

## THE LANCET.

London, Saturday, May 5, 1827.

THE following thing, we know not what else to call it, was published in *The Times* of Tuesday last; the reader is requested to peruse it with particular attention:—

“ TO HIS MAJESTY’S JUDGES, CORONERS,  
AND JUSTICES OF THE PEACE.

My Lords and Gentlemen.—Some months since I addressed a letter, through the medium of this paper, to the King’s Secretary for the Home Department, to caution him against the worldly designs and the injurious practices of men-midwives; and, if I am rightly informed, those statements have been well received by all the disinterested and respectable members of the medical profession. It was to be expected that teachers of man-midwifery, and their adherents, who regard the healing art chiefly for its profits, would become outrageous against the persons who expose their dishonourable vocation, and accordingly they have been liberal in abuse of them, and loud in the praise of their “*Diana of the Ephesians*,” but few sensible men calculated upon a by-intrigue to persuade the public that the birth of mankind ought to be considered a surgical operation; yet, this absurdity actually disgraces the printed circulars of a College which possesses the unemployed means for taking the highest station in Europe. It is my firm conviction, that the establishment and the further prevalence of man-midwifery, sanctioned as a branch of surgery, would compromise the justice of the country, by exposing the lives of child-bed women and infants to many dangerous and unnecessary secret operations. Under this impression, I should be passively dishonest, if I were to neglect the severe duty of asserting my professional thoughts. Having devoted as much time to the study of the elementary sciences which constitute the only safe foundation for the healing art, as any of my contemporaries; and having, from long-continued meditation and from experience, endeavoured to distinguish the means which help, and those which are hurtful, in the perilous business of surgery, I am free to confess that I view the operations of men-midwives as the most uncertain and the most violent of surgical enterprises. In common with many of the best informed physiologists, I regard the birth of the human race as a purely natural pro-

cess, most wisely and sufficiently secured by the unerring ordinations of Providence; and I am professionally assured, that it is always mischievous to tamper with pregnant women, under the pretences of hastening, easing, or retarding the most portentous and delicate work of the creation. Man-midwives allege that their interference is ‘a consequence of civilization which depraves the natural habits of women,’ forgetting the notoriety of a law to compel poor unmarried females to disclose their condition, because the known frequency of its concealment leads to a capital crime; while among the highly-civilized and numberless ladies and women of China and the East Indies, they universally employ ordinary matrons in the sanctuary of child-birth, and would revolt with horror from any proposal to admit the presence of a man. That educated men should submit to be associated with nurses and gossips, for whole days and nights, merely to wait the humiliating events of parturition, is contrary to decency and common sense; man-midwives, therefore, teach their disciples to assume directorial offices, and to be curiously or officiously meddling, under various pretences, by which the terrified and shocked distressed object is rendered obedient; and when the operator’s patience begins to fail, or his predictions are at fault, he rushes into the perilous adventure of using his conjectural desperate art; and I confidently believe that the increasing number of deaths to mothers and infants, as well as the pretended difficulties in midwifery, are mainly, if not altogether, imputable to such undue or improper interference. Whenever a degree of violence dangerous to the life of parent or child is meditated, the moral propriety of it should be confided to physicians or hospital surgeons of enlarged intellect. My present purpose is, therefore, to awaken the attention of the legal authorities of this kingdom, and to prepare them for deeds which must arouse the indignation of parties who may suffer from the audacity of young adventurers in surgical midwifery. Even before this innovation, it cannot be denied that many rash surgeons have been hurried by vanity, or from pecuniary necessity, urged to seek premature vulgar fame by attempting unjustifiable operations, trusting that fatal results would be hushed for the sake of the character of the profession; and my own experience in a metropolitan general hospital, where every medical officer is kept in check by rivals, has induced me to hold public consultations in the presence of all the students, in order to prevent questionable enterprises. If such precaution is needful in public practice, what security can we find in the privacy of a lying-in room, where often none but igno-

rant women are present, and where surgical acts of violence may be passed over without inquiry? The public are not aware that the self-constituted teachers of what is now termed "The Obstetric Art and Science," are not any of them general hospital surgeons, or hospital physicians, and their assumed authority to dictate to surgeons' pupils the terms on which they may commit irremediable injuries to women, or destruction to infants, are not sanctioned by law. I do not announce these alarming statements unadvisedly, but from serious apprehensions, awakened by the flippancy with which man-midwives write and speak of sacrificing a child, or wounding the vital parts of a mother. I am aware that the best provided judgment may err, and that there is necessarily much obscurity in the evidence required to decide whether an infant be living or dead during many stages of parturition; for I have witnessed a fatal mistake of this kind under the hands of one of the best informed teachers and practitioners of midwifery, it being discovered, when too late, that the sacrificed infant was alive; and the presumed deformity of the mother, which was alleged as the justification, was equally disproved, by her bearing five children afterwards without the help of art or surgical instruments. If, therefore, the highest authorities in man-midwifery are liable to such fatal mistakes, what frightful consequence may we not anticipate from a half-privileged class of young surgical adventurers? The wise laws of our country are most tenacious about the protection of human life, and your Lordships, the Coroners, and Magistrates, are properly jealous of any screening evidence intended to gloss over acts of atrocity. I, therefore, most respectfully submit, that whenever cases of violent death occur to mother or infant, from the use of surgical instruments or surgical hands, a coroner's inquest should be holden, and if sufficient proofs are adduced of hasty violence, or of rashness, the affair should be investigated before a jury, and a chief reliance placed upon the opinions of some grave disinterested physician, or experienced hospital surgeon, they being persons the best qualified to understand the intricate hinges of life or death, and to determine how far it may be ever expedient under given circumstances, to hazard the life of a mother or that of her progeny. If, however (as I professionally believe), those terrible violences are very rarely justifiable, and that experienced matrons are the competent and most proper assistants to lying-in women, it only remains to suggest a remedy for the humiliations, indecencies, and mischiefs, which attend surgical male midwifery. I, therefore, now propose, the restoration of the practice of midwifery to

females, beginning with the introduction of the wives, widows, or female kindred, of medical practitioners, by which every surgeon or apothecary may secure his female patients against the inroads of his competitors, and establish a respectable maintenance for such female, in the event of his premature death, while his consequent freedom from unnecessary confinement among gossips will allow him more time to follow his proper vocations.

