THEATRES AND MUSIC HALLS.

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE DAILY TELEGRAPH."

SIR,—In the letter you publish from "Zeo," in your issue of this morning, that lady states that "the secretary of the Royal Aquarium has to the back of the stage and introduced the gentleman to me." As this sentence may be construed into any meaning in the conduct of which "Zeo" complains, will you kindly permit me to briefly state the circumstances under which the introduction took place? On Sept. 30 last, Sir Walter de Souza wrote to me, amidst a perfect pandemonium, giving a horribly distorted description of the Zeo poster, which had been sent him by Mr. E. W. Thomas. The circular stated that the "sketch was a photograph from a huge street advertisement," and proceeded to say that "the question in the minds of many persons is, Will a new license be granted to the advertisers?" The letter concluded with the observation that the "question is the manager's business sensation." Sir Walter, in forwarding it, said it had been sent to him in his capacity as County Councillor, and marked "Private," and, further said, "I imagine all members of the Council have received the same." There can be nothing private that I can see in this communication, and I therefore send it to you to deal with it, as it concerns your interests."

On the evening of the day I received this letter a gentleman called to see the chairman, and in his absence through ill-health I was asked to see him. He introduced himself as a member of the Licensing Committee of the London County Council, and said he had received the same circular (probably in the one Sir Walter de Souza had kindly sent me) which he proceeded to read, and wished to make some questions concerning it. Acting on the instructions received from the chairman in the very courtesy and kindness of the members of the London County Council who would visit the establishment, I informed him that I should be glad to answer them as far as I was able, and to show him our numerous accommodations. A conversation then took place on the circular and photograph, and as the original photograph of Zeo were in the hands of the stage door I took the gentleman with me on to the stage. Here Mrs. Wieland and Zeo were standing, and after inquiring for Mr. Wieland, and informing them that I was with a member of the County Councillor to them. Mr. Wieland then returned. I repeated the object of my seeing him, introduced the County Councillor, and then left them.

On the occasion of the second County Councillor's visit the committee had sat, and many questions had been asked me respecting this lady. I therefore agreed to give him an introduction to Mr. Wieland to obtain the information he required. When I met Mr. Wieland he was with his wife and Zeo. I informed them he was a County Councillor seeking information about Zeo.

Ever since Zeo has been with us she has declined to see any gentlemen unless introduced by the manager or secretary; but in view of the attack which was then being made on our licence, and the publication of the distorted photo, I thought it well to afford the gentlemen interested the full benefit of the interview, and left them with the refusal or granting of the licence in the fullest expectation of learning the truth concerning the artiste and the establishment.

This, Sir, was the reason for my introducing the two Councillors.—I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

JOHN WILKINSON.

Royal Aquarium, Westminster, March 6.

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE DAILY TELEGRAPH."

SIR,—Some of your correspondents abuse the London County Council. Last night the County Council in little friendly advice, which is not to repeat the Zeo incident. Acrobats, as a rule, are not only muscular, but irritable under official interference. In this case, happily, it was only a question of nerve on the performer's side, but another case it might be a question of arms on the back of a County Councillor.—I remain, Molesworth and Zeo's manager are sensible men, and they lost nothing by not losing their tempers. The County Council have doubled Zeo's commercial value.—I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

JOHN HOLLINGSHEAD.

London, March 5.

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE DAILY TELEGRAPH."

SIR,—Permit me to reply to the very personal letter of Mr. Beerbohm Tree in *The Daily Telegraph* of this day, in reference to my remarks at the County Council on Tuesday last. In the first place, I would remind Mr. Campbell that I have no notion of his intention to interrogate me upon the statements of Mr. Tree, and my reply was, therefore, made on the spur of the moment without my having had the opportunity of referring to the documents contained in my letter of Feb. 6, (1) that he received repeated complaints that the doors of the Shaftesbury Theatre did not meet the requirements of the Council; (2) that the bolts were, however, made on the very pattern of the bolts approved by the Council at five new theatres; (3) that he was not pressed with requisitions and put to much trouble and expense; (4) that he was finally informed that legal proceedings would, the facts of the case are as follows:

