

know of any reputable journal carried on, on any other principle). "For the future our Correspondence Columns will be open to discussions on Nursing Matters, and on these alone—other letters will be suppressed"!! Britons (excepting only British Nurses) never, never shall be slaves!!

Now, the plain situation is this:—The *Nurses' Journal* is the official organ of the British Nurses' Association—paid for out of their pockets—exactly as the *British Medical Journal* belongs to the members of the British Medical Association, and, therefore, all members of those societies have a right to express their opinions in their own papers; and the proposal to deny such a right to men would be met by them with well-merited indignation.

BUT with women, this last outrage is but part of the policy of personal contempt with which the Honorary Officers have treated the nurse members for years—a policy which has now culminated in altering the whole constitution of their Association—so as to deprive the nurses of the last shadow of professional independence, and make them the bye-word of every organized woman's society in the Empire.

OUR Journal is now issued, without any control of any sort, by the Executive Committee, by a sub-committee composed of the Honorary Officers, Dr. Bezly Thorne, two of the Middlesex Hospital staff, and Miss Helen Foggo-Thomson!! The declared policy is to give a free hand to these persons to express their views monthly to the members, and "suppress" the views of those members who differ from them. We feel sure the certificated matrons and nurses, both at home and abroad, will appreciate their position, and will, no doubt, gracefully adopt any suggestion made by Miss Foggo-Thomson on nursing matters. The fact that this lady has never been in any way connected with a leading training school in any capacity, will, we feel sure, make her ultimatum on nursing matters of infinite value to those ladies who have merely held the leading positions in the nursing world with distinction and success!

THE "Plain Words about Money Matters" in the *Nurses' Journal* are better late than never, and we are glad to notice that Dr. Fenwick's "plain words about money matters," when he felt compelled to resign the Treasurership in 1894, owing to the beginning of the system of extravagant expenditure—over which he was denied control—have at last been taken to heart, and the outrageous office expenses are at last to be curtailed. We read: "Everyone is, by this

time, fully convinced that the hire of such expensive premises in May, 1894, was a mistake," and that by letting off part of these premises, the rates and taxes are to be reduced from £346 17s. 11d. to the more reasonable sum of £150 a year.

AGAIN, we have always protested against the employment of four paid officers, which was solely necessitated by two ladies having been appointed to the responsible position of Secretary to our Corporation at the high salary of £100 a year, who had never worked in an office in their lives, and who were ignorant of the branches of work which are now a *sine quâ non* in the education of a Secretary. Neither of these ladies knew shorthand, type-writing, book-keeping, or had taken the minutes at Meetings, so in consequence an extra clerk became a sheer necessity. It is now announced that "since February, 1897, the services of one clerk have been dispensed with." This is satisfactory—but had the Matrons been permitted a voice in their own affairs she would never have been engaged.

IN the tables of expenditure we see no report of the bonuses given to the secretarial staff. The item of 12s., the year's donations to poor nurses, stands sadly forth; but the £20 which we are told was bestowed on the clerks "for their loyalty," out of the nurses' money, does not separately appear. We strongly disapprove of this method of enforcing "loyalty," and as we are told that "the two pensions of £20 each entirely absorb the fund at the disposal of the Association," we hope the members will insist that these bonuses to the already well-paid staff shall be discontinued so long as it is necessary to refuse monetary help to our own poor nurse members, which has been done constantly during the last four years.

AGAIN, we read in relation to the legal expenditure—"Many friends and members alike . . . have come forward and defrayed the whole expense to which the Association has been put in these matters." Why is no table of contributors appended to this statement? We hope space will be found for it in the January number of the *Nurses' Journal*, as no statement has been made by the Treasurer in relation to this matter in any of his financial reports to the General Council.

ANY way we may congratulate ourselves that the reforms which we have constantly advocated for four years in our own financial affairs, and the need for which has been so indignantly denied by the Honorary Officers, are at last to be adopted! No doubt, with patience and perseverance (and we

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)