

Cambridge Daily News Monday 7th December 1891

THE SPINNING HOUSE SCANDAL

EFFORTS TO RELEASE DAISY HOPKINS

The following is a copy of the document under which Daisy Hopkins has been consigned to the Spinning House:

Copy of the Commitment

To the Keeper of the Spinning House or House of Correction of the University and Town of Cambridge

Whereas, Daisy Hopkin, has been apprehended by the Rev Frederic Wallis, one of the pro-proctors of the said University, within the limit and jurisdiction thereof, and hath this day brought before me and charged with walking with a member of the University, in a certain public street of the town and suburbs of Cambridge, and within the precincts of the said University, which charge, as well upon the information of the said pro-proctor I upon the examination of the said Fred Eric Wallis, and after hearing all the said Frederic Wallis had to allege in her defence, I do adjudge to be true. These are therefore to require and command you to receive into your custody the said Daisy Hopkin and her safely to keep in your said Spinning House for 14 days.

*Given under my hand and seal at Cambridge this 3rd day of December, in the year of our Lord, 1891,
John Piele, Master of Christ's College and Vice Chancellor of the University of Cambridge.*

It will be seen that there is a flaw in the document, the name of "Frederic Wallis" having been inserted in the place of "Daisy Hopkins." The document, as it stands, makes it appear that the pro-proctor, Mr Wallis, who was the direct instrument of the poor girl's arrest, made a statement in her defence, when as everyone knows, the very reverse was the case.

We are glad to be able to state that this morning Mr A J Lyon and Dr Cooper made a special journey to London to consult with Mr

Poland respecting the case.. We have received this after a telegram which states that Dr Cooper and Mr Poland will make an application in the High Court for a writ of habeas corpus, on the ground that the whole of the trial was irregular, and in further, there was nothing in the evidence to justify the conviction.

It is stated that at the Town Council meeting next Thursday the action of Mr Innes, the Chief Superintendent of the Borough Police, in regard to the case, will be challenged, and an explanation asked for.

Meanwhile it would be most interesting to most of the electors of the town to know what action, if any, Mr Penrose Fitzgerald, the representative of the town, is taking in this matter. This is a case in which his co-operation would be peculiarly desirable, and we hope he will not allow his connection with the University to overshadow his duty to the town.

THE SPINNING HOUSE SCANDAL - SHALL THIS INIQUITY CONTINUE?

[By an Occasional Correspondent]

A farce with a touch of drama, is a true description of the event proceedings in connection with the spinning House scandal. The Vice Chancellor, like his predecessor, Dr Butler, has gained a notoriety which will stick to him with the tenacity of a leech. The Star-Chamber which exists in this enlightened borough is a disgraceful, tyrannising institution. The Court having been "opened" to the public, enabled the farcical proceedings to be reported, and all who have read the case of Daisy Hopkin, the unjust charge brought against her, and the still more infamous sentence passed upon her, must feel that the sooner such proceedings was these are abolished, the better it will be for the town, the better for the University authorities, and the greater it will redound to the credit of all concerned. Some doubt existed previously as to the real manner in which the University Star-Chamber was conducted. Thanks to the force of public opinion, we have no longer reason to doubt, and the exposé which appeared in Thursday's issue of the Cambridge Daily news is sufficient to a proper sense of his or her duty. Now

that we know how the evidence is taken, and the autocratic position that the Vice-Chancellor adopts, we are fully able to see the absurdity of calling such a hearing a "trial" at all. Rather than go through such a farce again, in the name of common sense, let the statements of the "Bulldogs" go unchallenged; it would, at least, have the merit of preventing an honest advocate undertaking a fruitless task. All the persuasiveness of Mr Lyon (who did his best, and a good best, too) could not induce the Vice-Chancellor to put Daisy Hopkin upon her oath. Well may we ask, is this right or proper? From what charter, what law, what ruling did this dignified person obtain the knowledge which gave him the power to decline, and even to prohibit her from being sworn? His

[the next section is illegible in the BNA scan]