have only read one side. I have looked in vain for some answer to the various charges, and am compelled now to feel that the very absence of defence is significant.

Certain facts, the injustice of which I feel strongly, appear incontrovertible. No justification has been, and I cannot imagine that

any could be, offered.

I wish to state that I have not the slightest cause for partisanship. I am unknown to you or any mem-ber of your party personally, and have formed an entirely unbiassed judgment (often unwillingly) on the facts, so far as Ithave been able to obtain them.

If to any future protest I am allowed to append my name I will do so.

Not knowing your address I write to you at the office of the NURSING RECORD.

Yours faithfully, M. G., Matron.

## VOX POPULI. To the Editor of " The Nursing Record."

MADAM,-Would you allow one of the public to MADAM,—Would you allow one of the public to make a few remarks on the proceedings at the Imperial Institute on July 22nd. The Chairman, Sir James Crichton-Browne, was asked the question "If this is a nurses, association, why is it that there are no nurses proposing votes of thanks?" I may say here, for the benefit of those not present at the meet-ing, that Drs. Fardon, Carter, Bezly Thorne, Buzzard, and others usured the women's place. Now and others, usurped the women's place. Now I would especially ask nurses to note the Chairman's reply to that question—that nurses are too nervous and modest to come to the front; and as usual when men throw



such dust in our eyes to keep us from seeing, and inflect their voices with unctuous flattery to deafen our ears, there were a good many women in the audience who swallowed the bait, and smiled and bridled at Sir James' implied compliment. But Sir James was too wide awake to let the next question be heard. He thundered forth, "I am not here to be catechised," so the questioner had to sit down. As for modesty, is it considered immodest for a woman's voice to be heard in her own associa-tion? I only wish some of these men specieur tion? I only wish some of these men speakers would acquire a little necessary modesty to keep them in the background, for, as far as I could judge, they had neither the manner, ability, or voice which ought to be necessary qualifications even for men who attempt to speak in public. The very best cure for the Chairman's autocracy is for the nurses to assert their right to be heard in their own association. I only wish I was a member, even Sir James would find a difficulty in making me a silent one.

MOLLIE SOMERVILLE. Hon. Sec., Metropolitan Association of Women in Council.

# Hotice.

WE offer hearty thanks for many kind letters received since the annual meeting. No fear need be entertained that we shall be intimidated. We are absolutely indifferent to personal abuse, and we are fighting for great principles, and shall continue to do so. We regret that many letters received for publica-tion must be held over till next week.

# **NOTICE!**

Owing to complaints having been received from our Readers that they are unable to get the NURSING RECORD in some Districts, we append a list of Booksellers from whom the journal can be obtained :---

### WEST DISTRICT.

GARROULD, 150, Edgware Road, W. COSTER, 65 and 67, Weymouth Street. M. A. BAILEY, Paddington Street. — BURCH, 52, Great Marylebone Street. W. LEE, 248, Great Portland Street. G. WEAVER, 157, Great Portland Street.

NORTH-WEST DISTRICT.

C. GINN, 19, Princess Road, Regent's Park, N.W. SOUTH-WEST DISTRICT.

BAILEY & Co., 45, Streatham Place, S.W.

EAST DISTRICT.

Mrs. BERNSTEIN, 206, Whitechapel Road. G. EADES, 219, Whitechapel Road. W. MOIR, 57, Cambridge Road.

LEICESTER.

JOSEPH YOUNG, Chemist, Gallow Tree Gate.

MANCHESTER.

JOHN HEYWOOD, Deansgate. BOURNEMOUTH.

G. E. BRIDGE & Co., 128, Old Christchurch Road. DUBLIN.

FANNIN & CO., Grafton Street



