

numbered 127. (c) That 117 permits were issued for the State Uniform. (d) That the correspondence dealt with for the year 1929 amounted to: Letters received, 95,015; Letters despatched, 200,139. (e) That the Interviews for the year numbered 2,074.

State Registered Uniform.

On the recommendation of the Uniform Committee the applications of four Registered Nurses for duplicate permits to obtain the State Registered Uniform were granted.

The Committee reported that the following were issued during the year 1929: Uniform Permits, 2,314; Duplicate Uniform Permits, 51; Silver Badges, 2,800; Duplicate Silver Badges, 67.

Election of Committees.

Finance.—Miss Alsop, Dr. Buchan, Miss Bushby, Dr. Fawcett, Miss Gullan, Miss Haldane, Mr. Harper, Miss Villiers.

Registration.—Miss Alsop, Miss Brown, Miss Clark, Miss Hogg, Miss Meadows, Miss Sparshott, Dr. Thomson, Miss Villiers.

Education and Examination.—Miss Alsop, Mr. Blackman, Miss Bushby, Miss Cowlin, Dr. Fawcett, Miss Gullan, Miss Hogg, Miss Meadows, Miss Sparshott, Miss Lloyd Still, Miss Villiers, Miss Wilson.

Disciplinary and Penal Cases.—Miss Bremner, Miss Brown, Miss Bushby, Dr. Fawcett, Lady Galway, Dr. Murrell, Miss Sparshott, Miss Villiers.

Mental Nursing.—Mr. Blackman, Miss Brown, Dr. Buchan, Miss Bushby, Dr. Fawcett, Miss Hogg, Miss Sparshott, Dr. Worth.

General Purposes.—Mr. Blackman, Miss Bushby, Miss Clark, Lady Galway, Miss Haldane, Miss Sparshott.

Uniform.—Miss Bremner, Miss Brown, Miss Clark, Miss Hogg, Miss Meadows, Miss Villiers.

Motion.

The Chairman moved in accordance with notice:—

“That when an offence under Section 8 of the Nurses' Registration Act, 1919, is brought to the notice of the Disciplinary and Penal Cases Committee, that Committee be empowered to instruct the Solicitor to take action, reporting the case with full details at the next meeting of Council.”

In proposing the motion, Miss Musson said that when an offence under Section 8 of the Nurses' Registration Act was brought to the notice of the Penal and Disciplinary Committee under the Act there was no direction as to the action to be taken. It was desirable, however, that there should not be delay in dealing with it, and she therefore asked leave of the Council that the Disciplinary and Penal Cases Committee should have power to set the law in motion, reporting the case to the next meeting of the Council.

This was agreed.

Date of Next Meeting.

The date of the next meeting was fixed for February 28th.

DISCIPLINARY CASE.

The next business on the Agenda was a Disciplinary case—that of Mrs. Isabella Allan Dallas, 4336r, who had been informed by the Registrar, in accordance with the provisions of the Nurses Registration Act, of the charge against her and that the Council proposed to investigate this charge, and to determine whether she should be removed from the Register, and of the time and place of the meeting at which the case would be heard.

Mrs. Dallas attended the hearing of the case with her solicitor, Mr. Harvey, of the firm of Messrs. Kenneth Brown

Baker, Baker. Mr. Hewitt Pitt, of the firm of Messrs. Pontifex, Pitt & Co., solicitors to the Council, presented the case, and said that particulars of the charge had been sent to Mrs. Dallas at Fitzroy House, Fitzroy Square, W. These particulars were taken from the shorthand note of the case as stated by Mr. Justice Hills in the Divorce Court on November 12th. As stated in the Press, the case was one in which Mr. William Henry Moon, of Newton Terrace, York, intervened to prevent the making absolute of a decree *nisi* granted to Mr. Francis David Stuart, of York, because of the adultery of his wife, on the ground that he did not disclose to the court at the time of his petition that he had committed misconduct in a Glasgow hotel with Mrs. Isabella Allan Dallas, a nurse whose acquaintance he had made while undergoing an operation in a nursing home.

Mr. Stuart denied, on oath, the allegation that he had been guilty of misconduct with Mrs. Dallas.

Mrs. Dallas went into the witness-box and gave evidence on behalf of the intervention, and Mr. Justice Hill accepted her story that adultery took place on two occasions and therefore found for the intervener in the case before him.

Mr. Justice Hill found that the charge of misconduct against Mr. Stuart was proved.

In the judgment to which Mr. Pitt referred, Mr. Justice Hill said he had to consider the motives of Mr. Stuart and Mrs. Dallas, and their demeanour in the witness-box.

Mrs. Dallas was warned that she was not bound to give evidence, but she expressed her willingness to do so.

No motive for her coming forward could be suggested unless it were one which to some extent supported her story. The only motive he could see for her having given information to Mrs. Stuart's solicitors was that she felt herself slighted by Mr. Stuart or entertained some feelings of a woman scorned.

The other motive was one she said actuated her, that was sympathy with Mrs. Stuart in respect of the custody of the children.

Apart from these two motives he could not see that she had anything to gain. There was no real quarrel apparently between her and Mr. Stuart. She had not sought to extract money from him by any sort of blackmail. She had everything to lose in her own career by coming into the box and admitting her misconduct with Mr. Stuart.

As to their demeanour in the witness-box, he was bound to say Mrs. Dallas impressed him more favourably than Mr. Stuart, who impressed him very unfavourably indeed.

He could not believe a story Mr. Stuart told of a visit to an hotel in Glasgow.

Charges based on incidents alleged to have taken place at a Richmond hotel rested entirely on the evidence of Mrs. Dallas. The admitted facts made it in the highest degree possible she was speaking the truth, and he accepted her version of that occasion also.

Mr. Justice Hill dismissed Mr. Stuart's motion with costs, and granted the cross-motion of Mr. Moon to rescind the decree *nisi*.

Mr. Harvey, the solicitor who defended Mrs. Dallas, said that the charge against her was admitted, but the circumstances of the misconduct were unusual.

If Mrs. Dallas had not been directly listening to the voice of conscience she would not have been in the painful position in which she found herself.

Mr. Harvey stated that while he was in the Nursing Home, Mrs. Dallas, under the belief that he was an unmarried man, formed an attachment to Mr. Stuart. When Mr. Stuart obtained a divorce from his wife, Mrs. Stuart received through her solicitors a communication from Mrs. Dallas, who confessed to her that, with promise of marriage, and believing him to be a single man, he persuaded her to stay with him. It was difficult to justify her conduct

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)