

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.

Whilst cordially inviting communications upon all subjects for these columns, we wish it to be distinctly understood that we do not in any way hold ourselves responsible for the opinions expressed by our correspondents.

SELECTED OPINIONS.

To the Editor of THE BRITISH JOURNAL OF NURSING.

DEAR MADAM,—You have drawn attention to the attitude of the Press in general towards nursing opinion, but what about the Nursing Press? Who is responsible for the nursing paper which allows our opponents to make assertions in its columns, yet withholds our answers on behalf of the Nursing Profession? I refer to the *Nursing Mirror* and its attitude towards the claims of nurses for the management of the future Nursery Schools. Our claims are based on the actual words of No. 19 clause of the new Education Bill, which plainly indicate that the object of this new scheme is to attend to the health, nourishment, and physical welfare of children.

The Editor of the *Nursing Mirror* "differs" from our point of view that this work belongs to the nursing sphere and should come under the supervision of fully-trained nurses instead of teachers, therefore he "has no room" for arguments in our favour. A letter of mine, responding to one I considered an insult to the Nursing Profession, appeared two weeks after I wrote it, with all my arguments cut out, thus leaving a bare appeal for the support of nurses without the force of reason. In the same issue space was found for "An Infant Mistress" to advertise certain qualifications taken up by teachers as extras, and to make wild statements about what is "absolutely necessary" to qualify for the head of a Nursery School, though she safeguarded herself by saying "if I understand Mr. Fisher's scheme correctly." Since she didn't seem to understand the scheme at all, I replied, giving the actual words in the Education Bill relating to Nursery Schools, and emphasising the importance of supervision by a fully-trained nurse for this work in order to obtain the best results. I also exposed the insignificance of the Froebel Certificate and the Montessori method of teaching according to the estimation of Education Authorities.

This letter was returned to me with the Editor's "regrets," &c.

It should be noted that he *thanked* an "Infant Mistress" for what he evidently considered the last word to our claims. In fact, he could not restrain himself from sending *me* a free copy of the paper with a request to read it.

I have no need to thank him for the gift, the motive being so unworthy; instead, I would ask him to be so kind as to change the title of his correspondence columns. "Selected Opinions" might be more appropriate since it seems they must either coincide with his views or come within the scope of his criticism before they appear in those columns.

It would be interesting to know if other nurses have sent letters which do not come within his conception of "Everybody's Opinion."

Yours faithfully,
THERESA McGRATH,
President Municipal Nurses' Union,
M. and S.

45, Lloyd Street South,
Moss Side,
Manchester.

MERE SCRAPS OF METAL.

To the Editor of THE BRITISH JOURNAL OF NURSING.

DEAR MADAM,—I have read with indignation of the treatment of ladies who have given years of voluntary work for our country, by the Joint War Committee.

In this connection one is tempted to enquire if the decoration of the Royal Red Cross, by the bestowal of which His Majesty the King has signified his appreciation of the work during the war of Dame Furse and Mrs. Kiero Watson, are mere "scraps of metal," or whether these ladies have not a right to be treated with some measure of consideration and respect by the Committee and its Chairman.

If ladies of influence can be thus summarily removed, what chance of justice has an insignificant nurse?

Yours truly,
OUTSIDER.

VERY UNIMPORTANT.

To the Editor of THE BRITISH JOURNAL OF NURSING.

DEAR MADAM,—At a recent meeting, held at the Royal Infirmary, Manchester, which was addressed by Miss Rundle, the Secretary of the College of Nursing, Ltd., at which all nurses present were implored to join the College—although its autocratic Constitution was not explained—this lady stated that "there was a section of nurses opposed to the College, but they were very unimportant!"

The truth is that every intelligent member of the nursing profession who understands the value of economic freedom is opposed to this lay Company, in which the entire Executive authority is monopolised by men, and whose very obedient servant Miss Rundle evidently is. A shamelessly unprofessional and disloyal attitude towards her colleagues in the opinion of the "very unimportant," of whom I am one.

Yours truly,
A "VERY UNIMPORTANT"
BUT LOYAL PROFESSIONAL
MEMBER OF THE BART'S
LEAGUE.

OUR PRIZE COMPETITIONS.

QUESTIONS.

March 2nd.—Define thrombosis and the details of nursing required.

March 9th.—How would you bring up a baby which weighed 4 lb. at its birth?

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)