

more Mr. HUNTER—poorly supported as honest men always are—has had the courage to stand up and face a packed meeting of Governors, and refute the misleading statements of the Treasurer and Chairman. Mr. MURRAY IND was *en evidence* for once, and well “hemmed in” by friends was valiant and nonchalant. “He did not care for *The Nursing Record, Pall Mall, or Star.*” Not he; with jaunty air and his hands in his pockets, he looked, our reporter tells us, for all the world like the naughty boy who “didn’t care.” And what happened to that naughty little boy? Mr. BUXTON, who is an authority on Nursery Stories, will tell him if he is very good. And, meanwhile, perhaps someone will read him the following: “At yesterday’s meeting of the London Hospital,” says the *Evening News and Post*, “the Chairman said ‘the time had come for something to be done to put a stop to the attacks made on the management of the Institution.’ Quite so, and the best way to put a stop to the attacks is to remove the grounds for attack. Let the Managers manage, and let the Nurses nurse; let the Committee show that it, and not the Matron, controls the Hospital, and the necessary ‘something’ will have been done.”

* * *

In connection with the same meeting, *The Pall Mall Gazette*, has the following excellent article :

THE LONDON HOSPITAL, ITS NURSES AND THE CLOSURE.

“The House Committee of the London Hospital are still wedded to the policy of obscurantism. The Quarterly Court of yesterday was attended by their supporters in large numbers, and a resolution was passed thanking (in most effusive terms) the Committee and the officers of the Hospital for their management of its affairs. If it pleases the Committee to receive a vote of confidence every fifteen months or so, by all means let them have it. It is a far more significant comment on their management that, without, so far as we know, the slightest authority for so doing in their charter or by-laws, they moved the closure on yesterday’s discussion; and that, after two speeches, of their own supporters, which had occupied the best part of an hour, and when a speaker known to be opposed to their policy had risen, Mr. BUXTON at yesterday’s meeting laid down emphatically from the chair that discussion at the Quarterly Courts was embarrassing, and appealed to the Governor to stop it, not then only, but for ever. Such has always been the burden of the Committee’s song. However loyally their own friends and adherents may join in the chorus, they cannot expect the same blind devotion from the public.

“Let us illustrate the attitude of the Committee by the very simple question round which much of the discussion has lately turned—the question whether or not the holidays of the Nurses and Probationers should be extended from two to three weeks. At the last Court the Committee pleaded a *non-possumus* on the ground of want of funds. Since the last Court the Committee have given the extra week de-

manded to the Staff Nurses. But the Staff Nurses number about thirty, and the Probationers about one hundred and fifty. The concession, therefore, is a small one, and is granted, let it be noted, to those who are comparatively independent—a Staff Nurse being in possession of a Certificate of competency which enables her to nurse elsewhere—while it is denied to those who are practically at the mercy of the Committee for their whole future career. Still, the principle being granted, one would have thought the Committee would have welcomed discussion on the possibility of its extension. On the contrary, their whole endeavour yesterday was to preclude such a discussion. As their refusal has hitherto been based upon the cost of the concession, they were yesterday asked by Mr. HUNTER what the cost would be. Strange to say, they decline to give this information, and now allege that the Probationers prefer two weeks’ holiday to three! When modest proposals, temperately advocated, are met in this way, can the Committee wonder that their proceedings give rise to that comment in the public Press, and to that continued discussion at their own Courts, which they so much deprecate?

“Mr. BURDETT at yesterday’s meeting dexterously assumed that, because discussion has lately turned mainly upon two of the many defects originally pointed out in the Nursing arrangements, the others must be taken no longer to exist. Some, we are happy to think, have been more or less remedied. The Nursing Staff has been increased; two men have been engaged to do some of the heaviest manual labour previously performed by the Nurses, and the menial work has been in other ways diminished; some efforts seem to have been made to improve the food; and, as we have said, the holidays of the Staff Nurses have been extended to three weeks. But the Committee and Mr. BURDETT well know that these are but small instalments of the required reforms, and it is a mere touch of advocacy to pretend that other demands have been abandoned because they are not constantly repeated. It is difficult to deal with the Committee. If criticism is not repeated at every Court, it is assumed that it has been met. If it is repeated, the Committee is unfairly treated and the Hospital injured! For the rest, the tone of Mr. BURDETT’s remarks yesterday contrasted favourably with that of the periodical of which he is the proprietor. If he can induce the Committee, of which he is the warm supporter and trusted ally, to discuss reasonable objections and proposals in a reasonable way, his friends will soon sail in smooth waters. If not, so long as the nursing of the Hospital is mainly performed by learners, so long as women are worked eighty-four hours in the week, so long as girls just entering upon the trying ordeal of Hospital life are allowed only a week’s holiday at the end of each six months, and so long as Probationers not holding a Certificate of competency are withdrawn from the none-too-well-stocked Wards of the Hospital, and sent as ‘thoroughly Trained Nurses to nurse private patients, so long, the Committee may be sure, will the nursing arrangements of the Hospital excite unfavourable comment.’”

* * *

UNCLE PUMBLEHOOK was in his most guileless form—oleaginous, persuasive, sad, but even his “sweet reasonableness” failed to convince those two hard-headed lawyers, HUNTER and COSTELLOE, that black was white. Our representative looked in vain for the Mr. BURDETT—who, a few short weeks ago, denounced the ogre “Nurse Sweater” (by all that is most demoniacal) at the Annual Meeting of the Co-operation of Nurses in Hanover Square. Why should Mr. H. C. BURDETT’s heroic sentiments fail to find voice in the

BAILEY’S PATENT RUBBER “COMPLEXION” BRUSH AND WASHING GLOVE is unequalled for keeping a firm, clear complexion. Its use renders the skin delightfully fresh, soft, and smooth. They are only 3s. 6d. each, and will last for years. Procurable from all Chemists, or will be sent post-free upon receipt of Postal Order by the makers, DAVID MOSELEY & SONS, 14, Aldermanbury Avenue, London, E.C.

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)