

is also a nurse, selected by the Colonial Nursing Association for the Foreign Office, working in the town amongst the British residents. If it is possible for nurses under these different auspices to work harmoniously side by side, and with advantage to the community, in Zanzibar, why should it be impossible on the neighbouring mainland at Nairobi?

### The Central Midwives' Board.

The first meeting of the Central Midwives' Board after the vacation was held in the Board Room, Caxton House, Westminster, on Thursday, October 6th, Sir Francis Champneys presiding.

A letter from the Clerk of the Council was read transmitting an Order in Council continuing the Rules of the Board in force until June 30th, 1911.

#### REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE.

A letter was reported from the Medical Staff of the Royal Derby and Derbyshire Nursing Institution as to its suspension as a training school for midwives. The Chairman reported that he had had an interview with Dr. F. Cassidi, one of the medical staff of the Royal Derby and Derbyshire Nursing Institution, and had promised to announce at the next Board meeting that the institution had been, since July 28th, in a position to train pupils according to the rules of the Board. He hoped the press would take cognisance of this, and help to make it known.

Letters (addressed to the Chairman) were read from Mrs. Dugdale, of Meeson Hall, Salop, inquiring whether midwives were to be subsidised in sparsely populated rural districts? She wrote that for some time she had been employing one midwife, subsidising a second, and was about to establish a third. She considered that such subsidies should not be left to private charity, which was a precarious method. The Chairman replied that the community were indebted to private individuals like herself, and that subsidies from a public source were desirable. The Board directed the copies of previous resolutions on the subject should be sent to Mrs. Dugdale.

#### APPLICATIONS FOR REMOVAL FROM AND RESTORATION TO THE ROLL.

The removal of the names of nine midwives from the Roll on the grounds of ill-health or old age was authorised on their own application.

The application of a woman for the restoration of her name to the Roll after voluntary removal was refused.

#### APPROVAL AS TEACHER.

The application of Dr. James Robert Hall Walker for approval as a teacher was granted.

#### APPROVAL TO SIGN FORMS III. AND IV.

The applications of the following midwives for approval to sign Forms III. and IV. were granted: Mary Lucetta Buckman (No. 10380), Mary Carter (No. 2118), Gertrude Davies (No. 29355), Elizabeth Griffin (No. 7603), Annie Meesom (No. 26845), Ruth Poulton (No. 1902), Jane Webb (No. 7231).

The date of the next meeting was fixed for November 24th.

### Infringing the Midwives' Act.

The imposition of a fine of £5 upon a woman named Johnson at Leeds for illegally practising as a midwife draws attention to the fact that the practice of midwifery by unregistered women is now prohibited. Attention was probably called to Mrs. Johnson's practice by the fact that two inquests were held in connection with cases with which she was connected on two successive days.

The inquest was held in the first instance on the body of a child buried on a medical certificate that it was still-born, whereas it died three hours after its birth. It was stated at the inquest that Mrs. Johnson (the wife of a miner) attended the mother and advised the father to send for a doctor as the child was "right bad." A medical student from the Leeds Infirmary went to the house in answer to the summons, and the child died a few minutes after his arrival. The resident obstetric officer, who was informed by the student that the child had given two gasps after his arrival, but that his attempts to restore respiration by artificial methods had failed, inspected the body, and subsequently gave a certificate to the effect that the child was still-born, upon which it was buried. At the inquest he stated that he did this because the child was premature and could not have lived. The jury returned a verdict of "Death from natural causes," and the Coroner referred to the possibility of further inquiry being made with which the jury was not concerned. In that event a further explanation of the circumstances under which the certificate was given will no doubt be made.

The following day an inquest was held on the deceased infant of Mrs. Johnson's daughter, the woman being summoned for registering the birth of her child at an address where it had not been born. The defendant's explanation was that she registered the child at the wrong address because she did not wish to have it vaccinated, but it was pointed out by the prosecution that she was delivered at Mrs. Johnson's house, and that the probability was that she gave the wrong address because she did not wish to call attention to her mother's illegal practice as a midwife.

Subsequently Mrs. Johnson was summoned for practising habitually and for gain as a midwife, when it was stated that she had practised before the passing of the Midwives' Act, that she had not succeeded in obtaining registration under it, and that she had continued to attend confinements since April 1st, since which time the practice of midwifery by unregistered women was illegal. The fact that she had attended confinements on two occasions since that date was proved. Mrs. Johnson's defence was that she was paid for nursing only and acted as a midwife without charge. The Court imposed a fine of £5, but made an order that it was not to be enforced if the defendant desisted from infringing the law.

It cannot be too strongly impressed upon women who are not registered in the Midwives' Roll that they lay themselves open to penalties by practising as midwives.

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)