

their most primary duty in not having solved this very simple problem during the last thirty years, and that nothing could more conclusively prove the need that Parliament should, for the safety of the public, take steps to control these bodies, than this admitted state of chaos in the education of Nurses. But the Petitioners actually urge that "until such concurrence of opinion is obtainable it would be premature to establish a central body with exceptional powers of controlling the education and qualifications of Nurses." They do not say how such a desirable concurrence of opinion upon such a vital matter is to be obtained, and it may fairly be said that the experience of the past thirty years proves that the mere Training Schools cannot apparently arrive at such unanimity by their own unaided efforts. It is, moreover, manifest that their argument is quite irrelevant, if it is not intended to apply to the Association; and most misleading, if it is desired to infer that the Association would be endowed by the Charter with "exceptional powers of controlling the education and qualifications of Nurses." Because, as we showed last week, nothing less than an Act of Parliament containing the most drastic provisions could possibly confer these "exceptional powers," and from the beginning to the end of the Charter it is indisputable that no such powers are given.

But this very paragraph, which commences by bewailing the lack of uniformity in Nursing education, actually concludes by inferring that the existing Training Schools are conducted upon systems of uniform excellence, and that they are all aiming at a uniformly high standard.

To take St. Thomas's Hospital itself, for example, whose regulations for Nurses, handed to the Select Committee of the House of Lords in July, 1890, were found to be dated May, 1873, it is manifest that the "aiming" process has occupied, at the least, seventeen years, and we can only express the humble hope that when, if ever, they actually fire, they may hit a somewhat higher and more modern mark than their present most antiquated and inferior standard.

Paragraph 8 is an example of the most involved reasoning with which we have ever met. If it means anything at all, upon which we will not express an opinion, it means the old argument in another form—that nobody could publish a list of Trained Nurses who was not empowered to control the Hospitals in which those Nurses were educated—an argument which is manifestly ridiculous. But it is seriously

advanced, once more accusing the Association of not doing, precisely what it was denounced before the Board of Trade for attempting to do. But the Petitioners argue that if the Association is not accorded controlling powers over Hospitals, it would necessarily follow that "numbers of insufficiently-trained and inferior Nurses" would be Registered. Considering that, by the Regulations for Registration which we have before us, every Nurse, to be eligible, must have worked for three complete years in Hospitals or Infirmaries, the words which we have quoted, come with bad grace from Institutions which consider their pupils thoroughly trained at the end of twelve months; and we imagine that, with such a standard, the Petitioners can only prove their point by once more depreciating the value of the Training Schools, and showing that one year's Hospital work education and experience, is necessarily better than a three years' curriculum; or, to go one step farther, that no training at all is better than a one year's course.

Paragraph 9 is chiefly a *rechauffé* of paragraph 5, an amusing proof of the extreme difficulty which has been experienced in finding presentable arguments. It concludes by commenting on "the extreme difficulty of adequately revising the Register, and of removing the name of any person therefrom, except in case of gross misconduct." The Petitioners clearly have it in their power to lighten the difficulties of the Association by affording it their invaluable assistance. But it would be interesting to learn for what reason less than "gross misconduct" the punishment of removal from the Register should be inflicted, while it is very significant that the possession by the Association of this important power is thus tacitly admitted.

Paragraph 10 declares that, inasmuch as *most* of the large Training Schools keep lists of the Nurses trained by them, and inasmuch as any one can, therefore, at once find out all particulars concerning any one of these Nurses, therefore, the Register of the Association is unnecessary; an argument which is neither logical nor conclusive. It would be interesting, for example, to know how the hundreds of women who have never been at a Hospital could appear upon the Register of any one of these Institutions, and to what Institution a medical man "or any member of the public" must apply for information concerning a woman sent out as a trained Nurse who has never been trained anywhere. The next assertion, that, "the Training Schools can

**Early Weaning.**—For infants deprived of their natural food, Loeffund's Kindermilch is the most perfect diet; being, in physiological action and composition, a perfect substitute. Sold by Chemists, or apply—Loeffund, 14, St. Mary Axe, E.C.

**De Jong's Cocoa.**—Dr. Hehner (President of the Society of Public Analysts) says: "Of absolute purity and highest excellence; surpasses in delicacy of aroma and richness of taste the best kinds hitherto offered to the public."

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)