

beyond the reliable income of the Association, it would appear to most persons to be most natural that those, who object to such excessive expenditure, should decline to give their own money to be so administered. It is, in this connection, somewhat interesting that Sir Dyce Duckworth has not been, hitherto, a very prominent subscriber to the funds of the Association; and we cannot but think that protests against the discontinuance of large subscriptions from others, would have come with better grace—and perhaps with less bitterness—from a person who had exhibited previously, his own pecuniary interest in the matter. While we are on this matter, we may say that the Nurse members naturally consider that those who have taken upon themselves to manage the Association, and to oust those who successfully managed it before, are, and must be held, responsible for its financial stability.

Sir Dyce Duckworth's statements with regard to the recent case in the High Court of Chancery are singularly inaccurate and misleading. He says that "advantage" was taken "of an unhappily expressed letter from the hon. medical secretary to a nurse who had been but a few hours a member of the Association, and who was so foolish as to write an improper and most misleading letter to a nurses' journal reflecting on the conduct of the office business, to drag the Association into the law courts. They secured their costs only on a technical legal point—the merits of the case having been subjected to no judicial decision—and thus caused a loss to the Association of £150 of the nurses' money."

Sir Dyce Duckworth was in the Chair at the meeting of the Executive Committee when, as we have been publicly told, the "unhappily expressed letter" was "dictated" by the Committee to the officials. It is most unusual that the Chairman, under such circumstances, should attempt to cast the blame upon one official. It is the more extraordinary in this case, as Sir Dyce Duckworth is well aware that the letter in question was signed by Dr. James Calvert and Mrs. Dacre Craven as well as by Dr. Bezly Thorne. We have no hesitation in saying that it would have been more in accordance with English custom if Sir Dyce Duckworth, as the Chairman of the meeting in question, had taken the full blame for this "unhappily expressed" letter upon himself. Then, the facts of the case have been absolutely misrepresented

by Sir Dyce Duckworth. The Nurse complained of having been deprived of a certain legal right and privilege—and she had every right to do so. Sir Dyce Duckworth and others—because of that complaint—threatened to proceed against the Nurse to secure the erasure of her name from the Register—that is to say, practically, to ruin her professional career.

The threat now appears to Sir Dyce Duckworth to have been "unhappily expressed," and therein we cordially agree with him. But he, and those who acted with him, made that threat. The Nurse defended herself, and was finally, at great cost to herself, and with the greatest reluctance, compelled to appeal to the High Court of Chancery for protection against those who had threatened her. This self-defence, Sir Dyce Duckworth calls "dragging the Association into the law courts." The Executive Committee had done the wrong; they had threatened the Nurse; they were the persons against whom she sought protection. Before one of Her Majesty's Judges they pleaded, in effect, that their threat was vain and meaningless, and that the Nurse was very "foolish" to imagine for a moment that they had meant what they said. And, instead of paying the costs incurred by their fault, they caused these to be taken out of "the Nurses' money." After threatening the Nurse—after publicly eating their words—it is impossible to feel much surprise that these persons are now wailing from the house-tops that the Nurse has "attacked" them. Such conduct is not commonly associated with the highest type of courage.

In order, however, to prove how the Nurse might have fared had she not sought the protection of the Courts of Justice, all discussion on this matter in the General Council was stifled, and then the whole machinery of the Corporation was utilised, and with further "loss of the Nurses' money," a General Meeting of the Members was convened to pass a Resolution condemning the Nurse—unheard. The President of the Royal College of Physicians and President of the British Medical Association was brought to the meeting to propose this Resolution. The Senior Censor of the Royal College of Physicians was persuaded to come and to second the Resolution—neither of these two distinguished gentlemen having ever taken the slightest part previously in the affairs of the Association. And it is even asserted now that the

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)