

Nurses' Association from doing so. We would gravely warn the Hospitals' Association and its organ in the Press, that unless they desist altogether from this unwarrantable interference and opposition, it is certain to recoil upon themselves. So far as we can learn, the British Nurses' Association have taken no private action in any way—and most certainly they have taken none in public—to oppose the Hospitals' Association, except in self-defence. Then everyone recognises that the latter Association has had the worst of the encounter. Let us as peacemakers entreat the British Nurses' Association—confident in the justice of its cause—to show a noble example of magnanimity and refrain from any attack upon an Association from which we frankly own it has received nought but ill-will and opposition; and on the other hand, let us remind the Hospitals' Association that there is sufficient discord in the world already, without wilfully increasing its extent and diffusion. Let us on more politic grounds point out that the progress of the British Nurses' Association is phenomenal, and its future success now quite assured. Whoever are organising this new body are—judging from the results they have so rapidly achieved—evidently endowed with unusual courage, tact, business capacity, and knowledge of the world. We do not know whether to marvel most at the rapidity of their action in forming the new Association, or the deliberate carefulness with which its constitution was drawn up, at the extraordinary quickness with which it has achieved success, or the cautiousness with which each step forward is being taken.

But putting these and other undoubted facts together, we would point out that they denote a latent force in the British Nurses' Association, probably all the more powerful because so little displayed. We take no credit to ourselves, because our journalistic instinct instantly showed us that an enormous power for good or evil has been created in the nursing world. As we have frankly said before, we see plainly our own advantage in supporting this coming power—the British Nurses' Association. But we have always lived peaceably with our editorial brethren, and therefore we make this earnest appeal to the Hospitals' Association and its organ in the Press to cease their persistent but perfectly futile attempts to disparage or retard the progress and success of the British Nurses' Association.

We would only add one word for ourselves. This and our previous numbers may perhaps convince our contemporary that we are well able to take care of ourselves. If it continues the unusual—nay, in our somewhat wide experience hitherto unprecedented—course of action which from our first number it has pursued of open antagonism to this journal, we shall deeply regret the necessity then forced upon us of completely convincing our opponent of his unwisdom and great short-sightedness in so doing.

But we earnestly hope for better things. We look forward to the Hospitals' Association and the British Nurses' Association each pursuing its own work to its own credit, and for the great good of hospitals and of nurses. We look forward to our contemporary and this journal—each with ever-widening circles for whom we respectively cater—working and writing on our separate lines, and doing honestly and thoroughly all that in our power lays to instruct, interest, and amuse our readers, and to forward the objects and advance the wishes of our respective *clientèle*.

DIOGENES OUT OF HIS TUB.

IN our merry, mystical, would-be-medical contemporary this week, the question of the *Lancet* articles on the National Pension Fund is again raised. Our readers may remember that the leading medical journal stated that the rates charged by the National Pension Fund were higher than those of many insurance offices. For obvious reasons it did not desire to name any particular offices, for that would have been merely a most valuable and gratuitous advertisement for those companies. However, the omission was of course noticed, and the *Lancet* was challenged to give names and figures in support of its statement.

In its issue this week it takes up the glove, and explains that the facts it gives “are drawn from the published prospectus of the company named, because the prospectus happens to lie at hand as we write, and to contain a table from which the required annual premium can be computed. Any other company would, so far as we know, offer equally advantageous terms. The benefit is in a deferred annuity of £15 per annum to be granted to an entrant in the twenty-fifth year of age, enjoyed after the attainment of sixty years. The annual premium as tabulated is as follows: Gresham, £2 os. 2d.; Star, £2 6s. 8d.; Kent, £1 17s. 9d.; Nurses' Pension Fund, £2 10s. Will the actuary venture to call these figures in question, or to publish a further correction?”

We, ourselves, could have culled from the tables of other companies than these still more striking figures, as showing the great disparity between the rates they offer and those proposed for nurses by the National Pension Fund. We deemed it our bounden duty to our readers to point out to them these facts. We must also point out the fallacy underlying the statement that the Government premiums are much higher than those of the Pension Fund. Every man of business knows that of course they are. The Post Office scale is notoriously high, because it is only intended for persons who wish to insure for smaller sums than it will pay ordinary offices to accept, and therefore the rates have to be made higher in order to pay the expenses of working the scheme.

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)