

rates, so the Bill had a double effect—not only would it lead to an increase of general expenditure from the Imperial Exchequer, but it would also lead to an increase in local rates. His Scottish friends thought that, as the Government were always talking about economy, they should practise what they preached, whereas here they were setting up quite unnecessarily a body of new officials and incurring additional expenditure. Perhaps his noble friend in charge of the Bill could give an estimate of what the extra expenditure would be on the Exchequer and on the local rates, and also state the reason why the object desired could not be achieved by giving this work to the Local Government Board for Scotland instead of setting up a new Board.

Lord Balfour of Burleigh said that he was for eight years responsible for the government of Scotland, and this was the first time he had heard there was very little work for the Local Government Board to do. The Local Government Board for Scotland had not and could not have any of the technical knowledge that would be at the disposal of a Board such as that indicated in this Bill. In regard to expense, he was assured that if the same relative expenses were incurred in Scotland as in England, as soon as the Act came into force, there should not be a total expense of more than £200 or £300 a year to be defrayed from Imperial and local resources. Even in these days of strict economy, that did not seem a serious prospect. He hoped the noble Marquess in charge of the Bill would resist the noble Lord's suggestion.

The Marquess of Crewe said he could not accept the noble Lord's suggestion. It would entirely destroy the structure of the Bill, if the provision for the appointment of a representative Board were eliminated. He went on to explain the working of the English Act, after which Lord Strachie expressed himself quite satisfied, and Clause 3 was agreed to.

#### SUSPENSION FROM PRACTICE.

In regard to Clause 6, "Provisions as to suspensions," the Marquess of Crewe moved an Amendment to delete the words authorizing the Board "to suspend a midwife from practice for such period as the Board think fit." That might be for the term of her natural life. On the other hand, there was an appeal from a sentence of removal from practice altogether. Although one need not suppose that rules would be so made, or would so act, it would not seem right that a power should be given of practically destroying a right of appeal by allowing indefinite suspension. He proposed to omit the words, "for such period as the Board think fit," and this was agreed.

#### APPOINTMENT OF AUDITOR.

On Clause 13, "Fees and Expenses," the Marquess of Crewe moved to omit the words, "who shall be a member of one of the Societies of Chartered Accountants in Scotland, or a member practising in Scotland of the Society of

Incorporated Accountants and Auditors," and to insert "practising in Scotland, to be appointed annually by the Secretary for Scotland." Certain variations had to be made from the English Act, on account of the difference of Scottish procedure. The appointment of an auditor by the Secretary for Scotland followed the uniform practice in similar cases; and the change had the advantage that it removed from the Board the power of appointing their own auditor, and in most cases it was considered desirable that the auditor should be appointed from outside rather than by those whose accounts had to be audited. The amendment was agreed to with the remaining clauses. The Bill has now passed its third reading.

## THE CENTRAL MIDWIVES BOARD.

### PENAL BOARDS.

Penal meetings of the Central Midwives' Board were held at the Board Room, Caxton House, Westminster, S.W., on Thursday, December 16th, and Friday, December 17th (Sir Francis Champneys presiding) to consider charges against midwives, with the following results:—

#### THURSDAY, DECEMBER 16TH.

*Struck off the Roll and Certificate Cancelled.*—Mary Ann Coulthard (No. 7202), Maria Grundy (No. 3643), Jane Jackson (No. 1629), Annie Maycock (No. 8932), and Mary Anne Simpson (No. 20143).

In the case of Mary Ann Coulthard, the Inspector deposed that the midwife could read a thermometer, but could not set it.

In the case of Maria Grundy, the Health Visitor reported that she herself took a temperature and asked the midwife to read the thermometer; she stated that it registered 93.4, and that the patient's temperature was the same on the previous day.

The second charge against Jane Jackson was that, being in attendance at a confinement, she neglected to disinfect her hands and forearms, to wash and swab the patient, to take a record of pulse and temperature at each visit, to explain that the case was one needing the attendance of a registered medical practitioner when the patient presented symptoms of serious illness and suffered from a raised temperature.

The Chairman, in giving judgment, said this was a very serious charge; the midwife admitted that she had not washed her hands, and the patient developed puerperal fever.

The midwife admitted, in her defence, that she could not take a temperature, but said she could tell the patient was ill from her experiences.

Mrs. Maycock, who had been cited before the Board in 1911 and severely censured, writing, to meet the indictment against her, spoke of "the charges of which the most part is lies," and added "any bad-minded woman can lay a charge against you and there is no chance of confuting it."

Mary Ann Simpson, who was defended by her solicitor, Mr. Parkes, had been before the Board in 1907, on a charge of drunkenness and other

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)