To avert one probable objection against the immediate practicability of instructing a sufficient number of women to become midwives, I have to notify that there is a Lying-in Hospital situate in Brownlow-street, Long Acre, where females are taught midwifery; but if, from the inattention of the Governors or through the craft of man-midwives, this design is perverted, then the Governors or the Court of Chancery ought to rectify such abuses.

My Lords and Gentlemen,  
your obedient servant,

ANTHONY CARLISLE."

6, Laugham-place, April 23.

It is certainly desirable that all subjects connected with science should be discussed in the calm and dignified language of philosophy; but when an insignificant portion of argument is made the vehicle of an overwhelming quantity of abuse, and the most horrid imputations on the characters, professional and private, of a most useful and meritorious class of gentlemen, moderation in repelling the atrocious attack would be a sacrifice of principle; and tameness, negative criminality. Without hesitation, then, we denounce the above *thing* as a most villainous and unfounded calumny, not only on the professional character of GENERAL PRACTITIONERS, but also on the moral reputation of the ladies of England. We can scarcely believe that it is not a forgery; for who can imagine that any man possessing common sense, and some professional reputation, should avow himself as the author of such unheard of lies, and such an unparalleled attack on the rights and privileges of his professional brethren. We really feel too indignant to enter at this time upon any serious discussion of the subject

## MAN-MIDWIFERY.

*To the Editor of THE LANCET.*

In your last Number there is a copy of a second letter, which has been published in the *Times* newspaper, and signed "Anthony Carlisle," containing many coarse insinuations against the practitioners of midwifery; and, as one of that body, I feel called upon to make a few observations upon it. Why the enraged Knight should direct his spear against this particular class of the profession, and accuse *them* of "wordly designs," and of "regarding the healing art chiefly for its profits," I am at a loss to conceive. Why are not *we*, in common with those who

practise the other departments of the profession, to expect a remuneration for our days of anxiety, and nights of toil? But will any man of common veracity and common sense say, that the former does by any means compensate for the latter? I can from experience affirm that it does not; that no "profit" (taking this word as I suppose the author of the letter means it, in a pecuniary point of view,) is a sufficient recompense for the intense degree of anxiety which must be felt by every practitioner whilst conducting his patient through the perils of a dangerous labour. If a man wishes to practise his profession "chiefly for its profits," I would strongly advise him to relinquish this branch, and turn his attention to some other, for I can assure him it is not a bed of roses. But before I go farther, the following questions naturally arise: Who is this man? Is he competent to give an opinion on this subject? Has he studied it? If not, he has no right to obtrude his "professional thoughts" upon the public, and still less right (if possible) has he to make those "thoughts" the vehicle for malicious insinuations, slanderous abuse, and most abominable and false imputations, upon a body of men whose characters would suffer nothing from being brought into competition with that of the redoubtable Knight himself.

Now it happens, as I am informed, (for of him and his professional feats I know nothing,) that the author of this most extraordinary letter belongs to the privileged class of HOSPITAL SURGEONS; men who are precluded by their regulations, from obtaining a knowledge of the obstetric art, and therefore men of all others the most unfit to give an opinion upon the subject; and yet it is to them, forsooth, that recourse is to be had when cases of real difficulty occur: by the by, this admission of the possibility of such difficulty, falsifies one of his assertions, and a very principal one too, viz. "That the birth of mankind is a purely natural process, most wisely and sufficiently secured by the unerring ordinations of Providence." His "long-continued meditation and experience" ought to have taught him, that in the present artificial state of society, many are the causes, both physical and moral, that tend to interfere with his "purely natural process," often converting it into one of difficulty, and not unfrequently into one of danger; and in a case of this kind, would any one in his senses request the assistance of this Knight, although in his own estimation he may be an "Hospital Surgeon of ENLARGED INTELLECT," whilst there is a Blundell, a Gooch, or a Clarke, to be had? Any person who has been brought into contact with these gentlemen, can amply testify that men of "enlarged intellect" are to

be found, even without the precincts of an hospital.

Can a man unacquainted with the natural movements of any piece of mechanism, be expected to remedy it when defective? and if he cannot so act in insinuate machinery, how can he, in that most complex of all machines, the living body? How then can any one ignorant of natural labour, (and ignorant he must be, if not allowed to practise in ordinary cases of midwifery,) be expected even to give an opinion whether nature requires assistance, much less to interfere, for the purpose of rendering it? The truth is so obvious, that I trust "all the respectable and disinterested members of the profession" will need no further elucidation.

It is also stated, that "men-midwives teach their disciples to assume directional offices, and to be curiously and officiously meddling under various pretences, by which the terrified and shocked distressed object is rendered obedient." The above sentence must have been written in a temporary fit of insanity, for no man possessed of reason would have committed himself by uttering such a palpable falsehood. Terrified and shocked! In a former effusion of his "professional thoughts," by this same scribbler, did he not complain of the "unbounded influence" which the accoucheur possessed in the family? (it is true this influence might render unnecessary the attendance of an hospital surgeon.) Now I know not whether the worthy Knight is in a state of single blessedness or not; but whether married or single, he ought to know, that to terrify, shock, and distress the most interesting branch of the family, was not a very likely way of obtaining their confidence and esteem, so as to enable him to exercise this unbounded influence over it. He wishes to know what security we have against "surgical acts of violence," being performed in the "privacy" of a lying-in room? Talk about privacy, indeed! I say, that in no place is there less real "privacy" than in a parturient room,—none where the acts of the practitioner are more severely commented upon; he is judged chiefly by the result, and if the case terminates unfavourably, we be to his character, if he cannot bring forward a satisfactory explanation of his mode of conduct. A man had much better select the theatre of an hospital, if he wishes to engage in "questionable enterprizes," than a lying-in room. But what right has he to assert that this will be the case, or that women and children will be subject to "many unnecessary and secret operations?" Why are we to be branded with this charge, without even the shadow of evidence to support it? I sup-

pose this is another of his "professional thoughts;" but let me advise him not to give vent to them, if by so doing he is to stigmatise, to say the least of it, a very respectable part of the medical profession. He backs, it is true, one of his assertions, by the puerile accusation, that he once knew a celebrated accoucheur mistaken in his opinion with regard to the life of a child. Indeed! and did he never know an hospital surgeon mistaken in his opinion? And did it never enter his wise head to transfer all hospital surgery into the hands of females on this account? He states, in reference to this case, that the "presumed deformity" was disproved by the woman's bearing five living children afterwards; now I say that this circumstance in itself does by no means militate against the propriety of performing the operation in the first instance. The state of the soft parts of the mother are different at one time to what they are at another, as is also the size of the child's head.

