

PROGRESS.

VOL. VII. NO. 351.

ST. JOHN, N. B., SATURDAY, JANUARY 19, 1895.

PRICE FIVE CENTS

THE BIG HOSPITAL ROW.

FURTHER DEVELOPMENTS OF AN INTERESTING CHARACTER.

The Young Women Objected to Doing Work Which, They Claimed, Should be Done by Male—But Dr. Reid Do Wrong in Catechizing the Nurse?

HALIFAX, Jan. 17.—The row in the Victoria general hospital between the nurses on the one side and the lady superintendent and Dr. Reid on the other has temporarily calmed down. It is a drawn battle with the advantage in favor of the nurses over Miss Elliott. The trouble, it will be remembered, originated in a rule introduced by Miss Elliott, under which the lady nurses were asked to do objectionable work—work which they contended should be done only by the male nurses of the hospital. One day it came the turn of a nurse to perform this operation which had been objected to. She refused to do it and was suspended. The house surgeon had been a party to the refusal and he, too, was suspended. An investigation was held by the government inspector, Dr. Page of Truro. As a result of it the house surgeon was reinstated, on his signing an agreement to abide by the rules of the hospital. Seventeen out of the twenty nurses employed in the hospital resolved to refuse to do the same operation as had the suspended nurse. This made the situation rather alarming. Dr. Page wrote to various hospitals on the continent asking whether there the objectionable duty was required. Some replied that it was and some that it was not, generally the latter. Then finally Dr. Page reported that he saw no reason why the nurse should not be reinstated on signing an agreement to obey the rules of the hospital, as the house surgeon had done.

But the hospital authorities, so it seems, were bent on the lady's destruction as a nurse, and she re-held her position but for a brief period. She was called up by Dr. Reid and put through a renewed catechizing—questions which it was known how she would answer. She answered; and forthwith was dismissed, notwithstanding her reinstatement of a few hours before. A technical advantage was taken of the nurse, and she was told to go. But this dismissal was of short duration, for the local government, in deference to both influence and argument, quickly reversed the hospital mandate and sent the nurse back to full duty.

Yet though this is victory for the nurses, the advantage is not all with them, for Miss Elliott has also made her mark. She insists that if the young women will not do all that is required of them in the male wards they shall keep clear of that part of the hospital altogether, and that new nurses, as they join the hospital, shall come with the understanding that, unlike those now on the staff, they shall obey every order to go anywhere or do anything demanded of them.

The old nurses remonstrate against this, and ask that their sphere of usefulness be not so definitely circumscribed. They don't want to go out of the hospital with only a partial certificate of competency. The government has yet to decide fully upon this point.

Why is it that there is almost constant trouble, of one kind or another, in the Victoria hospital? Peace is the exception and war in some quarter or other is the rule. Despite it all, the hospital is a well conducted institution. The secret probably is in the fact that it is supported by the government, whom many people think they will be able to bulldoze; and also that medically and surgically, it is "run" by physicians who are volunteer workers. The medical board receive no pay. There is a divided authority in the management of the institution.

The medical superintendent of the hospital, Dr. Reid, will soon have to meet Dr. McKay, one of the medical board, in an investigation before the government, which the latter has demanded. Dr. McKay charges the superintendent with having attempted to place Mrs. Chipman, of Middleton, a patient who came to the hospital, on the medical side rather than on the surgical, in order to deprive Dr. McKay of the opportunity of performing the operation which her case required. The doctor alleges that Dr. Reid in this doing knew he was acting wrongfully, and that his motive simply was while depriving Dr. McKay of a patient, to put one in the way of other members of the medical board who are greater favorites with Dr. Reid than Dr. McKay is. Dr. McKay believes himself well fortified with proofs in support of his charges, and he is pushing the government to order the investigation.

