

Fosbrooke
Masonic Jennerian
the Provincial Grand
Gloucester and Hereford, in aid
for erecting a statue in honour of Dr.
Brother Fosbrooke was Chaplain of the Order of
counties of Gloucester, Hereford, and Monmouth.

MR. TOLLER'S PENSION.

SIR,—I have been from home or should have earlier protested against the unfair criticism by Mr. Sumner of the remarks made by me before the Visiting Justices in November last. I, however, do so now, for I find he distinctly charges me with picking out portions of Acts of Parliament in order to produce a false argument.

I never consulted any Acts of Parliament. The only data I took was Dr. Ancrum's speech. Dr. Ancrum invited the Guardians to judge the fairness of the pension by Civil Service rules. The deputation were then (and from Mr. Cadle's letter of last week, I judge he is still, as I am) in ignorance whether the seven years of "added service" were by Civil Service Rules fairly due to Mr. Toller's professional position, or only given by the Visiting Committee as a bonus for what was in their opinion the exceptionally good services rendered by Mr. Toller to the county.

Both the Guardians and the Justices were not clear on many points. It was excusable in the former, but not in the latter. For instance, Dr. Ancrum stated in October that Mr. Toller had been in the service of the county nineteen years and eight months.

There is no mistaking the report of the Lunacy Commissioners' visit to the asylum in July last. They condemned the inferior character of the keepers employed. As long ago as 1871 an escaped inmate, Mr. Field, of Cheltenham, published a pamphlet and pointed out the same defect. Yet as late as November last Dr. Ancrum cited the cheap pay of the officials (lower or as low as any asylum in England) as an economic virtue in the management of the asylum.

The remarks of Mr. Borrer are only excusable on the presumption that he was speaking on a question of which he only knew one side. I am a supporter of his system in regards to vagrants. In fact I believe I am one of the unique trio who he said at last Quarter Sessions had collected subscriptions to aid him. Therefore it is just possible that as I can see true economy in his system that I can also see it in other matters.

The member of the Visiting Committee selected to criticise the Guardians' objections was a barrister. He answered my remarks "That public feeling was uneasy about the character of officials employed in the asylum" by calling it an "airy nothing," which the Visiting Committee could not be expected to answer. Yet at the same time Mr. Sumner must have known that the report of the Lunacy Commissioners as to the state of the asylum in July last had justified that idea in the public mind.

In conclusion I will only say it would have been more satisfactory if the Lunacy Commissioners had at their July visit obtained the evidence which justified the arrest of the keeper Hawkins, and not have been required to be sent down a second time by the Home Secretary. I am, sir, your obedient servant,

Staverton House,

H. McILQUHAM.

January 17th, 1883.

SIR,—The public must have had enough of this subject, but I nevertheless crave permission to answer the letter of Mr. Cadle which appeared in your last issue. Mr. Cadle complains that I have fallen into an error with reference to his remarks at the interview between the Guardians and the Visiting Committee of the asylum, and stated that he based his calculation on the Circular Order of the Local Government Board of the 14th December, 1880, and not on the Civil Service rules as laid down by Act of Parliament, and "consequently could not pick out one part and leave the other out," as I suggested. Mr. Cadle has surely forgotten the terms of the order to which he refers. It recommends for each year of service one sixtieth, not of the average salary during the whole service, as assumed by

AL/3112