The author of the letter is evidently much piqued at a late regulation of the Royal College of Surgeons, for by it they clearly manifest their opinion, that regularly and properly educated male practitioners are less likely "to tamper with pregnant women, under the pretence of hastening, easing, or retarding the most portentous and delicate work of the creation," than a set of ignorant and officious women. In common gratitude, however, these females ought to hold a public meeting, and to pass a vote of thanks upon the individual who has made use of such exertions in their cause, although it appears to have been a forlorn hope; they ought also to come to an unanimous resolution of applying to him, and *him alone*, whenever in cases of difficulty they require the assistance of an "HOSPITAL SURGEON OF ENLARGED INTELLECT." The reiterated charge of indecency is almost too frivolous to be noticed; are there not many operations of surgery much more revolting to the tender feelings of a delicate female, to which, nevertheless, for the sake of her health, she is obliged to submit? and yet who ever heard of teaching females to perform them? I fear I have trespassed too long upon your patience, and must therefore abruptly conclude.

Remaining yours, &c.

CHARLES WALLER.

Aldersgate-street, May 7, 1827.

## THE LANCET.

London, Saturday, May 19, 1827.

CARLISLE, in his first letter to Mr. PEEL, says, "If, however, the greediness of a few individuals should expose this subject (man-midwifery) to free discussion, and the judgment of married men and modest women should be copiously awakened, perhaps the general custom of employing women may be again resorted to;" and in his second letter, this disgusting egotist submits the following proposition:—"I, therefore, now propose the restoration of the practice of midwifery to females, beginning with the introduction of the *wives, widows, or female kindred of medical practitioners.*" Hence, according to his own showing, he recommends that the wives, widows, and female kindred of medical men should addict themselves to "a *degrading vocation*," a "dishonourable vocation;" that they be "associated with nurses and gossips for whole days and nights," \* \* \* \* "in a lying-in room, where often none but ignorant women are present."

If the GENERAL PRACTITIONERS of the British empire, previously to the publication of this proposal, were ignorant of the opinion entertained of them by the *Hospital Surgeons* of London, they cannot be so now. Sir Anthony confesses, indeed, that he has not written "*unadvisedly*," which implies, we presume, that his letters have been sanctioned by his colleagues with "enlarged intellect." One would have supposed that Carlisle could have communicated his "professional thoughts" to Mr. Peel without mixing them up with charges of the most horrible description, and suggestions of the most insulting character, appertaining to the professional avocations of GENERAL PRACTITIONERS and their wives. Pray who are the wives of general practitioners? Who? why, the daughters of the most respectable, the most wealthy, and independent gentlemen and merchants

of England ; ladies who, in no single circumstance, are inferior to the " wives, widows, and female relatives," of the ignorant, conceited, malignant, lying, insulting, boasting, hospital surgeons of this metropolis. If Carlisle had made it the chief object of his life to accomplish the degradation of general practitioners, he could not more completely execute his task than in the adoption of his proposal. The wife, quoth this benighted oyster, " may thus secure his female patients against the inroads of his competitors, and establish a respectable maintenance for such females ;" so that we are to believe, first, that the talents of the general practitioner are not a sufficient security against the inroads of competitors ; and, secondly, that he is incapable of procuring for his wife those comforts which, from her station in society, she requires ; two inferences so truly insulting to the feelings of this class of gentlemen, that it is with pain we commit them to paper, although for the purpose of exposure and refutation. In this country, and we are delighted that it should be so, it is considered that nothing bespeaks want of talent, want of energy, want of industry, want of a correct and honourable spirit, more decidedly, than for a man to require from his wife the execution of any portion of labour as a necessary adjunct to his support, and we believe this feeling pervades even the inferior grades of tradesmen ; what, amongst such people, is thought to be more reproachful than to say of a man that his wife supports, or half supports, his family ; yet to this disreputable condition would Carlisle reduce the general practitioner ! and thus render him a bankrupt in character, as well as in pocket, whilst his wife and female relatives would be excluded from all respectable society, through following a " degrading and dishonourable vocation." Oh that there were

—————" in every honest hand a whip,  
To lash the rascal naked through the  
world."

TO SIR ANTHONY CARLISLE.

SIR,—I shall not make you any apology, for considering you the author of a pamphlet on the same subject as that to which you allude in your letters in *The Times*. And as every person who volunteers his services for the benefit of the public, must be desirous of knowing how his labours are received, I take leave, as one of that public, to inform you, that, in my opinion, if any printed document ever deserved the contempt and detestation of a whole nation, yours, Sir Anthony, may safely be produced as a claim for the reward. An individual who attempts in any manner to loosen the bonds of society, by destroying the confidence that should subsist between man and man, may very easily secure to himself a notoriety that none but the worthless will envy. If, Sir, you really are the writer of that pamphlet, which this letter supposes you to be, by imputing the basest of motives to the actions of other men, do you not clearly demonstrate those by which your own has been regulated? For I consider that the motives of any man, or any set of men, cannot be judged of correctly, but by the consideration that the same motives would have influenced my own conduct under similar circumstances. I do not hold it to be impossible for a bad man to be incapable of performing a good action, nor for a good man not to commit a bad action, and I offer you the benefit of this doctrine; but a bad action, let the motive be what it may, should always be marked with the strongest censure, in order to deter others from following the example. As I have not the happiness to be associated with you at present, I shall not, since the promulgation of your opinions, be over solicitous to obtain the honour of your society; from the rank however which you hold in that society, and as "the generality of mankind are naturally weak and credulous," the influence of your opinions, if not properly scrutinised, might be greater than if you were plain Mr. Carlisle, and had not knelt for a knighthood.

Taking it, as you do, for granted, "That the preservation of moral purity in woman is intrinsically good; that it greatly contributes to their own happiness, and not less so to that of men," how does it happen, Sir Anthony, that those men who profess what you term the most noble of sciences, the surgical and medical, and who "are assimilated with the Creator more than any other men," should be the first, according to your account of the matter, to dishonour their Creator? And to be so forgetful of themselves, as to become the destroyers of their own happiness, by corrupting the purity of women?