Was it a Money Vote?
HALIFAX, Jan. 17.—The city council on Tuesday night spent a session of two hours in a wrangle with Mayor Keele. Nothing was done that night but fight, and the time was clearly wasted. The issue was whether resolution of the council to ask the legislature to give it power, a year hence, to increase the city's assessment from \$110,000 to \$120,000, was a "money vote."

BETWEEN TWO STOOLS.

WILL HON. W. S. FIELDING GO TO THE GOVERNMENT?

The Vacant Probate Judgeship—Mr. Fielding's Personal Friend Not as Sure as Was Last Week—Hon. A. G. Jones Willing His Son Appointed.

HALIFAX, Jan. 17.—If ever a man regretted he had power, that man is Premier Fielding this week. Life for him the last few days must have been miserable on account of the vacant probate judgeship, and the necessity of filling the office. The fight for the place is extremely interesting if not exciting. As told in PROGRESS last week, Frank H. Bell thought he had a sure thing for the succession. He relied on his personal friendship with Hon. W. S. Fielding, and he smiled serenely at the very idea of a rival. Now he finds he has indeed a competitor, and one who is making him fight like grim death. And the opponent is not P. T. Congdon, whose claims on the liberal party were outlined last week, but he is none other than young H. T. Jones, who was mentioned as a third candidate. Congdon is out of the race by this time.

Nearly half a dozen liberal lawyers besides those named last week, asked for the position. Among them were W. B. Wallace and M. U. Lenoir. At this date the place as a compromise between Jones and Bell.

Jones' only recommendation is that he is the son of that old tried and trusted political war-horse Hon. A. G. Jones, and that recommendation should certainly go a very long way to secure the same man success. The liberal party, and Mr. Fielding personally, are under tremendous obligation to Mr. Jones. He has worked hard and never before asked ought but easy favors. Now he has set his foot down and said, "My son must get the probate judgeship." It is that dictum which makes the appointment a very serious matter for Premier Fielding, who was once Mr. Jones' protegee, in fact Mr. Jones gave him the start which placed him where he is.

The fact that on Monday twenty or more liberal lawyers of Halifax, headed by such men as W. B. Ross, E. Russell and Arthur Drysdale signed a memorial to Mr. Fielding protesting against H. T. Jones' proposed appointment, lends a very interesting feature to the fight. That was a pretty rough proceeding, and good party laymen, when they find out what was done, will sympathize with their old leader in a score of hard fought political battles.

Hon. Mr. Jones met Premier Fielding on the street early this week. Unfortunately the premier's companion just then was Frank H. Bell. The scene that followed was lively. Mr. Jones told Mr. Fielding in the plainest kind of language what he would think of him if he ventured to appoint the friend who had done practically nothing for the party, and pass over his son, ignoring the first request of any consequence he (Mr. Jones) had ever made. The premier seemed to lose control of his fluent tongue, and Mr. Jones took full advantage of the opportunity to express his mind. Bell came in for a good share of Mr. Jones' catechizing, and he was not at all prompt in his answers.

Thus the matter stands, Premier Fielding weighing the consequences of Hon. Mr. Jones' displeasure on the one hand, and the request of the liberal lawyers of the city and his regard for his personal friend, Mr. Bell, on the other.

Mr. Lenoir's "coherent and convincing" arguments on his own behalf will certainly avail him nothing; but it is said that if Premier Fielding does not appoint either Jones or Bell, he may, as a compromise, make Alderman W. B. Wallace the judge of probate. Or again, it is said he will promote John T. Ross from the position of taxing master, worth \$800 per year, to that of judge of probate, worth \$1,200, and give the taxing mastership to H. T. Jones.

"Uneasy lies the head that wears the crown." Mr. Fielding is finding just now that the possession of power is less desirable than utter weakness. He is bound to offend somebody. To night he is weighing the present and prospective wrath of a grand political fighter like Hon. A. G. Jones, who has spent his money and his time for the party, and the claims of Frank H. Bell backed by twenty liberal lawyers.

There's no doubt it's interesting. Megawhile cases are filing up for adjudication in the probate court.

