

Report of the Disciplinary and Penal Cases Committee.

Miss A. M. BUSHBY, Chairman of the Disciplinary and Penal Cases Committee, moved that its Report be received.

The Committee reported that it had considered the case of a Registered Nurse convicted of a felony. It recommended that the name of Miss Bertha Marguerite McBickford, Reg. No. 11874, be removed from the Register, and that notification of such removal be sent to the Press.

DR. GOODALL said, more especially as this was the first case of the kind, that he would like more information concerning the procedure. He could understand that some things should be taken *in camera*, but the facts ought to be made public, and this should be done in the Report of the Committee. The evidence on which the Recommendation is made should not be taken *in camera*.

THE CHAIRMAN asked Dr. Goodall whether he was making a motion, and Dr. Goodall said that he moved the Report be not taken *in camera*.

SIR JENNER VERRALL said that the Council was at liberty to make its own Rules, but it might be of interest to it to know the procedure of the General Medical Council. After explaining the procedure of the Penal Cases Committee of that body, he said that in the main, and in general, cases were not heard *in camera*. The facts were printed and circulated to members of the Council beforehand, and were presented by the Solicitor to the Council at its meeting convened to hear the case. The accused person was asked if he wished to be defended, and affidavits were read. The accused person might represent his own case, or be represented by his Solicitor. When the whole case was before them, then the Council debated *in camera*, after which the Press took a note of the decision.

It was satisfactory that it was not at all common to find an objection taken to the verdict.

THE CHAIRMAN said he had already told the Chairman of the Disciplinary Committee that it should state a reason. He proposed to her that the Recommendation should be amended, and suggested a form.

With one addition, after further consideration *in camera*, the following recommendation was adopted:—

"That it having been brought to the notice of the Committee by the Head Constable of Reigate, that Bertha Marguerite McBickford, Registered No. 11874, was, on August 12th, 1924, at the Surrey Sessions, Kingston-on-Thames, convicted of felony and sentenced to six months' imprisonment, her name be removed from the Register, and that notification of such removal be sent to the Press, and that she be required to surrender her Certificate of Registration to the Council."

MISS SEYMOUR YAPP asked what the legal position was, and the Chairman replied that the Council had been officially informed by the authorities of the Crown that this nurse had been convicted in a Police Court.

MISS SEYMOUR YAPP said that it was only fair to the Chairman of the Disciplinary Committee to say that she framed the Recommendation in the present form against her own judgment.

The majority of members of the Committee felt that it would be punishing the nurse far more severely than had already been done if the Council dealt publicly with the details of the case, especially if she became penitent, and wished to again earn her living by nursing.

Report of the Uniform Committee.

The Report of the Uniform Committee was presented by Miss COX-DAVIES, in the absence of the Chairman of the Committee, who moved that it be received.

The Committee recommended that thirty-three more firms be authorised to make the Registered Nurses' Uniform. The recommendation was approved.

The public business was then concluded, and the Press withdrew.

TO STATE REGISTERED NURSES.

The Registrar of the General Nursing Council for England and Wales has asked us to inform State Registered Nurses, that:—

(1) Owing to the thousands of retention fees received since September 1st, it will be some time before all receipts are issued. The letters are being dealt with in strict daily rotation.

(2) It would help considerably if nurses would not write or call at the office respecting their receipts. Most of the fees received have been by postal order or cheque. If retained by the sender the counterfoil of the former is sufficient safeguard as all postal orders can be traced by the postal authorities.

(3) The Registrar also wishes to remind nurses that all letters sent to the office must be stamped. Many have been received on which a charge of 3d. has been paid. Letters have also been received containing coin, on which a charge of 6d. has been paid.

(4) Applications for Permits for the Uniform have been received in large numbers, and Permits are being issued as quickly as possible.

(5) Woven Badges, Registered Braid and Buttons are supplied direct to approved tailors only, and can only be used on the approved Registered Uniform.

We note it is officially stated that it will be some time before all receipts for Retention Fees are issued. Why? It is an ordinary business rule to receipt money received forthwith, and we advise Registered Nurses who visit 12, York Gate, to pay their Retention Fees, to procure a receipt. Really responsible nurses have been known to complain that though they have paid the Retention Fees they have not received a receipt, and delay in sending these acknowledgments inevitably causes confusion.

THE REGISTER.

The State Register of Nurses for 1924 is a substantial volume, containing some 33,000 names, and we are glad that, as a member of the first General Nursing Council for England and Wales, we were able to secure its handsome crimson and gold binding, instead of the dull brown contemplated, good paper, good legible type, and furthermore every nurse who holds a certificate of training is credited with it, though what it cost to secure that measure of justice for nurses is realised by few.

POINTS TO NOTE AND REMEMBER.**DELAYS IN REGISTRATION.**

The Chairman's reply to Miss Cox-Davies' question as to delays in Registration was very misleading, so far as the Registered Nurses' Parliamentary Council is concerned. The Council had before it in June last a letter from that body stating that evidence had been placed before the Council of the unreasonable length of time applicants were kept waiting for registration, and giving two instances in which such delay was alleged.

The Chairman on receipt of the letter had previously asked for the names of these two applicants, one was given, and in the other case the reply was sent that the nurse preferred that her name should not be disclosed, but she applied for registration in April, 1923, and was not registered until 1924. The cases were typical, not exhaustive. On the suggestion of the Chairman of the meeting the case in which the name was given was referred to the Registration Committee to deal with, and to bring up a report at the next meeting, and that the Committee should be empowered to deal with additional evidence of delay in dealing with registration reported in the meantime.

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)