

scandal; and the Committee did not dare to challenge our statements in any one particular, as they most certainly would have done had such a course been possible, and, consequently, one by one, our contemporaries are examining the matter, and expressing their views upon it. For months we worked alone—now we have several of the most influential and powerful English Journals acting with us, and before we finish we intend to have every periodical of any importance through the length and breadth of the United Kingdom united with us in demanding inquiry and reform into the scandals of the Nursing Department of the London Hospital. For the sake of the Committee, we hope that we know more of what has been transpiring these last few years in their Institution than they are aware of. But we warn them that when the inevitable *exposé* comes, they will find it difficult to persuade the public that only three of their number were acquainted with facts which, we are informed, are common gossip in Whitechapel, amongst the officials in the Hospital and the students in the Medical College.

Now, we shall, as other demands upon our space permit, ask the Committee of the London Hospital whether they really believe the statements made on their behalf by their Chairman and their Treasurer at the last Court of Governors; and from their own published documents we shall prove, either that the Committee are themselves deluded, or that they are deliberately deluding the public. If the first be the correct view—and we cannot but hope that it is—we ask the Committee whether they are fitted for the responsible position they hold? If the latter, we leave it to the subscribers who support the Hospital to express their views upon such a situation.

It was alleged before the House of Lords' Committee that the Nurses were insufficiently fed. The Committee of the Hospital flatly denied this. In their report, made six months later, they admitted having had to change their contractor twice in that time—a strange necessity if their denial was true. Now, let us take their published accounts, on this matter, for the years 1888, 1889—the two years before the inquiry—the year 1890, which was half over when the allegations were made, and the last year, 1891, and this is what we find:—

Nursing Home Expenses.	Provisions.		Average per annum.	
	£	s. d.		£
1888	4,248	13 10	4,465	17 4½
1889	4,683	0 11		
1890	5,221	18 0	5,490	12 8
1891	5,759	7 4		

**Loefflund's Hordeum Compounds.**—C. Pepsine (in *dyspepsia*), c. Iron (in *chlorosis*, *anæmia*, *jaundice*, pleasant and digestible for ladies and children), c. Quinine (an excellent tonic in *neuralgia*, *nervous headache*, and *debility*), c. Lime-hypophosphit (in *ricketts*, *scrofulosis*, very digestible). 3s. 6d. Sold by Chemists, and Loefflund, 14, St. Mary Axe, E.C.

These are the Committee's own figures. They will not, we presume, pretend that the Nurses added to the Staff, last year, made this enormous difference in the cost. We do not for a moment complain of the increased expenditure. We only ask the Committee the simple question, Did they tell the public and the House of Lords the truth in saying that the Nurses at the London Hospital were properly fed in 1890? If so, how do they account to the subscribers to the Charity for the wasteful extravagance which has since raised the average cost of feeding these Nurses by more than £1,000 a year?

We pass on to another matter. It was alleged to the Select Committee that the Nursing Staff was insufficient, and that there were too many paying Probationers. This was flatly denied by the Hospital authorities; but, as we pointed out in our pamphlet on the subject,\* their own Report went far to prove the allegation. Let us now, once more, take their published accounts.

The actual numbers of Probationers are not given, and we must therefore take the receipts from the paying Probationers, which of course is exactly commensurate with the number at work and the salaries paid to the Nursing Staff, which will denote the numbers of regular workers.

	Payments from Probationers.		Average per Annum.		Salaries to Nursing Staff.	
	£	s. d.	£	s. d.	£	s. d.
1888	2,260	11 6	2,029	18 7	4,144	10 6
1889	1,799	5 8			4,244	11 10
1890	1,285	1 0	1,048	19 10	4,079	3 6
1891	812	18 8			5,224	16 1

If there be any mistake in these figures it is not our fault, as they are copied from the Annual Reports of the Hospital, and few people will deny their startling significance. Once more we ask the Committee the simple question, Did they tell the public and the Lords' Select Committee the truth, in declaring that the allegations in question were unfounded? If so, how comes it that since then they have dropped £1,000 a year in their receipts from paying Probationers, and in the last year have apparently diminished their number of these ladies by fifty per cent., and coincidentally and consequently increased their regular paid staff of workers by more than twenty per cent.? If this expenditure was unnecessary, this net loss of £2,200 a year is a scandalous waste of charitable money. If it was necessary, why did the Committee publicly deny the charges brought against their management and deceive the Select Committee and the public?

\* "The London Hospital Scandals," "The Record Press," Limited, 2d.

**Developing Children** should be fed on Loefflund's Alpine Milk Rusks, to avoid the dangers of Ricketts, Sourvy, &c., and ensure healthy formation of muscle and bone and easy teething at this most critical period. Sold by Chemists, or apply—Loefflund, 14, St. Mary Axe, E.C.

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)