

would be necessary to get witnesses up from some distance.

Miss Gregory's solicitor agreed to the course provided it meant a verdict of "not guilty" in relation to these cases.

Mr. Duncan proceeded to state the defence put in in writing by Miss Gregory which was to the effect that while the necessary number of cases had not been attended in every case at the time when the certificates were signed, that these certificates had not been signed improperly, that she had been in the habit of signing certificates if the pupil were satisfactory, and the cases booked were considered sufficient for her to complete the number required before the examination took place.

It was admitted by Miss Gregory that the certificates signed were not correct. She did, in fact, said Mr. Duncan, sign false certificates. The chief point for the Board to consider was the motive. An improper act might be done with an innocent mind, or a guilty mind. Did Miss Gregory honestly believe her act was allowable, or that it was the custom to such an extent that no moral guilt was attached to it? If so, her action might be described as an improper act done with an innocent mind. On the other hand, if she had acted as she had done in order to train more pupils than she could provide the required number of cases for, the position was different. It was for the Board to consider what motives influenced Miss Gregory.

Miss Hannam, the Secretary of the London Obstetrical Society, was then called, and questioned as to whether she was aware of the existence of any practice in connection with the examination of that Society whereby the number of cases required of a candidate was completed after the schedules had been sent in. She replied that about ten years ago candidates who had not completed their number of cases had been allowed in some instances to bring up a paper with them to the examination notifying that they had had the requisite number of cases, but the practice had been considered by the Council, and stopped.

After other questions the witness withdrew.

Mr. Godwin, for the defence, said that he thought the case had been very fairly put by Mr. Duncan. The main question was, whether or not Miss Gregory had given the certificates improperly to gain for her pupils entrance to the examination in an unfair manner.

He stated that Miss Gregory had a Nursing Home in Winchester which she ran in connection with the Winchester Lying-In Charity, and received pupils to train for the Rural Midwives' Association. Miss Gregory was a member of the Roman Catholic faith, and she found the interference in both professional and religious matters so unpleasant that she severed her connection with the Charity while continuing the Home. Her troubles dated from that time. The charges made against her in the letter she received from the London Obstetrical Society were, he understood, brought at the instigation of the Rural Midwives' Association. Miss Gregory did not regard the charges as serious, or conceive it possible that she could lose her certificate. Now, three months after she had been tried and punished by the Obstetrical Society she was retried by another tribunal for the same offence, which was contrary to English legal procedure.

The object of the Midwives' Act was to secure

capable and qualified persons as midwives. Miss Gregory had attended and supervised 500 cases of midwifery without a septic case and without a death. To remove a midwife with such a record from the Roll would be to defeat the main object of the Act, which it was the duty of the Board to administer.

After going into the details of all the cases mentioned by Mr. Duncan, Mr. Godwin claimed that in only three of the seven cases was there any real justification for the charges made against Miss Gregory, and in none of these cases was there any intent to do what was wrong. There was no suggestion of deceit or fraud; from the first Miss Gregory had disclosed all the facts, and the evidence on which the charge against her was based was her own letter to the Obstetrical Society.

Miss Gregory had not been seriously concerned about the withdrawal of the L.O.S. certificate because she held the certificate of Queen Charlotte's Hospital, which, Mr. Godwin said, he understood was a higher qualification. In consideration of this fact of her competence as a midwife, proved by her record, and that she had already been tried and punished, Mr. Godwin pleaded that it was not the duty of the Central Midwives' Board to deprive Miss Gregory of the certificate she had proved herself worthy to hold.

Miss Gregory then gave evidence on her own behalf.

In reply to the Chairman as to the information she had from Plaistow as to the cases the candidate referred to had seen there, she replied she had no certificate from Plaistow; she signed the certificate on information supplied by the candidate, who came to her through the Rural Midwives' Association. She took no steps to see that those candidates who had not had the number of cases which she had signed that they had seen to her satisfaction, made up the number after the examination was over.

The Board then deliberated in private. When the Press and Miss Gregory were recalled, the Chairman, addressing Miss Gregory, said that the Board had found her guilty of misconduct, and recommended that she be severely censured. It had been pleaded in her defence that she was a good midwife, but her whole duty as a Superintendent of others was not covered by this fact.

She had been dealt with for signing untrue certificates under the regulations of the Obstetrical Society. He would like her, and all others whom it might concern, to know, if they did not know already, the severe penalties for false certification to which any person was liable under the Midwives' Act. Section 12 of the Act was as follows:—

"Any person wilfully making, or causing to be made any falsification in any matter relating to the Roll of Midwives shall be guilty of a misdemeanour, and shall be liable to be imprisoned with or without hard labour for any term not exceeding twelve months."

It would be seen that the Act took a very serious view as to the signing of false certificates. The Central Midwives' Board had taken a merciful view of Miss Gregory's conduct, and, while censuring her, had decided not to remove her name from the Roll.

Her certificate would therefore be returned to her. Miss Gregory then withdrew, and the Special Meeting terminated.

AN ADJOURNED MEETING.

At an adjourned meeting of the Central Midwives' Board, which followed, Miss Wilson proposed that

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)