

tion), as I had with Mr. A. Kent. Mr. Hunter said also, send Dr. P. Mr. Kent and see "a copy of your charges" (with the idea that remedies would be applied).

I, on the 7th of Feb. sent the first list of charges. These remarks seem to me. On the same day I wrote to the Mayor, and said, "it came to my notice yesterday that some of the gentlemen of the Board have been aware that drastic reform is needed in nearly all, and every respect, and that they are about to glean out THEIR OWN stable themselves. Hence, these MOST UNMISTAKABLY, THE NEED of that cleaning, and that THEY are the persons to do it!" In the same letter, I said to the Mayor, "Under these circumstances, please hold my charges in abeyance, and take no further steps until you hear from me," and, that "it is undesirable to bring the matter before the public," as it might cause a "falling off" in the subscription. (See "SPECIAL NOTICE" further on).

Neither Mr. Kent nor Hunter acknowledged the receipt of my letter or of my charges. Dr. P., however did so on the 12th of Feb., and took the opportunity to say that these remarks seemed to him "UNWORTHY OF A CHRISTIAN GENTLEMAN," concluding his letter with THESE WORDS: "Trusting that this investigation will make us ALL MORE CAREFUL in discharging the duties of our trust." So much for these three gentlemen at the present.

I wish to draw special notice to the attitude of the Mayor towards the patients by reason of my actions, and by reason of the report of his own Inspector (Mr. Walsh) His Worship's attitude was most decidedly and unquestionably "on MY side," and on the side of THE PATIENTS, and I CHALLENGE HIM TO DENY IT!! I will deal with the Mayor later on.

MY CHARGES (IN PART).

The next thing is my publication in "The News," of the 13th of Feb., as follows:

A deputation from the H. for I, headed by Mr. A. Kent, and Inspector Chamberlain this morning, in reference to charges made against the management of the institution by a man named Elliott. He stated that good food was supplied the inmates, and that the nurses were negligent. The deputation showed that the charges were quite without foundation. There are at present 182 inmates, in the institution, and more than half of them are bed-ridden. The revenue for the past year has been insufficient to pay running expenses, and the Board has had to draw on capital account.

"THE NEWS" ON 15TH FEB.

In reply to this, I challenged them to meet me on a public platform, as follows:

"The deputation showed that the charges were quite without foundation." If the deputation really told Dr. Cha. or anyone else that my charges were "quite without foundation"—or even that they were in any way without foundation—then they told an untruth. Would to God—and for the sake of suffering, helpless humanity at the H. for I, that these "gentlemen" deputationists and the Board would meet me on a public platform. I dare them to do it. Their manliness (?) prompts them to do it. backdoor work. Let a little honest manliness prevail, and I am ready to have it out with them in public. Then we will see who is telling the truth."

This challenge was not accepted. This challenge and its non-acceptance, went the rounds of the newspapers, and the "Globe," 21st Feb., published a letter from "A. Visitor," regarding all my charges. And now, patient and gentle reader, read the following letter from Dr. Cha., and tell me if you really think my charges were "quite without foundation." Toronto, Feb. 17, '08.

To Col. Re H. for I: Dear Sir,—I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your favour of 14th inst. in reference to certain charges made against the H. for I. Before receiving your letter, and some days before knowing anything of your conviction with the institution, COMPLAINTS WERE MADE TO ME FROM ANOTHER QUARTER and I took steps to

bring the matter before the Board. A deputation, of the Board THIRTEEN, waited on me, and went into explanations as to the ACTION THAT WAS ABOUT TO BE TAKEN BY THE BOARD. I trust, therefore, that whatever may have been the DEFECTS EXISTING IN THE PAST they will be REMEDIATED AT AN EARLY DAY.

Yours truly,

T. F. Chamberlain, Inspector.

THE MAYOR AND THE TURNING POINT, ETC.

When the Mayor got my letter of 7th of Feb., stopping His Worship's further action, he replied on 9th of Feb.: "On of the ladies of the Executive Committee, called me up by 'phone' on Saturday," etc., etc. "SHE ALSO STATED THAT PROCEEDINGS WERE BEING TAKEN TO REMEDY THE DEFECTS IN THE MANAGEMENT, which WERE COMPLAINED OF." The Mayor went on to say that "but I fear it may be necessary for me to present them (my charges, etc., etc.)" to the Board of Control, when the "estimates are under consideration." (I here incidentally mention that, by the newspaper report, His Worship did NOT do this).

THE TURNING POINT.

In a "P. S." in the Mayor's own handwriting, in above letter of 9th Feb., he says: "HENCE WRITING ABOVE MR. MORTIMER CLARK HAS ARRANGED FOR AN INTERVIEW WITH ME TO-MORROW." I protested on Feb. 10th in vain, against this interview, without my presence!

I understand that Dr. P. was with Mr. M. C. at the interview. FROM THIS MOMENT THE WHOLE ATTITUDE OF THE MAYOR CHANGED. On 10th Feb. I wrote another letter, withdrawing my "holding-a-babe" request of 7th Feb. Now note His Worship's reply to this, on 10th of Feb.: "I shall now consider myself at liberty to make whatever use of your letters as may appear best IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST."

TRANSFORMATION SCENE IN THREE PARTS.

1. The Mayor is "glad," on 3rd Feb. is going to expose the matter to the Board of Control, 9th of Feb. 2. M. M. C. and Dr. P. appear on the scene!