An Express Agent's Fitting.
Superintendent Creighton of the Canadian express company has appointed another agent in Amherst. The former official of the company was Amos Purdy and he went away upon a sudden journey without telling his friends about it. He also neglected to tell his auditor and they perhaps mourn his absence more sincerely. One of them happens to hold a bill of sale upon his furniture, his horses, and turnout. Perhaps the people who have a right to feel more aggrieved than others over his

HEDROVE MR. BLAIR OUT.

THIS IS WHAT REV. MR. MULLIN CLAIMS TO HAVE DONE.

Nevertheless, the St. John Presbytery Deprived Him of His Pastorate—A Case Similar to that of Rev. Mr. Little—Mr. Mullin Found Guilty of Falsehood.

This week is not a happy one for two New Brunswick clergymen. It brings to them the sting that the disciplining rod of the church imparts. Rev. Mr. Mullin, of Stanley, York county, has been deprived of his pastorate by the St. John presbytery and Rev. Mr. Little, of Sussex, has been removed from his office in the church of England by the board of triers of the synod of this diocese.

In both these cases the suffering ones have the balm of sympathy and the hope of appeal. Rev. Mr. Mullin proposes to appeal to the courts of the country. Both cases have been long before the public and both are what may be termed celebrated cases and their whole history is told they may become still more celebrated.

There are many points in which there is a parallel in the matter of these two cases. Besides those mentioned another point consists in the fact that both disputes have been productive of much discussion and have hurt very much the interests of the churches where these divines labored. When such troubles arise the cause for which churches are built and ministers are trained does not prosper.

It is some six or seven years since Rev. Mr. Mullin and his flock at Stanley began to see things differently from one another. It was all because of a church picnic. His parishioners were willing to accept the services of some Fredericton ladies who offered to aid them. This was not agreeable to Rev. Mr. Mullin, who said that his wife and daughter were competent to look after things without assistance. But his workers had their way, the Fredericton ladies attended the picnic, and Rev. Mr. Mullin and his family didn't. They made \$274 at the picnic and told Mr. Mullin of the fact. "Oh, no, you didn't," he replied. "You made over \$300." They assured him that they didn't. "Well, that was what my boy Jim told me and he must know."

This started the breach between Rev. Mr. Mullin and some members of his communion and congregation. He did not appear to have as much tact as he might, and remarks such as the above was apt to make enemies. Some found fault with him on political grounds and said that he made himself too conspicuous in politics, that at a public meeting he would interrupt speakers, call upon them to prove their statements, tell them that they were wrong and make himself too prominent generally. Of course those who were opposed to him politically did not like this and some of those were on his side did not like it either.

The St. John presbytery have been trying for some years to get him to resign but he has refused to do so and though many have left his church and those who remain are indifferent, he has held on and put up with a diminutive salary. At length extreme measures were decided upon. A committee was appointed to make a presbyterial visit to Stanley. They did so and this week reported to the presbytery in session at St. John recommending the dismissal of the reverend gentleman from the field.

Rev. Mr. Mullin was present and made an eloquent defense. His bearing and gestures were dramatic and would do credit to an old Athenian senator. But his enunciation was not excellent, his tact in speech was not pronounced and his argument was weak. The recommendation therefore carried, though the ballot was close and was only decided by the casting vote of the moderator.

One of Rev. Mr. Mullin's lines of defense raised quite a laugh and is worth repeating. It was in regard to the charge respecting politics. He said that he had only spoke once at a political meeting and that was when the school question was up. "And it was of great benefit, too," he added, "and I drove Andrew G. Blair out of the county."

Another interesting point in his defense was his answer to the argument that so many had left his church. "Oh, well, I didn't want them," he replied. In many of these cases he told why he did not want them and had some accusation to make against them. For instance, he said that Dr. Moore, of Stanley, who used to be one of his pillars, was a Swedenborgian.

Rev. Mr. Mullin now proposes to bring the matter before the general assembly. He entered his protest then and the ground of his appeal is that there was not sufficient evidence to justify his being dismissed from that pastorate.