Granting, too, that women were employed more generally than at present in the practice of midwifery, would it cease to be considered a branch of "those noble sciences," while the aid of a hospital surgeon is to be sometimes required? I shall not dwell on the absurdity of women being exclusively employed in the management of any business, the most difficult and important part of which is to be conducted by men of "enlarged intellect," who, in order to preserve the purity of women, must derive the knowledge required for that business by inspiration, or some such supernatural means; nor shall I point you out, Sir Anthony, as the brightest example of a hospital surgeon, if he is to be selected for his enlarged intellect. When the practice of midwifery was in the hands of females, they as well understood how to break the "intricate hinges of life and death," as any "grave, disinterested physician, or experienced hospital surgeon."

But do you really believe, Sir, that the corruption of the manners of women is in any degree occasioned by the employment of men as midwives? You know that many other things in this luxurious age, tend to produce that effect, without the assistance of accoucheurs. And how the morals of our wives, widows, daughters, and nieces, are to be improved by following the business of midwifery, I am quite at a loss to conjecture.

I am equally at a loss to imagine, why it was necessary to go so far as China for an example of the delicacy of women. In the reign of Charles II. when it was predicted that the world (not the moral world, as in the present instance) was about to be destroyed, the Duchess of Portsmouth observed, "that she would go to China." If this matter were properly examined, I incline to think that China would not serve your turn, Sir Anthony, any more than it would that of the Duchess of Portsmouth. You are fond of reading, I am informed, especially before delivering a Hunterian oration, and you might have read that the Roman ladies, who, according to some of the Latin writers, were remarkable for the purity of their manners, did not employ men in the business of midwifery. And these ladies, too, had not the advantage of a modern education, printed books, nor a Carhale to teach them how to suppress their passions. When you write again, Sir Anthony, I should advise you to make yourself acquainted with your subject—at least in theory; but do not be ambitious of obtaining the character of a moralist.

You may observe that, in this letter, I have attempted to show the weakness of your argument. In any future communications, should they become necessary, I will endeavour to prove the fallacy of your conclusions;—that it is the same reason

which induces a good physician to quit practice, that prompts a surgeon to undertake the business of midwifery. It is not for the gratification of lust, Sir Anthony, it is for bread—it is for the bread which some hospital surgeons are endeavouring, by all means in their power, to monopolize and withhold.

I remain, yours,

May 23, 1827.

A COMMONER.

P.S. As the pamphlet which I have attributed to you is anonymous, the author of this letter will remain unknown until that work is acknowledged, and not any longer.



## SIR A. CARLISLE.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR,—Nothing is more indicative of a vitiated mind, than a disposition to suspect vice where none exists. A man, with such a mind, is like one looking at an object through a coloured medium, which tinges every thing with its own peculiar hue, while he supposes that to be inherent in the object, which in fact resides in the vitiated medium through which he views it. That Sir A. Carlisle has shown great penetration in detecting vice, where it was never before suspected to exist, is certain. Whether he deserve our pity or our admiration for this great power is for the public to decide.

Sir A. Carlisle has attempted, in a letter to the public on the practice of midwifery, to brand a large and highly respectable body with the mark of infamy—let him be careful lest he burn himself. He does not allow that body to be even respectable, for he says, all the “disinterested and respectable members of the profession,” consider his assertions justifiable. One would suppose no man would be bold enough thus to decry a large and intelligent portion of the community, without some facts to support his assertions; yet such is the case. He does not bring forward a single fact to justify their condemnation, but is contented with making assertions of the most gross, insolent, and unfounded kind. If he had been acquainted with any facts that would have supported his assertions, is it probable that he would have withheld them?—Certainly not. He himself tells us, that where there is the slightest possible doubt respecting a female's death in parturition, he would have the medical attendant dragged as a culprit before the tribunals of his country. A man who would require this, on mere surmise, is not likely to withhold facts from delicacy of feeling, especially if his sense of duty were as strong as Sir A. Carlisle's; for his sense of public duty is so strong, that it alone induces him to calumniate nine-tenths of his professional brethren. But does not his own paper prove, that the love of duty is strongly seconded by the love of gold? Does he not propose to throw this degrading, this disgusting, this demoralising practice into the hands of his own body—the hospital surgeons! *Men who pride themselves on knowing nothing of the subject!!!* How are these chaste beings to avoid the demoralising effects of such practice? Had his care for the morals and respectability of his own clan been equal to the anxiety he feels for the general practitioner; or, in truth, had he conscientiously believed the

practice of midwifery to be as degrading as he represents it, would he have introduced it into the sanctum sanctorum of the profession? No; he would have done his utmost to have kept that clear of it. But he wishes to introduce hospital surgeons to the practice of midwifery, in consequence of their being better qualified to decide on the propriety of operations. This cannot be in consequence of their knowing more of the subject, because they pride themselves on being ignorant of it. We might have concluded, that it arose from their higher sense of honour and responsibility, but Sir A. Carlisle tells us, they have none of that feeling; on the contrary, in the hospitals in which he has had experience, it has been necessary for the consultations to be held "in the presence of all the students, to prevent" these HOSPITAL SURGEONS from being guilty of "questionable enterprises." Yet these are the men whom he considers better qualified to practise midwifery than the general practitioner. Let us hope they are not so bad as he represents them. But we cannot be surprised, if he thus treats his own immediate companions, whom he knows, that he should vilify the general practitioner, whom he knows not.

Sir A. Carlisle is very anxious to cast reflections on the female attendants of a lying-in-room—defining them "nurses and gossips"—forgetting that those females are generally chosen from the particular friends of the individual. The mother, sister, or friend of her youth, being generally selected to attend upon her, on this trying occasion. Then, is it not an insult to British females, to assert, that it is humiliating to a man of education, to associate with those whom they consider their best and most enlightened friends? Is it not still more insulting, to suppose that such females would countenance the vice and demoralising transactions that he supposes to take place in the lying-in-room?

But, for a moment suppose that parturition is always an entirely natural process, (which Sir A. Carlisle himself denies,) and suppose, also, that the female attendants are the mere gossips he represents them, and consequently, that the medical attendant is the only intelligent and morally responsible individual present. What remedy does he propose to prevent crime in the lying-in-room? Why, he recommends the removal of the only intelligent and morally responsible individual there, leaving the case entirely to the care of those "nurses and gossips," whose very contact is sufficient to pollute the medical attendant!!! But allowing Sir A. Carlisle an advantage in his argument, which he himself renounces, namely, that the "gossiping" friends of the female are not the despicable individuals he

would represent them, but, on the other hand, that they commonly are, what I believe them to be, highly respectable and intelligent females. Even then his proposition is not likely to succeed. The education that females in the higher orders of society receive, renders them more particularly excellent in those qualities which form the great beauty of female character—namely, gentleness, timidity, and a disposition to question their own powers—qualities admired by men, because they are most contrasted with masculine excellence, but which entirely disqualify a female from undertaking those duties which require promptness, decision, and firmness, in the greatest degree, and where the absence of such powers will occasion the loss of life.

