

WE are glad to observe that Mrs. Rollaston, a member of the Aston Board of Guardians, appears to be a lady of spirit, and she has our entire sympathy (after our personal experience on the executive of the Royal British Nurses' Association) at the attack of a howling mob of men made upon her for daring to exercise her right of speech in her position as a Guardian of the Poor. As we reported last week Mrs. Rollaston expressed the opinion that the nurse of the workhouse should be asked to resign, as she had not obtained the post in a truthful manner, so at their last meeting the nurses' friends on the Board censured Mrs. Rollaston and tried to howl her down when she exercised her right of reply. Well do we know the scene!

BUT Mrs. Rollaston stuck to her guns, and said, with regard to the vote of censure on herself for writing to the Local Government Board, she questioned very much the right of any committee to arrogate to itself the right to censure any member of the Board for exercising individual right when it pertained to the question of morality and truth. They had deceived the Local Government Board in regard to the appointment of Nurse Carson, and the Guardians had no right to condone the offence.

IF the Board condoned the offence they practised on the Local Government Board the same false pretences as the nurse had practised on them. If they retained her services, could they have confidence in her? ("Yes.") Several Members rose to a point of order, and Mr. Taylor strongly protested against Mrs. Rollason being allowed to proceed, and was greeted with a storm of applause. Mrs. Rollason essayed to speak amid the general confusion, Mr. Cooke calling out that the lady guardian had been trying to intimidate the nurse. Mrs. Rollason asked if the discipline of the institution could be maintained if they employed such persons. The officers of the Board had a moral claim to be placed besides persons of like character with themselves. The Chairman (angrily): I cannot allow this to go on. This woman is of good character. (Loud applause.) Mrs. Rollason said she had been upbraided with not showing that Christian sympathy she ought to show to one of her sex. (Hear, hear.) Members might say "Hear, hear," if they liked, but she was proud to stand there and tell them she did not believe in Christian sympathy if it did not walk hand-in-hand with morality. (Loud cries of "Shame" and "Withdraw.")

MRS. ROLLASON did not withdraw, and we commend her courage and example to other women guardians—many of whom are well acquainted with the scandalous intimidation attempted by their male colleagues—when questions of morality and nursing discipline are under discussion.

AN interesting contribution to the *Trained Nurse*, is one upon "Restraint and Seclusion," by Miss Maud S. Shatford, of the Danvers Hospital, Danvers, Mass. In this hospital for the insane restraint by mechanical means is unknown, and comparatively little sedative medicine is used, and it is claimed that this treatment is justified by results. Patients quickly respond to kind treatment, enjoy occupation, and appreciate pretty clothes, with which even those who have the habit of destructiveness are usually so pleased that they have little inclination to tear them. Miss Shatford is of opinion that in most cases it is the fault of the nurse when a patient resists and refuses to do what is necessary. This is a happy doctrine for the insane, and as it certainly holds good with other invalids and with delirious patients, as it does also with naughty children, we think there is much to be said in its favour. All nurses who love their craft will rejoice to hear that in one institution, at least, it is considered bad nursing to restrain insane patients, and that the practice is held to "result in the diminution of the usefulness of the nurse, and the deterioration of the moral character of the hospital. Let a nurse be in the habit of restraining a patient as soon as she becomes troublesome, and the nurse herself becomes indifferent, self-indulgent, and quite unfitted for her duties.

MR. MICHAEL DAVITT, M.P., in his interesting book, "Life and Progress in Australia," gives graphic descriptions of life in the communistic labour settlements along the river Murray, and we catch the following glimpse of the genus midwife. Mr. Davitt says:—

"I had the good fortune to meet one of the most noted villagers on the Murray while at Kingston. This was 'the communist midwife,' as she was called by her fellow-settlers. Her status as a settler was established from the first. The disqualification of sex which debarred all the other women from ranking as such, and from exercising the right of voting, was waived in her regard. She hailed from 'Cork's own town and God's own people.' She never had such a busy time before. Murray life was the best thing she had yet enjoyed. The land was so fruitful, and children increased so rapidly. The men had improved in every way by the change from the towns. Their treatment of ladies was more courteous. They willingly drove her at any time of the night to any camp where duty called her. Yes, she was a firm believer in Communism. There was little of it in her native city by the Lee, it is true. But Cork had many things to learn yet, though no other city could turn out better doctors or more efficient midwives. She was a firm believer in the success of the settlements, and hoped that Communist principles would always guide their destinies."

IT will interest our readers to learn that Hanna Kindbom is the name of the lady who, as

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)