

The Central Midwives' Board.

A Meeting of the Central Midwives' Board was held at the Board Room, Caxton House, S.W., on March 18th. Dr. F. H. Champneys, Chairman of the Board presided.

CORRESPONDENCE.

The correspondence included a letter from the Secretary of the Midwives' Institute, notifying the re-appointment of Dr. Stanley B. Atkinson to represent the Institute on the Board for another year, and one from the Secretary of Queen Victoria's Jubilee Institute for Nurses, making a similar announcement in regard to Miss Rosalind Paget.

A letter was also received from the Registrar-General, whose reply was unfavourable to the request of the Board for the addition of a new column to the Birth Register, to contain the name, status, and address of the person who delivered the child.

REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE.

The report of the Standing Committee was next considered. The Committee recommended in connection with a letter from Dr. A. G. R. Foulerton, County Medical Officer for East Sussex, as to medical practitioners "covering" midwives "that the Secretary be instructed to draft a case for the opinion of the Privy Council as to whether a certified midwife personally delivering a woman in childbirth is acting as a midwife where a medical practitioner has been engaged to attend the case."

They also recommended that in reply to the application of Dr. J. Bright Banister, Obstetric Registrar of Charing Cross Hospital, for appointment as one of the Board's examiners, that Dr. Banister be placed on the list of supernumerary examiners.

The recommendations of the Standing Committee were adopted.

The Standing Committee having revised the lists of Recognised Training Schools, Recognised Teachers, and Approved Midwives, recommended them to the Board for adoption.

Of the Approved Midwives nineteen were removed from the list, five because they had sent up no pupils, eight who had retired, or left the address on the Roll, and could not be found, and four who had not replied to communications from the Board.

On the recommendation of the Standing Committee, Mr. Horace George Brown, M.R.C.S., and Mr. Ernest L. Ward, M.R.C.S., were approved as teachers, and Dr. Edward Herbert Young recognised *pro hac vice*.

The application of Lucy Maria Hutley, No. 14562, for approval to sign forms III. and IV. was approved.

RESOLUTION.

Sir George Fordham then moved the following resolution, of which he had given notice:—

"That the only business which shall be considered by the Standing Committee at any meeting shall be that which, in the ordinary routine, would come before the meeting of the Board then next following, together with any motion, notice of which may have been given for such meeting of the Board in accordance with Rule A—12, and any special matter which, in the opinion of the Chair-

man of the Board, is of an urgent character, and is laid before the Committee by his direction."

In moving the resolution, Sir George Fordham said that as far as he had been able to ascertain the Standing Committee was set up in 1905, and its duties were then confined to dealing with matters in which personal character was concerned, such as the selection of examiners, teachers, approved midwives, etc. Personally he did not consider that the Standing Committee formed a necessary part of the mechanism of the Board, which could do its work quite well without it. The quorum of the Committee had been fixed at three persons, and though he had no objection to three members digesting the business which would come before the Board at its next meeting, he doubted whether the Standing Committee was entitled to a roving commission to do any business it might think proper, and to report or not to the Board as it saw fit.

Suggestions which had come before the Subcommittee, as he understood them, in relation to Rule B, would result, if adopted, in two sets of midwives being enrolled, one set with a higher qualification than the other. For the better conduct of business he proposed that the Standing Committee should be restricted to the limits defined in the resolution he had proposed, under which it had considerably more powers than at present. Great mischief was likely to arise in public business if committees dealt with matters outside their purview. He deprecated three members altering the rules.

Mr. Ward Cousins seconded the resolution, as he considered the duties of committees should be well defined.

The Chairman said he thought Sir George Fordham was under a misapprehension, which he had tried to explain to him by letter. The leaflet to which Sir George Fordham referred had been circulated to members by his authority as a matter of information. It had come to his knowledge that the proposal made in the leaflet had been made, and that support was being sought for it. There were two courses open to him: (1) not to give the Board the information; and (2) if given, to send it round in a separate envelope from the notices summoning the Standing Committee, which would have meant extra expense and clerical work. He thought the Board would like to have the information, and it was sent round. Perhaps he should have given more exact directions as to how the leaflet should be headed. No action was taken, or intended to be taken, upon it by the Standing Committee. It was an act of supererogation on his part sending out the leaflet. Perhaps on another occasion it would be better not to do so. Nothing was discussed at the Standing Committee of which the Board were not informed.

Mr. Parker Young said that he was surprised when he received the leaflet, and Sir George Fordham said that Sir William Sinclair was equally alarmed with himself. Miss Paget was of opinion that the paper was an exceedingly useful one, and was sent round unofficially.

On being put to the vote the resolution was lost. The date of the next meeting of the Board was fixed for April 22nd, and the meeting terminated.

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)