Rev. Mr. Little has had a much severer penalty imposed than had Mr. Mullin. He has been deprived from his office in the ministry. This comes rather in the nature of a surprise to those who had been following the case.

It was thought that his prosecution had

HE DROVE MR. BLAIR OUT.

THIS IS WHAT REV. MR. MULLIN CLAIMS TO HAVE DONE.

Nevertheless, the St. John Presbytery Deprived Him of His Pastorate—A Case Similar to that of Rev. Mr. Little—Mr. Mullin Found Guilty of Falsehood.

This week is not a happy one for two New Brunswick clergymen. It brings to them the sting that the disciplining rod of the church imparts. Rev. Mr. Mullin, of Stanley, York county, has been deprived of his pastorate by the St. John presbytery and Rev. Mr. Little, of Sussex, has been removed from his office in the church of England by the board of triers of the synod of this diocese.

In both these cases the suffering ones have the balm of sympathy and the hope of appeal. Rev. Mr. Mullin proposes to appeal to the courts of the country. Both cases have been long before the public and both are what may be termed celebrated cases and their whole history is told they may become still more celebrated.

There are many points in which there is a parallel in the matter of these two cases. Besides those mentioned another point consists in the fact that both disputes have been productive of much discussion and have hurt very much the interests of the churches where these divines labored. When such troubles arise the cause for which churches are built and ministers are trained does not prosper.

It is some six or seven years since Rev. Mr. Mullin and his flock at Stanley began to see things differently from one another. It was all because of a church picnic. His parishioners were willing to accept the services of some Fredericton ladies who offered to aid them. This was not agreeable to Rev. Mr. Mullin, who said that his wife and daughter were competent to look after things without assistance. But his workers had their way, the Fredericton ladies attended the picnic, and Rev. Mr. Mullin and his family didn't. They made \$274 at the picnic and told Mr. Mullin of the fact. "Oh, no, you didn't," he replied. "You made over \$300." They assured him that they didn't. "Well, that was what my boy Jim told me and he must know."

This started the breach between Rev. Mr. Mullin and some members of his communion and congregation. He did not appear to have as much tact as he might, and remarks such as the above was apt to make enemies. Some found fault with him on political grounds and said that he made himself too conspicuous in politics, that at a public meeting he would interrupt speakers, call upon them to prove their statements, tell them that they were wrong and make himself too prominent generally. Of course those who were opposed to him politically did not like this and some of those were on his side did not like it either.

The St. John presbytery have been trying for some years to get him to resign but he has refused to do so and though many have left his church and those who remain are indifferent, he has held on and put up with a diminutive salary. At length extreme measures were decided upon. A committee was appointed to make a presbyterial visit to Stanley. They did so and this week reported to the presbytery in session at St. John recommending the dismissal of the reverend gentleman from the field.

Rev. Mr. Mullin was present and made an eloquent defense. His bearing and gestures were dramatic and would do credit to an old Athenian senator. But his enunciation was not excellent, his tact in speech was not pronounced and his argument was weak. The recommendation therefore carried, though the ballot was close and was only decided by the casting vote of the moderator.

One of Rev. Mr. Mullin's lines of defense raised quite a laugh and is worth repeating. It was in regard to the charge respecting politics. He said that he had only spoke once at a political meeting and that was when the school question was up. "And it was of great benefit, too," he added, "and I drove Andrew G. Blair out of the county."

Another interesting point in his defense was his answer to the argument that so many had left his church. "Oh, well, I didn't want them," he replied. In many of these cases he told why he did not want them and had some accusation to make against them. For instance, he said that Dr. Moore, of Stanley, who used to be one of his pillars, was a Swedenborgian.

Rev. Mr. Mullin now proposes to bring the matter before the general assembly. He entered his protest then and the ground of his appeal is that there was not sufficient evidence to justify his being dismissed from that pastorate.

