

the provinces—to attend the Meeting and vote against these proposals. In other words, the effort to alter the entire constitution of the Association was deliberately fixed for a time when the majority of members could not possibly take part in the discussion and settlement of the matter.

Secondly, at the Meeting in question, for the first time in the history of the Association, the members were not required to sign the attendance book, and any person who gave the name of a member of the Association who had paid his or her subscription for the year, was permitted to enter the meeting-room. It is, therefore, impossible to say whether or not only members of the Association were present at the Meeting; and, as a matter of fact, as soon as the proceedings commenced, a stray photographer with a camera was discovered and ordered to withdraw. This important question was immediately raised, and the natural and just demand was made that, as the Meeting was asked to recast the entire constitution of the Association, and as there was considerable opposition to this proposal amongst the general body of members, it was imperatively necessary that the names of those who voted for and against the various resolutions should be taken down. Such a demand would doubtless have been conceded by any ordinary meeting, as a matter of common sense as well as of ordinary justice. It would even have been a protection to the officials, because it would have been impossible, then, for it to be said that unqualified persons were deliberately introduced into the Meeting in order to give the officials a majority. If such a step was not taken, why was not every person present compelled, as hitherto, to sign his or her name in the proper book provided for that purpose? And if the officials thought that there was a strong majority of actual members on their side, it would obviously have strengthened their case to have allowed, nay, even to have insisted upon, the names of those who voted being taken down. But when it is remembered that these same officials are known to have deliberately introduced to the last Special General Meeting a gentleman who was not a member of the Association at all, and to have illegally persuaded him to take a prominent part in the proceedings of that Meeting, and, furthermore, that at that Meeting it is known that the officials neglected to prevent other persons being present who were not members

of the Association, then it is evident that they have by their proceedings actually justified suspicions of the gravest character in connection with the General Meeting held last week.

Thirdly, the proceedings were distinctly irregular. The existing Bye-Laws are still valid, and one of them provides, in the most distinct and definite manner, that

“No new Bye-Law shall be added, and no standing Bye-Law shall be altered or rescinded, at a General Meeting, unless such addition or alteration be formally proposed and seconded by members of the Corporation at the said Meeting.”

Yet, at the Meeting, the Chairman not only neglected to comply with this Bye-Law, but even after it had been read to him, refused to do so, and, as a matter of fact, it was not complied with in one single instance. It is, therefore, beyond all dispute that the proceedings at this Meeting were entirely irregular, and that, therefore, it is most questionable if they were valid, and if the Bye-Laws were passed in proper form. If this be the fact, it would only be the latest proof of the extraordinary want of business capacity which has characterized the management of the Association for the last four years; and at any rate it is an excellent example of the contemptuous manner in which the officials ignore the provisions of the Charter and Bye-Laws.

It is noticeable that one of the Bye-Laws which they have proposed evidently is intended to provide for such irregularity in the future, because, as we have already pointed out, it is proposed in the new Bye-Laws that any infraction of the Bye-Laws shall be held to be valid, provided it is not immediately objected to!! It has been remarked, already, that such a provision is unprecedented, and would, in fact, only have been proposed if it were intended that such infringements should take place.

It will be observed, finally, that at the Meeting it was pointed out that certain of the Bye-Laws are, in themselves, irregular, and that one, at least, evades a definite decision of Her Majesty's Privy Council. The only answer made to this was most characteristic—that the Privy Council must take care of itself.

It has been stated in the press, on the authority of the Acting Secretary, that there were two hundred and sixty-eight persons at the Meeting, and that only twenty voted against the Bye-Laws. The latter fact, at

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)