

which she holds three every week to meet the needs of those in various stages of training. Miss Anderson has but a small opinion of the value of text books, and does not advise their use. She tells her pupils to give in answer to questions asked them in examinations just the routine they would follow in the Home, and impresses upon them if they do this all will be well. Her ambition is to turn out not only midwives who are well up theoretically, but who also are of real practical use in the homes of the poor, and it is satisfactory that she is able to report of pupils trained in the Home that their professional capacity has been highly praised, and they have gained a reputation for taking a kindly interest in their patients, and their careful attention to the feeding and general condition of the children has been specially remarked.

Midwives are received for three, four, five, or six months, the fees varying from £15 15s. to £30. Only trained nurses are allowed to take the three months' course.

Monthly nurses are received for 8 or 12 weeks, the fees being ten and fourteen guineas respectively.

The value of the work of the Home is far-reaching, and through the midwives it trains its influence is bound to be far reaching and fruitful in good results.

At Christmas the husbands and children of all the in-patients are entertained at the Home, and just now Miss Anderson is very busy with preparations.

Money could scarcely be better spent than by sending donations to her, not to pay the butcher and baker and tax collector—there are 364 other days in the year when this may be done—but with the definite object of bringing a little brightness and happiness into the lives upon which the burden of poverty presses with pitiless insistence.

The following are the questions set at the recent examination of the Central Midwives' Board:—

1. What signs and symptoms in a pregnant woman would lead you to suspect some contraction of the pelvis?
2. What troubles of the urinary bladder may occur in connection with (a) pregnancy, (b) labour, (c) lying-in?
3. What precautions do you adopt in order to prevent infection during labour and lying-in?
4. What do you understand by uterine inertia? How would you treat it in the first and second stages of labour?
5. What are the questions to be asked and the points to be observed on your first three visits during the lying-in?
6. What are your duties to the child, according to the rules of the Central Midwives' Board?

The Central Midwives' Board.

Special meetings of the Central Midwives' Board were held at the Board Room, Caxton House, Westminster, on Thursday, December 12th, and Friday, December 13th, for the hearing of the charges alleged against 32 midwives, and the applications of two others, whose names have previously been removed, for restoration to the Roll. Dr. F. H. Champneys presided.

The following are the results of the investigation:—

REMOVED FROM THE ROLL AND CERTIFICATE CANCELLED.

EMILY ARMITAGE, 10334, charged with negligence and misconduct in not sending for medical assistance, and in failing to notify the fact that medical assistance had been sent for to the local supervising authority.

HARRIET JANE BIGNEY, 7077, accused of negligence and misconduct in not wearing a washable dress, etc. Administering medicine on her own responsibility, of discontinuing attendance on the fifth day, well knowing that the patient was suffering from puerperal fever, and of attending another confinement without disinfecting to the satisfaction of the local sanitary authority.

MARTEA BULLAMORE, 16661, accused of negligence and misconduct in not explaining that a registered practitioner should be sent for under circumstances required by the rules, of failing to notify the local supervising authority when a doctor was called in, knowing that the patient was suffering from puerperal fever, and of attending two other confinements without disinfecting to the satisfaction of the local supervising authority, and of not being competent to use a clinical thermometer.

HELEN COLCANNON, 21105, accused of attending four confinements while still under suspension by lawful authority from practice as a midwife, in order to prevent the spread of infection; of having been in attendance on a patient suffering from puerperal fever; of attending a confinement without disinfecting to the satisfaction of the local supervising authority; neglecting to call in a medical practitioner in a case of seriously ruptured perineum, and other charges. Mrs. Colcannon's defence was that the patient referred to only "took on the shakes" the day after she gave up the case, and that she disinfected all her clothes with Condy's Fluid!

MARY JANE GOULBOURNE, 4903, who took no notice of the citation sent her, was struck off for offences against Rule E, evidence having been offered to show that she had previously been warned by the inspector.

SARAH HARTLEY, 6311, charged with negligence and misconduct in not explaining that the attendance of a medical practitioner was necessary in cases of puerperal fever and seriously ruptured perineum; failure to disinfect adequately before attending three other confinements. That having had three fatal cases of puerperal fever in her practice in four days, and having been duly suspended by lawful authority in order to prevent

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)