

## Charge of Murder against a Certified Midwife.

At the Richmond Police Court on Thursday, April 20th, the magistrates further investigated the charges preferred on the previous day against Thomas Jones, a draper, of Brompton Road, S.W., and Annie Marian Sadler, of Westmoreland Street, Pimlico. We refer to the case here, because Mrs. Sadler, who is also known as Palmer, having, she states, been twice married, is a certified midwife, having obtained admission to the Midwives' Roll under the name of Annie Marian Palmer (3883) by virtue of having obtained the certificate of the London Obstetrical Society in January, 1902.

According to the *Times* of Friday, April 21st, which we quote below slightly abbreviated, Jones was brought up on remand charged with performing, or attempting to perform, an illegal operation on Elsie (Daisy) Sweetman, formerly in his employ as a shop assistant, and Mrs. Sadler was charged with assisting in performing it. Both were now charged with murder.

Mr. Travers Humphreys (instructed by Mr. Peavor) prosecuted for the Treasury; Mr. Margetts defended Jones; and Mr. T. Duerdin Dutton appeared on behalf of Sadler.

Mr. Travers Humphreys said the girl Elsie Sweetman was 22 years old. There would be no question, he thought, when the evidence had been heard that the girl died from the effects of an illegal operation, and that that operation was performed in a most extraordinarily reckless manner. She was employed by the prisoner for some three months up to January of this year. . . . She seemed to have been frequently with Jones, and they were generally accepted among their friends as keeping company. In March she consulted a doctor, who found that she was pregnant. The allegation was that on April 1st she went to the house of the female prisoner, and there underwent an operation. On April 5th Jones telephoned to a nursing home at Pagoda Avenue, Richmond, asking whether the girl, who was ill with influenza, could be put up for a few days. About 9 o'clock that night Jones and the girl arrived at Pagoda Avenue in a motor-cab. It was seen at once by the ladies in the house that the girl was not suffering from influenza, but was in a desperately ill condition. Nurse Galley very properly sent for a doctor at once. Dr. McGuire saw the girl about 10 o'clock and found that in addition to other symptoms there were indications of peritonitis. Jones remained in the sitting-room while the girl was being examined. The doctor afterwards said to him:—"This girl is very ill; she may not recover. I understand from her she has had something done to her." And Jones accepted the situation as being correctly stated.

Dr. McGuire saw her again on the morning of Sunday, April 8th, and she was then in a very serious condition. About two hours later she made a statement. This statement was made in the absence of the two defendants, but, counsel submitted, it was evidence against them, being a

dying declaration. In order that it should be admissible it was necessary that the prosecution should show that the girl was dying, and knew that she was dying, and was without hope of recovery. The girl said to Nurse Galley: "I shall never be better. I am going to die. I shall be happier then, shan't I?" Nurse Galley said: "Yes, you are dying. Won't you tell me the name of that woman? You will involve so many in a big difficulty if you don't." The girl then said: "Mrs. Palmer, Westmoreland Street, Pimlico."

According to another report, the names of Nurse Palmer and Nurse Sadler were found by the police inspectors outside Mrs. Palmer's door. She explained that she was both Nurse Palmer and Nurse Sadler, and contended that she was entitled to use both names, and was certificated in both.

The hearing was adjourned until Friday, April 28th.

We are unable to obtain any evidence that the accused woman has received general training as a nurse.

### MANCHESTER MIDWIVES.

Dr. Sergeant, Medical Officer to the Local Supervising Authority of the County of Lancaster, asks us to make clear that the two midwives referred to in our issue of last week in connection with Mrs. Lawson's paper at the Nursing and Midwifery Exhibition—in which she mentioned that two *Lancashire* midwives, cited to appear before the Central Midwives' Board, and who were exonerated, cost the National Association of Midwives £30 to defend them—were not practising in the Administrative County of Lancaster, and it would be more correct if they were referred to as belonging to the County Borough of Manchester.

We have pleasure in giving this explanation.

### THE USES OF IZAL.

Messrs. Newton, Chambers, and Co., Ltd., have drawn our attention to a contribution published in the *Journal of Obstetrics*, dealing with the treatment of puerperal sepsis by active disinfection of the uterus. The disinfectant used was izal, and the author, referring to that preparation, writes: "I was led to try it for intra-uterine work on account of my previous experiments in the treatment of sloughing faucial inflammation often seen in cases of septic scarlet fever. In this disease I took groups of similar cases and treated the fauces with various antiseptics, such as strong chlorine solutions, carbolic acid (pure), strong mercurial solutions, and so on. While most of these were actively poisonous, none seemed to do very much good. After reading the work of H. H. Gordon and Klein on the action of izal on the streptococci found in scarlet fever, I tried swabbing the fauces with undiluted izal, and I at once found a difference in that the izal did not attack healthy mucous membrane, but had a marked effect of necrotic tissue." The writer adds that he has never seen any toxic symptoms from izal, and from inquiry into the after history of the cases of puerperal sepsis which form the subject of the paper referred to above he finds that, in several, subsequent pregnancy had taken place, and he concludes therefore that it has no deleterious action in this respect.

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)