Sir Anthony Carlisle, if he know any thing about midwifery, (which I much doubt,) must be aware, that in its practice danger frequently meets the accoucheur when he least expects it; and in such a form, that nothing but the most immediate and decided proceedings can rescue the unfortunate patient from the jaws of death. Is this a situation in which the gentleness of the female character can be brought to bear with advantage? He answers this question himself; he says he would here call in a medical man. I can tell him, that during the five minutes required for procuring such aid, it is probable the patient would be lost. Let him for a moment draw in his own mind such a picture as would here present itself. We will suppose a young female, about to present her admiring and beloved husband with the object of their joint wishes and expectations; we will suppose her attendant to be an intelligent individual, but still a female, with a female's heart; we will suppose such an occurrence to take place as I have alluded to, what would be the scene presented? The female who attended her, if an intelligent one, would be the first to perceive the danger, which would, in all probability, deprive her of her self-command. The interesting female herself, in a few moments made sensible of her danger by the fatal changes going on, would not only suffer from the prospect of immediate dissolution, under the most distressing circumstances, but her sufferings, her agony would be increased by a want of confidence in every thing that was done for her; in all probability no one present would have the command of their own feelings, and consequently, nothing efficient would be done. The affectionate husband hearing of the danger of his beloved wife, would rush into the apartment, and perhaps arrive in time to receive her parting blessing with her parting breath. What would be the feelings of any medical man on now entering the room?

He would see the midwife, who should have been all coolness and collectedness, probably insensible at the bed's foot; the lovely wife a corpse in her husband's arms, he writhing with agony, or mute with unutterable anguish; looking with idiotic vacancy on her beloved features, now pointed and deformed by death—at one moment flattering himself with the hope that she may still be restored, at the next, his mind opening to the horrid truth, that he, who an hour before was picturing to himself his happiness as a father and a husband, was now a widower and childless: his salutation to his medical friend, "Oh! hadst thou been here, I had not had this cause of grief," must rend the heart of any feeling man; yet even this misery would be heaven to the feelings of that man whose conscience told him, "Thy calumnies, thy writings, thy gross and unfounded insinuations have occasioned this." Let not any one suppose that this picture is overcharged; I have myself seen such a scene as the one I have described; but, thank God, without the aggravation of knowing that by deed or writing I had occasioned its occurrence. But let us leave this subject, which it is sickening to contemplate.

The remarks you made in the 194th Number of your valuable Journal, on the proposed employment of the wives or relatives of medical men, in the practice of midwifery, and the gross insult Sir Anthony Carlisle dares to cast upon those females, so exactly accord with my own feelings on the subject, that I do not think it necessary to make any comments on that part of his letter. But I must say, that considering the light in which he views that practice, a greater insult cannot possibly be conceived. If he chose to insult ourselves, he might have spared our dearest female connexions: if not from the natural gallantry of a gentleman, at least from the feeling that a similar attack might be made on his own friends. But, I feel confident there is too much gentlemanly feeling among general practitioners, to allow them thus to violate the laws of civilized society. Such attacks are produced only by the conjoined influence of the pure feelings of a pure surgeon, and the sense of public duty of Sir A. Carlisle.

I cannot, however, but hope, that Sir A. Carlisle's abuse of accoucheurs arises from his ignorance of the subject on which he has presumed to write. When he sees how dangerous the innovation he proposes would prove, I trust he will be willing to acknowledge his error, and apologize to the practitioners of midwifery, in as public a manner as he has insulted them. This, I think, is the least he can do. Let him reperuse his letters, and I am confident he will be convinced with what truth it may be said, that

"they are richer in phrases than in arguments, and as to facts, they contain exactly none."

Excuse the length at which I have trespassed upon you, and allow me to subscribe myself one of that body, which I shall never be ashamed of belonging to, until by its vices or ignorance it renders itself contemptible.

I am yours, &c.

A GENERAL PRACTITIONER.

## MAN-MIDWIFERY.

To the Right Hon. STURGES BOURNE, his Majesty's Secretary of State for the Home Department.

SIR,—Just before your predecessor, Mr. Peel, retired from office, he was employed in a correspondence with the Colleges of Physicians and Surgeons, and the Company of Apothecaries, concerning the propriety of putting the practice of Midwifery under the same legislative securities as the other branches of medicine, and I venture to approach you on the same subject, in the hope that you will perfect the good work Mr. Peel had begun.

As mankind, from the highest to the lowest, are the worst possible judges of medical skill, and are easily deceived by the most ignorant pretenders, the governments of civilised countries have formed corporate bodies to watch over the state of the medical profession, and to see that its members are properly educated before they are permitted to take care of the public health. In England, this duty devolves upon the Colleges of Physicians and Surgeons, and the Company of Apothecaries, and these are supposed to take care that no man shall practise medicine, surgery, or pharmacy, without being properly educated, and possessing a competent knowledge of these subjects. But there is a branch of surgery and a branch of medicine which are left without any security. The former is the art of attending women in natural and difficult labours; the latter is the art of relieving the diseases of pregnant and lying-in women, to which I may add, the diseases of new-born infants. Neither the Colleges of Physicians and Surgeons, nor the Company of Apothecaries, require their members to study these subjects. The College of Surgeons excludes from its Examiners those members who practise midwifery, and thereby renders itself incompetent to examine in this branch of surgery. The College of Physicians forbids its fellows from practising midwifery, and thereby renders itself incompetent to examine in this branch of medicine; unless men are capable of scrutinizing the knowledge of others on a subject which they do not choose to understand themselves. Thus the whole female and infantile population of England, in the most critical of all situations, the only one which involves two lives at once, is confided to men whose competency to the task is left entirely to chance.

To remedy this defect in medical legislation, a society has been formed by the most eminent practitioners of midwifery in London, who have applied to the Colleges of Physicians and Surgeons, and to the Com-

pany of Apothecaries, requesting them to place this branch of the profession under the same securities as the other branches of medicine and surgery.

