

passed a Resolution asking me for an explanation of my letter in the *Nursing Record*, and that this Resolution was kept from my knowledge; that, instead of sending me a "request to show good reason" for my letter, three Honorary Officers informed me that the Committee had "decided to proceed against me" for the erasure of my name from the Register; that the Committee never informed me or my Solicitors that they had neither authorised nor intended such a perversion of their decision to be conveyed to me.

But, from this reply of the Executive Committee, I find that an attempt is now being made to minimise the significance of the judgment against them in the High Court of Justice, which makes it necessary that I should enter into further particulars concerning my Action. At the trial, the Committee made no attempt to defend the proceedings threatened in their name, and actually pleaded that they "never intended to erase the plaintiff's name, or to hold any meeting to erase her name" from the Register of Nurses. In other words, that the letter signed by Dr. Bezly Thorne, Dr. James Calvert, and Mrs. Dacre Craven meant nothing at all.

I prefer to make no comment on this defence. But it left nothing for the Judge to do but to decide which party had been in the wrong—that is to say, which side should pay the costs.

The Judge held that I had been "entitled to come to the Court for relief," and that, therefore, I was "entitled to the costs of the motion." His lordship said: "I confess I am most unwilling to visit the costs of this application upon the defendants, BUT I CANNOT SEE MY WAY TO THE CONTRARY. I THINK THEY HAVE BEEN MOST UNFORTUNATE IN THE COURSE THEY HAVE PURSUED."

No further comment is necessary upon this gravely-worded judicial condemnation of the Executive Committee. Finally the Judge ordered my costs to be paid by the Corporation.

Now, Ladies and Gentlemen, I appeal to you, as the governing body of the Corporation, for some expression of your opinion upon these facts, and for your future protection of the 2,000 other women who, like myself, have trusted our professional reputations as Registered Nurses into your hands.

I am, Ladies and Gentlemen,

Your obedient Servant,

G. E. BARLOW.

REPLY TO MISS BARLOW FROM THE
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.*

Royal British Nurses' Association,
17, Old Cavendish Street,
January 3rd, 1896.

MADAM,—The Executive Committee have received and carefully considered your letter of December 5th. They are unable to accept it as an accurate or fair statement of the circumstances relating to your case against the Corporation; in fact, it is difficult to understand how you can have committed yourself to some of the statements in your letter, unless it is that you have not been kept fully informed of what has taken place.

On the 7th June you were elected a member of the Association, after signing a declaration that you would obey its rules and regulations and generally promote its interests.

In a few days a letter from you appeared in a public journal, dated the 8th June, which contained statements of a misleading character. This letter was not written to the Committee or to any officer of the Association, but was sent to a newspaper for publication. In this letter you allow the public to infer—

(1) That you ought to have received your voting

papers five weeks before. As a fact, you had only been a member one day.

(2) That you had been refused the papers on making a personal application for them. This was not the case. You were told by the Secretary that it had not been the practice for Members, joining after the voting papers had been sent out in May, to receive voting papers, but that she would consult the Honorary Officers as to whether it would be in order to send them. She received instructions to do so, and sent them to you the very next day.

(3) That you had made a personal application for the papers. As the letter was dated June 8th, and you made no application before the 12th, this was an untrue statement.

It was impossible that such a letter, reflecting as it did gravely upon the Officials of the Association, should remain unnoticed.

You next complain that you received a threatening letter from Messrs. Lewis & Lewis. The Committee, who have had before them a copy of the letter, fail to find any threat in it, and are of opinion that in view of the unjustifiable attack made on the management, you have no cause of complaint as regards the course adopted by the Secretary.

You state that you received this "threatening letter" on June 15th. You must then have realised that your letter, as it stood, contained an untrue statement, and yet you made no attempt to correct it, or to put yourself right. There was nothing whatever to connect the correction made in the *NURSING RECORD* of the 22nd June with your letter, and the first intimation which the Committee received as to

* The only points of any importance in the above lengthy document have been criticised elsewhere. The fact that the Executive Committee devote so much attention to immaterial points is very significant. They are compelled to admit Miss Barlow called at the offices on the 12th June, that she saw the Secretary, asked for her voting paper, and left the offices without it.—Ed.

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)