

was unsatisfactory. A servant girl confined there had to do her own washing immediately after her confinement, and became ill, and the child developed ophthalmia. The mother and child slept in the front basement kitchen, which was really a room which could not have been legally occupied as a separate sleeping apartment. In another case of a servant whose child died from infantile diarrhoea, there was good reason to suppose that the child would not have died if it had had proper care. It was looked after by two little boys, children of the woman who was supposed to look after the house.

In addition to the unhealthy conditions, irregular practices went on in these homes. In some exorbitant fees were charged; in some cases there was actual procuring of abortion; there was cruelty to the mother and child incidental to the child being removed immediately after it was born; and then, undoubtedly, some of the people who kept these houses were of drunken habits and associated with the carrying on of prostitution. In one house, for instance, the husband lived on his wife's earnings, and interviewed the women who were to be confined. The women while waiting had been put to hard work, and complained of the husband having acted in an undesirable manner towards them. The husband told the inspector nearly all the patients were single girls; they looked upon him as "Dad," told him all their troubles, and discussed matters with him they would not mention to his wife. In this house one of the girls had a difficult labour, and stitches had to be put in. This husband of the proprietress carried the girl upstairs, and some of the stitches were torn through. Though they knew what had occurred no doctor was called in. That was a very serious thing.

Again, these lying-in homes formed a depot for the traffic in the adoption of children. Agreements were made, and sums varying from £10 to £100 were given for procuring the adoption of a child. The children were sent out of London, and it was impossible to trace them. It would be a great advantage if some record were kept of these places so that it would be possible to trace the children. The infants were separated from the mother at birth, because otherwise the mother wanted to keep the child, so it was hurried away as soon as possible. The witness said he knew of one lying-in home where seven infants were removed on the day of their birth. In one such home the woman in charge had formerly been imprisoned as a criminal lunatic.

At the conclusion of Dr. Hamer's evidence Mr. Courtauld was recalled and cross-examined.

(To be concluded.)

THE MIDWIVES (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Before the Scottish Midwives Bill passed through Committee an amendment was carried restricting the penalty attached to women not certified under the Bill attending women in child-birth, otherwise than under the direction of medical

practitioner, to those who practise "habitually for gain." Mr. Barnes said it was only as part of "a bargain," that he would move to add them to this Bill, that Sir Frederick Banbury allowed the Bill to be read a second time.

THE CENTRAL MIDWIVES BOARD.

PENAL BOARD.

A special meeting of the Central Midwives' Board, for the hearing of charges alleged against seventeen certified midwives, was held at Caxton House, S.W., July 22nd, with the following results.

Struck off the Roll and Certificates Cancelled.—Frances Clarke (No. 19530), Mary Folland (No. 11886), Matilda Halliday (No. 18847), Janeta Hanson (No. 18613), Ann Holmes (No. 19101), Jane Pincombe (No. 17356), Emma Poulton (No. 1256), Elizabeth Roberts (No. 14473), Marie Alexandra Seare (No. 11811), Harriett Stone (No. 18497).

Severely censured.—(Report asked for from Local Supervising Authority in three and six months' time) Sarah Hudson (No. 19345), Caroline Meredith (No. 12239).

Three cases were adjourned. In another the Board considered the charges not proved, and took no action, and one midwife had died.

In the case of Sarah Hudson, who did not explain that a case of inflammation of and discharge from the eyes of a child was one needing the advice of a doctor, the Chairman said the case was an extremely bad one, and the midwife thoroughly deserved to be struck off the Roll for gross carelessness.

In the first adjourned case the midwife, who was present, and who was charged with being intoxicated at a case, and unfit for the performance of her duties, pleaded illness. The Chairman informed her that the Board expected her to produce evidence of the illness, and testimony of her habits as to sobriety from competent persons.

The second adjourned case was defended at length by the Rev. E. R. Sill, who asserted that the midwife's certificate and register of cases had been sent to the Board by registered post on the previous evening. The Board therefore decided to adjourn the case till these had been received.

The third adjourned case was that of a midwife who was not charged with any professional delinquency, but of misconduct in living with a man who was not her husband. She pleaded that she was separated from her husband, and had trained as a midwife to support herself, the Guardians taking charge of her children. She admitted that she had a child two years old of which the man with whom she was accused of living at present was the father, but denied having associated with him for two years, though she still lived in the same house—statements corroborated by the man's sister. The case was adjourned for further evidence, and in order that the Board might inquire from the Guardians why they had custody of the children.

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)