(1) Under date July 16, 1889, the owner of the theatre was called upon by the Council to carry out five different alterations. Four are not material to the present discussion, but the fifth was as follows: "That the padlocks to the doors on the first floor landing be removed, and that each of such doors be fastened with a single purpose-made lever bolt of a pattern to be approved by the Council." On April 26, 1890, it was reported to my committee that the requirements had been carried out, but that lever bolts on the doors as usually approved by the Council. The attention of Mr. Phipps (the architect) was drawn to the omission on May 1, and on July 16 he replied as follows: "All the doors next the Haymarket are entirely free from bolts of every kind, and are always open and free for ingress and egress when the theatre is open to the public. I submit this should be accepted as compliance, it being better than even automatic bolts. If at any time the Council should find any of these doors in any way fastened when the audience is in the theatre, let them proceed against the lessee under the powers in their Various Powers Act." Now, as to this last clause, it appears that I was fastened with dead locks (i.e., ordinary locks without a handle) and cross-bars; the matter was brought before a meeting of the Council on July 29, and by its approval another letter was addressed to Mr. Phipps, informing him that legal proceedings would be taken unless the requisition was complied with, to which he replied on Aug. 4, stating that it would take three weeks to complete the works so desired, but promising that the wishes of the Committee should be complied with. On Oct. 23 he wrote that the locks and cross-bars had been altered as required; but it appeared upon inspection that the fastenings did not comply with the requisitions of the Council, inasmuch as they were not lever bolts of the approved pattern, because they could not be fixed to unlock both, and in the absence of the key were as objectionable as the former padlocks. In the meanwhile, Sir, it is to be observed, that I had remained in abeyance, but on Nov. 6 the letter referred to by Mr. Tree was addressed by the trustees of the theatre by the Council's solicitor, informing them it would be necessary to take proceedings unless the requirements were complied with. About the middle of December Mr. Phipps called upon me, and I promised to meet him at the theatre and inspect the bolts myself. I did so, and was assured by him that the two doors which were fitted with the fastenings in question were always unlocked sometimes with the audience in the house, remained so as long as the performance continued. I reported this to the chairman, who expressed his then next meeting, and, accepting Mr. Phipps's assurance, we determined to take no further action.

(2) The matter was duly considered. Under instructions an official from the Architect's Department visited the theatre at long intervals, but found the doors opened as promised except on one occasion (Feb. 9), when one door was found to be fastened until 9.10 p.m., when a performance was taking place; but such longer it remained as I am not in a position to say, as the assistant left at that time. Mr. Tree seems to take pride in the fact that the bolts which he has sent for him, and that he does not recognise the courtesy and forbearance with which he has been treated. He says: "There was never any question of certain doors being wrongly fastened during performances." What does he suppose was the object in having bolts of a single character substituted for padlocks on the doors but to make the means of exit in case of emergency easily available? And how could they be made so if they were fitted with fastenings which required a key, and the men in charge of the key, to open them? As all experts on architect, Mr. Phipps, can explain why proper fastenings were insisted upon, and I must leave it to the Council to satisfy that point with him.

It is perfectly true, as Mr. Tree writes, that the bolts at his theatre are similar in pattern to those approved by the Council in certain other theatres, but he is mistaken in supposing that the conditions of the exits are alike in all. Due to the other buildings where those bolts have been authorised, other means of exit are provided, and therefore the objections to their use do not apply. In conclusion, allow me to add that I accept to the fullest my share of the responsibility for all that has been done in regard to those bolts at the Shaftesbury Theatre. The duty which devolves upon my committee of ensuring the safety of places of entertainment, as far as we are able to do so under our inadequate powers, is such as must necessarily entail very heavy hardship on individuals; but I can point to the fact that since this duty was undertaken by the Council not one single appeal against the recommendations of the Committee has been made, and, indeed, although the parties aggrieved have the power of appealing to the Home Secretary for the appointment of an arbitrator if they conceive themselves to have been unfairly treated.—I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

T. O. PARDELL, Chairman Theatres, &c., Committee.

March 7.

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE DAILY TELEGRAPH."

SIR,—The thanks which the theatrical profession owes to *The Daily Telegraph*, for the attention it always bestowed in its columns upon theatrical affairs, have never been more thoroughly exemplified than in the eminently fair way you have given to the latest escapade of the London County Council. Whilst it is the duty of true citizenship to govern the world with as few laws as possible, it appears to be the endeavour of the County Council to increase the maximum of legislation with which existence can be encumbered. It was the boast of the late Government that no multitudinous and comprehensive were the statutory privileges which he might accord for the administration of Manchester that nobody could blow his nose in the streets of that city without first consulting the town clerk. The Council seems desirous of emulating the administrative zeal of Sir Joseph Heron, and I question whether its powers would be exercised with equal forbearance. What need is there for legislation on the laws of theatres? Who, except myself, is dissatisfied with the existing situation? Mr. Beerbohm Tree, I presume, is not under the jurisdiction of the Lord Chamberlain in an insult and an injury to art, with to be subjected to the ordeal of a visit of Mr. Beerbohm-Tree and to admit that this jurisdiction is in any manner unsatisfactory, unhilarious, unpleasant, and artistic sympathy as to reduce the evil to a minimum. Indeed, it is the very dissatisfaction with which an absolute despotism is administered which blinds the majority to the evils which it entails. It is especially stressed from trade, I should be among the last to advocate any protection of the interests of mere commercial speculation in the music halls, and I should hail with pleasure any proposal calculated to induce the Council of intimate interest into the performances at these temples of tedium. But the proposals of the County Council are not in the interests of the public, but are calculated to afford the gentlemen interested the full benefit of the interview with the refusal or granting of the licence in the fullest expectation of learning the truth concerning the artiste and the establishment.

