

A letter was received from the Inspector of Midwives for Norfolk asking whether, under the conditions named, a midwife is bound to attend a patient whom she has delivered during the ten days of the puerperium required by Rule E. 12. It was decided that the Inspector of Midwives for Norfolk be informed that there is no reason why a medical practitioner should not employ a midwife under the circumstances stated. A midwife displaced by the doctor who employs her becomes a monthly nurse, and ceases to act as a midwife.

APPLICATIONS.

The following applications were granted:—

For voluntary removal of Name from the Roll.—From five midwives on the grounds of old age, ill-health and inability to comply with the rules.

For recognition as lecturer from Dr. John Robert Logan, and from Mr. Vivian Mercer Métivier, M.R.C.S., L.R.C.P. (*pro tem.*).

OTHER BUSINESS.

The Secretary was instructed to give notice to the Approved Training Schools, Lecturers and Training Midwives in Scotland that the Board does not propose to renew their approval after March 31st, 1917, as, after that date, all schedules presented by candidates from these institutions who desire to enter for examination in England must be approved by the Scottish Board.

As there is now a Scottish Midwives' Board, it is manifestly right that it should be the only authority to approve Training Schools, Lecturers and Training Midwives in Scotland.

EXAMINATION PAPER.

DECEMBER 13TH, 1916.

1. What are the measurements of the foetal skull, and what is the importance of each with regard to the size of the pelvis?
2. Describe in detail your method of making an abdominal examination. What conditions might you find on making such an examination in the first stage of Labour which would make it necessary for you to advise medical help?
3. What are the chief causes of too early rupture of the membranes? To what evil consequences may it give rise? What can be done to prevent it?
4. What is "Uterine Inertia," what are its varieties, and how would you recognise and treat each variety?
5. Describe carefully your treatment of the cord and of the umbilicus from the moment of birth until the tenth day. What complications may arise if proper care is not taken?
6. Explain the reasons why medical help is advisable in the following conditions:—

- (a) puffiness of the hands or face;
- (b) loss of blood during pregnancy;
- (c) purulent discharge during pregnancy;
- (d) dangerous feebleness of the child.

What dangers to the mother or child might be incurred by neglecting to advise medical help?

PENAL CASES.

A Special Meeting of the Central Midwives Board to consider charges against six midwives was held at Caxton Hall, Westminster, December 13th, with the following results:—

Struck off the Roll and Certificate Cancelled.—Mary Ann Hadfield (No. 14039), Susan Spreadborough (No. 5226), Emma Jane Toby (No. 13852).

Adjourned for Report in Three and Six Months.—Mary Biddick (No. 4933), Ann Glasspool (No. 3800), Elizabeth Wallington (No. 14982).

The cases of Midwives Biddick and Glasspool were somewhat similar, both having neglected to obtain medical assistance for infants suffering from inflammation of the eyes. Both midwives seemed to have failed to realise the seriousness of such a condition. In the case of Midwife Biddick it was stated that her practice was a large one, and that she attended between 500 and 600 cases a year.

The Chairman spoke seriously to them of the terrible consequences that might ensue from the neglect of this rule.

Mary Ann Hadfield was reported as 80 and dirty. One member of the Board remarked that she ought to have a gold medal for working till that age.

Midwife Toby, one of whose patients died from pulmonary embolism, stated in her defence that the doctor didn't know what a white leg was till she explained to him. She further said that the inspector had always had her knife into her, and that she might come to want a shilling before the midwife.

Cases Adjourned for Judgment on Report of Local Supervising Authority.—Reports were received in the following cases and the midwives struck off the Roll:—Bertha Flemming (No. 30137), Elizabeth Seed (No. 30835), Annie Lewis (No. 19616).

Further Consideration of the Charges alleged against Harriet Mary Gaines (No. 17127) resulted in the midwife being cautioned.

The charge against Midwife Gaines, which was partly heard on November 8th, and which was adjourned for more evidence as to the state of her health, was that, on September 20th she was convicted at Chertsey Court of Summary Jurisdiction of having been found drunk.

The medical evidence went to show that the condition of the woman's health would favour the supposition that a very small quantity of alcohol would overcome her.

The medical man, in his letter, said that he remembered an occasion in his own experience when, under similar circumstances, the same misfortune had overtaken him.

The Chairman said that he considered the letter of this doctor to be a very admirable one, and that he had no doubt that the midwife had been overtaken on this one occasion. She should be advised to take the pledge.

The Application for restoration of name to the Roll of Alice Bamber (late No. 24691) removed in 1914, was granted.

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)