

it certainly would not suffice to support so honourable a position."

On another occasion, pathos having failed, this same wily old gentleman attempted to undermine principle with blandishment. He looked on a cap as a badge of servitude.

"Why cover up your beautiful 'air?" he asked insinuatingly.

At two successive committees we considered this all-important question, when we made it quite plain that we would rather have resigned the Matronship of "Bart's" than relinquish the outward and visible sign of our professional status as "Superintendent of Nursing." Happily, like a proverbial Scotswoman, we retained "baith."

Miss A. Millicent Ashdown, a strong supporter in the *Sunday Times* of a charitable appeal for the "Nation's Nurses" at the present time, and whose letter we criticised in our last issue, writes an indignant denial that, as we stated, she is a member of the R.B.N.A. We apologise; we did not know it was so bad as that! We regret we have not space for the whole of this lengthy epistle.

Because we pointed out that there were already innumerable charitable funds for nurses, Miss Ashdown considers our objection to starting another "Nation's Fund for Nurses" in war time illogical. We distinctly said, "if the College of Nursing desires to be a charitable institution, let it accept that position, although the guinea fees paid by the nurse members (over which they have absolutely no control) should meet all justifiable expenses of a voluntary organization." Neither has the College any right to appeal in the name of the Nation's Nurses, as thousands of us are not members, and do not recognise the authority over our profession of a Company of laymen and their nominated Council. Let these men appeal to the public to finance the work of their Company in their own names, and abide by the result.

Miss Ashdown professes to agree with our policy for the profession of "hard work, self-support, mutual help, and independence," but goes on to claim "that it is precisely because of the absence of mutual help that it becomes necessary to have a "Nation's Fund for Nurses," who have not received help from the Nursing Profession. . . . The majority of Nurses have barely sufficient for their own needs if they are to remain independent, and are therefore not in a position to give to others, even though they would like to do so."

We do not follow this argument. We agree

Nursing is a badly paid and often sweated work. And whose fault is it? Before the war, that of the Training Schools, who are now attempting to monopolise all economic power over trained nurses, through the autocratic Constitution of the College of Nursing.

And since the war we must blame the War Office, and the Joint War Committee, which have not only depreciated our standards, but encouraged every form of voluntary labour and competition.

We taxpayers, who are told it is costing us seven million a day to run the war, and that the charitable public have subscribed close on seven million pounds for the work of the Joint War Committee, claim that the nurses controlled by them have a right to adequate salaries, care in sickness, and sufficient pensions, and that it places the "Nation's Nurses" in an entirely false position, as servants of the State, to be held up *in formâ pauperis* by the very persons already provided with ample funds to meet all their needs.

Had Miss A. Millicent Ashdown been an active member of any of the self-governing Nurses' Organizations, which we cannot gather that she is, she would have realised that an enormous amount of "mutual help" has been forthcoming amongst their members during the past twenty years, and she would restrain her gibes, such as describing the nurses who have co-operated as "Pharisees," and accusing those who have worked and paid for the "Union" movement in our ranks of "jealousy" of an organization such as the College of Nursing, Ltd.—a Company of male employers, the Hon. Officers of which are men who are out to deny the fundamental principles of "self-government, mutual help, and independence" to the nursing profession—a policy many of them have ruthlessly pursued for a quarter of a century. To endow such an organization with unlimited funds spells slavery, and not emancipation for the worker. If Miss Ashdown and those nurses who are willing to accept charity instead of just remuneration for their skilled work do not realise this, we advise them to study political economy before attacking those colleagues who have devoted their lives to the upraising of the educational and economic condition of trained nurses. No charity, no cadging, no patronage, and no dependence is our motto. We need none of them. Let women be paid justly by the men who employ them, as they are compelled to pay their fellow-men. They will then cease appreciating their highly skilled work, at the cost of casual labour.

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)