

MEETING WITH DAVID GAYGILL; 28 NOVEMBER, 1987
(40 minutes)

- * Stated our concern about lack of midwives being educated next year at Christchurch Polytechnic. (4 for South Island)
- * Outlined our reasons why this course doesn't attract the numbers.
- * Outlined present education requirements to produce a midwife.
- * Effects on maternal and child health, and ongoing midi education.
- * Discussed merits of separate course and D.E. course.
- * Discussed Nurses' Act, 1971, Amendment 1983 and its restrictiveness for midwives.
- * Stated dual option was not a desirable state of affairs - he nodded.

HIS VIEWS:

- * Hasn't thought about midi much.
- * Has had informal meetings with Margaret Shields
" Cullen
" Phil Goff
- * Seems uninvolved personally with midi - very little information.
- * Was on Polytechnic Council for 8 years - feels that nursing in Polytechnic was not the best option but that's what we're left with and the structure we have to work in.
- * Seems supportive of separate midi course.
- * Sees a separate association of midwives as being relevant - he would be forced then to address that body on midwifery matters rather than N.Z.N.A. Questioned why we hadn't done it before if the problem was as bad as we say (lack of midwives, etc.)
- * Didn't exclude D.E. but saw it as a long term future objective. Would certainly look at any proposal set up if e.g: College of Midwives with their own course - as long as not state funded. Wasn't really interested in talking further about the D.E. option - could see arguments for it. D.O.H. itself he said, was strongly against it.
- * Said to put energies into a lobby to change Nurses Act 1971 and 1983 amendment. Got excited about the prospect of reducing the doctor 'gatekeeper' role to maternity services.
- * If Nurses Act was changed it would highlight inadequacies of present education and force the issue. Today's midwives would be able to provide these services and he would have to look at immediate action on providing adequate education for the future midwives needed to meet the demand.

MEETING WITH GEOFFREY PALMER: 23 JANUARY, 1988

Discussed role of Cabinet Social Equity Committee.

- * Admitted to knowing nothing about health but wanted to know.
- * I said I had come to see him in his role of Chairman of the S.E. Committee

Did he know that midwives could help improve women's (especially Maori and Pacific Islanders) access to the Maternal Health Services.

We are an underutilized group - we have a long and detailed training and often it is wasted - he was aware of how midwives were trained which was heartening and agreed wholeheartedly that midwives and nurses are underused and over-doctored.

As deregulation progressed he hoped to change this state of affairs.

He "believed there was a law which inhibited midwives from being independent". We discussed the law - he seems very receptive to changing it. He said we would have a real antagonist in the Health Department. They would be against allowing nurses and midwives further autonomy.

We discussed O & G's and their monopoly on childbirth; the "terrible business in National Womens". He and Caygill he said were very interested in any information that would change this monopoly.

I pointed out how rapidly O & G's had taken over and how over supplied we were in O & G's, even according to the NZMA's own calculations. He was amazed at these figures and very interested to use them.

He said of course we'll always need them for safety, etc.

I told him of Rosenblatts study and the DOH's resistance to it - very interested - never heard of it and definitely wants a copy (which I will send).

He said any information at all we had on health services he would like.

- * When I suggested another way to change attitudes, encourage a different group of women into midwifery (especially Maori and Pacific Island Women) was to re-introduce Direct Entry he had no comment to make at all. Don't really know whether he just wasn't interested or was against it. He wrote everything I said down though.

He said he'd never had a midwife in to see him before and was delighted to have talked. I assured him it would not be the last time - we are now fighting for our survival. He said "Yes, there wasn't many of us left was there?" Promising!

I left him with a summary of the issues I had planned to discuss with him and asked him to research who instigated the changes to the Nurses Act and Obstetric regulations.

Karen Gilliland