The College of Surgeons, and the Company of Apothecaries, candidly acknowledged the existence of the evil, and expressed a wish to remedy it; and, within the last month, the former has gone so far as to require every one who presents himself for examination to produce certificates of having studied midwifery. The answer of the College of Physicians displayed more casuistry than candour. They stated that attendance on women in labour belonged to surgery, and, consequently, did not belong to them; that the diseases of pregnant and lying-in women were only a branch of medicine, and that medicine was the subject on which they examined their members. Now if the College of Surgeons had replied that attendance on women in labour was only a branch of surgery, and that surgery was the subject on which they examined their members, the sophism of the answer would have been too glaring to be overlooked; and yet this answer of the College of Physicians is equally, though perhaps not so obviously, sophistical. A knowledge of the diseases of pregnant and lying-in women, it is true, is a branch of medicine; but the question is, is it a branch which the fellows of the College of Physicians study, practise, and understand? The candid answer is no. For the same by-law which forbids them to practise the surgical, excludes them from experience in the medical part of midwifery. As the application to the corporate bodies did not terminate satisfactorily, the Society for regulating the Practice of Midwifery applied to Mr. Peel.

At this period Sir Anthony Carlisle published a letter in *The Times* newspaper, in which he endeavoured to counteract the influence of the Society on the mind of Mr. Peel. On such an occasion, an adviser ought, at least, to possess a competent knowledge of the subject; but Sir Anthony knows literally nothing about it; he has never practised midwifery—is totally ignorant of what is going on in the lying-in hospitals and charities of this great town; has no means of ascertaining the frequency of the difficulties of labour, and the diseases of pregnancy and child-bed; the comparative skill of the male and female practitioners of midwifery, and, consequently, the comparative security of those who are attended by females and those who are under the care of physicians and surgeons. On all these subjects he knows no more than about the philosopher's stone, and, consequently, is deficient in the most essential requisites for a competent adviser.

The statements of Sir Anthony are what

might have been expected, from such a source—strange assertions, without the smallest proof. That for men to practise midwifery is unnecessary, degrading, indecent, and dangerous—unnecessary, because it requires no skill—degrading, because it is submission to what nurses are equal to—indecent, because it raises impure thoughts, and leads to impure intercourse—and dangerous, because it converts a safe natural process into a dangerous surgical operation. It is so clear that it is neither the one nor the other, that it is provoking to be called upon to prove it. But as these statements may be injurious to the profession and the public, it is necessary for some one to put them down. I must follow Sir Anthony into detail, in order to show how little reliance can be placed even on his facts. He asserts that Queen Charlotte was attended in all her labours by “good Mrs. Draper,” “without difficulty or misadventure.” “The Princess Charlotte was attended by a male practitioner, with a very different result.” The truth—the logic—and the feeling of this statement, are equally remarkable. Queen Charlotte was not attended by good Mrs. Draper in all her labours, but only in one. Even if she had, it would prove nothing but that most women do well even under bad attendance. And the insinuation that the Princess Charlotte died because she was attended by a man, is quite brutal. Poor Croft is removed beyond the reach of calumny; but there are surviving relations both of the patient and her surgeon, who do not require this fresh bitterness to be mingled in the cup of which they have already drunk.

The foundation of all his advice is the assertion, that not one woman out of a thousand requires more assistance than what female attendants are able to afford. So far is this from being true, that the mortality in childbed is ten times greater—about one in a hundred; and as there are many difficulties which do not terminate fatally, the number which requires medical and surgical attendance must be several in a hundred. I have before me some tables, showing the proportion between the number of deaths in a specified number of lying-in women. Of 18,642 women delivered, 211 died, that is, 1 in 93; of 269 women, 10 died, that is, 1 in 26; of 2,947 women, 14 died, that is, 1 in 210; of 2,982 women, 36 died, that is, 1 in 99; of 10,190 women, 107 died, that is, 1 in 95. These tables, Sir, you will find in Dr. Merriman’s work on *Difficult Parturition*, p. 309. The deaths, of course, form but a small proportion of the difficult labours, or the diseases during pregnancy or after delivery, which are all beyond a woman’s skill. What then becomes of Sir Anthony’s assertion, that “not one case in a thousand requires

more assistance than what an experienced mother can give?” But if the best plan was to confide in females in ordinary cases, and consult medical men only in cases of difficulty or illness, lying-in women would have been attended more prosperously formerly, when this plan was pursued, than now; and more prosperously now among those classes who still adopt it than among those who do not. Is this the fact? Just the reverse. If you look into the Bills of Mortality about the year 1660, when the plan recommended by Sir Anthony was generally pursued, you will find that the deaths in child-bed were as 1 in 36. Since then the proportion has been steadily decreasing till it amounts only to 1 in 107. Thus, while the practice of midwifery has been passing out of the hands of women into those of medical men, the mortality in child-bed has been steadily diminishing. But even now, a large proportion of lying-in women are attended by females, and physicians and surgeons are consulted only occasionally. These are the patients in lying-in-hospitals and lying-in-charities, the poor in cities, and the peasantry in the country, while the middling and higher classes are attended by medical men. Thus you have an opportunity of comparing the former plan, so strongly recommended by Sir Anthony, with the latter, which he so bitterly reviles. Of course we ought to find that the rich die far more frequently in child-bed than the poor. Quite the reverse. Among the latter the mortality is about one in one hundred; among the former, it is so trifling, that I know many sensible, well-informed, attentive practitioners of midwifery, who had been in extensive practice many years before they lost one patient in child-bed.

But if lying-in women are safest under the care of female attendants, why are they not placed under such care by the best judges of what is wisest on these occasions? As Sir Anthony has been twice married, without having had any children, I cannot put to him the *argumentum ad hominem*. But why do not physicians and surgeons, when their wives or daughters are pregnant, confide them to female attendants? If they consider the task degrading to a man of education, I admire their assurance in requesting him to undertake it, and his folly in consenting to do so. Take away respect, confidence, and regard, and a medical attendance in a medical family is a profitless, painful, and ungracious task.