3. And the Mayor is going to act for THIS PUBLIC INTEREST after these incidental persons interview him! (All the subsequent acts of the Mayor (for the "Public Interest" remember!) are, I will show, for the "interest" of the Board—a Board, which I will also show, is governed, ruled, controlled, etc., etc., by about six out of nine women, who alone from the Ex. Com.—YE MEN of Formerly think of THE YE MEN, who know what it is to be GOVERNED by a WOMAN!! will you have the courage to INVESTIGATE THIS specially? this woman committee who have caused dozens of presidents, members, matrons and others to leave the Board, and the Home in disgust (and many who refuse to work with them, and many who refuse to JOIN the Board when solicited. One President left because he could "NOT PUT UP WITH THOSE WOMEN), and all the patients suffer and stew in treatment of the most inhuman kind—"WOMEN" but I disagree—I deal with their later on. To the Mayor again!

THE MAYOR "RIGHT ABOUT FACE."

THE INVESTIGATION, ETC.

On 2nd of March I met the Mayor outside the Board room door before this wonderful "INVESTIGATION." From a few words which passed between us I at once saw how that "Investigation" was going to be carried on and ended. Sir, I determined to go over my part, and clear out quickly. This will explain to many well wishers why I left the room! The Invest. DID go on and DID end, exactly as I anticipated. The Mayor was "thoroughly satisfied" with his "thorough Invest." "Quite satisfied" that my charges and those of his own Inspector, and others, were "quite unfounded." Now how was this "Invest." conducted? Were any witnesses called on either side? "Evidence" means "that which elucidates and enables the mind to see truth." "a witness"—"one who testifies to a fact," etc., etc.

The Mayor, Dr. Cha., and Dr. Sheard left the room for a short time to "invest." They go to the patients and tell them not to fear—they may freely and fearlessly appeal to THEM!! They go to Ward No. —, and ask, "Have you anything to say about the Home?" "complaint?" The patient promptly replies, "I'm not going to tell you anything at all." "Why not?" "Because, I have been told that shall be the end of the Home if I do!" Is the reply "Oh, no, you won't, we will protect you."

Now the great majority of these patients are exceedingly intelligent, and they knew that when the PROTECTOR-ATE of the Mayor ceased at the end of the meeting (7 p.m.) they would be under the PROTECTION of THE BOARD! THE WOMEN, Ex-Com. of the Matron, Head Nurse and House Doctor, of whom they stand in great terror and whom they nearly all cordially hate.

No witnesses were called, on any way or the other, or anywhere! Oh, yes, by the bye, there was ONE witness in favour of the patients, and that was a circular sent round to the Mayor and GREAT DAY OF INVEST, that two of their number had been dismissed and that the others were warned to "behave themselves, or a law suit will be started" (or words to that effect). The Mayor said that such a circular was a "most disgraceful and intimidating" "procedure," and that he turned it into a witness for the patients. A question was asked, "Were the two patients who were dismissed allowed any hearing in their defence?" "No!"

What does the Mayor know REALLY and by PERSONAL experience? Has he visited the patients six years, six months, six weeks, six days, six hours? No! He visited them only once, and that for three quarters of an hour. He rendered his own Inspector's report (BY HIS WORDS RESPECTING IT) mere WASTE OF TIME, as so many charges would have shared "a like fate." I saw this and got away quickly, hoping for a more favorable opportunity.

The Mayor's action amounted to condemnation of all the charges AS MERELY HEARSAY EVIDENCE. Now, I want to ask the Mayor whether he has HIS "evidence" Certainly not from visiting for six years. Certainly not from REAL, CONSTANT PERSONAL CONTACT WITH THE PATIENTS IN VISITING in sorrow, and in sympathy? Then where DID he get it from? Why? It was HEARSAY EVIDENCE given by THOSE WHOSE INTEREST IN IT WAS TO SHIELD THEMSELVES FROM THE RESULT OF THEIR OWN GROSS MISMANAGEMENT, ROBBERY, JOHNNERY, etc., etc., and the Mayor believed them and did not believe the patients. I ask, "Is the value of the hearsay evidence (WITH PROOF), of the PATIENTS of less value than the hearsay evidence of their oppressors?" who only have the proof of power and influence, and whose one, and only one thought is to "care" for themselves. I say "NO," more emphatically than I would a Magistrate on the Bench do in this case? Ask Colonel Denison!

But the Mayor is satisfied! "Quite satisfied," after the interview with M. M. C., and Dr. P.—not quite satisfied BEFORE that interview, thought!

If I were a M. M. C. or a Rev. Doctor of Divinity, I should be satisfied, only slowly and of course influentially. I think I would have fared better.

THE OPINION OF OTHERS AS TO THEIR VERY UNWORTHY INVEST.

The Rev. W. Brookman writes to the "Mail and Empire" on 3rd of March: "Sir,—In the matter of the invest yesterday, at the H. for I, as one who has long taken some little interest in the institution, my congregation having gone there for the last twenty years with a thank-offering of fruit and flowers in loving sympathy with its suffering inmates; I think it is only right and in accordance with British fair play to the public of Toronto, to say: (1) That it was not a public interest that was called by advertisement, but by invitation or request of the friends connected with the institution or its boards, and officers and other staff, and physicians who had been at various times connected with the home, so that I, for