

much better pleased if the Resolution before us was withdrawn. (Hear, hear, and applause.) It seems to me that the Resolution before the meeting certainly condemns her very strongly, and implies that a Nurse is not at liberty to write a letter complaining of the management of the Association to a public newspaper without previously communicating with the Executive Committee—the very Committee which she is complaining of, to the very judges that she is complaining of as not being capable judges. (“Hear, hear,” and laughter.) It would be just the same, as I say, if when I write and speak very strongly against the constitution of the General Medical Council, they should say, “You are bringing us into ridicule; we will strike you off the Register.” It is just the same, it seems to me. Then as to bringing the action at law; it seems to be going very near to trampling on the principles of English law to attempt to intimidate anybody against bringing an action at law. I must say I think it is taking a very dangerous ground. (Hear, hear.) My feeling with regard to the conduct of the Executive in the matter might be put just in the judge’s words: I think they have been “very unfortunate,” and the sooner they get out of the mess by stopping all these Resolutions and all this fighting the better. (Hear, hear.) I do not see that Nurse Barlow is making any attack on the Association at present. I think it would be a great deal better to “bury the hatchet,” and let there be an end of the matter.

The CHAIRMAN: May I ask you to hand up your amendment in writing? Would Dr. Hugh Woods permit me to interrupt him by saying that he is not correct. There was no attempt to intimidate any Nurse, but simply an expression that she should not appeal to a Court of Law until she had tried other means first. (Applause.)

Dr. HUGH WOODS: No; but the party she is litigating against is the Council.

The CHAIRMAN: You said she had received a letter which might have frightened her. The letter from the solicitors was not from the Executive. It was from the Secretary.

Dr. HUGH WOODS: What I wished to explain is, that this distinct Resolution before the meeting is one which would, in fact, intimidate any Nurse from resorting to a Court of Law.

The CHAIRMAN: Is this Amendment seconded?

NURSE BEATTY: I second it, as a Nurse.

The CHAIRMAN: I will now ask someone to speak who is going to support the resolution.

Dr. LOVELL DRAGE: I got up to speak just now—

The CHAIRMAN: I will now call on someone to speak in support of the resolution; and after that someone will speak in support of the amendment, and so on.

A MEMBER: Does not the amendment come before the resolution?

The CHAIRMAN: It will be put before the resolution, but the discussion will be conducted in the usual way.

Dr. BIERNACKI: Will there be an opportunity given later on for further amendments?

The CHAIRMAN: Have you one to propose?

Dr. BIERNACKI: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: I will take it now. If your amendment is of such a nature as the other it would probably be accepted. We want to bring matters to an issue,

Dr. BIERNACKI: It is a compromise. Then, as a matter of fact, I may say, Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, that in contrast with the other speakers I will not keep you more than perhaps two minutes. It seems to me in both the original resolution which was put forward, by those who put it forward there was rather a tone as if they thought it would be much better if it were withdrawn, so to speak, that it was time we dropped this miserable discussion and settled down as friends. After that they proposed what seems to me an exceedingly aggressive resolution. When that was finished the other side gets up and proposes another exceedingly aggressive resolution. Now I think that every member of this Society who has gone into the case must feel in their inmost hearts that mistakes have been made on both sides. (Applause and “hear, hear.”) Miss Barlow’s mistake—I do not know Miss Barlow—I know neither party—it does not matter to me, I only want to see the thing settled, if possible, at once—Miss Barlow’s mistake was that indiscreet letter which she wrote to the NURSING RECORD, but I must really say that I think that that letter would have been very much better met by a dignified statement of the facts in another number of the RECORD. That might have settled the business; but I think that by turning the whole machinery of the Association on to Miss Barlow, what was comparatively a storm in a teacup, as Dr. Woods said, has been converted into an exceedingly serious dissension. The mistake on the other side, ladies and gentlemen, is that the Executive Committee, or those acting for them, failed to tell Miss Barlow in plain English that they did not intend to take her name off the Register. (“Hear, hear,” and applause.) You cannot get behind the mistake Miss Barlow made, and you cannot get behind that mistake. And now we have to meet the question on the financial side. If you are going to censure Miss Barlow, I do not see how you can help censuring the Executive Committee. If you deal out justice to her, deal out the same kind of justice to them (“hear, hear”); but, on the other hand, it seems to me it would be very much better—now the time has come—to finally drop this miserable discussion altogether. (Cries of “Hear, hear.”) I think it is possible to frame an amendment which will reflect on neither party, and be in the nature of a compromise, and finish the matter altogether. I saw a reference in a certain paper to what was called the “next stage” of these proceedings. That means that there will be further stages. I think that there should be no further stage. It is simply with that view, and as a perfectly disinterested member of the Society, knowing no single member of the Executive Committee or of Miss Barlow’s party, I put forward the following amendment. I may say that the nature of this amendment is such that while it implies that Miss Barlow’s letter was indiscreet, it does not offer a formal condemnation on the part of the whole Association as to her action, and, on the other hand, while recognising that Miss Barlow sought the protection of the Court in the absence of certain letters or information it does not say whether that information should or should not be given. It seems to me fair, if you are going to treat one side one way you must treat the other in the same way. The following is the amendment which I propose:—“That Miss Barlow’s action in writing to a public newspaper with reference to the non-delivery of her

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)