THEATRES AND MUSIC HALLS.

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE DAILY TELEGRAPH."

SIR—As the foster-father of Zoo, I am desirous of putting as plainly as possible before the public what actually took place on the occasion of the two visits paid by County Councillors to my daughter at the Aquarium. On the first occasion I was called to the back of the stage by my wife, who told me that one of the officials had just informed her that a County Councillor was present in the building, and that he wished to interview Zoo in reference to the charges that were afloat concerning injuries to her back caused by her performance. I at once complied at the request, and immediately proceeded in search of the managing director, of whom I knew not a soul in the house. I met the manager's son, and asked him if he could tell me where I could find his father. He informed me that he was not in the building—in fact, out of town. Noticing that I was agitated he asked me what was the matter, and I told him of the presence of the Councillor, and what he desired to do. He said, "Do not permit it under any circumstance. My father, I am sure, would not do so if he was here." I then went back to the back of the stage, and found the secretary in company with my wife and Zoo and a gentleman whom I had never seen, introduced to me was a County Councillor, intimating that he had been deputed to inspect a picture which was a gross exaggeration of the Aquarium poster. The stranger said to me, "I wished to know if this is your performer, and to see Zoo in perfect picture of the performer, and to see if she has any sore, for it is rumoured that she has received injuries upon her back, owing to the nature of her performance, and I should like to be certain as to its truth." My wife immediately replied, "Zoo is not a horse or a wild beast on exhibition," adding that she had never before been so insulted. My wife took the child down Zoo's shoulders. She asked the Councillor if he saw anything indecent in the costume or could possibly see a sore on her back. His reply was "that he saw nothing to censure in any way," and that "there he was in front of the child." At the close of my daughter's performance we found the County Councillor, introduced, again visited the stage, accompanied by another person whom he introduced as a Scotch friend of his, and they both thanked Zoo upon her performance. My wife, however, at once led her away to the dressing-room. The Councillor engaged me in conversation, and promised me that he would speak in favour of Zoo at the Council meeting next day. I attended that meeting to hear what took place, but though Mr. M'Dougall commended Zoo's secretary severely as to the alleged injuries to Zoo's back, the gentleman who had seen her upon the occasion did not say anything, and was sitting in close proximity to him, never opened his mouth upon the subject. The second Councillor who came to see Zoo was also introduced to me by the secretary under the circumstances described in my foster-daughter's letter, every word of which I most emphatically endorse.

I know, Sir, that people wonder why I permitted these interviews and examinations, and say that had they been in my position they would have acted in a manner totally different with the Councillors. I would not have permitted them, Sir, had I had only my own interests to consider; but these gentlemen, as I believed, empowered by the Council to take these proceedings, and on the first occasion it was suggested that I had interfered with the action of the Councillor it would be thought that I was afraid to allow my child to be seen. I was afraid to allow the slightest harm to be done to her, and if the opinions gained thereby I knew my business would be jeopardised. My daughter has described the effect of these persecutions—for they are nothing else—upon herself and Mrs. Wieland. I know that Zoo has suffered greatly in health and spirits, and that I have had to be firm to look that my child was not worried. I am sure that no one will be so foolish as to believe for a moment that she is no longer her old light-hearted self. I think that she has been the victim of a malicious and scandalous persecution, and who necessarily broods upon it. It is my intention that upon the licensing day when the decision of the committee was made known regarding her pictures and photographs she completely broke down, and positively refused to perform any more at the Aquarium, and I am sure that the earnest assurances of the secretary that she should be protected by the manager and the Council needs no comment. I have heard it intimated that the two gentlemen who conducted has been called in question were invited to come to the back of the stage upon the occasion of my visit—I can only say that no such invitation emanated from me or, as far as I am aware, from anyone else. Each one could tell their own story. Neither could I, as a Councillor with a request to see Zoo, and the request was formulated in such a manner as to be a command. Some persons may conceive that a professional gymnast should be a callous creature deadened of all feeling. Would to God only say that many of the ideas regarding the lives of artistes such as Zoo are wrong, and at variance with the actual facts. Zoo, if a professional gymnast, is a lady, and has a sensitive organisation. She has been reared by myself and wife not only to perfect her in her profession, but to give her all the advantages that can be obtained by long residence on the Continent. She is an accomplished linguist, speaking four languages fluently, and French is a good musician. Her ability is exceptional, in every way, and we came both to the conclusion to present to the notice of her own countrymen, little dreaming that among them we should find those persons to cause us the greatest trouble and misery of our lives. I thank you, and I remain, Sir, your obedient servant,

H. W. WIELAND.

Westminster Aquarium, March 7.

