

THEN there appeared letters and telegrams denying that Mrs. BEDFORD FENWICK had taken any part in proposing or organising the Congress. Now, Mr. BURDETT has once more been hoisted with his own petard. For he took upon himself to write to Dr. BILLINGS, the Chairman of the Congress, certain questions, and as he bound himself to publish the replies has, doubtless much to his distaste, been compelled to do so. We condole with him, and congratulate British Nurses on the important information which has thus been unwittingly obtained for them.

- Mr. BURDETT ASKED—
1. Who originated the International Nursing Congress in Chicago?
  2. Has Mrs. BEDFORD FENWICK been requested officially, or otherwise, to act as Chairwoman of the British section of the Nursing Congress?

DR. BILLINGS REPLIED—

“Mrs. FENWICK when in Chicago in October last suggested the formation of an International Nursing Congress,

And at that time was asked by Mrs. FLOWER to be chairwoman of the British section.”

\* \* \*

THE “misrepresentation and abuse” concerning Mrs. FENWICK, and the various Societies with which she is connected—carefully confined outside the limits of libel—has made the *Hospital* notorious in Nursing circles. So I commend Mrs. FENWICK’S manner of dealing with Mr. H. C. BURDETT to all Nurses who may find themselves stigmatised again by the *Hospital* as “thieves” or “scum.” Because the following letter—which was inserted with a very feeble attempt at “making believe” that Mr. BURDETT liked it—appeared in the *Hospital* last week :—

3, Old Serjeants’ Inn, Chancery Lane,  
London, March 1st, 1893.

Sir,—In 1887, Mrs. Bedford Fenwick had occasion to instruct me to give you notice, that if you published any libel concerning her in the *Hospital* newspaper immediate legal proceedings would be taken against you.

You have since prudently confined yourself to abuse and misrepresentation of every scheme with which Mrs. Fenwick has been identified.

In consequence of an article in the *Hospital* of February 25th, headed “Mrs. Bedford Fenwick’s Position,” a matter which is clearly no concern of yours, and which is discussed in a manner manifestly malicious, I am instructed now to give you formal notice that if any libel on Mrs. Bedford Fenwick is published in the *Hospital* newspaper, criminal proceedings will be immediately commenced against you and your co-editors and the printers of that paper without any further warning.—I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

To H. C. BURDETT, Esq.

F. S. RANDOLPH.

\* \* \*

It is now well known in the Nursing World, that it was the resignation of Mrs. FENWICK and her friends from the Hospitals’ Association, which caused the total collapse of Mr. H. C. BURDETT’S

scheme for Registering Nurses “after one year’s training” for a yearly payment of one shilling sterling.

\* \* \*

Mrs. FENWICK then, and since, has boldly asserted that the control of the Nursing Profession should be in the hands of Medical Men and Nurses alone, and that the interference of an official of the Stock Exchange in any question which concerns Nurses from a professional standpoint, is both impertinent and absurd.

\* \* \*

IN an annotation headed “The Sweating of Nurses,” the *Provincial Medical Journal* says :—

“Our attention has been directed to the amount of money earned by Nurses, and the small proportion given to the wage-earners. Combination amongst Nurses can alone check the sweating process to which, in many Institutions, Nurses are subjected. Some Nursing Institutions we know of are under-staffed, the consequence being that Nurses are worked at a high pressure, and on returning from one severe and trying case are sent off at once to another without even an hour’s rest. We are told that there is a difficulty in obtaining Nurses. This is hardly a sufficient excuse, and we are more inclined to think that *l. s. d.* are the considerations which influence some committees in dealing with their Nurses. For the present we are generalising, as we do not wish to mention any individuals, but we may be compelled to single out Institutions.”

\* \* \*

I HOPE our influential contemporary will not omit to notice the fact reported at the last Quarterly Court of the London Hospital, that the authorities had sweated £1,700 out of the labour of 34 private Nurses during the past year. A more iniquitous statement has seldom, if ever, been reported to any Court of Hospital Governors. I congratulate the 34 white slaves upon their generosity to the London Hospital in contributing £50 each to its funds last year, an amount which very few of the House Committee have ever given; but I could wish that it was also possible for me to congratulate them upon their sense of self-respect and professional feeling. What wretched pittance are these defenceless women receiving per annum for their arduous and highly estimated labours? The Committee keep the balance sheet of their business carefully concealed from the subscribers.

\* \* \*

I CULL the following from the *Westminster Gazette*. where evidently Nurses have “a friend at Court” :—

“In the columns of the *Pall Mall Gazette* we frequently had occasion to comment upon the relations of the London Hospital to its Nurses. We are glad to learn that, though moving slowly and with no very good grace, the House Committee is gradually improving the conditions of its Nurses’ work in many material points. It will be remembered that the Select Committee of the House of Lords recom-

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](#)