

opinion of the Board as to the propriety of the conditions under which a midwife in the employment of a voluntary nursing authority in the County is sometimes required to perform her duties.

The letter was as follows:—

"It has come to my notice that a nurse engaged by a Voluntary Nursing Authority has, in the course of her duties, to attend midwifery cases and do other district work. She also has, when required, to go to live with the patient, and in some instances to sleep in the same bed as the patient, and attend midwifery cases, if necessary, whilst living in the house with the patient. Most of the houses in which she has to live with the patient are small cottages, and in some instances very dirty.

"It appears to me that these arrangements are very unsatisfactory for a midwife, as she cannot possibly keep herself in a cleanly condition. I should be very much obliged if you would let me have the Board's opinion on the matter, as it would come before the Council if a case was infected in any way whilst the nurse was in attendance."

The Board decided that the Acting County Medical Officer of Health for Berkshire be informed that Rule E. 1 states that the midwife must be scrupulously clean in every way, and Rule E 5 deals with the question of contact with infectious conditions, and that these Rules must not be infringed.

INEXPERIENCED INSPECTORS.

A letter was read from the Council of the Incorporated Midwives Institute transmitting for the consideration of the Board a copy of a resolution forwarded by the Institute to the Local Government Board asking that body to refuse to sanction the appointment by local bodies of unqualified and inexperienced women as Inspectors of Midwives and for other health work.

The Board agreed that the Incorporated Midwives Institute be thanked for its communication.

APPLICATIONS.

For Removal from the Roll.—Applications were received from thirteen midwives for the removal of their names from the Roll. The applications were granted.

For Recognition as a Teacher.—The following applications were granted: John Shields Fairbairn, M.B., F.R.C.S., William Dove Macfarlane, M.B., F.R.F.P.S., John Abernethy Willett, M.D.

RECOGNISED TEACHERS.

The Standing Committee recommended the Board not to re-appoint certain recognised Teachers in London after the termination of their period of approval on March 31st, 1915.

Mr. Parker Young said that he was sorry to have to differ from the Standing Committee, he considered the proposal arbitrary. There was nothing whatever against any of the teachers

whom it was proposed not to re-appoint, nothing against their efficiency or success, and this being the case it was hard to take away from them a source of income.

A letter was read by the Secretary, by request, in which the teacher stated that it appeared to her a pity to transfer to hospitals, for instruction, some of the pupils of recognised teachers who gained their practical experience in Maternity Homes. (1) These pupils were often of a lower social station than hospital pupils, and required more individual teaching than they obtained in a hospital class. (2) Maternity Homes were often not near a hospital, and pupils lost good work owing to the time spent in going backwards and forwards to the hospitals for lectures. (3) It was hard on the lecturers to be deprived of their work, and the inference would be that their appointments were cancelled owing to their incapacity. Further, the income they made was a consideration. She suggested that the Board might decide to recognise no more private lecturers but deprecated its cancelling the appointments of existing ones.

Mr. Parker Young said he thought the lady, with whom he was unacquainted, put the case extremely well. The lecturers should not be struck off with one stroke of the pen.

The Chairman said that the four teachers in question had had notice given them twelve months ago. The object of the Standing Committee was to get the best results, and it was the duty of the Board to do its best to improve the education of candidates.

The recommendation was carried, Mr. Parker Young dissenting.

We think that the policy of the Board to centralise theoretical teaching is the right one. It is very noticeable in studying the list of successful candidates that the percentage is lower in the case of those who have had private tuition. Those medical practitioners who have devoted themselves to this work might still find a useful and remunerative sphere as private coaches.

PENAL BOARD.

A Special Meeting of the Central Midwives Board was held at the Board Room, Caxton House, on Wednesday, February 17th, at 11.30 p.m., for the hearing of the charges alleged against eight midwives.

Removal from the Roll, and Certificates Cancelled.—Rosetta Bromley (No. 3396), Harriet Clulow (No. 1617), Jane Dorothea Whitley Collins (No. 17271, L.O.S. Certificate), Elizabeth Ann Dunn (No. 17168), Martha Elsworth (No. 30966), Kate Holder (No. 20394), Catherine Seabury (No. 1924).

Severely Censured. Report asked for in Three and Six Months' Time from the Local Supervising Authority.—Jane Dunford (No. 4187). In communicating to this midwife, who appeared before it, the decision of the Board, the Chairman informed her that the Board had decided to censure her for offences shown, not of incompetence, but because she was not very trustworthy.

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)