

that she had been denied a voting paper. The officials called a special meeting of the Executive Committee, which resolved that the nurse should be asked for an explanation and an apology. But Dr. Bezly Thorne, Dr. James Calvert and Mrs. Craven, disregarding this instruction, wrote to the nurse stating that steps would be taken to remove her name from the Register—in other words, threatening to ruin her, professionally. Fortunately for her, she had friends, and the matter being placed in the hands of an eminent firm of solicitors, the officials were asked to define the crime which the nurse had committed, and what proceedings they intended to take. Failing to obtain any definite information from them, the nurse applied to the High Court of Chancery to restrain the persons named and the Executive Committee from carrying out their threat. It is eminently characteristic that, when the trial of the case came on, Dr. Bezly Thorne and Dr. James Calvert hurriedly resigned their offices of Hon. Secretary and Treasurer and pleaded that they were not responsible. The Executive Committee pleaded that the threat was a mistake and meant nothing at all. But the Judge ordered the Corporation to pay the nurse's costs. Those who had done the wrong shuffled out of their responsibility, and left the Association—that is to say, the Nurses—to pay the large costs of their attempt to intimidate a nurse.

WE ASK NURSES TO REMEMBER THAT THIS THREAT OF PROFESSIONAL RUIN MIGHT HAVE BEEN MADE TO ANY ONE OF THEM; AND THAT THIS CONDUCT ON THE PART OF THE OFFICIALS COST THE ASSOCIATION MORE THAN £250.

Finally, as if to prove their malice, the officials convened a meeting, and declared a Resolution carried, condemning this Nurse—for whom one of Her Majesty's Judges had given judgment—actually condemning her for having defended herself against the threats of the officials.

THESE FACTS REQUIRE NO COMMENT. BUT WE ASK EVERY NURSE MEMBER TO REFLECT AS TO THE POSITION IN WHICH SHE PERSONALLY MIGHT BE PLACED BY SUCH PERSONS.

We will not at present recall the various extraordinary proceedings which have taken place since; the manner in which free discussion has been stifled, and in which untrue statements have been made to the members concerning the affairs of the Association.

We pass on to the General Council List for 1896, which was prepared by Mr. Fardon, of the Middlesex Hospital, and the other officials. Not only were the founders of the Association once more deliberately excluded, but the General Council was carefully packed with nurses from the Middlesex Hospital and the Chelsea Workhouse Infirmary, the matrons of those Institutions being officials of the Association. The medical men on the Council who had objected to the mismanagement were summarily removed therefrom without the slightest justification, and their places filled by young and unknown members. The plan succeeded because there was no time or opportunity to acquaint the members with the meaning of the printed Council List sent out to them for their acceptance. Consequently, a sufficient number of members believing that it had been prepared in all fairness, returned it unaltered, so that the officials were able to claim at the Annual Meeting that it had been adopted. Until 1895, the just principle had always been maintained that the General Council should be representative of all the members, and indeed of the whole Nursing profession—the matrons of the leading nurse training schools having permanent seats; the matrons of large provincial hospitals and nursing institutions always being selected to fill the vacancies caused by the retirement of similar officials; while each hospital at which nurse members were working, and each nursing institution according to its size, was given one or more representatives; and when, in her turn, that representative retired, the institution she represented was asked to nominate another in her place. This course was not only just and right, but it was for the manifest benefit of the Association, and it was then recognised as an honour to be elected as a member of the General Council. Now, chiefly by the action of Mr. Fardon, instead of the Middlesex Hospital having two or three representatives as before, no less than sixteen seats were filled by nurses connected with that institution, whereas the fair share of this comparatively small hospital would be, at most, two representatives.

This year, the system has been carried still further. Mr. Fardon pleads that hospitals to whom the officials have applied have refused to nominate representatives as they formerly were glad to do; and it is notorious that some of the best institutions and the leading members have refused to take any part in so

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)