

body of midwives. Ultimately the words were retained. An unsuccessful attempt was made by Sir F. Powell to place the formation of the Midwives Board in the hands of the General Medical Council, instead of those of the Lord President of the Privy Council. Dr. Ambrose also took exception to the proposed constitution of the Board on the ground that it would be open to the Lord President to appoint persons who were not medical practitioners, and moved an amendment which Mr. Heywood Johnstone opposed, on the ground that its effect would be to make the board an entirely medical one, whereas in his view there should be a lay element. He was supported by Sir Walter Foster, and the amendment was withdrawn.

Mr. T. P. O'Connor endeavoured to place the selection of the four medical practitioners in the hands of the General Medical Council, but Mr. Heywood Johnstone opposed his motion, which was defeated, as the object seemed to be the exclusion of a representative of the Incorporated Midwives Institute.

Mr. O'Connor moved an amendment, the object of which was to take from the Society of Apothecaries the right of appointing one of the four medical practitioners to serve on the Board, and to put in its place the Royal British Nurses' Association.

Our conclusion, founded on previous experience, that it was the aim of the R.B.N.A. to obtain the appointment of a *medical man* to represent the *Nurses' Association*, expressed in a recent issue, is thus proved correct. We are glad that once more Mr. Heywood Johnstone came to the rescue, pointing out that midwifery is not a substantial part of the work of the R.B.N.A., while the Society of Apothecaries had always had recognition in kindred matters, and Mr. Burns brought out the fact that this Society first took up the question of Midwives Registration in 1813, and was responsible for the first bill on the subject. Mr. O'Connor continued to insist on the right of the R.B.N.A. to representation, though Sir Michael Foster pointed out that the Bill dealt with midwives, and not with nurses. We do not, however, follow the latter in his assertion that a midwife is a nurse, and something more. A midwife is not necessarily, or even commonly, a nurse at all. Ultimately Mr. O'Connor asked the Committee to allow him to withdraw the amendment in order to enable him to raise the claims of the R.B.N.A. later, but this the Committee refused, and his amendment was negatived by 23 votes to 5.

Surely this Irish champion of liberty cannot be aware of the intimidation of the nurse members exercised by the Hon. Officers of the R.B.N.A.

that he desires to give these men authority over midwives. The management of the Nurses' Association is discredited not only in this country, but in all countries where nursing is a skilled profession.

But the mouthpieces of the R.B.N.A. had still another card to play, and Mr. Boscawen moved that a representative of the R.B.N.A. should be added to the Board. This was rejected by 19 votes to 4.

Another effort was also made to deprive the Midwives Institute of representation by Dr. Ambrose, who moved that the Victoria University should be put in its place. This was rejected.

When the Clause was put as a whole, Mr. T. P. O'Connor, persistent to the end, challenged a division upon it, but was defeated by 20 votes to 3.

Other amendments were one which altered the maximum fee to be charged by the Central Board from 10s. to £1 1s., and also one that each certified midwife shall give notice annually to the local supervising authority of her intention to practice or continue practising.

The Bill was then ordered to be reported to the House.

We congratulate Mr. Heywood Johnstone on successfully piloting the Bill over all the pitfalls laid for it in the Committee stage, and also the Incorporated Midwives Institute that they have not been deprived of representation. Those aware of the policy of the Hon. Officers of the R.B.N.A. know that they are always ready to allow others to do the work, and then to step in and reap the fruit of their labours. We are glad that in this instance it has not succeeded.

Legal Matters.

BEATTY v. BRITTEN AND ANOTHER.

Some time ago Miss Alice J. Beatty, M.R.B.N.A., in the course of a public lecture, described her experiences in St. Veronica's Convent, Chiswick, where she stated she was compulsorily retained. As the accuracy of her statements was impugned by Mr. James Britten, the Secretary of the "Catholic Truth Society," Miss Beatty took steps to legally prove her veracity. We are requested by Mr. Cecil A. Lumley, Solicitor to the plaintiff, to state that the action brought by Miss Beatty was settled out of court on the defendant, Mr. Britten, paying the plaintiff £100, to include damages and costs, and including all matters in dispute between the parties to the action, and handing to the plaintiff a signed letter of apology. This is the second case in which Miss Beatty has received substantial damages. We hope she may not again have occasion to protect herself in a court of law.

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)