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE DAILY TELEGRAPH."

SIR—Mr. H. A. Jones, in correcting my quotation from his letter, remarks that "vulgar" and "decency" are hardly synonymous terms. Fortunately for the purposes of the present controversy it under any circumstances. My father, I am sure, would not do so if he saw her."

He then went back to the back of the stage, and found the secretary in company with my wife and Zoo and a gentleman whom I had never seen, introduced to me was a County Councillor, intimating that he had been deputed to inspect a picture which was a gross exaggeration of the Aquarium poster. The stranger said to me, "I wished to know if this is your performer, and to see Zoo in perfect picture of the performer, and to see if she has any sore, for it is rumoured that she has received injuries upon her back, owing to the nature of her performance, and I should like to be certain as to its truth." My wife immediately replied, "Zoo is not a horse or a wild beast on exhibition," adding that she had never before been so insulted. My wife took the child down Zoo's shoulders. She asked the Councillor if he saw anything indecent in the costume or could possibly see a sore on her back. His reply was "that he saw nothing to censure in any way," and that "there he was in front of the child." At the close of my daughter's performance we found the County Councillor, introduced, again visited the stage, accompanied by another person whom he introduced as a Scotch friend of his, and they both thanked Zoo upon her performance. My wife, however, at once led her away to the dressing-room. The Councillor engaged me in conversation, and promised me that he would speak in favour of Zoo at the Council meeting next day. I attended that meeting to hear what took place, but though Mr. M'Dougall commended Zoo's secretary severely as to the alleged injuries to Zoo's back, the gentleman who had seen her upon the occasion did not say anything, and was sitting in close proximity to him, never opened his mouth upon the subject. The second Councillor who came to see Zoo was also introduced to me by the secretary under the circumstances described in my foster-daughter's letter, every word of which I most emphatically endorse.

I know, Sir, that people wonder why I permitted these interviews and examinations, and say that had they been in my position they would have acted in a manner totally different with the Councillors. I would not have permitted them, Sir, had I had only my own interests to consider; but these gentlemen, as I believed, empowered by the Council to take these proceedings, and on the first occasion it was suggested that I had interfered with the action of the Councillor it would be thought that I was afraid to allow my child to be seen. I was afraid to allow the slightest harm to be done to her, and if the opinions gained thereby I knew my business would be jeopardised. My daughter has described the effect of these persecutions—for they are nothing else—upon herself and Mrs. Wieland. I know that Zoo has suffered greatly in health and spirits, and that I have had to be firm to look that my child was not worried. I am sure that no one will be so foolish as to believe for a moment that she is no longer her old light-hearted self. I think that she has been the victim of a malicious and scandalous persecution, and who necessarily broods upon it. It is my intention that upon the licensing day when the decision of the committee was made known regarding her pictures and photographs she completely broke down, and positively refused to perform any more at the Aquarium, and I am sure that the earnest assurances of the secretary that she should be protected by the manager and the Council needs no comment. I have heard it intimated that the two gentlemen who conducted has been called in question were invited to come to the back of the stage upon the occasion of my visit—I can only say that no such invitation emanated from me or, as far as I am aware, from anyone else. Each one could tell their own story. Neither could I, as a Councillor with a request to see Zoo, and the request was formulated in such a manner as to be a command. Some persons may conceive that a professional gymnast should be a callous creature deadened of all feeling. Would to God only say that many of the ideas regarding the lives of artistes such as Zoo are wrong, and at variance with the actual facts. Zoo, if a professional gymnast, is a lady, and has a sensitive organisation. She has been reared by myself and wife not only to perfect her in her profession, but to give her all the advantages that can be obtained by long residence on the Continent. She is an accomplished linguist, speaking four languages fluently, and French is a good musician. Her ability is exceptional, in every way, and we came both to the conclusion to present to the notice of her own countrymen, little dreaming that among them we should find those persons to cause us the greatest trouble and misery of our lives. I thank you, and I remain, Sir, your obedient servant,

H. W. WIELAND.

Westminster Aquarium, March 7.

