

for re-approval to undertake the practical training of midwives were granted.

APPLICATIONS FOR APPROVAL.

The application of Mr. William St. John Cogan, L.R.C.P. and S., Edin., for the same purpose was granted, and those of Dr. L. M. R. Campbell and Dr. Allan Shiach, *pro hac vice*.

The application of Midwife Annie M. Barlow (No. 26623) was granted and those of Midwife H. A. Macarthur (No. 41206) and Midwife L. E. Willes (No. 33508) *pro hac vice*.

The next ordinary meeting of the Board will be held on May 18th.

PENAL MEETING.

A special meeting of the Central Midwives Board for the hearing of charges alleged against certified midwives was held at Caxton Hall, Westminster, on April 14th. Sir Francis Champneys presided.

The results were as follows:—

Struck off the Roll and certificate cancelled.—Ellen Healy (No. 12094), Sarah Buckingham (No. 7367), Caroline Collier (No. 20513), Mary Pearson (No. 15817), Mary Robinson (No. 11090), Emma Stretton (No. 14908), Elizabeth Thorpe (No. 32008), Mary Ann Watson (No. 7434).

Censured.—Kate Elizabeth Irish (No. 20451).

Cautioned.—Alice Lavinia Beard (No. 18684).

Two of the cases, Midwife Watson and Midwife Irish, were defended, the latter by counsel.

Midwife Beard appeared in person to answer the charges brought against her. The Board found that several of the charges were not proved, and that though in one case it was proved that there was serious rupture of the perinæum, the midwife had examined the patient carefully in the manner prescribed, but she had failed to realise that the tear was more than a slight one. With regard to her negligence in omitting to take temperatures, the Chairman impressed upon her that she was not to regard the wishes of the patient in this matter but to abide by the rules of the Board.

One of the charges against Midwife Irish was that "a doctor having been sent for you did not await his arrival."

The solicitor for the midwife explained that the medical man in question had some time previously had occasion to report the midwife on some matter not connected with the Board, the midwife's defence being that owing to this circumstance she thought the doctor would decline to work with her, so that although she was in the house she did not come into the room, but left another woman to assist him.

The Chairman said that the patient must always be the first consideration, and no personal feelings could excuse a dereliction from duty.

With regard to the charge that the midwife had failed to bring the necessary appliances, the solicitor explained that this woman of sixty-one had to go a distance of four miles by cycle

on a wild snowy night, and that her apron and other articles had become detached and lost during the journey.

Midwife Pearson defended her negligence with regard to the taking of temperatures by asserting that "her experience gained over long years was sufficient." She made some amusing comments on the inspector, and ended her letter by saying that if her name was removed from the roll she would retire knowing she had done her duty and had earned the grateful appreciation of hundreds of clients.

Midwife Robinson urged the same defence with regard to temperatures, and also stated that it was a common practice to send feeble newly born infants to the doctors' surgeries. The infant in question died an hour after its return.

The charges against Midwife Thorpe included negligence in that "the child suffering from inflammation of the eyes you did not explain," &c.

In this case, two different Health Visitors visited the lying-in woman and inspected the child's eyes.

The midwife in her written defence said, "One tells you to do one thing and one another. Uncertified midwives have a much better time and not so many critics."

EXAMINATION PAPER.

The following are the questions set to candidates at the Examination held by the Central Midwives Board on April 10th.

1. Describe the anatomical position of the Bladder. What disorders of micturition may be present during pregnancy?

2. What are the commoner causes of hæmorrhage in a woman who is 24 weeks pregnant? How do you endeavour to distinguish between them?

3. What is an occipito-posterior presentation and what would you find on examination?

Why is labour prolonged and how may delivery take place?

4. What is involution of the uterus? What are the commoner causes of sub-involution of the uterus, and to what symptoms and signs would it give rise?

5. Describe some of the different methods of preparing food for an artificially fed infant a week old.

6. What leads to inflammation of the Breast? How would you recognise it?

What are the Rules of the Central Midwives Board dealing with this condition?

Application has been made by the L.C.C. to the Local Government Board for a grant-in-aid of the salaries and expenses of the two inspectors under the Midwives Act, 1902, by reason of the co-operation of the work of the inspectors with schemes for maternity and infant welfare in the administrative county of London. The Board has now intimated that it has decided to make a grant of £317 11s. 5d. in aid of the expenditure incurred during the year 1915-16.

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)