

unto, themselves. If they are not capable of this they are not capable of holding the positions. Committees will very likely say "We cannot afford to pay such women." The reply should be "Then have no school." How far should the Superintendent of the school be allowed to decide with regard to accepting or rejecting applicants? Entirely. When she is in doubt, let her consult her committee: let her have the discipline in her own hands: let her feel that she has the support of her committee; always let her be very sure of her ground, then firmly maintain it. If this course is adopted with wisdom, in nine cases out of ten she will very soon find herself master of her position, and her committee will be more than glad to have advice on all matters pertaining to the school. There is still another class of hospitals not yet named which we wish to mention. The hospital which has either a doctor or a trained nurse as superintendent. In such hospitals we find the superintendent of the hospital the head of the training school; and the feeling is quite prevalent that in such hospitals the superintendent of the training school has very limited authority, and I think the feeling has ground upon which to stand. Still, I have held positions in hospitals governed in both the above-named ways, and I have never felt myself limited in authority, often have I had more responsibilities thrown upon me than I would have chosen. In such hospitals the office of superintendent of the training school must of necessity, it is felt, be inferior to that of the superintendent of the hospital. There must be but one head, this is what we are constantly told. But the superintendent of the hospital and the superintendent of the school are both there and must work together; one is not working for the other, and the superintendent of the hospital should realise that to properly manage a training school and turn out well trained nurses, quite as much brains is required as is called for in properly managing a hospital, and the inferior officer is, in a way, more valuable to the superior than is the superior to the inferior. The smooth running of a hospital depends fully as much upon the ability and trustworthiness of the superintendent of the school as upon the superintendent of the hospital, and that the best results may be attained, the feeling of superiority and inferiority should never be allowed to enter the thoughts of either. They work together, and both are working for the best interest of the hospital with which they are connected; disagree on many points they will, if each has a mind of his and her own; quarrel they never should; each should consider the right of the other, and the superintendent of the training school should be as well cared for and free from limitations as the superintendent of the hospital.

Legal Matters.

ASYLUM ATTENDANT FINED FOR CRUELTY.

ON Saturday last, Maud Desenne, of 19 Ashburnham Road, King's Road, Chelsea, an attendant in the London County Council Lunatic Asylum at Cane Hill, was charged, before the Croydon county magistrates, with assaulting and illtreating Alice M'Culloch, a patient.

Miss Alice Withall, head attendant on the female side of the Asylum, gave evidence that on June 24th she was in the dormitory, when she heard a smashing of glass in the day room. She saw the defendant drag the patient out of the lavatory by the neck of her dress, and smack both sides of her face. She also caused the patient to go down into a sitting posture with great force, and thrust her right knee into her back, still holding the neck of her dress. She then punched her on the back of the neck with her clenched fist. Witness remonstrated with the defendant, and reported the matter to the Matron.

Dr. James Moody, Medical Superintendent of the Asylum gave evidence as to suspending the defendant, who was no longer in the Asylum, having been required to leave at once. Striking was not allowed under any circumstances. It was a gross breach of all Asylum treatment ever to beat a patient. The Bench were unanimous in convicting the defendant. The Chairman, in imposing a fine of £2, and 13s. 6d. costs, said that the prosecution was a most proper one as these poor unfortunate lunatics must be safeguarded. We cannot agree with a contemporary, which heads an account of the conviction, "Severe Punishment for an Asylum Nurse." On the contrary, we consider the punishment an exceedingly lenient one for the offence. We notice with satisfaction that the solicitor for the defence stated that "owing to the endorsement on the certificate given her, the defendant was practically shut out from any employment of a similar kind in future." We hope so.

We record next the case of the conviction of a patient, for assaulting a nurse, who did not get off with a fine.

ASSAULTING A WORKHOUSE NURSE.

ELIZABETH OWEN, an inmate of the Coventry Workhouse, was charged before Messrs. F. W. Franklin and R. Hill, with assaulting Nurse Rosina Turner. Evidence was given that when the woman was told by the nurse to make her bed, she said she would not take orders from an "undersized thing" like her. She also told the nurse she would not mind hanging for her, and threatened to split her head open with a medicine bottle, which she picked up. In the course of a struggle, which

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)