" who entirely owe their promotion to high office in the nursing world to "London" influence, who have accepted nomination on to the College Council, and adopted the State Registration ticket. But even now Miss Lückes need not despair, the College of Nursing is a lay corporation, its Bill is an Employers' Bill, and there is no doubt that if it becomes law it will effectually snuff out, for the remainder of her natural existence, all effective power of self-government for the nursing profession, which is after all the pith of "anti" policy. With Louis XV Miss Lückes may take heart of grace. *Après moi le deluge!*

### POOR LAW AUTHORITIES AND THE COLLEGE OF NURSING.

Owing to the pressure of the Association of Poor Law Unions, the College of Nursing, Limited, has altered its qualifications for Poor Law nurses; but still Poor Law Guardians and officials are not satisfied. They now want to know if the registration condition of a certificate of not less than two years' training in a recognised school for nurses, followed by at least two years' *bona fide* practice as a nurse (Section 2 (d)), is not to apply to Poor Law trained nurses? "We admit," says the *Poor Law Officers' Journal*, "that the conditions for registration for membership of the College have been revised to meet points most fairly raised on behalf of the Poor Law nurse. But as we look at the revision which has been done we say it will not do. Either from clumsy drafting or disagreement among members of the Council trying to come to agreement, the provision has resulted in inconsistent conditions which leave the Poor Law nurse, and the nurse trained under the Poor Law, in as bad, if not worse, position than was the case under the previous conditions. . . . The more this question of registration for membership of the College of Nursing is looked into the greater grows the difficulty of having any conditions for the registration of the Poor Law nurse other than the

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)