

one, can hardly feel satisfied with what I felt pretty sure would be the verdict, when at the meeting, for I went, having heard there would be (2) The good commonsense of the public will perceive, I am sure, that Col. Elliott can have no other possible motive for doing what he has done than the good of the poor sufferers, for he is a retired British officer on his pension, who uses the most of his time in endeavoring to do good amongst the poor, sick and suffering ones, and now, as I understand from him, he has been threatened to be kept from visiting the Home. I am writing in the interests of the Home, and the sufferers in it, and Col. Elliott has no knowledge even of my intention to write a word about it or him, let alone this letter. I can only say that some of the evidence that has been shown me occasionally was most touching and pitiable, to say the least.

May I not ask you, Mr. Editor, as one who, like myself, loves fair play on both sides, to let the public know this much.

Yours, etc.,

W. BHOOKMAN

And I now quote the letter I got from an old gentleman whom I call Mr. "One Who Knows"

Toronto, March 10, '06.

"Dear Sir—"I sat in the Mail and Empire" of yesterday that you had been ejected from the H. for I, last Saturday, by a police officer, for daring to expose the gross mismanagement of the Board of Directors of that Institution."

"I am sorry that you consented to leave the Home at the instigation of the policeman, whose authority was false at best. Had you been allowed to go out by force, you would have had a strong case against him—as well as against those who backed him up in the matter."

"I did not consent—the policeman DID put me out by FORCE."—J. E.

"The Bogus Invest. that took place some days ago, was simply a farce, and upon a fair and impartial Invest. will prove more in favor of your charges than otherwise."

"Should you counsel a good, honest lawyer, you can eventually prove charges and conditions of all sorts, attempts at hiding the inhuman treatment of the suffering inmates of the Home."

"God is just and He is on your side." The policeman got his instruction from Dr. P., which were that "If I would not leave the Home at the request of the official staff, the policeman was to forcibly eject me. This he did by pushing me out of the Board Room, through the lower gallery, two outside doors and through the grounds into the street."

I now quote the concluding part of an article in the Mail and Empire of the 2nd of March.

Speaking to The Mail and Empire last night, Mayor Urquhart said:

"The investigation conducted by myself, Dr. Cea, and Dr. Shear at the H. for I, was very thorough, and I am glad to say that the charges made against the Institution were not substantiated in any particular."

On that day I drew the attention of Mr. Jennings, ONE OF THE EDITORS, TO THIS PAPER, and he at once said THE INVESTIGATION WAS ALL BOSS!!!

THE REV. DR. PARSONS.

At the meeting of the 2nd of March this reverent gentleman LIFTED HIS HANDS AND EYES TO HEAVEN and "THANKED GOD FOR THE KIND, LOVING, GENTLE HEART OF THE MANAGEMENT," ETC., ETC. On the 13th of March he wrote that Jane Dunwoody had been an inmate of the Home for Incurables, in this city, for some years (several) past. She is not a fit person to be an inmate any longer, and there is no other place suitable to send her to except the jail here. This was very suggestive, and poor Jane "PLEADED GUILTY" OF HER MOST AWFUL CRIME OF DOING nothing at all. The sentence was 30 fine, or six months WITHOUT hard labor. I think this latter kind thought of the Magistrate was humane in the extreme, especially as it took three strong men to carry Jane to the prison way up two flights of stairs; certainly "WITH HARD LABOR" for those three innocent!!!

On the occasion of the annual meeting, 2nd March, at which I was present but, voiceless, as I had been told on good authority that I HAD NO RIGHT to speak, not being a member, Dr. P. came up to me (after the meeting), whilst I was in a Ward speaking to three male patients, and told me "I was not to visit the patients any more." I looked him full in the face, and reminded him that "he and I were" in the presence of God, who saw us speaking one to the other, and that "he was taking a great responsibility on himself in thus hindering one of God's children ministering to these poor sufferers," and more to this effect. The man could not face His God, and replied "It was the Board." Just like Adam—"It was the WOMAN." He then turned to me again and said, "Col. Elliott, there is something in your past, which will not bear the light." I folded my arms and looked at him again, and said; "Yes, Dr. P. I was in Lunatic Asylum for some time, through mental depression, brought on by a conscientious discharge of my duty." (a complaint which Dr. P. is not likely to suffer from) and you, Sir, have gone over this city and told people I am "a lunatic." He denied this—I said, "Yes! You told Mrs. — that I was demented and out of my mind (a snarl)." He replied that he did not say THAT EXACTLY, but that "he had heard I was in a Lunatic Asylum"—"At once a coward and a liar."

I may here remark that my companions in the same affliction as myself in Bethlehem Hospital, were Honorables, Generals, Colonels, Majors, Captains, Ministers of every denomination and Doctors of Divinity (like Dr. P.) and that they were not cowards and liars, and gentlemen of all classes of society.

As this person has dragged my private affairs before others, I would like to ask him two questions. I. Was his retiring salary from his late church supplemented at all? If so, WHY? and if so, by whom?

A TWO WILLS.

REV. DR. PARSONS—MR. MORTIMER CLARKE—THE LATE MISS J.

