

PRIVATE TUITION AND INSTITUTIONS.

Belfast Union Maternity Hospital.—A. Dodds, E. Neill.

Birmingham Maternity Home.—E. M. Riley.

Crosland Moor Workhouse, Huddersfield.—E. Mowbray.

General Lying-in Hospital.—G. Vickers, M. A. Young.

Greenwich Union Infirmary.—M. L. T. Smith.

Hull Workhouse.—A. Kendall.

Kensington Union Infirmary.—A. M. Beard, M. Haywood, L. M. H. Jones, L. M. Perchard, M. C. Perry.

Kingswood Nurses' Home.—K. A. Borthwick, E. S. Hurr.

London Hospital.—C. H. C. Mitchell.

Preston Union Workhouse.—E. Ratcliffe.

Rochdale Union Infirmary.—A. Cunliff, A. Rimmer.

St. Mary's Hospitals, Manchester.—D. W. Billington, C. Horton.

University College Hospital.—M. Hurley.

PENAL BOARD.

A Meeting of the Central Midwives Board was held at the Board Room, Caxton House, Westminster, on Thursday, November 12th, Sir Francis Champneys presiding, to consider the charges against thirteen certified midwives, with the following results:—

Struck off the Roll and Certificate cancelled.—Alice Bamber (No. 24691, C.M.B. Examination), Alice Rachel Boast (No. 19791), Eliza Edwards (No. 20151), Eliza Lancaster (No. 20227), Esther Page (No. 16642), Susannah Smith (No. 3410), Frances Tooley (No. 18934), Mary Walker (No. 5215).

Severely Censured, and a Report asked for by the Local Supervising Authorities in three and six months' time.—Anne Lakin (No. 16330), Mary Ann Smith (No. 11576).

Cautioned.—Sarah Edge (No. 9894 L.O.S. certificate).

Action Postponed.—Alice J. Beatty (No. 6248, L.O.S. certificate).

The consideration of one case was postponed owing to the serious illness of the midwife.

The defended cases were first taken, three being from the county of Kent; the first being Mrs. Esther Page who was present. Mrs. Page was charged with not explaining to the husband or nearest relative that the case was one in which the attendance of a registered medical practitioner was required, of neglecting to notify the Local Supervising Authority when medical help had been sought, of having been in contact with a case of puerperal fever, and continuing in attendance upon two other patients without having undergone any disinfection to the satisfaction of the Local Supervising Authority. Miss Harrison, the County Inspector was present. Mrs. Page,

who said she could not afford to be legally represented, claimed that she did give the husband the necessary form, and that the doctor called in did not tell her the case was one of puerperal fever.

Miss Harrison read to the Board the record of the midwife's work, as the result of her inspections, covering a considerable period of time. There was no other midwife practising in the district and that was why the L.S.A. had been lenient.

In pronouncing sentence the chairman said this constituted one of the worst cases he had heard of. She should have been brought up before the Board long ago. A woman who was a danger should not be allowed to practise even if she were the only midwife in the district.

The next case was that of Eliza Edwards (age 72). She was defended by her daughter, Miss Eva Edwards, and also by a married daughter. She was charged with various offences against the rules including not taking and recording the pulse and temperature.

In her defence it was urged that she attended one case concerning which she was charged, out of charity, for no fee, and a declaration was put in by a patient to say Mrs. Edwards had omitted to take her temperature for two days because her thermometer was broken, but she took it before, and afterwards as soon as the thermometer was replaced. In regard to the keeping of records her daughter stated that she was "gifted with her work but not with booking down."

After hearing the inspector's report the chairman said that this case also was one which should have been brought to the notice of the Board sooner.

Mrs. Boast, also a Kent midwife, aged seventy-five, wrote that she wished to come off the Roll, as "I am tired of the way I am treated by Miss Harrison; I can't stand the correction she gives me."

The next case heard was that of Miss Alice J. Beatty, against whom it was alleged: "That you persistently neglect and refuse to give reasonable facilities for the inspection by the Local Supervising Authority of your Register of Cases, bag of appliances, and place of residence, and an investigation of your mode of practice, as required by Rule E 24."

Miss Beatty, who conducted her own case, was accompanied by her solicitor. In opening the case Miss Beatty took exception to the constitution of the Board which was to hear it. Asked by the Chairman to whom she objected, she said she objected to Miss Rosalind Paget; she was always prejudiced against her, and was a member of the Midwives Institute, which was antagonistic to her. Asked if there was any one else, she said she objected to all medicos as a rule, but she supposed she would have to put up with that. The Chairman said that the Board was constituted by Act of Parliament. She also took exception to the notice given

previous page

next page