Rev. Mr. Little has had a much severer penalty imposed than had Mr. Mullin. He has been deprived from his office in the ministry. This comes rather in the nature of a surprise to those who had been following the case.

It was thought that his prosecution had

HE DROVE MR. BLAIR OUT.

THIS IS WHAT REV. MR. MULLIN CLAIMS TO HAVE DONE.

Nevertheless, the St. John Presbytery Deprived Him of His Pastorate—A Case Similar to that of Rev. Mr. Little—Mr. Mullin Found Guilty of Falsehood.

This week is not a happy one for two New Brunswick clergymen. It brings to them the sting that the disciplining rod of the church imparts. Rev. Mr. Mullin, of Stanley, York county, has been deprived of his pastorate by the St. John presbytery and Rev. Mr. Little, of Sussex, has been removed from his office in the church of England by the board of triers of the synod of this diocese.

In both these cases the suffering ones have the balm of sympathy and the hope of appeal. Rev. Mr. Mullin proposes to appeal to the courts of the country. Both cases have been long before the public and both are what may be termed celebrated cases and their whole history is told they may become still more celebrated.

There are many points in which there is a parallel in the matter of these two cases. Besides those mentioned another point consists in the fact that both disputes have been productive of much discussion and have hurt very much the interests of the churches where these divines labored. When such troubles arise the cause for which churches are built and ministers are trained does not prosper.

It is some six or seven years since Rev. Mr. Mullin and his flock at Stanley began to see things differently from one another. It was all because of a church picnic. His parishioners were willing to accept the services of some Fredericton ladies who offered to aid them. This was not agreeable to Rev. Mr. Mullin, who said that his wife and daughter were competent to look after things without assistance. But his workers had their way, the Fredericton ladies attended the picnic, and Rev. Mr. Mullin and his family didn't. They made \$274 at the picnic and told Mr. Mullin of the fact. "Oh, no, you didn't," he replied. "You made over \$300." They assured him that they didn't. "Well, that was what my boy Jim told me and he must know."

This started the breach between Rev. Mr. Mullin and some members of his communion and congregation. He did not appear to have as much tact as he might, and remarks such as the above was apt to make enemies. Some found fault with him on political grounds and said that he made himself too conspicuous in politics, that at a public meeting he would interrupt speakers, call upon them to prove their statements, tell them that they were wrong and make himself too prominent generally. Of course those who were opposed to him politically did not like this and some of those were on his side did not like it either.

The St. John presbytery have been trying for some years to get him to resign but he has refused to do so and though many have left his church and those who remain are indifferent, he has held on and put up with a diminutive salary. At length extreme measures were decided upon. A committee was appointed to make a presbyterial visit to Stanley. They did so and this week reported to the presbytery in session at St. John recommending the dismissal of the reverend gentleman from the field.

Rev. Mr. Mullin was present and made an eloquent defense. His bearing and gestures were dramatic and would do credit to an old Athenian senator. But his enunciation was not excellent, his tact in speech was not pronounced and his argument was weak. The recommendation therefore carried, though the ballot was close and was only decided by the casting vote of the moderator.

One of Rev. Mr. Mullin's lines of defense raised quite a laugh and is worth repeating. It was in regard to the charge respecting politics. He said that he had only spoke once at a political meeting and that was when the school question was up. "And it was of great benefit, too," he added, "and I drove Andrew G. Blair out of the county."

Another interesting point in his defense was his answer to the argument that so many had left his church. "Oh, well, I didn't want them," he replied. In many of these cases he told why he did not want them and had some accusation to make against them. For instance, he said that Dr. Moore, of Stanley, who used to be one of his pillars, was a Swedenborgian.

Rev. Mr. Mullin now proposes to bring the matter before the general assembly. He entered his protest then and the ground of his appeal is that there was not sufficient evidence to justify his being dismissed from that pastorate.

Rev. Mr. Little has had a much severer penalty imposed than had Mr. Mullin. He has been deprived from his office in the ministry. This comes rather in the nature of a surprise to those who had been following the case.

