

## [ The Central Midwives' Board.

A meeting of the Central Midwives' Board was held at the Board Room, Caxton House, Westminster, on Thursday, April 18th.

### ELECTION OF OFFICERS.

Dr. Champneys was re-elected Chairman, and Mr. Fordham, Hon. Treasurer. Mr. Fordham, who was not present, had written signifying his willingness to act if elected, but at the same time pointing out that he thought the Treasurer's duties should be defined. He also pointed out that he considered the auditor's fee was excessive, unless he was used as an accountant.

Sir William Sinclair drew attention to the solicitor's charges. He also considered that the examinations cost too much. It was agreed to ask Mr. Fordham to define what he considered should be the duties of the Treasurer for the consideration of the Board.

### CORRESPONDENCE.

Amongst the letters read was one from the Clerk of the Council transmitting an Order in Council extending the period for which the present Rules are in force to April 30th next.

A later letter notified that the Lords of the Council proposed to approve the suggested Rules, with the exception of Section D.I. The old rule would continue in force. Section D.I. is the section concerning which the Midwives' Board has been at issue with the Privy Council, as to certain exemptions in the case of Workhouse Infirmarys. The Privy Council has now *ordered* the present rule to be continued, and the Board has bowed to the inevitable.

Miss Paget moved a resolution to be sent to the Privy Council in addition to an acknowledgment of the letter, which she ultimately withdrew, accepting Mr. Parker Young's amendment, "That this Board regret the action of the Privy Council in exempting a large class of institutions from the operation of the Act." The Secretary was directed to send a copy to the Privy Council.

Another letter considered was one from the Clerk of the Council transmitting a letter from Dr. J. M. Rhodes on the training of midwives, and inviting observations from the Board thereon. Dr. Rhodes stated that it appeared a Deputation which had recently waited on the Lord President had tried to make out that the Poor Law authorities wanted two standards for midwives. This was not true. At a recent Poor Law Conference those present were unanimously in favour of one examination. He drew attention to the training schools recognised in the South and the North of England, those in the South appearing to be in the preponderance, while the North was not fairly represented. Mr. Parker Young proposed that the letter should be referred to the Standing Committee for consideration and report. Sir William Sinclair considered that the best plan was to allow it to lie on the table, as, coming from Manchester, he knew its underlying tactics. He agreed that as the letter had been forwarded by the Privy Council, some acknowledgment was

necessary. Eventually it was decided, on an amendment to Mr. Parker Young's motion, proposed by Miss Wilson, seconded by Miss Paget, that the Lord President be thanked for the communication, and that his Lordship's attention be drawn to certain facts—amongst them that no mention whatever was made by the Deputation referred to of different examinations; what was taken exception to was the recognition of two standards. As to the alleged partial recognition of training schools, they were recognised on their merits, and not with reference to locality.

### THE FELDMANN CASE.

The Secretary then reported the result of the appeal of Mrs. Feldmann from the decision of the Board in removing her name from the Roll for employing an unqualified substitute. The appeal was heard in the King's Bench Division on April 9th, and was dismissed by the Lord Chief Justice, who refused to disturb the finding of the Board.

### REPORT OF PENAL CASES COMMITTEE.

The Penal Cases Committee reported a letter from the Town Clerk of Southampton, asking the Board to reconsider the case of Adeline Letitia Bellis, No. 11111, censured by the Board on January 31st, and recommended "that in view of the fact that the Board acted on Bellis's own admission, it sees no reason to re-open the case." Miss Paget said that she thought the Board should know more about this case. From a letter which had appeared in the *Lancet* on the subject, she thought it was important, as when the Board considered it, apparently all the facts were not before it. From the letter it appeared that the midwife had not been reported by the Local Supervising Authority, which, further, had no official knowledge that she had been censured. The report of the case was read by the Secretary, and Miss Paget expressed the opinion that in future the Local Supervising Authority should be communicated with. She had raised the point with regard to this case, because she was the only certified midwife on the Board, and she felt bound to see that the interests of midwives were protected.

On the recommendation of the Committee, it was decided that 18 midwives be summoned to appear before the Board, and an additional 7 subject to the finding of a *prima facie* case by the Local Supervising Authority.

The dates fixed were May 16th and 17th.

### REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE.

The report of the Standing Committee was then considered. Two midwives were removed from the Roll on their own application. The following doctors were approved as teachers: Miss Alice M. Dodd, M.B., Mr. Herbert J. Godwin, M.B., F.R.C.S., Miss Margaret Joyce, M.B. The following midwives were approved for the purpose of signing forms 3 and 4: Eliza Barnes (23295), Emily M. Chambers (300), Helen M. Gray (10849), Eleanor Miller (22760), Evelyn M. Neison (10599), Lois B. Watkins (23925).

In connection with the amendments to the rules Sir William Sinclair moved that a rule be framed requiring midwives to take the patient's temperature at each visit. The proposition was not carried.

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)