

a meeting definitely convened to condemn her action.

In the next place, it is noticeable that the proposer and the seconder of the Resolution were eminent gentlemen who have hitherto taken no part whatever in the work of the Association, and their remarks conclusively proved that they were performing an irksome duty without full knowledge of the facts. The question has naturally arisen—Why did not the members of the Committee who have been implicated in these proceedings venture to propose and second this Resolution?

When the facts of the case had been, to some extent, elucidated by the friends of the Nurse, it became evident that the Committee had no defence of their own to make. The proceedings were justly condemned as "ridiculous," as "stupid," and as "a storm in a tea-cup"; and it must be distinctly remembered that the blame for all the proceedings rests upon the Committee—the Nurse certainly did not ask, nor could she have expected, to be attacked. The Committee pleaded in Court that the threat made to proceed against the Nurse to erase her name from the Register meant nothing. The Resolution of the meeting on January 28th conclusively proves what the threat might have meant, if the Nurse had not taken legal proceedings to defend herself. The lesson will sink deeply into the minds of the Nursing profession. It must be remembered that the Nurse was threatened with the erasure of her name from the Register—professional disgrace, and, perhaps, professional ruin—merely because she had made a complaint of being deprived of a legal right and privilege by the officials of the Association. It is perfectly futile and foolish to say there was no threat. There is the letter in black and white. If no threat was intended, why was the letter ever written?

Finally, in order to prove to all the world that the attitude of the officials towards this Nurse is one of the most impartial benevolence and goodwill, a Resolution was sent out, all over the world, condemning the action of the Nurse as disloyal and unjustifiable, but giving no single fact connected with her case, and totally withholding from the knowledge of those to whom the Resolution went the facts which, if given, would have exonerated the Nurse in their eyes. The Nurse very wisely, this time, let matters take their course, and on this occasion the threat was

carried out—with what result it is, of course, impossible for us to forecast. But of one thing we are already assured. The sympathy of the public is entirely with the Nurse. Concerning the Resolution—which, as we have already explained, we cannot take the legal responsibility of publishing—it contains, at any rate, one manifest misstatement. It asserts that the Nurse brought an action against the Association. She did nothing of the kind. She applied for an Injunction restraining the Executive Committee from taking irregular proceedings against herself; and those irregular proceedings were stopped in consequence. There was no action against the "Association," and the Resolution is therefore inaccurate on its face. As will be seen from our report, the feeling of the meeting was clearly shown by the speeches which were made in support of the Nurse, and by the absence of all argument, and of anything except thinly-veiled abuse, advanced against her. When the vote was taken, the Chairman took the unusual course of deciding, on his own responsibility, that one after another of the amendments were defeated, and finally that the Resolution was carried, merely by a show of hands. All who are acquainted with public meetings are aware of the difficulty of estimating the numbers of those voting by such a haphazard guess. And it is an accepted rule at such meetings that voting shall always be by accurate counting, or by the taking down of the names, of those who vote for and against Resolutions. In this case, it was peculiarly necessary that one of these courses should be adopted, and preferably the latter. No one knew who voted, nor whether those who held up their hands were members of the Corporation or not. If they were members of the Corporation, no one knew whether or not they were entitled under the Charter to vote on the occasion. Considering that the Resolution in question distinctly traversed a decision given in the High Court of Justice, that it was manifestly defamatory, that it introduced the extraordinary principle that the Nurse was "disloyal" for having defended herself against a threat which meant nothing, and that her action was "unjustifiable," although it had been justified by one of Her Majesty's Judges, we have no hesitation in saying that it was incumbent upon the Chairman and the other officials of the Association to have taken every possible means to ascertain, at least, the numbers of those who voted on either side.

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)