

standard than that of those prepared by the plaintiffs.

I consider that the evidence does show, again speaking generally, that members of the public, when they ask for "Tabloids," mean and expect to get the goods of the plaintiffs.

The defendants are manufacturing and retail chemists carrying on a large business. They have businesses at several different places, including two shops in Deansgate and Piccadilly, Manchester. They have sold, in response to orders for "Tabloids," goods not of the manufacture of the plaintiffs' firm. The defendants and all their assistants knew that "Tabloids" denoted the plaintiffs' goods. It has been proved that, on September 10th, 1902, the defendants supplied to Winifred Davies in fulfilment of a prescription "Tabloid Potassii Chloratis, B. W. and Co.," things which were not the plaintiffs'. On September 12th, 1902, Mr. Thomas Smith was supplied with "Cascara Sagrada" in similar shape and form to the plaintiffs' "Tabloids," in response to a request for "Cascara Sagrada Tabloids," which were described on a list shown to and read by the assistant as "Cascara Sagrada Tabloids, B. and W." On August 13th, 1902, Mr. W. H. Sykes, was served with goods not the plaintiffs', they having been represented to him as the plaintiffs' goods in reply to an express inquiry whether they were Burroughs and Wellcome's goods. I have specially mentioned these three cases because there was a passing-off where the goods were not denoted as "Tabloid" or "Tabloids" only, but in such a way as to make it absolutely certain that the plaintiffs' goods were referred to by the use of their name or initials. There were nine other cases where the goods required were referred to as "Tabloid" or "Tabloids." In all, twelve cases were proved, seven taking place at the Piccadilly shop and five at the Deansgate shop. Nine were accompanied by the production of writing showing what was wanted. The witnesses gave their evidence well, and I believe them.

Defendants' motion to remove plaintiffs' trade marks from the Register dismissed.

Certificate, Section 77 (a), granted to plaintiffs.

Injunction granted against defendants.

Defendants to pay damages and costs—also costs of the Comptroller of Trade Marks.

Hospital Sunday Fund.

At a meeting of this Fund, held at the Mansion House this week, it was decided that Hospital Sunday next year should be June 12th. It was announced that this year's collection reached the total sum of £64,975. Of course a large share of this excellent result is due to the magnificent generosity of Mr. Herring; but, considering the bad state of trade generally throughout the year, the collections must be regarded as most satisfactory.

Nursing Echoes.

* * * *All communications must be duly authenticated with name and address, not for publication, but as evidence of good faith, and should be addressed to the Editor, 20, Upper Wimpole Street, W.*



The *Queen* newspaper of the 12th inst. contains a most admirable and lucid article on "State Registration of Trained Nurses," making it quite plain how advantageous such a reform would be to nurses from an educational and industrial standpoint. It proves that, in spite of the progress made in trained nursing in the last few years, as "medical science seems to be running along the lines of success in every way, and surgery is galloping off at such a pace, it takes the nurses all their time to keep up with them at all."

The article supports the principles of self-government incorporated in the Draft Bill promoted by the Society for the State Registration of Nurses, and adds: "This is a subject which cannot be over-estimated by every member of the public."

We are requested by the Chairman of Charing Cross Hospital to make quite plain the fact that, under the regulations in force till a recent date at this hospital, the nurses received a three years' training, "being styled a probationer for one year, and nurse for two years. Private nursing has been discontinued for many years past." We are glad to hear it.

In the remarks in our issue of the 5th inst., to which apparently exception has been taken, we quoted the Regulation which was in force until June, 1903. The Regulation, as quoted, was as follows:—"The term of a probationer's training is a complete year. It may, however, be extended by the Lady Superintendent for another quarter, and each one will have to pass such examinations as to her qualifications as may from time to time be prescribed. At the expiration of one month from the date of entry, every probationer shall be required to engage herself to continue in the service for at least two years longer than the year of probation. . . . When the term of probation has expired, her engagement will require her to serve as nurse to the sick at the hospital or in private houses as the Lady Superintendent may appoint."

It will thus be seen that the primary cause for confusion and dissatisfaction rests with the hospital

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)