

has been allowed so greatly to exceed its reliable income; in which the provisions of the Charter and Bye-laws have been violated; and in which a member of the Association has been compelled to appeal to the Court of Chancery for protection against the Executive Committee."

This was a sweeping condemnation of the proceedings of the Executive Committee and the officials. Miss Breay sent her letter by registered post, and in order to save time, also by express delivery, on June 30th; having been told, two days previously, by Miss Guiseppi, the acting Secretary of the Association, that letters containing Resolutions must be registered. On July the 1st, she received a letter from Miss Guiseppi acknowledging the safe receipt of the text of her resolution, and saying nothing whatever about the letter not having been registered—Miss Guiseppi, as it afterwards appeared, having herself signed the Post Office receipt for the safe delivery of the letter. The evidence in the recent action showed that it was stated to the Executive Committee on July 3rd that Miss Breay's letter was not registered, but the Committee, declining to shield themselves from censure by such a transparent quibble, directed that Miss Breay's Resolution should be placed, and published, upon the Agenda of the Annual Meeting. It is noteworthy that the whole object of registering the letter, of sending the text of the resolution in writing, and of sending it three weeks previously, to the Secretary, is in order that the resolution may be inserted upon the Agenda; the actual words of the Bye-law being: "No resolution shall be proposed at any annual or special general Meeting unless the full text of the resolution shall have been sent in writing, and by registered letter, to the Secretary, at least three weeks' previously, for insertion upon the Agenda of the said Meeting."

The object, then, had been attained; the Resolution had been received in due time by the Secretary; it had been inserted upon the Agenda. It was clearly the Chairman's duty to put it before the Meeting, and to take the sense of the Meeting upon it. But Sir James Crichton-Browne took upon himself to withhold the whole matter from the Meeting, and to prevent Miss Breay from exercising her right as a member to bring forward her Resolution. The case was tried in the City of London Court, as our last issue showed, and

the jury found that Sir James Crichton-Browne had acted "maliciously and wrongfully" towards Miss Breay. The matter was so novel, and the point of the law so important, that, although the jury found their verdict for the plaintiff, the judge reserved his decision as to whether the verdict could be upheld or not, in law. After ten days' "most careful consideration," he announced that he "must enter judgment for" Miss Breay—in other words, that the verdict of the jury was in his judgment, good and effectual in law.

The day after this judgment was delivered—the 16th inst.—there appeared a letter in the *Times* from Sir James Crichton-Browne's solicitors, asking the public "to refrain from forming an opinion until the Association, which we venture to submit is the best judge of its own affairs, has had an opportunity of expressing its opinion upon the points at issue." This clearly foreshadowed the proceedings which took place that same day at the Meeting of the General Council, which we report in another column. Sir James Crichton-Browne then made a lengthy, and it would seem a very irrelevant, speech, and a vote of confidence in him was proposed, together with his re-election as Vice-Chairman. All discussion on the matter was forcibly prevented, and the Resolution was carried, although, as it was subsequently shown, this was entirely out of order.

Those who remember what took place last January, will have been prepared for the present proceedings. Then, a Nurse who had complained of the mismanagement of the Association, and had been threatened in return by the officials with professional ruin; who had consequently been compelled to appeal for protection against their vindictiveness to the High Court of Chancery; had found that the officials pleaded that they never meant anything at all by their threat, and she had been awarded her costs by Mr. Justice Stirling. A special Meeting of the Association was summoned in the name of Her Royal Highness Princess Christian, to consider a Resolution condemning this Nurse, in strong terms. It will be remembered that, on that occasion, the General Meeting was astounded that Sir John Russell Reynolds, the then titular head of the medical profession, proposed the vote of condemnation on the Nurse. He conclusively proved that he knew absolutely nothing con-

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)