It was thought that his prosecution had

HE DROVE MR. BLAIR OUT.

THIS IS WHAT REV. MR. MULLIN CLAIMS TO HAVE DONE.

Nevertheless, the St. John Presbytery Deprived Him of His Pastorate—A Case Similar to that of Rev. Mr. Little—Mr. Mullin Found Guilty of Falsehood.

This week is not a happy one for two New Brunswick clergymen. It brings to them the sting that the disciplining rod of the church imparts. Rev. Mr. Mullin, of Stanley, York county, has been deprived of his pastorate by the St. John presbytery and Rev. Mr. Little, of Sussex, has been removed from his office in the church of England by the board of triers of the synod of this diocese.

In both these cases the suffering ones have the balm of sympathy and the hope of appeal. Rev. Mr. Mullin proposes to appeal to the courts of the country. Both cases have been long before the public and both are what may be termed celebrated cases and their whole history is told they may become still more celebrated.

There are many points in which there is a parallel in the matter of these two cases. Besides those mentioned another point consists in the fact that both disputes have been productive of much discussion and have hurt very much the interests of the churches where these divines labored. When such troubles arise the cause for which churches are built and ministers are trained does not prosper.

It is some six or seven years since Rev. Mr. Mullin and his flock at Stanley began to see things differently from one another. It was all because of a church picnic. His parishioners were willing to accept the services of some Fredericton ladies who offered to aid them. This was not agreeable to Rev. Mr. Mullin, who said that his wife and daughter were competent to look after things without assistance. But his workers had their way, the Fredericton ladies attended the picnic, and Rev. Mr. Mullin and his family didn't. They made \$274 at the picnic and told Mr. Mullin of the fact. "Oh, no, you didn't," he replied. "You made over \$300." They assured him that they didn't. "Well, that was what my boy Jim told me and he must know."

This started the breach between Rev. Mr. Mullin and some members of his communion and congregation. He did not appear to have as much tact as he might, and remarks such as the above was apt to make enemies. Some found fault with him on political grounds and said that he made himself too conspicuous in politics, that at a public meeting he would interrupt speakers, call upon them to prove their statements, tell them that they were wrong and make himself too prominent generally. Of course those who were opposed to him politically did not like this and some of those were on his side did not like it either.

The St. John presbytery have been trying for some years to get him to resign but he has refused to do so and though many have left his church and those who remain are indifferent, he has held on and put up with a diminutive salary. At length extreme measures were decided upon. A committee was appointed to make a presbyterial visit to Stanley. They did so and this week reported to the presbytery in session at St. John recommending the dismissal of the reverend gentleman from the field.

Rev. Mr. Mullin was present and made an eloquent defense. His bearing and gestures were dramatic and would do credit to an old Athenian senator. But his enunciation was not excellent, his tact in speech was not pronounced and his argument was weak. The recommendation therefore carried, though the ballot was close and was only decided by the casting vote of the moderator.

One of Rev. Mr. Mullin's lines of defense raised quite a laugh and is worth repeating. It was in regard to the charge respecting politics. He said that he had only spoke once at a political meeting and that was when the school question was up. "And it was of great benefit, too," he added, "and I drove Andrew G. Blair out of the county."

Another interesting point in his defense was his answer to the argument that so many had left his church. "Oh, well, I didn't want them," he replied. In many of these cases he told why he did not want them and had some accusation to make against them. For instance, he said that Dr. Moore, of Stanley, who used to be one of his pillars, was a Swedenborgian.

Rev. Mr. Mullin now proposes to bring the matter before the general assembly. He entered his protest then and the ground of his appeal is that there was not sufficient evidence to justify his being dismissed from that pastorate.

Rev. Mr. Little has had a much severer penalty imposed than had Mr. Mullin. He has been deprived from his office in the ministry. This comes rather in the nature of a surprise to those who had been following the case.

It was thought that his prosecution had