

Medical man, for example, has to gain his "legal diploma" *before* he can be registered: he does not gain it by Registration. Scores of Doctors are not registered, but they possess a "legal diploma" nevertheless. How, then, can a Nurse, who only becomes registered upon the certificates of efficiency and conduct which she has already gained, be transformed into such an element of disturbance as Dr. Sansom fears? Can anyone believe that, because the fact that she holds certain certificates is printed upon an alphabetical list of Nurses' names, she will thereby become untrustworthy?

We cannot in the next place refrain from expressing our surprise and sorrow that Dr. Sansom should endeavour to sow distrust between Medical men and Nurses. Even presuming for one moment that Nurses would be so disloyal as to act in the manner he supposes possible, does Dr. Sansom not realise that, were his efforts successful in preventing Nurses from being organised under the control of their natural leaders—Medical men—which is the very essence and *raison d'être* of the British Nurses' Association, the only other alternative would be that they would be organised, as our contemporary points out, under unprofessional management, with a result which can easily be foreseen? We will not say more upon this matter, because we feel sure that, had Dr. Sansom been aware of the real facts of the case, he would never have written his letter, nor would he have been surprised at the severity of some of our remarks.

We are well aware indeed that some of our readers consider that our "criticisms are too scathing." We beg them to believe that we have sources of information which, perhaps, they do not possess. We know, for example, exactly the reasons for this rancorous hostility to the British Nurses' Association from a certain small clique; and we prophesy—because we know—that, if a true history of the movement be ever compiled, it will be admitted that what defence we have made of the Association and its Members has been, if anything, much too measured. If the detractors of the Association will cease their efforts, nothing will give us greater pleasure than to be freed from criticism of those efforts.

We must now revert to Miss Lückes' pamphlet, the final consideration of which we have been compelled hitherto to postpone. How completely her remarks upon the subject of the Registration scheme of the British Nurses' Association are answered by the Editorial in the *Lancet* it is unnecessary perhaps to point out. The assertion that the scheme implied a "theoretical examination" "to get the Nurses' names placed on a public Register," is proved to be an entire misstatement. The Association evidently has no

thought of being an examining body—of having anything in any way to do with "theoretical," or any other kind of examinations. It merely proposes to register the names of those Nurses who—whether their schools hold examinations or not—already have certificates of efficiency from such Institutions. So the page after page about "the adoption of one theoretical standard," "finer shades of character," and so on, are all entirely and altogether out of court. In fact, the great accusation which we bring against this pamphlet is, that it ascribes to the Association projects of which it had no conception, and certainly no intention of proposing, and then denounces it for these imaginary proposals.

But Miss Lückes has a third objection to the Association. She states that "there can hardly be a greater mistake, with regard to the need of Nurses, than to imagine that Convalescent Homes—that Institution life of any kind—would prove a refreshment to tired or sick Nurses, needing rest and change." As we had occasion previously to observe, the chief characteristic of this pamphlet is that it advances statements unsupported by any proof, and almost immediately afterwards effectually confutes them. So now no tittle of evidence is given that Convalescent Homes imply "institution life," and upon the same page that the preceding assertion appears we are told that there are "lonely, friendless workers, of course." This cannot be denied, but Miss Lückes considers that these are now already provided for. "They are so small a minority, that it is not difficult to find kind-hearted people who are ready to bestow the most cordial hospitality on over-tired Nurses, who are eager to make them happy, and who take pains to do this in the Nurse's own way, and according to her individual inclination."

It might be asked if this is really the experience of any Hospital Matron. Has anyone found the public "eager" to take in Nurses convalescent from scarlet fever and diphtheria? We may remind Miss Lückes that Convalescent Homes are not the usual resort of Nurses who are only "over-tired." So the "lonely, friendless workers," one is told to believe, never suffer from accident or illness, but only from being "over-tired." Miss Lückes' experience in this matter is probably unique. Most Hospital workers would say that Nurses are, as a rule, frequently in need of change of air and scene; that few are rich enough to be able to afford to go to lodgings or hotels; and that many have no friends who would care to have them, if recovering from an illness in a Hospital, which, to the ordinary unprofessional mind, instantly suggests something contagious. And, as a fact known to all, we may assert that a large number of Nurses have

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)