Sir Anthony ridicules the idea of making the birth of mankind a surgical operation. This is the only good thing he has said on the subject; but wit, like poetry, is not always “a true thing.” Parturition is commonly a natural process, which is best

performed when left to itself, but it is liable to be interrupted by unnecessary interference, and it is sometimes attended by dangers which require the utmost skill. It is, therefore, most securely conducted by one who knows when to do nothing, and when to interfere. It was a natural supposition which probably influenced our ancestors, that it might be safely left to females until surgical or medical assistance became necessary. Experience, however, proved otherwise—even the most natural labours are often so long as to exhaust the patience and excite the alarm of the chief sufferer. Now, the female attendants (and the fact is notorious) so far from preaching patience, and dissipating alarm, are among the very first to become themselves impatient, to imbibed the alarm, and either urge or employ a pernicious interference. Whenever danger arises, they have neither the skill nor coolness to face it. Sir Anthony will say, send for a surgeon or physician in such cases, but in no others. He knows too little of the subject to know the conclusive answer. The difficulties of labour and the diseases of child-bed are at least often unfit subjects for consultation; they are so sudden and impetuous that the patient is lost before the surgeon or physician arrives. It is a common saying among practitioners of midwifery, that the safety of the patient depends upon the person who is originally on the spot. A consultation is often a farce, or rather a tragedy. I have been called to not a few such consultations in my time, and my memory is full of scenes, the relation of which would move you, Sir; prolonged labours, where the patient was dying when I have been taken into the room; hæmorrhages in which I found the mother a corpse; and fevers, which were not discovered till it was too late to cure them.

The decisive reason for preferring an educated medical man, even for the conduct of ordinary labour, is, not that it requires artificial assistance, but because he is most capable of combating unreasonable alarm; and if real danger arises, he is on the spot, ready and competent to meet it. It was probably the gradual discovery of this that led to the practice of placing lying-in women, even in common cases, under the care of medical men, and which will perpetuate the practice in spite of Sir Anthony Carlisle.

I know of no other gauge by which to measure the respectability of any branch of our profession, than its capability of saving life and suffering, and exciting the powers of the understanding. Apply this test to midwifery, as it ought to be known and practised. A practitioner of this art is occupied, not only in attending natural and difficult labours, but in prescribing for the diseases peculiar to women in the unim-

pregnated state; likewise for the diseases of pregnancy and child-bed, and those of infancy and childhood. To render himself competent to those tasks, he requires not only a regular education, and a general knowledge of the various branches of medical science, but engrafted on this a minute, accurate, professorial knowledge of the peculiar branches of medicine and surgery which he practises. These are subjects which, in part, or in whole, have attracted the attention of some of the wisest medical philosophers that ever lived; and I know of none, in the whole compass of medicine or surgery, of such scientific interest or practical importance.

William Harvey, the discoverer of the circulation, lectured at the College of Physicians, not only in medicine, but in surgery. To him the healing art was "one and indivisible," and he considered no part degrading to practise. When I think of this man, the greatest genius that was ever dedicated to physiological investigations—dressed in the habit of the times of Charles and Cromwell, riding on horseback to see his patients, with a foot-cloth, and a footman running by his side to hold his horse (*Bodleian Papers*), "called in to the cure of young women in travail," and prescribing so successfully, "that a healthy and sprightly child was born into the world," administering surgical aid with his own hands, in abortions and the diseases of the uterus.—(*Exercit. de Generations.*) When I picture to myself this great man thus occupied, and then think of those who account it a degradation to practise the like, I cannot refrain from smiling. The daintiest physician, if consulted about the liver, condescends not only to learn the symptoms of the disease, but to touch the patient's hypochondre; but it is beneath him to interfere when the disease is in the uterus. A few inches make all the difference between dignity and degradation. A tumour of the liver is worthy the attention of a philosopher; a tumour of the uterus is below the notice of a man. To stop a hæmorrhage from an artery by a ligature, is a splendid operation; to stop a hæmorrhage of the uterus by delivery, is a degrading act.

As to the indelicacy of employing men in the practice of midwifery, the objection scarcely deserves a serious answer. As they must be employed in cases of difficulty or illness, on which occasions this evil cannot be avoided, the question obviously resolves itself into one of more or less frequency; but if medical men were employed only in dangerous cases, I doubt whether they would be competent to manage them. He who does not often witness a natural labour, has no notion of the resources of nature. He will have no criterion to judge how far the pro-

cess may be prolonged with safety, and will be continually mistaking a tedious for a dangerous labour, and interfere either too late or too early. That these are not merely plausible conjectures, I shall prove from a passage taken from the manuscript lectures of Dr. William Hunter, the most accomplished and celebrated physician of his time, and perhaps the greatest lecturer on medical subjects that England has produced, whose reputation is now as fresh and unfaded as when he died, and who practised most extensively this branch of the profession. He used to say, "we are greatly improved in midwifery; every body knows, who lives in this town, that fewer children are born dead, and what is the reason? It is only within these last twenty years that women have had men-midwives almost universally: formerly they were retained in the house, and called for only in difficult cases; thus it was with the Chamberlains, my master and others, and what was the consequence? Why all cases were difficult. They were so bad before they were called in, that every body was frightened. They could not know what nature could do, and therefore had immediate recourse to art; and whenever they had delivered a woman by operation, they thought they had done a great feat."

So far from practitioners of midwifery being more profligate than other men, I believe them less addicted to gallantry than physicians and surgeons. They set out in life with a stronger sense that an irreproachable character is necessary to their success, and this stamps an habitual influence on their feelings and conduct; but I contend that they have no peculiar temptations. On such occasions the mind can take no other direction than that of sympathy and science. I have attended in my time some of the fairest of my countrywomen, and on these occasions never thought of any thing but compassion for their sufferings, contrivance for their relief, anxiety for their welfare, and joy at their deliverance. That man must be oddly constituted who could feel and think in any other way.

There is one view of the subject in which the opinions of Sir Anthony are glaringly and indefensibly absurd. He thinks that physicians and surgeons ought to be consulted about pregnant and lying-in women in cases of disease or difficulty; yet he remonstrates with the medical corporate bodies for requiring their members to study the subject. Whether they are employed in ordinary cases, or only in extraordinary ones, is it not plain that they must require a proper education to fit them for it? Sir Anthony seems to think, that if a man is "an hospital surgeon, has an enlarged intellect, has studied the elementary parts of his pro-

fession, and has meditated much about the good and the evil of surgical interference," he is a competent adviser; but take him, the "beau-ideal" of such a character, into a lying-in chamber to a case of difficult labour, and if he did not speedily discover his incompetence, the very nurses and gossips would.

