

was conveyed. In all six children were infected. The midwife's defence was that she had never seen the disease before. The Board resolved that the case should be reported to the Local Government Board, and also that approved teachers should be requested to note the importance of mentioning pemphigus.

In Emma Roe's case, her patient was a dwarf with contracted pelvis. She was charged with employing her husband, a blacksmith, to act as her substitute. It was stated that before the passing of the Midwives Act, he himself, acted as a midwife, and we understand displayed a sign with "Ye Olde Man Midwife" painted on it. He examined the patient in question who thought he was a doctor. Craniotomy was eventually performed. The Inspector stated that Mrs. Roe carried chicken bones in her bag "for luck."

Elizabeth Ann Kilgour was found guilty of negligence which resulted in the death of the mother.

The case of Agnes Bateman was defended, and Dr. Pelliet, the Inspector also attended. Her ability to read the thermometer was tested at the Board, and found to be unsatisfactory. She was also found to be ignorant of the Rules of the Central Midwives Board.

NOVEMBER 12TH.

The result of the Board's deliberations on November 12th was as follows:—

Struck off the Roll and Certificates Cancelled.—Amelia Ann Dare (No. 8826), Margaret Blair Elliott (No. 37908), Elizabeth Ann Holton (No. 8830), Eliza Martin (No. 15646), Helen Elizabeth Pugh (No. 31099), Elizabeth Rudall (No. 18657), Harriet Shillabeer (No. 8835).

Censured.—Sophia Alice Brockway Cook (No. 24314), Mary Ann Tatler (No. 1832).

Sentence Postponed.—Sarah Ellen Moss (No. 3074).

Mrs. Moss, who appeared before the Board and was defended by her Solicitor, was charged primarily with not explaining that the case was one in which the attendance of a registered medical practitioner was required, in the case of a child suffering from inflammation of, and discharge, from the eyes. Medical evidence was produced to prove that the child was blind in one eye, and nearly blind in the other.

Another point brought out from inspection of the midwife's Register of Cases was that all her cases seemed to have a uniform temperature of about 100 deg. F. on the evening of the first day. The inspector who was present, asked by the Chairman if this had not aroused her notice, did not appear to understand it was anything unusual. Asked if she were a certified midwife, she replied in the negative.

After the Board had deliberated, the Chairman informed Mrs. Moss that it had decided to postpone sentence and to ask the Local Supervising Authority to report upon her work at the end of three and six months. He added that she was

extraordinarily lucky not to be struck off the Roll. The child was practically blind owing to her fault. She should remember it to the day of her death, and never forgive herself.

Another midwife struck off the Roll was charged with procuring admission to the Board's Examination in April last by producing two certificates falsely stating that she was of good moral character, and further that she was guilty of misconduct in procuring the signatures of two persons, of approved position, without disclosing to them that she had given birth to an illegitimate child. Mr. Bertram, who prosecuted, said that under Section II of the Act the midwife was liable to imprisonment for fraud.

The facts were admitted, but the defending solicitor stated that the midwife was seduced under promise of marriage by a man whom she afterwards discovered to be married. When she secured the certificates she was expecting marriage, and therefore hardly regarded her fault as a lapse. He urged that she was punished by having to provide for her child. She had now obtained an excellent post, but if she lost it would be driven to prostitution.

After evidence as to the midwife's present employment, the Chairman said it appeared that she was acting as a district nurse on a midwife's certificate. In announcing the decision of the Board to strike her off the Roll, he said that the question of having an illegitimate child was her own affair. She was removed from the Roll for fraud in obtaining admission to it by false certificates. A midwife who had to be in other people's houses should be a person of chaste life. The Board would be guilty of complicity if it did not strike her off. Sir Francis Champneys further commented on the fact that, having gained the certificate of the Board, the midwife proceeded to get posts to which she was not entitled. She was not a nurse but midwife.

The approved teacher who signed the examination schedule enabling the midwife to procure admission to the Roll, was censured. It transpired that she was delivered in the Home owned by this teacher, who subsequently agreed to train her, and to sell her business to her when trained. It was stated in evidence that the Inspector, Dr. Macrory, who was cognisant of the facts, gave no advice. The Inspector, who was present and interrogated by the Chairman, said that she did not regard the conduct of a woman who had had one child and was repentant, as disgraceful. The Chairman said that they would not discuss that, as they would not agree. Women who wanted to practise as midwives should not have illegitimate children. They could not run the two things together.

The Board considered that an approved teacher should have helped it, and had not done so. The Chairman further announced its determination not to sanction "amateur white-washing." A lost character might be regained, but that was for the Board to decide. He further stated that chastity and morality were of the first importance

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)