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE DAILY TELEGRAPH."

SIR—Mr. H. A. Jones, in correcting my quotation from his letter, remarks that "vulgar" and "decency" are hardly synonymous terms. Fortunately for the purposes of the present controversy it is under any circumstances. My father, I am sure, would not do so if he saw her."

He then went back to the back of the stage, and found the secretary in company with my wife and Zoo and a gentleman whom I had never seen, introduced to me was a County Councillor, intimating that he had been deputed to inspect a picture which was a gross exaggeration of the Aquarium poster. The stranger said to me, "I wished to know if this is your performer, and to see Zoo in perfect picture of the performer, and to see if she has any sore, for it is rumoured that she has received injuries upon her back, owing to the nature of her performance, and I should like to be certain as to its truth." My wife immediately replied, "Zoo is not a horse or a wild beast on exhibition," adding that she had never before been so insulted. My wife took the child down Zoo's shoulders. She asked the Councillor if he saw anything indecent in the costume or could possibly see a sore on her back. His reply was "that he saw nothing to censure in any way," and that "there he was in front of the child." At the close of my daughter's performance we found the County Councillor, introduced, again visited the stage, accompanied by another person whom he introduced as a Scotch friend of his, and they both thanked Zoo upon her performance. My wife, however, at once led her away to the dressing-room. The Councillor engaged me in conversation, and promised me that he would speak in favour of Zoo at the Council meeting next day. I attended that meeting to hear what took place, but though Mr. M'Dougall commended Zoo's secretary severely as to the alleged injuries to Zoo's back, the gentleman who had seen her upon the occasion did not say anything, and was sitting in close proximity to him, never opened his mouth upon the subject. The second Councillor who came to see Zoo was also introduced to me by the secretary under the circumstances described in my foster-daughter's letter, every word of which I most emphatically endorse.

I know, Sir, that people wonder why I permitted these interviews and examinations, and say that had they been in my position they would have acted in a manner totally different with the Councillors. I would not have permitted them, Sir, had I had only my own interests to consider; but these gentlemen, as I believed, empowered by the Council to take these proceedings, and on the first occasion it was suggested that I had interfered with the action of the Councillor it would be thought that I was afraid to allow my child to be seen. I was afraid to allow the slightest harm to be done to her, and if the opinions gained thereby I knew my business would be jeopardised. My daughter has described the effect of these persecutions—for they are nothing else—upon herself and Mrs. Wieland. I know that Zoo has suffered greatly in health and spirits, and that I have had to be firm to look that my child was not worried. I am sure that no one will be so foolish as to believe for a moment that she is no longer her old light-hearted self. I think that she has been the victim of a malicious and scandalous persecution, and who necessarily broods upon it. It is my intention that upon the licensing day when the decision of the committee was made known regarding her pictures and photographs she completely broke down, and positively refused to perform any more at the Aquarium, and I am sure that the earnest assurances of the secretary that she should be protected by the manager and the Council needs no comment. I have heard it intimated that the two gentlemen who conducted has been called in question were invited to come to the back of the stage upon the occasion of my visit—I can only say that no such invitation emanated from me or, as far as I am aware, from anyone else. Each one could tell their own story. Neither could I, as a Councillor with a request to see Zoo, and the request was formulated in such a manner as to be a command. Some persons may conceive that a professional gymnast should be a callous creature deadened of all feeling. Would to God only say that many of the ideas regarding the lives of artistes such as Zoo are wrong, and at variance with the actual facts. Zoo, if a professional gymnast, is a lady, and has a sensitive organisation. She has been reared by myself and wife not only to perfect her in her profession, but to give her all the advantages that can be obtained by long residence on the Continent. She is an accomplished linguist, speaking four languages fluently, and French is a good musician. Her ability is exceptional, in every way, and we came both to the conclusion to present to the notice of her own countrymen, little dreaming that among them we should find those persons to cause us the greatest trouble and misery of our lives. I thank you, and I remain, Sir, your obedient servant,

H. W. WIELAND.

Westminster Aquarium, March 7.

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE DAILY TELEGRAPH."

SIR—Mr. H. A. Jones, in correcting my quotation from his letter, remarks that "vulgar" and "decency" are hardly synonymous terms. Fortunately for the purposes of the present controversy it