

their original Resolution, and tried to evade their responsibility also, by pleading that they "never intended to erase, nor to hold a Meeting to erase" the Nurse's name from the Register. We find that most people regard this defence as incredible. There was the official threat to proceed against the Nurse, in black and white. The Committee knew that their officials had perverted their Resolution, yet they condoned that conduct. They allowed legal proceedings to drag on for four months, and when brought to the bar of Justice pleaded that the letter written in their name meant nothing, that the threat to ruin the Nurse's professional career meant nothing. Why did they not make this statement in July? We leave the public and our contemporaries in the Press to express their opinion concerning these proceedings. But this defence left the Judge nothing to decide except which party had been in the right, and he ruled that Miss Barlow was clearly entitled to her costs, and that the Executive Committee ought to pay these. Then Counsel appeared for the Corporation, before the Judge, and agreed that the costs should be charged on the Corporation, and the Judge consented. It appears, however, that neither the Executive Committee nor the General Council authorised the employment of Counsel for this purpose; and the mystery has still to be cleared up why the Solicitor of the Corporation was not employed if the Corporation was implicated; and by whom the outside Solicitors and Counsel were employed to defend the case.

It is understood that the Corporation will be called upon to pay a very considerable sum for these proceedings, and on behalf of Nurses, we protest against money for such a purpose being taken from the subscriptions of the Nurses—given to support and aid Nurses in their work.

Now we come to the penultimate scene in this case. The fact that legal proceedings were in progress against the Association was kept back from the knowledge of the General Council in October, and in the Report from the Executive Committee presented to the Council on the 10th inst., one short perfunctory and misleading paragraph was all the information conveyed to the governing body on this most important matter. And when this question was about to be discussed, the Chairman, Sir James Crichton Browne, took the unprecedented course of ruling that discussion out of order—the Council therefore

being asked to accept a Report which they were prevented from considering. Many members, perhaps, voted for the Chairman's ruling in the belief that the question would be raised on a Motion of which notice appeared on the agenda; but having prevented discussion on the Report, Sir James Crichton Browne ruled that the motion was also "out of order," and the meeting was abruptly closed, to the great indignation of a large section of the Council. The governing body of the Corporation has, in fact, been prevented from discussing a matter of vital importance to it—the circumstances under which the Corporation has been held by a Judge of the Supreme Court to be in the wrong, and in which expenses, to an amount perhaps equalling the whole annual subscriptions of the members of the Corporation, have been incurred. It is, perhaps, not to be wondered at that certain persons were most anxious that the proceedings in the case of Miss Barlow should not be discussed by the governing body of the Corporation. But the attempt to stifle discussion will inevitably cause the ultimate condemnation of those concerned, to be the greater.

The next scene will take place at 20, Hanover Square, on Tuesday next, the 28th inst., at four p.m., when it is stated that a Resolution will be proposed which is of so extraordinary a nature that we cannot take the legal responsibility of publishing it in these columns. In brief, that Resolution asserts that the Nurse was "disloyal" to appeal to the High Court of Justice for protection, and that her action, although justified by a Judge of the Supreme Court, was "unjustifiable."

Such are the facts, and they concern every Nurse in the United Kingdom. Miss Barlow has, as a matter of principle, and with the deepest reluctance, been compelled to defend her professional position as a Registered Nurse, by legal proceedings. For it must be clearly remembered that for a simple letter of complaint in a public newspaper she was threatened with the erasure of her name from her professional Register—the extreme penalty in other professions for the most disgraceful conduct.

One of Her Majesty's Judges has, after the most careful consideration, definitely and distinctly ruled that Miss Barlow "was entitled to come to the Court for relief." Those who intend now to traverse this high judicial de-

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)