CAUTIONED.

MISS JANE BORTHWICK (No. 21319), (L.O.S. Certificate), Staffordshire, charged with inserting two stitches in a lacerated perinæum, and with charging the patient one shilling for the operation. Miss Borthwick, who appeared before the Board, stated as her defence that she "happened to have needles and stitches with her, as she thought they might be useful, and did it on the spur of the moment. She only put in one stitch." In cautioning her, the Chairman said that the Board was unable to say she had broken a definite rule, but if the laceration was serious a medical practitioner should have been called in; if not serious, why put in a stitch? If unnecessary, she should not have put in a stitch and charged the patient for it.

MRS. ANNIE FLEID (No. 6612), Birmingham. In this case a patient died from hæmorrhage, due, according to medical evidence, to partial adherence of the placenta. Mrs. Field informed the Board that the patient did not bleed until she began to throw herself about; then she could hardly hold her. She was washing the baby while waiting for the birth of the afterbirth, as Dr. Baldwin had told her "any time the afterbirth doesn't come

you can sit and wash your baby."

MRS. EMILY MARY FOSTER (No. 550), Kent.
MISS SYBIL MARY ROSARIO POPE (No. 24191),
London, C.M.B. Certificate. Miss Pope appeared
before the Board, and was defended by Counsel,
Mr. Graham Moule, instructed by Mr. Pope.
Amongst the charges against the midwife were the
employment of an uncertified substitute to conduct
a confinement; that when summoned at 6 a.m. the
following morning to the child suffering from
bleeding from the navel, she instructed the messenger to tie the cord herself, afterwards sending
an uncertified person to visit the case, but not herself attending till later, when she did not examine
the child.

The first witness called was Dr. Shields, L.C.C.

Inspector of Midwives.

Mrs. Cornwall, the mother, who gave her evidence excellently, said that she engaged Nurse Pope, but was attended in her confinement by Nurse Faville. She proved that she sent for Nurse Pope at six the next morning, as the baby's cord was bleeding, but no one came till 10 o'clock. Cross-examined by Counsel as to whether she knew Nurse Pope was ill in bed, she said Nurse Pope answered the door.

Questioned by Mr. Duncan, she said when she sent at six o'clock to Nurse Pope, the messenger came back with something to tie the cord. Then someone had to be found who could do this. Ultimately a neighbour came in and tied it. In reply to Mr. Parker Young, she said the baby was in bed with her when Nurse Pope came, and she never took it out of bed.

In reference to Nurse Flaville conducting the labour, Counsel said that Nurse Flaville was sent to report as to the progress of the case, and did

not return until it was all over.

Mrs. Webb, another patient, also gave evidence. For the defence, Counsel pleaded that whatever Miss Pope had done had been done in ignorance. There was no wicked intent. He asked the Board

to consider that she had had 502 cases and no maternal death. He could assure the Board that after her somewhat unpleasant—and expensive—experience she would never employ an uncertified person again.

In cautioning Miss Pope, the Chairman said that the Board had never laid down a rule that no unqualified person must ever be sent to follow up a case. The rule was carefully drawn not to exclude the training of pupils. The Board thought Miss Pope had stretched this a little far; pupils must be supervised. The most serious charge related to Mrs. Cornwall's child. It was alleged that Miss Pope was not well; but a midwife must be on or off duty. Either she must be prepared to jump out of bed and go to a case at any moment, or should have a substitute on duty. She advised that a doctor should be called in if necessary, but it would have been better if she had advised that one should be called in in any case. He cautioned her to observe the rules carefully, in the spirit as well as in the letter.

MRS. ANNIE MARIAN PALMER (No. 3883), London (Certificate London Obstetrical Society), appeared before the Board to answer various charges. In respect of charges made by one patient, she said "the woman was in fear of her baby, and asked me if it would fall to the child, the amount of poison she

had taken beforehand."

MRS. JANE TAYLOR (No. 12733), West Sussex. This midwife, who is over 70, was defended by her daughter. Amongst the charges made against her—not by the Central Midwives' Board—was one that a patient had three children at a birth, two very small, and that she wrapped the latter in the placenta and burnt them with it. The Board considered the charge unfounded. In this connection, they were informed by the defendant's daughter, "the Inspector chastised me about the three children." Mrs. Taylor was cautioned in respect of charges against the rules.

SENTENCE DEFERRED.

Sentence was deferred in the following cases:— Mrs. Mary Elizabeth Cornwall (No. 12500),

Birmingham.

MRS. ELIZABETH GAZEY (No. 1436), Warwickshire, was charged with negligence and misconduct in various respects. One patient alleged that the midwife washed the child, and then gave her the dirty water to wash herself with, and there were other accusations. The midwife alleged, on the other hand, that the patient and her husband "had unpleasantness," as he denied the paternity of the child, and she (the midwife) was "made the scapegoat." The Board considered some of the charges in the indictment proved.

MRS. MARY MORRALL (No. 20249), Staffordshire, MRS. SUSANNAH MORGAN (No. 4832), Merthyr

Tydvil.

Mrs. Mary Jane Whittle (No. 10510), Manchester.

Mrs. Catherine Williams (No. 1449), Denbigh.
Allowed to Resign.

MRS. ELIZABETH NASH (No. 20572), Newcastle-on-Tyne,

MRS. MARY ANN NAYLOR (No. 12565), Leeds.

previous page next page