

miseration and incidentally help to find the funds to enable our "managers" to control our professional and personal independence? We consider the situation equally false and absurd. We advise Mrs. Martin Harvey to acquaint herself with the true inwardness of the misnamed Funds she advocates and no further meddle therein.—Ed.]

THE AWAKENING.

To the Editor of THE BRITISH JOURNAL OF NURSING.

DEAR MADAM,—The Royal British Nurses' Association is to be congratulated upon the success of the Conference held under its auspices on November 7th. It was my privilege to attend both sessions. The speakers did full justice to the important and interesting subjects dealt with. One impression gained was that the nurses are at last beginning to wake up and take an intelligent interest in their own professional affairs, and to realize that no battle can be won by the generals alone, the rank and file must fight, too, if professional freedom is to be secured and *deserved*.

It was refreshing and edifying to hear the nurses speaking up and giving their views upon a matter of such importance as a Bill for the State Registration of Trained Nurses. It was a happy idea to provide a special session to explain and compare the two Bills. It was quite obvious that the one drafted by the Central Committee was the one to which the audience gave its support. Another impression I gained was that if Professor Glaister came from Scotland at the expense of the College of Nursing Co., Ltd., to speak on behalf of the Bill drafted by that body, it was a great waste of the company's money. To call vital principles insignificant "trifles" is not the way to convince an enlightened audience. I was pleased to observe three military Matrons present, who also, apparently, supported the Bill of the Central Committee; at least, they gave no support to Professor Glaister.

A "PICKER UP OF LEARNING'S CRUMBS."

A GREAT BENEVOLENT FUND FOR THE NURSING PROFESSION.

To the Editor of THE BRITISH JOURNAL OF NURSING.

MADAM,—In a recent issue, you draw attention to the vulgarity of a poster begging for subscriptions for Lady Cowdray's Fund for Nurses. It is, indeed, sad to reflect that Matrons connected with the Fund should have submitted to this public degradation of their profession.

But there are still greater evils covered by this poster which appeals for funds for the College of Nursing and the Tribute Fund for Nurses.

The following resolution, adopted by the Council of my Society in May, 1918, expresses the opinion of all those who care for the independence and dignity of the nursing profession:—

"The Council of the National Union of Trained Nurses protests against the methods by which the British Women's Hospital Committee is raising Funds for providing annuities for nurses, for the following reasons:—

"1. It objects, as being inconsistent with the dignity of the profession, that appeals for charity

should be made by means of advertisement in the Press and by posters placarding the streets.

"2. It maintains that such a Benevolent Fund should not be coupled with an Endowment Fund, especially for an unrepresentative body such as the College of Nursing, Ltd., which has as yet no established claim to confidence.

"3. It urges most strongly that the British Women's Hospital Committee, whose feelings of sympathy for the nursing profession it fully appreciates, should place the management of the Nation's Fund in the hands of a really national and representative body.

"For this purpose the Council of the National Union of Trained Nurses suggests that a joint committee should be formed of the existing benevolent funds, such as the Trained Nurses' Annuity Fund, the Royal British Nurses' Association Benevolent Fund, the Queen's Nurses' Benevolent Fund, the Edith Cavell Homes, the Junius Morgan Benevolent Fund, and any other that may appear suitable."—I am, yours faithfully,

EVELYN L. C. EDEN,

Hon. Adviser to the National Union of Trained Nurses.

46, Marsham Street, S.W. 1.

REVERENCE FOR THE DEAD: IS IT REALLY TRUE?

To the Editor of THE BRITISH JOURNAL OF NURSING.

DEAR MADAM,—This is the question I asked of the pleasant-mannered Secretary of the British Women's Hospital Committee, at her office a few days ago. Her reply was that it was perfectly true; a "Victory Ball" was to be given at the Albert Hall, on November 27th, in aid of "The Nation's Fund for Nurses," to celebrate victory. She was very surprised at my indignant protest. In the first place, peace has not been proclaimed, technically, therefore, the war is not over. An armistice means a *temporary* cessation of hostilities. Surely the dominant thought in the mind of all true patriots in this connection is that this large measure of victory has been won for us by the incomparable valour of our sailors and soldiers—wounded and otherwise—and *above all* by the "great sacrifice" of those unconquerable souls who fell in their tens of thousands on the battlefield. Was there ever such a strange way of celebrating their passing?

If people like to dance on such an occasion they are, I suppose, at liberty to do so; but they are *not* at liberty to do so in the name of and much against the wishes of patriotic nurses (some 400 of whom have also made the great sacrifice). It is an act of sacrilege towards the dead, and an insult to the great profession of nursing. This was the substance of my conversation with the lady, who could not see my point of view. We are certainly entitled to rejoice, but our hearts are full, and we incline more towards the giving of unbounded thanks to the "only Giver of all victory," for the conquest of an evil power in the world.

REVERENCE FOR THE DEAD.

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)