

awarded a first-class certificate. She remained on when trained as staff Nurse in C ward, being much attached to the excellent Sister who presided, and who had held that position for five years. The Sister had a serious illness which incapacitated her for five weeks, and upon her recovery was recommended rest and change of air by a physician. To this the Matron was opposed, and intimated to the Sister that she had better resign; this the Sister refused to do, and said she would appeal to the Committee. Upon this the Matron accused her in Committee of breach of discipline and gross misconduct, which cruel accusation the Sister repudiated and proved to be absolutely false; yet although she proved her innocence, the Committee insisted upon her resigning, 'as it would be a breach of discipline for her to remain after what had happened.' During the discussion before the Committee Miss P——, a casual helper of the Matron's, interviewed the Nurses of C ward, insinuated faults in the Sister, which she persuaded them to repeat at the Matron's office—a dishonourable course which Miss C—— refused to take, although she was intimidated and accused of disloyalty "to the Matron." A few days later the Matron insisted on Miss C—— also resigning her position as Nurse in the Hospital. This she did, judging by the treatment accorded Sister C—— that it would be useless to bring her case before so weak and unjust a Committee.

Her father a little later wrote to the Chairman, asking an explanation of the circumstances which could compel his daughter whose record at the Hospital was unimpeachable being made to resign by the Matron. The answer he received was to the following effect:—"That Miss C—— had been accused of no fault, and that if at any time she should require a testimonial from the London Hospital, she would receive a first-class reference, but that nothing further could be done in the matter as the authority of the Matron must be upheld." Conduct more base on the part of any Committee cannot be imagined. This lady's case was strongly recommended by three of the Sisters under whom she had worked, unknown to Miss Lückes, to the Matron of another large Hospital, who gave Miss C—— a trial, and from this position, where she remained several years and maintained the highest standard of character and ability as a Nurse, she was appointed the Matron of a Hospital, which post she still fills to the satisfaction of all concerned."—I am, &c.,

A LOVER OF JUSTICE.

This letter disproves the statement made by the London Hospital in their defence, that they inquired into every case brought before them, and dealt justly therein.

"Sir,—The authorities of the London Hospital have written to you to "emphatically deny" the truth of the statements made by your Special Commissioner. As a former Probationer of the London Hospital, I can corroborate the truth of every thing she has said. The letter to you is signed by Mr. Hampton Hale, Chairman of the House Committee. As it adduces no proof in support of his emphatic denial, it becomes important to understand precisely the personal acquaintance with the truth which this gentleman possesses. On December 19th, 1892, I wrote a letter to the House Committee in which I stated that when in the Hospital I had protested against the fact that "a Probationer should have been sent every day direct from erysipelas patients in

Blizard ward to assist in Nursing a tracheotomy case in Isolation, thus recklessly risking the child's life by the possible conveyance of the erysipelous poison to the open wound in the throat." At a Governor's Court, held on March 1st, Mr. Hampton Hale is reported, in the leading Nursing paper—the NURSING RECORD—to have said, concerning this statement of mine: "This is a serious charge, but I say here that there is not one word of truth in the charge. It is utterly false from beginning to end. It never has been done, and I hope and trust it never will be done. I call this a charge; I say this is a charge against the administration of the Hospital. There is not one word of truth in it, and Probationer F—— must have dreamt it." As soon as I saw this in the NURSING RECORD I wrote to the Committee, and among other things said: "Either your Chairman or I have told a deliberate lie. I, for my part, offer and am anxious for an opportunity to prove my words. But you will probably find that Mr. Hampton Hale will not exhibit a similar eagerness." Now, Sir, the public will imagine that the Committee, for the sake of the honour of its chairman, and for the safety of the sick poor whose lives are clearly endangered by such mismanagement, would immediately demand an investigation. It will be astounded to hear that Mr. Hampton Hale quietly pocketed my accusation, and the Committee wrote that they had "no intention of re-opening the question." Now your Commissioner has independently noted that the erysipelas and isolation wards are under the management of one Sister—a fact which was emphatically denied in public by the Chairman of the Committee—which he dared not give me an opportunity of proving, and which one of the defenders of the Hospital now admits to be true. And yet Mr. J. H. Buxton, Mr. Hampton Hale, and Sir Andrew Clark have once more the calm assurance to deny this in their reply to your Special Commissioner. I therefore ask the public, what reliance can be placed on the denials from the London Hospital authorities? Will you also permit me to quote a sentence from a letter I wrote to the Governors of the London Hospital on February 27th of this year, after stating certain grave facts, and which is very appropriate in view of your action at the present moment:—"I have perhaps said sufficient to prove the necessity which exists for an independent public inquiry into the management of the Nursing department of the London Hospital. For the sake of Nurses, for the public, and the Institution itself I venture to urge the great necessity which exists for such an inquiry. Until this is done, and reforms are effected, you will have constantly recurring scandals and constantly increasing loss and discredit to your great Institution."—I am, Sir, yours faithfully,
M. F."

The caustic words of this injured lady commenting upon the statement made to the Governors of the London Hospital by the Chairman concerning the shameful mismanagement in the Erysipelas and Isolation wards will not be pleasant reading for the trustful friends of the Hospital. The least that the Governors can do is to insist upon their Chairman either proving his words or withdrawing and apologising for his statement.

"Sir,—The letter in your issue of the 2nd inst. signed by the authorities of the London Hospital, is I think, a very strong illustration of the "weak Com-

The "NURSING RECORD" has a Larger Sale than any other Journal devoted solely to Nursing Work.

The "NURSING RECORD" has a Larger Sale than any other Journal devoted solely to Nursing Work.

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)