

separate balance-sheet, of course," as if placing the expenses of the department where they ought to be—amongst the expenses of the other department—and the full receipts of the department where they ought to be—amongst the full receipts of the other departments—would make a "separate balance-sheet." However, the examination continued: "(8,491). On page 31 you have the expenditure on various other items, but on this item of 'Private Nursing Institution' I see no expenditure?—All those receipts are profits, you see; all net profits. (8,492). This is a net profit, you say?—Yes. (8,493). And then on another balance-sheet you have the expenses and the income of the Nursing Institution?—Yes; it is not published in this book. (8,494). Is that only kept now for the first time?—No; it has been kept each year for the last four years. (8,495). And the alteration that you speak of is that it is to be included in this report?—Yes."

Now there can be no mistake about these statements, and therefore we wish to know how it comes to pass that the Committee has apparently altered its mind and determined not to include the balance-sheet of the Private Nursing Department in the annual report of the Hospital. Why is the Committee still concealing from the public the total amount which it has received for the services of its Nurses? Why is it still concealing the total amount of the expenses of the Institution? If there is nothing to be ashamed of, why this mysterious secrecy? If the receipts and expenditure are both larger than can be justified, that, of course, explains the matter at once. But, whatever the reason may be, we unhesitatingly contend that the Committee, as trustees for the subscribers, have no possible justification for their conduct in permitting the full, true, and particular accounts of a public Charity to be withheld from public knowledge. Seeing, then, that in this present report there is no statement of the expenditure of the Private Nursing Institution, and no separate balance-sheet, we are forced to the conclusion that once more the deception perpetrated in previous reports has been repeated, and that, without a word of explanation, the net profits of the Institution, remaining after the payment of all its expenses, have been placed amongst the gross receipts from voluntary contributions, legacies, rents, and dividends. We call attention to this significant fact, and to its only possible explanation—that the Committee are, for some reason, afraid to let the real figures be known. We must, therefore, take

Loeflund's Hordeum Compounds.—C. Pepsin (In dyspepsia), c. iron in chlorosis, anaemia, jaundice, pleasant and digestible for ladies and children), c. Quinine (an excellent tonic in neuralgia, nervous headache, and debility), C. Lime (—hypophosphit, in rickets, scrofulosis, very digestible). 3s. 6d. R. Baelz and Co., 14-20, St. Mary Axe, E.C.

the figures as they stand, and even then they are startling enough, because it appears that the net profits ground out of the labour of its Nurses by the London Hospital, in one single twelve months, amounted to no less than £1,377 2s. 11d.—surely the very sublimity of sweating! And how is this unrighteous gain obtained? Not by open competition in a free market, but by grinding the face of helpless women, by cruelly deceiving the rich, by callously breaking a definite promise, and by the absolute neglect of a primary duty. By paying miserable pittance to workers on the pretence that they will obtain compensating educational advantages, and then depriving them of these advantages in order to send them out to make money for the Hospital. As slaves are let out on hire in darkest Africa, so are Nurses in England at this present day. But there is one great difference, wherein is shown our grand superiority. The system pays much better in London than it does in Zanzibar. The rich who support the London Hospital, and who in credulous trustfulness apply to it for the help of the "thoroughly trained Nurses" it advertises its ability to supply, are sent Probationers who ought to be learning their work in its Wards. Those who trust in its good faith, the London Hospital considers to be quite fit for the experiments of "prentice hands." And far be it from us to deny that it has some justification for its belief.

This Hospital promises that it will board, lodge, and teach its Probationers in its Wards. And then it sends them out, breaking its promises and stopping their education, in order that they may make money for it, and be boarded and lodged at somebody else's expense. The Hospital admits the sick poor to be properly nursed and tended, and on that assumption obtains an enormous annual income from the benevolent. And then it sends out the best of its Nurses, and consequently deprives the sick poor of their help.

The system is indefensible, and the greatness of the profit only deepens its enormity. But in these days abuses once exposed are doomed. They may—indeed they generally do, die hard—but their extinction is inevitable if the light of public opinion is only kept concentrated upon them as we intend to keep it concentrated on the Private Nursing Institution of the London Hospital.

On account of very great pressure upon our space, "The Vicar's Daughter" is held over until next week.

Loeflund's Alpine Milk Rusks (ground) ensure the most perfect development of bone and muscle in growing children from 6 months to 2 years of age. Prevents rickets, scurvy, and ensures healthy progress at the most critical period. Invaluable in teething. 1s. 6d. R. Baelz and Co. 14-20, St. Mary Axe, E.C.

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)