WILL, THE FIRST—The late Mrs. J. L. told W ** over and over again that she had remembered him in her WILL—this was said when she was perfectly well, strong, and able to speak with decision and clearness. She also repeatedly said that Dr. Parsons was well enough off already—"Why was this FIRST will destroyed?"

WILL, THE SECOND—After this lady's decease, a Will was read, and found to be "another Will," W ** was NOT "remembered" in the Will, as promised, but Dr. P. (strange to say) was very much remembered. This Will was dated 25 April, 1891, and stated: "I direct my Executors (Mr. Mortimer Clark and Mr. J. Gartschore), to pay the sum of £2,000 TO THE HOLDER OF ANY MORTGAGE, which may exist on the house of Rev. H. M. PARSONS, D. D., Toronto, Jarvis St., etc., etc. in testimony of my high appreciation of his ministrations as Pastor of Knox Church."

NOW what DO we see here? We see a Will destroyed and another made when the lady was weak and feeble, and quite in a different condition of mind as that of her former determination, that W. ** was to be "remembered" and Dr. P. "had sufficient salary already" and Miss M. C. HOULD THE MORTGAGE? Did he make the second Will? DID DR. P. owe HIM the £2,000?

It is wonderful. Why did Dr. P. leave the "Administration" who wanted him to leave? Is it true that he refused to leave unless upon certain conditions and DID he leave when Mr. C. supplemented his retiring salary?

That SECOND WILL is a marvelous production—"quite" as impartial (?) "disinterested" (?) and "self-sacrificing" (?) as the "Management" and the "Managers" of the H. for I. I would suggest a study of it in the Surrogate Office, City Hall. It is signed by "Jacqueline Leslie," in a very tremulous

way (80 cents fee, and quite worth THAT "sacrifice").

As Dr. P. has dragged me before the public at Lunatic Asylum, perhaps he will tell the public something about these TWO WILLS. If not Mr. M. C. can MR. A. KENT.

I have little more to say about this person. When I handed a note to Dr. P. on the 21st of March, I asked him to witness that act, and he read it by a loud laugh at me in the presence of several ladies and gentlemen—perhaps he did not know better!

MR. MORTIMER CLARK—THE FIRST AND ONLY DIRECTRESS.

THE FIRST DUTY DISTRESS. My natural disposition and my feelings as a Christian gentleman, who has always associated with ladies and gentlemen, in the real sense of these terms, lead me to regret the absolute necessity of speaking the truth with my usual candor and plainness of speech. Duty must sometimes be done, though our feelings be sad, especially when that duty has to do with 180 helpless sufferers.

To me the greatest puzzle in life has been, and now is, WHY SO MANY WOMEN are so hard treated, so callous, so cold, so indifferant? and especially so TO THEIR OWN SEX!

God made WOMAN to be a "HELP-MEET!" How sadly many have utterly failed in this; how many have broken the heart and blasted the "Home" and husband and children of the Almighty God of LOVE that there are some grand and noble exceptions to this. GOD BLESS ALL SUCH!

And now to my painful DUTY. Mrs. M. C. is held in great terror by all and everybody—the patients, the Matron, the Head Nurse, the Resident Doctor and all the servants; feared by all and loved by none. This lady controls the Executive Com., which committee controls the Board, (YE MEN deny it IF YOU CAN). This lady when she and three or four other ladies wish to pass anything that THEY want done, they pack the meeting with their majority-clique, consisting of herself, Miss M. M., Mrs. McM., and one or two others on the "Government" side.

Mrs. M. C. "is" lashed by the sufferings of the poor patients that, when she hears of these sufferings from those "outside the Home" pays a visit of condolence to the "Home" and tells them that "she hears so much OUTSIDE about the cruel doings 'INSIDE the Home' that she has visited them so as to justify her doings and tells them, 'You know, dear people, that I desire your happiness and comfort.' Reader! we hear of 'Angels unawares.' Are there some on that Ex. Com.?" Mrs. M. C. "is" the Queen of Water (the former most able, efficient, kind and loving Matron), out of the Home? Mrs. M. C. is the Queen Empress. She is "MISS MORTIMER CLARK," as she informed me on the date (10th of April) the policeman throttled me.

MISS M. MARTIN.

I think this is the lady who looked at me very suggestively at the Close of the annual meeting of March—suggestive rap of "kindness, tenderness and love," but of victory, triumph and laurels—and also suggestive of the articles written from the H. for I, to the Press, as knowledge of the and a scrupulously true list of articles they are, too! But more of this under the heading of "The Press."

I would like to "investigate" Miss M. M. Did she help the F. L. D. "Nag" Miss Van de Water out? Is she the intimate friend of Mrs. Downman (the present Matron and Housekeeper), and did she help in making Mrs. E. Bowman Miss Van de Water's successor? Does she live very near the Home? How many are there in the family who live in the house (or in the cellar) with her? Did she ever (or does she KNOW of anything of it), take anything out of the "Home" and, if so, did a servant "tell on her," with the result that the servant was dismissed from the Home to be taken on afterward as a servant in the house of one of the Board ladies? Did she ever get, have, or take any food from the Home, or pantry and garden of the Home for the use of herself and family? Will she lend me the Minute Book of the Executive and