

The Central Midwives' Board.

A meeting of the Central Midwives' Board was held at the Board Room, 6, Suffolk Street, S.W., on Thursday, July 27th.

Present—Dr. Champneys (in the chair), Miss Wilson, Miss Paget, Sir William Sinclair, Mrs. Latter, Mr. Parker Young, and Dr. Dakin.

The minutes of the previous meeting were confirmed.

It was announced that the Privy Council had authorised a rise of salary for the Secretary and the head clerk, the Secretary to receive £500 per annum, rising to a maximum of £600.

Letters were read as to the construction of certain rules in Section E, and, in answer to a letter from the Clerk of the Gloucestershire County Council forwarding copy of a Report of the Sanitary Committee, with reference to the carrying of appliances by Midwives, and the laying out of the dead, it was moved by Miss Paget, seconded by Miss Wilson, and carried, "That they be referred to the rules, and further, that the Board would suggest that the Local Supervising authority should give some instruction to ignorant Midwives in the use of appliances."

With regard to E 15, it was not in the power of the Board to alter the rules; they must be enforced for the general safety.

A letter from the Secretary of the Midwives' Institute, forwarded a letter from Mrs. S. M. Budzanover, asking permission to undergo the Board's examination in the German language.

It was moved by Sir William Sinclair, seconded by Mrs. Latter, and carried, that as her letter already showed a fair knowledge of English, she could wait a little time and pass her examination in the English language.

The financial statement was read, and as printing was a very heavy item, it was moved by Mr. Parker Young, seconded by Miss Wilson, and carried, that the Secretary should get estimates and see if it could be done more cheaply.

The report on the recent examination was that there had been 307 candidates, of whom 22·8 per cent. had failed.

The fees had amounted to £322 7s., the expenses to £323 16s. 10d., leaving a deficit of £1 9s. 10d.

The reports of the visiting gentlemen, Sir William Sinclair, Manchester, Dr. Herman, Bristol, and Dr. Champneys, London, were then read, and the summing up was that, on the whole, everything was very satisfactory, the examiners were considerate, and asked good questions; the midwives were decidedly women of better class.

There were three deficiencies of training noticed by all the examiners.

(a) No knowledge of artificial feeding of the newborn infant.

(b) No knowledge of abdominal examination of the mother.

(c) Ignorance of the Rules of the Board.

At the end of this report, Dr. Parker Young moved a cordial vote of thanks to those who had given up their time to visit the examinations, especially to their colleagues on the Board, Dr. Champneys and Sir William Sinclair. This was seconded by Mrs. Latter, supported by Miss Paget, and carried unanimously.

The report of the Standing Committee was next read and adopted as follows:—

- (a) Adjourned consideration of case against midwife No. 11,031, who delayed in sending for the doctor; the patient developed puerperal fever and died. It was decided that she be severely reprimanded.
- (b) Letter from the husband of a midwife asking the Board to reconsider its refusal to certify his wife. The Board declined to enter further into the matter.
- (c) Letter from the Town Clerk of Worcester reporting that the Local Supervising Authority find a *prima facie* case of misconduct against certified midwife No. 786. This was deferred until an explanation had been obtained from the midwife.
- (d) Letter from Dr. Boobyer, M.O.H., Nottingham, reporting that the Local Supervising Authority for Nottingham find that a *prima facie* case of negligence and misconduct has been established against certified midwife No. 4,991. It was decided that the midwife should be cited to appear before the Board.
- (e) Letter from Dr. Hugh Woods, General Secretary, London and County Medical Protection Society, Ltd., calling attention to the conduct of a certified midwife as revealed by the evidence at an inquest. This was postponed for further details.

The following applications for recognition as teachers under Rule C 1 (3) were approved.

Sydney Colen Legge, Esq., M.R.C.S., L.R.C.P., Robert Owen Morris, Esq., M.A., M.D., M.B., C.M., William Arthur Pierce, Esq., L.S.A., Arthur William Scott, Esq., M.R.C.S., L.R.C.P., Arthur H. N. Lewers, Esq., M.D., F.R.C.P., Angus Macphoe, Esq., M.B., C.M., M.D., Alexander Gordon Milne, Esq., M.B., C.M., M.D., Henry Percy Potter, Esq., F.R.C.S., M.D., L.S.A., Joseph Hambley Rowe, Esq., M.B., C.M., Richard E. Worthington, Esq., M.B., M.R.C.S., L.R.C.P., James Dunlop Williamson, Esq., M.D., M.Ch., William Henry Breffit Brook, Esq., M.D., F.R.C.S., Charles H. Miles, Esq., L.S.A., M.R.C.S., L.R.C.P.

The following applications of certified Midwives for approval under Rule C. 1 (2) were accepted:—

Misses Christiana Freeman, Elizabeth Charlotte Aylward, Ethel Mary Cauty, Amelia Beda Clarke, Margaret Hutber, Mary Hirst Watkins, Constance Welch, Ellen Davis, Margaret Cornelia Lancaster, Frances Anne Hassell, Madeline Jane Bevan, Martha Ann Hodgkins.

Miss Paget moved "That a copy of Section E of the rules be sent free of charge to every woman receiving the Board's certificate," saying that she thought rules that were to be enforced should be given to each person that she might have no excuse afterwards for neglecting them.

Miss Wilson seconded this.

Mr. Parker Young objected to it because he said every woman ought to have and understand Section 1 of the rules before going in for the examination. This led to much discussion; finally the motion was put to the vote and carried.

It was decided to put advertisements in the *British Medical Journal* and the *Lancet* inviting applications as teachers from medical men, it being felt that many of those who would be best suited for this work were at present lost because they did not know the need for their services existed.

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)