

at such attempts being inconveniently remembered can be easily understood. He has now reprinted a letter from an anonymous source which he published in his paper on May 18th, 1889, and with much show of virtuous indignation shuffles the responsibility for the scurrilous language of that letter upon his anonymous correspondent. With characteristic forgetfulness, however, he does not inform his readers of the very important fact that on May 20th, 1889, the then solicitor of the Association complained direct to Mr. Henry C. Burdett of the abusive allusions, in the letter in question, to members of the Royal British Nurses' Association as "the scum of the Nursing profession," "Nurses who took refuge in the Association to obtain pseudo-respectability because they could not get it elsewhere," and so forth. To that complaint Mr. Burdett replied on May 25th, 1889, that "we consider the letter complained of to be *only a fair criticism* on a matter of public interest, and we must decline to give up the name of the writer." The italics are ours. In other words, Mr. Burdett deliberately approved of the scurrilous words in question as "fair criticism," and accepted the full legal and moral responsibility for those words.

No one, we ourselves least of all, would be so unfair as to hold an Editor responsible for all the opinions expressed by his correspondents. But when an Editor deliberately accepts such responsibility, and deliberately accords his approval to such views, he has no one but himself to thank if that damaging fact is thereafter recalled against him. If this were the first, or the last, occasion, however, on which Mr. Burdett had attacked the Royal British Nurses' Association we might have let the matter rest; but it has been proved again and again that, from the day of its inception, Mr. Henry C. Burdett was its most determined enemy. Will he venture, for example, to deny that, week after week, and month after month, he published anonymous letters abusing the Association and its members; that he accused a member of having decamped from a Hospital with funds belonging to the Institution, and that when it was pointed out to him that the Nurse of the same name who belonged to the Association was not the woman who was implicated in that matter, he never uttered one word of apology or regret for the reckless and unfounded charge which he had brought against a defenceless woman, from mere spite and malice against the Association to which she belonged.

Will he deny that he published some "figures for Nurses to note and remember," in which he deliberately compared the annual subscriptions received by the British Nurses' Association for *two years* with the same receipts for *one year*, and that he actually argued from the natural diminution in amount thus shown that "at this rate the Association must soon die of inanition," and that medical men and Nurses were falling away from it in large numbers? When his attention was publicly drawn to this attempt to mislead Nurses and to injure the Association he made no sort of excuse or apology.

He cannot deny that, upon his oath, before a Select Committee of the House of Lords, he stated that "the registration scheme of the British Nurses' Association gives a bogus complexion to an untrained Nurse and makes the public liable to believe that she is trained when she is not"—a statement which it is unnecessary to characterise. He cannot deny that, on the same occasion, he stated, "I have seen a case of a Nurse who did not get a certificate at her Hospital because she was discharged for having in her possession the property of a Probationer, and her certificate was refused, and now she goes out as a trained Nurse with Princess Christian's name as her authority for what she does." It was publicly pointed out, at the time, that this statement of Mr. Henry C. Burdett's was in each particular untrue and misleading. But he carefully abstained from giving the Nurse's name so that she could challenge his assertion in the Law Courts; and as to his reference to her Royal Highness, the statement was as malicious as it was unfounded. He cannot deny that he concluded his evidence to the Select Committee by stating that the question of Registration of Nurses was "really dead."

Finally, will Mr. Henry C. Burdett deny that he announced in his paper that the Select Committee of the House of Lords had, in their Report, condemned the scheme of Registration; or will he pretend that when his statement was contradicted on the highest authority, that he ever apologised for, or withdrew, so misleading an assertion. We should regret to be compelled to waste our space by reprinting word for word the attacks made by Mr. Henry C. Burdett upon the Association to which we have alluded, or many others, to which we might refer. But we imagine he will not venture to deny the accuracy of the above reminiscences.

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)