

## LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.

*Whilst cordially inviting communications upon all subjects for these columns, we wish it to be distinctly understood that we do not IN ANY WAY hold ourselves responsible for the opinions expressed by our correspondents.*

## A GOOD EXAMPLE.

To the Editor of THE BRITISH JOURNAL OF NURSING.

DEAR MADAM,—I send herewith my subscription, 9s., to the JOURNAL, up to March, 1916, and in doing so cannot refrain from adding my small quota to the chorus of appreciation that is evoked wherever the JOURNAL is known.

When I have read the apt remarks made on current abuses and the righteous conclusions drawn therefrom, I can truly say "While I was musing, the fire burned," and I rejoice that what I feel, but could not express, is here so ably and so convincingly set forth. But it does make me want to *do* something. I can but send my mite (5s.) towards "State Registration of Nurses," and I wish it were tenfold.

With best wishes, dear Madam,  
Yours sincerely,

JESSIE GRANT.

Z. B. M. Mission, India.

## MIDWIFE'S APPEAL ALLOWED.

To the Editor of THE BRITISH JOURNAL OF NURSING.

DEAR MADAM,—In your report of the case of *Stock v. the Central Midwives Board* in the High Court of Justice several points are brought out which are of great importance to midwives. Will you pardon me, therefore, for referring to them at some length?

In the first place everyone will agree that on the facts brought out no other judgment could have been possible. Certain information concerning the midwife was placed before the Board, which was not communicated to the midwife, and upon which the Board adjudicated in her absence. Further the Lord Chief Justice pointed out that according to the Board's own rules, which it had not observed, the information should have been supplied in the form of a statutory declaration. Under these circumstances it would have been a gross injustice to uphold the Board's decision against Mrs. Stock.

Some midwives whom I have met seem to think that now the question of what constitutes "misconduct" under the Midwives Act is authoritatively settled and that it is limited to "infamous conduct in a professional respect." That is not the way in which I read the decision of the Court, or interpret the remarks of the judges. Indeed, according to my view for the first time some light has been thrown upon the way in which "misconduct" in a midwife will be regarded in future appeals to the Higher Court. The Lord Chief Justice expressly said that misconduct in

Section 3 of the Act was not limited to the discharge of the duties of a midwife. Each case must be decided on its merits.

It must be remembered that a midwife has to produce evidence of good moral character before she can get on to the Midwives Roll. If, therefore, she loses that character presumably she is liable to be removed from it.

Moreover, the reasoning of the experts was clear and logical. Lord Robert Cecil, who appeared for the Central Midwives Board, argued that a midwife of immoral character might corrupt her patient's husband, and further, the knowledge that she was being attended by such a woman might be prejudicial to the patient herself. I think every midwife of standing will uphold this view. It is most unfair to subject a patient knowingly or unknowingly to the care of a midwife of bad character, to say nothing of the danger of possible infection. These things should not be done under the authority of the Central Midwives Board, and it is essential therefore that it should have the power to remove a midwife from the Roll for other than professional misconduct if it considers it in the public interest to do so.

Lastly, the Central Midwives Board employs legal advice. Why were they not advised—or reminded—for apparently they made the rule as to Statutory Declarations themselves, that, as the Lord Chief Justice put it, "the Board should strictly comply with its own rules"?

I am, Dear Madam,  
Yours faithfully,

CERTIFIED MIDWIFE.

## NOTICES.

We propose to refer next week to a letter from a member of the I.S.T.M. criticising, in another paper, some editorial comments which appeared in this Journal in reference to the Society.

## FRENCH FLAG NURSING CORPS.

Candidates for the French Flag Nursing Corps for service in France can be interviewed by arrangement with Lady Barclay, 60, Nevern Square, London, S.W. Mrs. Bedford Fenwick will be at 431, Oxford Street, W., on Friday, June 4th, and Monday, June 7th, from 2.30 to 5 p.m., to see candidates, who must be well educated and hold a certificate for three years' training. Experience of fever nursing is an additional advantage. Nurses speaking French are preferred.

## OUR PRIZE COMPETITIONS.

June 12th.—What is an intravenous infusion, and how is it applied?

June 19th.—What are the points to be observed in caring for a case of nervous shock.

June 26th.—What symptoms would lead you to apprehend the onset of (1) *sapræmia*, and (2) *septicæmia* in a lying-in woman?

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)