

should be questioned—they have flouted the notion that 84 hours labour per week for 50 weeks a year could tire any reasonable being; that one sardine is not amply sufficient nourishment for a nurse about to do 12 hours night duty; that £12 wages minus washing, is not an elegant sufficiency for any woman; that so marvellous is the system, and so unlike every other institution in the Empire, that any supervision of the wards for the comfort and well-being of the patients, and the superintendence of the Nurses on duty, is quite superfluous on the part of the Matron. In fact, the enormous salary of £350 (more than trebled during the present Matron's term of office, what with an increase of £200 per annum entire, and special board, washing, and service, to say nothing of £50 thrown in by way of bonus), is merely an unconsidered trifle when it is taken into consideration that this officer may or may not sit in a luxurious office for six hours per day, for 5 days per week, for 40 weeks per annum. Hard labour indeed! Compare it with the mere irresponsible duties of the Nurses and Probationers, and then say who is justified in demanding more pay and less work? Miss LANDPORT'S vigorous defence called forth a budget of replies and protests. One patient writes:—

"I have been to the London Hospital myself, and do not blame the Nurses; they work till they are fit to drop. Just listen to this evidence, given before the Select Committee on Hospitals, page 298: 'Very often the children could not be attended to, as they should. If they were crying and requiring attention you could not give it. In one case I remember, a child who had had its eye excised crying bitterly all night; when it was taken in the Nurse's arms it stopped. Of course the crying inflamed the eye. Then on another occasion I remember there were two children who had had operations for hare-lip, and that is a case in which it is very important that

THE CHILD SHOULD NOT CRY.

These children did cry unless they were walked about with. The Nurse spent a great part of the night in walking about with them. Of course, the ward work was thrown back by this. The probationer told me that the sister said, 'Then, Nurse, they must cry, as there is no special Nurse sent.' Then another witness told about patients being tied in bed (page 309), and about patients falling out of bed (page 308) because there were not enough Nurses to look after them, and of patients who got the wrong medicine given to them because of hurry and overwork (page 301), and about dressings causing unnecessary pain (page 301) because they had to be done in a hurry."

\* \* \*

MR. JOSEPH COWLEY, of 14, Clarence Street, Bethnal Green, writes:—

"I now write to inform you that my brother, William Cowley was in the London Hospital for a period of eight months, and was discharged in a terrible condition by the authorities. He has frequently informed me, when visiting him, that his bed wounds were very bad, but I was quite unprepared for the horrible appearance he presented when I saw him at his own home. This, I believe, was caused through the Nurses being overworked, and consequently they could not spare time to dress the places properly. He is now at Mile-end Infirmary, and there treated with great kindness."

THE *Morning Leader* then goes on to say:—

"We had not intended referring to the London Hospital. We are, however, compelled to do so. A Governor of the London Hospital has come to the defence of the system pursued at the Institution. We print his effusion—print it without comment, not, of course, because we accept it as satisfactory, but rather because it is an evidence of the manner in which the responsible and deliberate allegations preferred against the Hospital have been met. The assertion that our action is due to the "enmity of one of our staff" is puerile—we have no other word to describe it. Thus writes the Governor:—

I have much enjoyed the ridiculous rhodomontade which you are printing every day concerning the London Hospital. Please go on with it during the dull season. But do not for a moment imagine that the Committee or Governors will pay the least attention to your vaporings. We have taken care that the leading papers shall not attack us, and you and your Radical friends may rant on as you like. We have £23,000 a year from sources you cannot touch, which will more than pay the salaries of the staff, and if the subscriptions fall off, we shall just close 100 or 200 beds, and placard the East-end that owing to the wicked attacks upon us we deeply deplore and lament that we must refuse admission to poor working men. There is no other Hospital for them to go to, and when the pinch came we should soon see what was thought of your proceedings. We know your attacks are merely due to the personal enmity of one of your staff to our matron. We have every confidence in her, and in the Committee, and shall treat your attacks, therefore, with the contempt which they deserve. The public, moreover, will not believe you, and you will not catch one of our present Nurses coming forward to give information against the Hospital. And if those who have left do so, it will be because of some personal motive which the Matron's private register would soon expose. If the Nurses break down, that only shows that they are not strong enough, and there are always 50 others waiting to take their places, which proves the immense popularity of the Hospital and the admirable way in which it is managed. My impression is that the Nurses at the London Hospital have not enough work to do, or they would not have so much time to grumble."

\* \* \*

FOR answer to this is written:—

"If only to prove that this governor, whoever he may be, is quite wrong in his conclusions, I, who have been associated with the London Hospital, will willingly come forward to tell all I know. I fail to understand what this gentleman means when he refers to 'some personal motive which the matron's private register would soon expose'; and I may tell you that I already know that his letter, as a whole, has been read with amazement (and amusement) by the Nurses in the institution. What he says as to Nurses who are waiting to take the place of the present staff as soon as they break down is perfectly true, but it is scarcely humane to use the fact as

AN ARGUMENT AGAINST THE SISTERHOOD.

The girls whom he speaks of as 'waiting to take their places' have no idea of the hardships of the posts they covet. When they have this knowledge—and you, sir, are rapidly imparting it—your correspondent, the governor, may not be able to say with such fine scorn that 'there are always 50 others waiting to take their places.'

"However, we have been honored with another letter from a governor of the London Hospital—a letter whose bright sympathy with the Nurses, whose suggestiveness, and whose concern for the patients present a remarkable contrast to the first epistle. Writes this governor:—

"All Nurses owe you a debt of gratitude for taking up the cudgels on their behalf, but past, present, and future Nurses

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)