

the fact of the beneficial *indirect* influence of a defined and protected standard of education, in reacting down through the poorer schools, in stimulating and encouraging by setting a standard, is entirely overlooked. Is it purposely overlooked? It almost seems so, for it is such a well-known and self-evident fact that it is hard to see how intelligent people can overlook it. Is it not true that a definite standard of professional education improves the methods of the common schools? Has not the Plumbers' Act improved the training of plumbers? Are not veterinarians better prepared now than when they had none?

Already the definition of a minimum training for nurses in New York State has reacted beneficially upon the High Schools in the matter of the teaching of domestic science. Is not this result a good one for the community? Is it not a fact that the technical education of England is open to severe criticism from other countries just at present, and is it not true that her failure lies in not preparing her workers effectively for their work?

In comparison with this genuine and useful function which the State is competent to perform, is it not bat-blindness, is it not stupid, to fumble about the question of how to get an unfit woman off the Register? If Registration was in force, a nurse would still have to get her calls for cases from some private source. The State would not send her her cases. She would still join her hospital nursing association, or her co-operative association, or her club-house registry, just as she does now, and these centres will speak for her moral character, just as they do now. The independent nurse, who gets her cases directly from doctor or patient, must be intimately known by them. Under Registration, the State testifies *primarily* to the education; secondarily, it would reject women whose moral bill of health was not good, and it can reject them if it will. Can it be supposed that a State certificate will not be a powerful incentive and stimulus to nurses? Arguments have been made to show that all members of the medical profession are not sainted by their Registration Bills, but has anyone stopped to imagine what they might be like if there were no Medical Acts? In hearing the inquiries and reading your opposition on this subject it seems as if a deliberate attempt were being made in certain directions to raise a false scent—to rush people off on the wrong track. Then there are others who are evidently bewildered. But how can any woman fail to see that the present condition of nursing education is a drag and a set-back to the whole of woman's education in general?

And how can anyone acquainted with the first principles of social reform fail to understand that the disorganised condition of nursing work is economically bad, and that it cannot but have an

injurious effect upon the general status of the labour of self-supporting women?

This larger outlook—the relation of the nurse's economic condition to the work of self-supporting woman in general, and the relation of the nurse's education to the education of the self-supporting woman in general—is the outlook which needs to be taken. From this point the question needs to be studied, and it is surprising that this most vital and intimate relationship is so widely ignored.

L. L. DOCK.

Legal Matters.

IN THE DIVORCE COURT.

AN UNSAVOURY STORY.

The most unsavoury story of *Dyke v. Dyke* and *Woolley*, heard in the Divorce Court by Sir Francis Jeune, must be here referred to because, as the President put it, "the petitioner was under the necessity of engaging a nurse (on account of his varicose veins), and with whom he committed adultery." The counsel for the petitioner admitted that "unfortunately adultery did take place on two occasions," but after evidence had been tendered in support of the allegations of adultery with *Ada Rowles* from 1902 to the present time, he said that, having regard to the evidence which had just been tendered, he did not feel justified in further contesting the plea of the King's Proctor.

It will be noted that at present trained nurses have no means of dissociating themselves from women who, whether nurses or not—the very large majority are not—bring discredit on their calling, and the public have no protection against those women who enter their houses in the dual capacity of nurse and mistress.

AN UNTRUSTWORTHY WITNESS.

In the case of *Fisher v. Fisher*, heard on Saturday in the Divorce Court before Sir Francis Jeune, one of the witnesses was a trained maternity nurse, *Miss Eliza Clements*. She had previously made a statement to one of the representatives of the King's Proctor and signed it, but in giving evidence she did not bear this statement out, and Mr. Rawlinson, K.C., for the King's Proctor, then said that she had been seen talking to Mrs. Fisher in the corridor of the court since signing the statement.

"I don't believe a word you say one way or the other," said the President, sternly, to the witness. "You are a trained nurse, and I am sorry to have to say this to you; you may go."

FOUND GUILTY OF MANSLAUGHTER.

At York last week, *Dorothy Turnbull*, a single woman, thirty years of age, was indicted for the wilful murder of her newly-born male child, found guilty of manslaughter, and sentenced to twelve months' hard labour.

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)