

the alleged printer's error in the date of your letter was in the affidavit made by you on the 25th July, 1895.

In paragraph 5 of your letter you say that the Secretary drew the attention of the Executive Committee to your letter to the NURSING RECORD. Your statement is not correct, as the Secretary did not do so. Later on you speak of *ex-parte* statements made by the Secretary. The Secretary made no *ex-parte* statements at all, and the Committee fail to understand what possible grounds you can have for making such a statement. Your public letter was quite sufficient evidence to justify the action of the Committee.

The Committee do not think it necessary to reply to your letter to them in every detail; there are, however, some points in it which are important and demand attention, especially your complaint as to the terms of the Resolution of the meeting of June 25th not being sent to you, and the letter signed by the Honorary Officers of June 28th, and also the action of your advisers in forcing on the application for an injunction on July 24th.

With regard to the Resolution passed at the meeting of June 25th, it was not necessary that the actual terms of the Resolution should be sent to you. The Committee decided upon a certain course authorised by the Bye-laws, and instructed the Honorary Officers to acquaint you with their decision. The judge has decided that the letter written by the Honorary Officers was perfectly legal, and that your solicitors are in error in saying that it was illegal, but whether or not it exceeded the terms of the Resolution is immaterial to the point at issue. Had the Committee chosen to proceed upon the lines indicated in that letter it was quite open to them to do so, and it would have been a perfectly legal proceeding, but what the Committee really desired—and their subsequent letters and actions fully bear this out—was to enquire first into the circumstances under which you wrote your letter to the NURSING RECORD, and to hear what you had to say and then decide as to whether or not any further proceedings in the matter should be taken.

After some correspondence, your Solicitors wrote asking for a definite answer, "Yes or no," as to whether the Committee intended, at their meeting called for July 26th, to erase your name from the Register or not. To such a request in itself no exception could be taken, but the circumstances under which it was made are open to the gravest objection. You state in your letter "The Committee vouchsafed no reply, an application for an injunction was therefore made, &c." Now, the Committee cannot refrain from characterising this as a misrepresentation of what actually occurred. There had been ample time for you to make the demand before, but you delayed doing so until half-past eleven o'clock on the morning of July 24th, the day of the Annual Meeting of the Association at the Queen's Hall, where the Secretary was served with the notice. You must have known that it was an absolute impossibility for the Committee to be called together, and for a reply to be sent before two o'clock on the same day. You, or at least your advisers, must have known that the Secretary upon whom the notice was served had no authority herself to send such a reply as was asked for, but a reply was sent, a reply sent under considerable difficulties at the earliest possible moment by the Honorary Counsel of the Association, stating in the most explicit manner, and bearing all the weight and authority that Mr.

Muir Mackenzie's name is justly entitled to carry, that he would himself attend the meeting, and that nothing should be done to prejudice you. The Committee are at a loss to imagine what more could have been done or expected under the pressure of time, yet this action is what you characterise as "no reply," and base your justification for proceeding with the application for an injunction.

You afterwards complain that "The Committee permitted the legal proceedings to extend over nearly four months, and thus involved me in very heavy costs." It is difficult to understand that you have been kept so ignorant of what has been done in your name as not to know that the long Vacation intervened between the commencement of your action and the time when it came on for hearing.

The Committee suppose you have read the judgment that was finally delivered on the hearing of the case, and how in consequence of what the Judge held to be an insufficient notice the Association has to bear the costs of the action; and they think that every well-wisher of the Association will cordially share the regret to which the learned Judge himself gave expression at the result.

You ask what reparation the Executive Committee propose to make you? The Committee can only express their extreme regret that any Member of the Royal British Nurses' Association, especially one who had only so recently joined its ranks and had not had time to acquire any knowledge or experience as to its working, should have allowed herself to be induced to take the grievous and extraordinary step of resorting to litigation upon such a pretext, and they fail to see that any reparation is due to one who like yourself has attempted to bring discredit upon and injure an Association which so closely touches the welfare of your fellow Nurses.

Signed on behalf of the Executive Committee,
EDWD. A. FARDON,
Medical Honorary Secretary.

REPORT OF GENERAL COUNCIL MEETING.

A MEETING of the General Council of the Royal British Nurses' Association was held on Friday, January 10th, 1896, at 5 p.m., at the Offices of the Association. Present: H.R.H. Princess Christian, and a large number of members. The PRESIDENT asked Sir James Crichton Browne to take the chair.

The minutes of the last meeting having been read and confirmed, the TREASURER read his Report, the adoption of which was proposed by H.R.H. PRINCESS CHRISTIAN.

Dr. BEDFORD FENWICK, while expressing the satisfaction which he believed many members of the Council felt at the clear and elaborate details afforded by the Treasurer, found himself constrained once more to point out how greatly the expenditure of the Association exceeded its reliable income. During the last year more than £700 beyond the income of the Association had been spent, and once more he was compelled to protest against a course which could only have one conclusion.

The TREASURER (Mr. John Langton) replied at some length chiefly to the effect that it was impossible, in his opinion, to conduct the affairs of the Association more economically. The Treasurer's report was then adopted *nem. con.*

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)