

My charges were—

1. That twelve hours of incessant work are too much for Nurses.
2. That too much authority is given to the Matron.

The Lords' third report:

The Committee consider that eight hours' work is, as a rule, as much as should be required from Nurses.

The Committee are strongly of opinion that no absolute power ought to be given to any Matron.

A defender of the Hospital admits that the Matron is "virtually an autocrat," and that the Committee are practically under her complete control. This extraordinary reversal of the positions of committee and matron quite explains the present mismanagement, and cannot be justified, I suppose, upon any grounds. The Lords' Committee reported that they considered the difficulties at the London Hospital which were brought before their notice in 1890 "would have been avoided had the governing board not allowed their authority to fall into the hands of salaried officers." I cannot imagine a more crushing condemnation than this, but the committee of the London Hospital have ever since continued to hold this same anomalous position towards their paid officials. No wonder that they are afraid to permit a public inquiry into their management. But how men like Sir Andrew Clark and Mr. Rathbone can attempt to justify the continuance of such a system passes my comprehension.

3. That it was unfair to the public to send out mere Probationers after one year's training as "thoroughly-trained Nurses."

3. Lord Kimberley queried whether the system was very far short of fraudulent. The Lords reported that they are of opinion that the minimum period after which a Nurse can be advertised as thoroughly trained is three years. (Page 98.)

4. That leaving the entire power of the dismissal of Probationers in the hands of the Matron was a bad principle.

4. The Committee are strongly of opinion that the appointments and dismissals (of the Nurses) should be made by the chief executive authority of the hospital.

5. That the private Nurses were sweated out of three-quarters of their earnings.

5. The Committee think that a sliding scale commission on their earnings . . . would be a fair addition to their regular hospital wages. (Page 98.)

Without going into further details, I have probably said sufficient to prove that the charges which I made, so far from being disproved or disposed of by the Lords' Committee, were actually held by them to be justified and in need of reform. I submit that the fact that these reforms have not been carried out in the London Hospital proves how

utterly bad the management of that Institution is, how completely careless of public opinion the committee are, how oblivious to the fact that they are only the dispensers of public charity, and how impossible, therefore, it is to obtain any reforms at the London Hospital without the aid of publicity.

The public will believe that those who are only anxious to prove the truth of every statement which they have made, are more likely to be in the right than those who content themselves with "emphatic denials," but refuse to take any steps to clear themselves, and the Institution they mismanage, from the grave charges brought against them.

The following appeared in our influential contemporary the *Medical Times and Hospital Gazette* last week:—

SIR,—My attention has been drawn to a letter from a Mr. Whyte in your last issue, the personalities in which, as you rightly suggest, caused it to be excluded from the columns of the *Pall Mall Gazette*. As you have afforded it publicity I feel sure that you will permit me to make a few remarks on the subject. As Mr. Whyte states that "He knows nothing about the London Hospital," his opinion on the matter cannot be held to be valuable, and therefore need not be discussed. I am unable to descend to his level of abuse—which is not argument—and in reply to him would only say that it would have been more honest if he had told your readers that I have offered to prove the truth of every word which I have stated; but that the London Hospital Committee have shirked the necessary public inquiry which would enable me to do so. I leave your readers to judge which side is afraid of the truth being known.

Amongst the charges which I have brought against the managers of the London Hospital, from my personal experiences, and which have been corroborated by others from their own knowledge, are the following medical points:—

That the erysipelas and isolation wards (for fever and diphtheria, &c.) are under the superintendence of the same Sisters who have to attend the medical staff during their rounds in both wards; that Nurses are sent up and down direct from erysipelas cases to nurse children with tracheotomy; that there is no direct supervision of the Nurses' work by the Matron, as she seldom if ever visits the wards, and yet she is absolutely responsible for placing or removing "Special Nurses," the resident staff having been deprived of any power in this important medical matter; that probationers, before they have passed through the course of two years training, are

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](#)