

Nurses should work, subjected to a very considerable strain on their physical powers of endurance, and be compelled to go from nine o'clock at night till ten o'clock the next morning without any solid meal. These were all serious questions, deserving every attention at the hands of the House Committee, and nothing she urged should be done at that meeting to prejudice the calm consideration of the evidence when it was published in the form of a Blue Book. They should not, by any hasty vote at the meeting, render the impartial consideration of those questions more difficult, or give the public the idea that the Hospital authorities resented criticism, or offered nothing but blind opposition to every reform that was suggested.

* * *

THE Chairman reminded Mrs. Hunter that they, as a House Committee, were willing to have those questions sifted to the bottom.

* * *

MRS. HUNTER still maintained that the passage of that resolution would give the idea that there was nothing in the charges which had been made, and that there was nothing to alter in the nursing arrangements of the Hospital. She denied that she was either a "wire-puller," or was associated with "wire-pullers," by which was meant, she was informed, the British Nurses' Association. She had honestly tried to bring the grievances of the Nurses before the House Committee before taking the extreme course of offering evidence before the Lords' Committee, but the former body had seemed to be utterly inapproachable and difficult to get at. When the House of Lords, therefore, appointed a Committee to deal with the administration of the Hospitals, all that she had done was to send in a note on behalf of the Nurses, intimating what they had to complain of, and asking if such evidence would be accepted.

* * *

MR. J. HALL, in seconding the amendment, said that had not Mrs. Hunter taken the action she did, he should have felt bound to offer some opposition to the action of the House Committee in proposing to absolve their employées from all blame without venturing to offer a particle of evidence in favour of that action. As had been truly said by Mrs. Hunter, it was very premature for the House Committee to ask the Court to sanction the passage of such a resolution. And he asked them to remember that he was influenced by no feelings of malevolence towards the Hospital; on the contrary, as one of the oldest residents of Whitechapel, who had seen the progress of the Hospital from its first extension to the present time, he was very greatly interested in the

welfare of the Institution. At the same time, there were many reasons why the House Committee should reconsider their resolution, and the most important was that it had been passed by only nine members of a Committee which nominally consisted of about thirty members. Again, it seemed to have been forgotten that their Matron was sometimes away from the Hospital for three days out of seven, and that all authority seemed to have been taken away from their House Governor, Mr. Nixon. In the opinion of the speaker, too, a considerable alteration was required in the constitution of the House Committee in order to make it more democratic. It seemed to be a generally accepted rule in the election of House Committeemen that business men should be overlooked, and that only men of wealth should be elected.

* * *

SIR EDMUND HAY CURRIE then opposed the amendment and with exquisite courtesy, repeated, and repeated again, in spite of Mrs. Hunter's repeated denials, that the whole charges were only an organised attempt to damage the Hospital. He declared that he was intimately acquainted with everything connected with the London Hospital, and then proved his intimate knowledge by declaring that the Matron hardly ever left the London Hospital, when even in her own evidence before the Lords Committee, Miss Lückes stated that the Committee had given her permission to be always out of the Hospital from Saturday to Monday. And as is well known in the East End, this frequently is extended from Friday to Tuesday, to which Mr. Hall in his speech evidently referred. Then Sir Edmund Hay Currie proved that his intimate knowledge did not extend to the number of the Nurses in the Hospital, and had to be put right by the Secretary.

* * *

AFTER some further desultory remarks, a vote was taken, and eight Governors declared for the amendment, and twenty-three against it. But as one of our correspondents last week pointed out, twelve of these were members of the Committee and only eleven were independent Governors who thus consented to swallow blindfold the unsupported assertions of the Committee, against the eight who held to the more English and honourable idea, that both sides should be investigated before a decision was taken. There can be no doubt that the Committee have enormously prejudiced their case with the public by thus attempting to burke discussion and inquiry. Everyone feels that there must be something to hide if the Committee are in such a hurry to close up the question that they compel the Governors to

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)