

MESSAGE FROM HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN TO
THE NATIONAL BABY WEEK COUNCIL.

Buckingham Palace.

I gladly congratulate the National Baby Week Council, of which I am Patron, on the occasion of its fourteenth anniversary, and on the splendid educational and propaganda work which it continues to carry out on behalf of the Mothers and Children of the Country.

MARY R.

BOOKS SUGGESTED FOR THE READING OF THE
NURSE UPON THE NURSING OF NERVOUS AND
MENTAL DISEASES.

- Psychology of Insanity. Bernard Hart, M.D. University of London Press.
Nervous Diseases for Nurses (Organic) Dr. Sands. W. Saunders Co.
Psychology for Nurses. Mary Chadwick, S.R.N., F.B.C.N. Wm. Heinemann, Medical Books.
Nursing Nervous Diseases (Functional). Mary Chadwick, S.R.N., F.B.C.N. George Allen & Unwin.

STRICTLY GERM-PROOF.

The Antiseptic Baby and the Prophylactic Pup
Were playing in the garden when the Bunny gambolled up ;
They looked upon the Creature with a loathing undisguised ;
It wasn't Disinfected and it wasn't Sterilised.
They said it was a Microbe and a Hotbed of Disease ;
They steamed it in a vapour of a thousand-odd degrees ;
They froze it in a freezer that was cold as Banished Hope
And washed it in permanganate with carbolated soap.
In sulphuretted hydrogen they steeped its wiggly ears ;
They trimmed its frisky whiskers with a pair of hard-boiled
shears ;
They donned their rubber mittens and they took it by the
hand
And 'lected it a member of the Fumigated Band.
There's not a Micrococcus in the garden where they play ;
They bathe in pure iodoform a dozen times a day ;
And each imbibes his rations from a Hygienic Cup—
The Bunny and the Baby and the Prophylactic Pup.

—Harper's.

COMING EVENTS.

July 9th.—The Queen opens the new Bethlem Hospital at Monks Orchard, Eden Park, Beckenham. 3.15 p.m.

July 9th.—The British College of Nurses. Annual Dinner, Monico Restaurant. 7.45 for 8 p.m.

July 9th.—"At Home" given by the Matron-in-Chief and Members of Princess Mary's Royal Air Force Nursing Service, at which Her Royal Highness Princess Mary, Countess of Harewood, G.B.E., has graciously consented to be present. Grosvenor House, Park Lane, W. 3.30 to 6.30 p.m.

July 10th.—The British College of Nurses. Annual General Meeting, 39, Portland Place, W. 3 p.m., followed by Reception and Tea.

July 11th.—Bedford College, Regent's Park. Presentation of Certificates by Miss Margaret Bondfield, M.P., Minister of Labour, to successful students in International Course in Public Health for Nurses, and International Course for Nurse Administrators and Teachers in Schools of Nursing. 3.30 p.m.

July 14th.—National Council of Nurses of Great Britain, Advisory Committee on International Affairs. (Board Room of Registered Nurses' Association), 39, Portland Place, W.1. 4.30 p.m.

July 19th.—The British College of Nurses. Monthly Meeting of Council, 39, Portland Place. 2.15 p.m.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.

Whilst cordially inviting communications upon all subjects for these columns, we wish it to be distinctly understood that we do not in ANY WAY hold ourselves responsible for the opinions expressed by our correspondents.

A DOUBLE STANDARD OF MORALITY.

To the Editor of THE BRITISH JOURNAL OF NURSING.

DEAR MADAM,—I note that at the meeting of the Church Assembly at the Church House, Westminster, on June 20th, Mr. Athelstan Riley, vice-president of the English Church Union, moved the following resolution:—

"That the Archbishops and Bishops of England be asked to consider in all its bearings the present situation with regard to divorce, and to issue counsel to the laity as to their social relations with persons divorced by the State courts, and contracting fresh alliances as to the rights and duties of Holy Matrimony," and that with the omission of the words with reference to social relations, the resolution was carried with only two or three dissentients.

So far, so good.

But I think that many Anglo-Catholics must be profoundly amazed and shocked at some of the arguments used by Mr. Athelstan Riley in support of his resolution.

He stated that in 1913 only 577 marriages were dissolved by the courts. In 1915 came the facilities for poor persons (why should facilities be restricted to those who can afford to pay a high price?) then "in 1923 when the cry of equality between the sexes was at its height a short measure was passed putting husband and wife on an equal footing—a cruel and wicked Act."

"Cruel and wicked" to whom? To husbands, apparently who before that Act was passed could divorce their wives for unfaithfulness, while the wife of an unfaithful husband could only divorce him if she could prove cruelty in addition to adultery.

Be it remembered that the saintly Bishop King of Lincoln held that adultery constituted the one legitimate cause for divorce. But as if Mr. Athelstan Riley had not outraged the feelings of church people enough, he proceeded, "We are as God made us. There is and can be no equality in matters of sexual morality between men and women. It has pleased God to create a profound inequality. There is inequality of temptation, in the results of the sin of the individual, in the consequences to the family, and eventually to society at large."

If Mr. Riley wished to promulgate the obnoxious and abhorrent doctrine of a double standard of morality, let him leave the Almighty out of his argument, which appears to me impious. There may be inequality of temptation, but temptation can be overcome, there may be inequality in the results of the sin to the individual, but guilt is not measured by visible results, a most abominable and un-Christian argument, and as to the effect on the health of the family of an immoral husband and father who can estimate its danger.

None know better than nurses who are brought into close touch with this question of divorce in the course of their intimate professional duties, the unhappiness caused by unfaithfulness.

Undoubtedly the question of civil and religious marriages and their respective indissolubility needs investigating and a clear pronouncement made. A civil authority can, presumably, dissolve a marriage contracted in the civil courts, but can a civil authority dissolve a marriage where the marriage vow has been a religious one? Let the bishops say.

And I profoundly hope they will utterly condemn the dangerous doctrine of a double standard of morality.

Yours faithfully.

ANGLO-CATHOLIC NURSE.

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)