

If a candidate proposed to do anything not justified by the emergency, it became the duty of the examiners to deal with this fault in their award.

If the answers showed want of proper instruction, the question would be likely to elicit more accurate teaching from the teachers.

They hoped that the quality of the teaching on which Dr. Stookes commented would improve when the course of the curriculum was lengthened, as had been recommended by the Board. It was always the duty of an examiner to reject a candidate whose examination showed that she was not safe to practise as a midwife.

Miss Paget moved that enquiry be made where the candidate who had received such inadequate instruction in making vaginal examinations was trained.

The Secretary said records were kept of such reports by examiners, and it was accordingly agreed that it be an instruction to the Secretary to look up the facts.

We agree with Dr. Stookes that if a midwife has not had definite practical instruction in the difficult subject of intra-uterine manipulations the patient is safer if she leaves her alone, as ignorant manipulation is likely to do more harm than good.

It is a question whether, in the interests of the lying-in mother, practical instruction should not be given to midwives during their training on this subject on the definite understanding that they will transgress the rules of the Central Midwives Board if they use their knowledge except in grave emergency when the services of a medical practitioner are unobtainable.

In two cases correspondence was considered concerning certificates which appeared to have been tampered with and it was decided that the candidates should not be admitted to examination.

Correspondence was also submitted with an Approved Midwife who has been in the habit of sending up for Examination on Schedules signed by her, candidates, the majority of whose cases had been taken under the exclusive supervision of midwives not approved by the Board.

It was decided that the midwife should be removed from the list of those approved to train pupils.

In reply to an enquiry from Dr. F. N. A. Menzies, Principal Assistant Medical Officer of Health of the County of London, asking the Board's opinion as to whether the administration of the London County Council Bill dealing with lying-in homes, assuming the event of its becoming law, should be entrusted to the London County Council or to the various Borough Councils, the Board strongly approved the view of the Chairman, expressed in his letter to Dr. Hamar of July 15th, that administration should be entrusted to the London County Council, not to the Borough Councils.

#### APPLICATIONS.

*For Removal from the Roll.*—The applications of

seven midwives for the removal of their names from the Roll were granted.

*For Recognition as Lecturer.*—The following applications were granted:—Walter Andrew Bowring, F.R.C.S., L.R.C.P.; Trevor Berwyn Davies, M.D., F.R.C.S.; Hugh Nethersole Fletcher, M.D., F.R.C.S., Edin.; Theodore Henry Ionides, M.B., F.R.C.S.; Charles Henry Jacomb-Hood, M.R.C.S., L.R.C.P.; Joseph Shardlow, M.B.

*For Approval to Undertake the Practical Training of Pupils.*—The following applications were granted:—Miss Grace Edith Blott, No. 24458; Miss Elsie King Hollway, No. 25318.

The next ordinary meeting of the Board will be held on October 7th and the next Penal Board on October 28th.

#### MIDWIFE'S' LIBEL ACTION.

Echoes of the "Stock" case were heard recently at the Birmingham Assizes. It will be remembered that Mrs. Stock's name was removed from the Midwives Roll by the Central Midwives Board on a charge of misconduct, and, on appeal to the High Court, she obtained a reversal of this decision, as the Court held that the proceedings at the hearing of the case by the Central Midwives Board had not been conducted in accordance with the Board's rules.

At the Birmingham Assizes Mrs. Stock brought an action for libel and claimed damages against the Rev. W. Dore Rudgard, Vicar of Longford, the libel complained of being, it was asserted, contained in a letter written by the defendant to Dr. Bostock Hill, Medical Officer for Warwickshire. This letter was read at the hearing of the case before the Central Midwives Board.

Mrs. Stock stated in evidence at the Birmingham Assizes that she was granted a separation order by the Warwick magistrates, and made arrangements for the Guardians to take charge of the two children.

In 1912 she left Warwick, and took rooms at Longford, where a widower named Hill was the father of a child born to her in November. In February, 1914, Hill took a house in the Longford Road, where she, Hill, and his sister lived.

She became connected with the church working party, and also had a Red Cross working party at her house. As the majority of the subscribers to her party wished the garments to go to the Red Cross Society she sent them to the Coventry Branch and not to the church. She admitted receiving a letter of apology from the defendant. As her practice had been ruined she was anxious to obtain damages.

The defendant, in his evidence said he was advised to write the letter to Dr. Bostock Hill. He did not know whether the statements in it were true or false. He wrote it in order that Dr. Bostock Hill might, if he deemed it advisable, use it at the hearing of Mrs. Stock's case before the Central Midwives Board.

The jury awarded the plaintiff £50 damages, and judgment was entered accordingly.

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)