

The Midwife.

The Central Midwives' Board.

A Special Meeting of the Central Midwives' Board was held at the Board Room, Caxton House, Westminster, S.W., on Thursday, December 3rd, when charges against thirty-three midwives were heard.

Previously the applications of three midwives for restoration to the Roll were considered and refused. The result of the deliberations of the Board on the penal cases brought before it were as follows:—

Struck off the Roll and certificate cancelled	19
Severely censured	5
Censured	2
Cautioned	3
Allowed to retire	1
Adjourned	2
Deferred for lack of evidence	1
						33

Struck off the Roll and certificate cancelled.

Eliza Allsop 4898, Grace Baker 329, Mary Annie Barton 837, Sarah Elizabeth Beardsley 11288, Charlotte Bradford 3315 (previously censured), Sarah Brown 330 (previously cautioned), Elizabeth Ellis 3660, Catherine Evans 18280, Sarah Ann Fitton 7666, Jane Folland 12516, Fanny Hartland 7211, Sarah Ann Lambert 3699, Hannah Naylor 1980, Dinah Ann Peace 20958, Edith Mary Peacock 6187, Catherine Rhoda Emily Skoines 200, Mary Sparks 3352, Sarah Stevenson 497, Mary Stokes 15574.

Severely censured.

Jane Deane 20723, Annie Marian Palmer (henceforth to be printed in Roll as Sadler) 3883, Mary Rimmer 2073, Anne Sephton 3717, Rosetta Bromley 3396. In all these cases the Board decided to ask for a report in some months' time from the Local Supervising Authority.

Censured.

Fanny Froggett 3086, Annie Maddocks 4445. Report to be asked for from L.S.A.

Cautioned.

Emily Langley 1480, Mary Ward 5546, Maria Wigley 12359. Report to be asked for from L.S.A.

Allowed to Retire.

Nancy Slatter 14558.

Adjourned.

Two cases were adjourned, the first until a *primâ facie* case had been established by the Local Authority, the second on a medical certificate that the midwife concerned was in hospital.

Lack of Evidence.

In another case, for lack of evidence, the Board were unable to come to any conclusion. They decided, therefore, to ask for a report on the midwife

in three months' time, especially in regard to cleanliness, from the Local Supervising Authority.

In many of the cases the charges were of the same nature, negligence, and misconduct as regards uncleanness, in person, clothing, and the management of the patient, failure to take the necessary appliances and antiseptics to confinements, inability to use a clinical thermometer, and other similar charges with which we are now painfully familiar, proving that a large amount of midwifery is still in the hands of ignorant and untrained women, proving incidentally also that their practice is now brought under control, and that it depends largely upon the efficiency of the Local Supervising Authority whether they are allowed to continue it, inasmuch as the Central Midwives' Board takes cognisance of neglect to observe the rules when such neglect is brought before them.

In one case it was reported that when the eye of an infant, five days old, was observed to be inflamed, the midwife advised that mother's milk and subsequently bread poultices should be applied. When seen by the doctor the disease was of four week's standing, one eye was destroyed, and the other discharging.

Mrs. Palmer admitted to the Roll on the L.O.S. certificate, and for years attached to the General Lying-in Hospital, York Road, S.E., "without a complaint," appeared in person, and was defended by her solicitor. One of the charges was that she was convicted and fined at the Westminster Police Court of a breach of the Infants' Life Protection Act under the name of Sadler. It was explained that she had married again, but had made her connection under the name of Palmer, and so used it still. The Chairman informed her that she was at liberty to use a professional name, but that she must be entered on the Roll under the name of Sadler. It was decided to report the facts of the case to the authorities at York Road Lying-in Hospital.

Mrs. Dinah Ann Peace, who was charged with having been convicted and fined at the Mansfield Police Court with assaulting two women, the alternative in each case being a month's hard labour, replied to the Secretary's request that she would send in her certificate, "You have wrote for my certificate, but I shall not send it while you have such bad and lying women about you." She further intimated that she was willing to meet Miss Lessey (the inspector) at any time, and added:—"Miss Lessey came as a policeman. We had a few words then, and she has never been since."

Another midwife wrote in reply to the demand for her certificate:—"I should have thought the certificate belonged to myself, as I have paid for it; but I shall see about it."

The difficulty which some midwives find in appearing before the Board was shown by the request of one:—"I ask you to cross me off the

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)