If I wanted to add force to my refutation of these misrepresentations, by damaging the authority of him by whom they are made, Sir Anthony has saved me the trouble, by his last letter on the subject. Displeased with the late regulation of the College of Surgeons, which requires that their Members shall in future produce a certificate of having studied midwifery, he appeals to the judges, coroners, and justices of the land—warns them that this sanction of the College will lead to the further prevalence of man-midwifery; where, as it is only calculated to compel men to study it before they practise it—surely a very reasonable demand—he proposes, that whenever it is thought necessary to employ surgical assistance in labour, the matter should be confided in hospital physicians, or surgeons of enlarged intellect. Just the individuals, of all others in the profession, who know nothing at all about the subject, and are the least competent to deliberate about its difficulties—so incompetent, that if there was any anxious case of midwifery in their own families, instead of relying upon their "own enlarged intellect," or on that of any of their order, they would instantly run to some eminent practitioner of midwifery for assistance. The surgeon apothecaries are more competent than "the hospital physicians and surgeons of enlarged intellect." Lastly, he advises, that whenever a woman dies in childbed under the care of a surgeon, the case shall be submitted to a Coroner's Inquest and a jury; his words are, "Whenever cases of violent death occur to mother or infant in the use of surgical instruments or surgical hands, a Coroner's Inquest should be holden." It is said that physicians and surgeons have their misdeeds to answer for, and it is an obvious question why the failures of midwifery should be held up before such a tribunal, while those of medicine and surgery are passed over silently. Suppose Sir Anthony's proposal put into practice generally, and whenever a patient died after active practice, whether medical, surgical, or obstetrical, the case submitted to the scientific and delicate criticism of coroners or jurymen. Of all professions medicine is the most anxious. The thought, that whatever may be a man's judgment, knowledge, and attention, he must sometimes err, and that this error may involve the loss of a life, keeps many an anxious and conscientious mind restless by

day and sleepless by night. Whenever a patient dies under his care, he is prone enough to look back on the treatment of the case—to consider if enough had been done, or too much; whether, in short, the result would have been the same if the treatment had been different. As long as man is liable to err, and medicine rests on only probable evidence, no knowledge, ability, or assiduity, can guard against this. But these are painful subjects to discuss, and painful suspicions to entertain—even in the silent and solitary chamber of a man's own conscience, and they embitter a large portion of the life of every conscientious physician. But to have these questions discussed, and these suspicions raked up by a set of men who know nothing of the subject, and as little of the delicacy necessary for such investigations, would make the practice of our profession quite intolerable. I wonder Sir Anthony could pen such a proposal, without immediately afterwards blushing and erasing it.

Long as this letter is, I have had room only to point out the leading errors of Sir Anthony's statements; the rest I must leave to tumble by their own weight and weakness. Such are the insinuations, that the practitioners of midwifery are more influenced by pecuniary gain than other members of the medical profession; that they attend even the most natural labour, under the pretence that no woman can be delivered without their assistance; that they are guilty of more unnecessary and injurious activity of practice than practitioners of medicine or surgery; that the teachers of midwifery are not general hospital physicians and surgeons. (He might as well have complained that they are not military commanders.) If there had been room, I should not have shrunk from the easy task of demolishing these absurdities. The knowledge of mankind on subjects at all out of their way can never be rated too lowly. It is surprising how many a falsehood in fact or in reasoning is read over, even by people of sense and education, without suspicion, till its absurdity is explained to them.

I am sanguine enough to think, that what I have written will convince you, Sir—the judges, coroners, and justices of the peace—the Colleges of Physicians and Surgeons, and the Company of Apothecaries, and the public at large, that a knowledge of labour and its difficulties, the diseases of pregnant and lying-in women, and the diseases of infants, form a branch of the profession which is important to the welfare of the community, honourable to those who practise it honourably, and which ought to be placed under the same securities for competent knowledge as the other branches of medicine and surgery. How to do this is a more

difficult question. There are but two ways: either for the medical corporate bodies already in existence to modify their regulations, so as to include midwifery in their examinations; or to form a separate corporate body expressly for that purpose.—The latter would be the simplest and most natural method, if the practitioners of midwifery were distinct from the rest of the profession; but this is not the case. If it is so at all, it is only with some half dozen or dozen men in London, who lecture exclusively on these subjects, are physicians or surgeons to lying-in hospitals, and, although not wholly, are more especially resorted to for attendance and advice in such cases. But the great mass, 99 out of the 100, of the practitioners of midwifery are either surgeons or apothecaries practising it as a branch of their profession. Surely, therefore, the best method would be to modify the regulations of the present corporate bodies, and adapt their examinations to what ought to be the qualifications of those whom they examine.

If I might advise the College of Physicians, for whom I entertain the sincerest respect, I would say, abrogate that law which forbids your fellows to practise midwifery, and permit those junior fellows, who may choose to practise it, to do so; and when they become too full of medical employment to continue it, let them continue to give their advice in its difficulties and dangers. By this means you will soon rear among yourselves a set of men capable of examining others in this branch of the profession; you will improve a department of medicine which requires to be cultivated by the best educated minds; and those who are engaged in it, instead of wasting their best years in obscurity and neglect, and pining and withering under the painful consciousness of failing in their profession, will become useful and eminent during the active years of their life.

You may be told, Sir, that provided a man is well educated as a physician or surgeon, his education as a practitioner of midwifery may be left to his own care. I will mention one fact, which will show how little this assertion is to be trusted. In some of the large medical schools of London, the students of anatomy and surgery amount to two or three hundred. Five-sixths of these become surgeon-apothecaries, and, consequently, practise midwifery, and yet the midwifery class seldom exceeds fifty; so little truth is there in the above assertion. The greater number of these begin practice without any knowledge of it, either practical or theoretical; even thus, however, they are better and safer than female practitioners, for they are more cool in danger, and more capable of being taught by expe-



rience. Time and practice, and errors which might have been prevented, gradually improve them; but some retain their ignorance of the subject through life; and all might have been better by a regular education.

As men are much influenced by the conduct of others, it may be useful to add, that in all the principal universities of the Continent, midwifery is considered an essential part of medical education; and that the University of Edinburgh was so convinced of the evils of neglecting it, that about two years ago they passed a law, requiring every student to acquire a competent knowledge of it before he could take the degree of doctor of medicine.

I have the honour to be, Sir,

Your obedient humble servant,

A MEMBER OF THE SOCIETY FOR REGULATING THE PRACTICE OF MIDWIFERY.