

inquiry, but sent in one of its staff, who is clearly a journalist of the first rank, as a paying Probationer, to see, hear, and report, independently and impartially, the true state of the case. It is easy to see, from the sound and fury which has pervaded the *Hospital* ever since, that its Editor is quite overcome with his emotions at his advice being thus seriously taken and acted upon, while it is quite pitiable to observe the apprehension which has seized his mind that, for ought the authorities of other Hospitals can tell, there may be, at this present moment, in various other Institutions—

" A chiel among them taking notes  
And faith she'll print it."

if we may slightly alter the prophetic poet. There can be no doubt that the authorities of Guy's Hospital, King's College, and other Institutions which are patronized by Mr. BURDETT, will feel eternally grateful to that gentleman for this, as for all his other mercies. Meanwhile, words almost fail the Editor of the *Hospital* to adequately express his feelings on the matter, and he threatens, in plain language, that the London Hospital is about to bring an action for libel against the *Pall Mall Gazette*. We can only express our fear that there is no hope of such an event. The London Hospital does not "court public inquiry" quite so ardently as its Committee would like everyone to believe, and a Court of Law would be the very best place for eliciting certain facts concerning the management, as perhaps three or four of the Committee and one or two of the officials are well aware. On the other hand, the *Pall Mall Gazette* demands a public inquiry into the condition of affairs at the London Hospital, and, if its Committee were wise—which experience has proved that they are not—they would meet what is now inevitable by immediately arranging for an inquiry for the sake of their own reputation, as well as in the best interests of the Institution. Why should they hesitate, indeed, to do so? They "emphatically deny" everything *en bloc*; let them seize the opportunity of proving the truth of their denial. They "court public inquiry"; let them prove their words by accepting the challenge of the *Pall Mall Gazette*. Even they must be dimly realising that all the volumes of smoke must imply the existence of some fire, and that these

constant scandals must mean that there is something wrong in the present system. The Committee of the London Hospital must do something now; they cannot maintain silence in the face of the extremely damaging statements concerning their management exposed in the public press, and of the mass of circumstantial evidence which is being rolled up against them.

Putting aside all that has been said against the Committee, however, for the moment, it must be noticed how they have been defended, and, to our mind, the Hospital might, with much propriety, pray to be saved from its friends. It would be quite impossible to imagine anything more conclusive, in support of the statements as to the incapacity of the Committee, than the admissions made by the defenders of the Hospital. Its strongly biassed "friend" feels himself obliged to admit that the Matron is an "autocrat," and that the Committee are very "weak." It would be interesting to know whether the interviewer had gleaned these facts from the House Governor, because it is difficult to see in what other manner he could have obtained such information. Whether the "friend" of the Hospital had, or had not, good authority for these statements, it will hardly be disputed that the Committee must have sunk to a very low point in the general estimation of the Hospital officials if such a definite impression of their feebleness could be conveyed to a casual inquirer. It may fairly be questioned whether men, possessed of a tinge of self-respect, would continue to administer a public Institution when a Select Committee of the House of Lords considered that they had "allowed their authority to fall into the hands of salaried officers," when even amongst those who uphold them they are contemptuously referred to as "weak," while one of their salaried officers is described as "virtually an autocrat." We frankly confess that it is beyond our comprehension that any body of Englishmen should, of their own free will, continue to hold such an extraordinary position in relation to their dependants, and we would counsel them to adopt the only dignified course which is open to them under such circumstances, and to resign authority which it appears to be the opinion of their own friends, defenders, and servants, that they are too weak to maintain.

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)