

must be remembered that Mr. Henry C. Burdett was examined on oath on the occasion to which we now refer. There are several assertions made by Mr. Burdett, which we could easily prove are entirely inaccurate; but we will confine our attention to those which have been proved to be so, by sworn evidence. In a lengthy reply, which, a subsequent witness pointed out, seemed "to have no relation to the question," it seems that Mr. Burdett went out of his way to attack the management of King's College Hospital. Considering that this Institution has been one of Mr. Burdett's chief supporters in opposing the Royal British Nurses' Association, this proceeding appears, at first sight, to be decidedly ungrateful upon his part. But, reading between the lines, it becomes evident that a desperate attempt is felt to be necessary to rehabilitate the London Hospital in the eyes of the Select Committee, for reasons which are by no means difficult to fathom; and that, for this purpose, invidious comparisons were needful between this and other kindred Institutions. Mr. Burdett stated on oath as follows: "I think I have an intimate knowledge of the cost and relative expenditure, and the degrees of efficiency in the Hospitals, and I cannot explain why it is that there is this difference. For instance, taking the London Hospitals with Medical Schools, of which there are eleven" (any professional person, by the way, would have informed Mr. Burdett that there are twelve), "King's College, on the three years' average, costs, for each bed occupied, £120 14s. 1d.; whereas the London only costs £68 18s."

On July 13, the Rev. Nathaniel Bromley attended and gave evidence before the Committee "to contradict a statement put in by Mr. Burdett." He stated, with reference to the above figures, "the truth is that for the last three years, 1888, 1889, 1890, the expense per occupied bed of King's College Hospital (the average number of occupied beds being 163) is £93 16s., instead of £120 14s. 1d." "Is that on exactly the same data as the other calculations?" asked Lord Thring. "No," replied the witness. "I find that Mr. Burdett has taken in the previous year, 1887, when we spent £9,000 in enlarging the Hospital by raising the roof and adding virtually a floor for the accommodation of the Nurses." "Then you mean," said Lord Thring, "that Mr. Burdett put into his calculation £9,000 which was extraordinary expenditure?" "Yes," replied Mr. Bromley. "The inquiry went on as follows: 'It is only an explanation? An

explanation; but it is unfair to say that it is an average expenditure, because that £9,000 was a solitary expenditure which does not occur every three years. Take any other three years, and you will find the beds under £90 a year.' The witness further stated that Mr. Burdett's attention had been called to this unusual expenditure beforehand.

In reply to another question, Mr. Burdett stated: "Now, taking the London Hospital, the cost per bed occupied, for provisions, is £17 1s. 7d.; at King's College it is £26 17s. 8d., a difference of £10. Now I think that is a matter which should certainly make the authorities of the Institution have a special inquiry."

With reference to this assertion, the Rev. Mr. Bromley stated: "Now, I have carefully gone into the three years, and I find that our average is £16 12s. 9d., and not £26, and I can only account for Mr. Burdett saying that it is £26 by the fact that he may have added on the board of the Nurses; but he has not done so with regard to the London Hospital." Lord Sandhurst finally asked, "Do you wish to contradict anything about the price of the alcohol in the next question?" "No; that is a very small question; but with regard to the domestic expenses he puts us down at £25 odd, as against £10 odd at the London. But then, the London has an enormous laundry, and they do all their washing themselves. We pay £1,000 a year for washing; and you will see, of course, that in the items which Mr. Burdett has put down, there is no such item as that appearing in his list. Then, on the other hand, the wages and salaries at the London (I do not wish to disparage the great work of the London Hospital, but I only want to justify ourselves in comparison) are put as about equal with King's College (£23 2s. 3d. as against £23 9s.); but they have 630 odd beds to divide it between, whereas we have only 180, so that King's College compares very favourably indeed."

We sincerely sympathise with King's College Hospital as to the serious slur cast upon it by Mr. Burdett, because, of course, these erroneous statements will very probably obtain currency where their contradiction may not follow them, and grave injury, therefore, be done to a very deserving Institution. Comment is almost superfluous. The statements which we have quoted are clearly untrue. They were evidently made publicly for some definite purpose. They must have been made either in full knowledge that they were inaccurate and misleading, or in

Loefflund'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 (—hypophosphite, in rickets, scrofulosis, very digestible). 3s. 6d. R. Baelz and Co., 14-20, St. Mary Axe, E.C.

Loefflund'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](#)