This, Sir, was the reason for my introducing the two Councillors.—I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

JOHN WILKINSON.

Royal Aquarium, Westminster, March 6.

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE DAILY TELEGRAPH."

SIR,—Some of your correspondents abuse the London County Council. Last night the County Council in little friendly advice, which is not to repeat the Zeo incident. Acrobats, as a rule, are not only muscular, but irritable under official interference. In this case, happily, it was only a question of nerve on the performer's side, but another case it might be a question of arms on the back of a County Councillor.—I remain, Molesworth and Zeo's manager are sensible men, and they lost nothing by not losing their tempers. The County Council have doubled Zeo's commercial value.—I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

JOHN HOLLINGSHEAD.

London, March 5.

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE DAILY TELEGRAPH."

SIR,—Permit me to reply to the very personal letter of Mr. Beerbohm Tree in *The Daily Telegraph* of this day, in reference to my remarks at the County Council on Tuesday last. In the first place, I would remind Mr. Campbell that I have no notion of his intention to interrogate me upon the statements of Mr. Tree, and my reply was, therefore, made on the spur of the moment without my having had the opportunity of referring to the documents contained in my letter of Feb. 6, (1) that he received repeated complaints that the doors of the Shaftesbury Theatre did not meet the requirements of the Council; (2) that the bolts were, however, made on the very pattern of the bolts approved by the Council at five new theatres; (3) that he was not pressed with requisitions and put to much trouble and expense; (4) that he was finally informed that legal proceedings would, the facts of the case are as follows:

(1) Under date July 16, 1889, the owner of the theatre was called upon by the Council to carry out five different alterations. Four are not material to the present discussion, but the fifth was as follows: "That the padlocks to the doors on the first floor landing be removed, and that each of such doors be fastened with a single purpose-made lever bolt of a pattern to be approved by the Council." On April 26, 1890, it was reported to my committee that the requirements had been carried out, but that lever bolts on the doors as usually approved by the Council. The attention of Mr. Phipps (the architect) was drawn to the omission on May 1, and on July 16 he replied as follows: "All the doors next the Haymarket are entirely free from bolts of every kind, and are always open and free for ingress and egress when the theatre is open to the public. I submit this should be accepted as compliance, it being better than even automatic bolts. If at any time the Council should find any of these doors in any way fastened when the audience is in the theatre, let them proceed against the lessee under the powers in their Various Powers Act." Now, as to this last clause, it appears that I was fastened with dead locks (i.e., ordinary locks without a handle) and cross-bars; the matter was brought before a meeting of the Council on July 29, and by its approval another letter was addressed to Mr. Phipps, informing him that legal proceedings would be taken unless the requisition was complied with, to which he replied on Aug. 4, stating that it would take three weeks to complete the works so desired, but promising that the wishes of the Committee should be complied with. On Oct. 23 he wrote that the locks and cross-bars had been altered as required; but it appeared upon inspection that the fastenings did not comply with the requisitions of the Council, inasmuch as they were not lever bolts of the approved pattern, because they could not be fixed to unlock both, and in the absence of the key were as objectionable as the former padlocks. In the meanwhile, Sir, it is to be observed, I had remained in abeyance, but on Nov. 6 the letter referred to by Mr. Tree was addressed by the trustees of the theatre by the Council's solicitor, informing them it would be necessary to take proceedings unless the requirements were complied with. About the middle of December Mr. Phipps called upon me, and I promised to meet him at the theatre and inspect the bolts myself. I did so, and was assured by him that the two doors which were fitted with the fastenings in question were always unlocked sometimes with the audience in the house, remained so as long as the performance continued. I reported this to the chairman, who expressed his then next meeting, and, accepting Mr. Phipps's assurance, we determined to take no further action.

(2) The matter was duly considered. Under instructions an official from the Architect's Department visited the theatre at long intervals, but found the doors opened as promised except on one occasion (Feb. 9), when one door was found to be fastened until 9.10 p.m., when a performance was taking place; but such longer it remained as I am not in a position to say, as the assistant left at that time. Mr. Tree seems to take pride in the fact that the bolts which he has sent for him, and that he does not recognise the courtesy and forbearance with which he has been treated. He says: "There was never any question of certain doors being wrongly fastened during performances." What does he suppose was the object in having bolts of a single character substituted for padlocks on the doors but to make the means of exit in case of emergency easily available? And how could they be made so if they were fitted with fastenings which required a key, and the men in charge of the key, to open them? As all experts on architect, Mr. Phipps, can explain why proper fastenings were insisted upon, and I must leave it to the Council to satisfy that point with him.

It is perfectly true, as Mr. Tree writes, that the bolts at his theatre are similar in pattern to those approved by the Council in certain other theatres, but he is mistaken in supposing that the conditions of the exits are alike in all. Due to the other buildings where those bolts have been authorised, other means of exit are provided, and therefore the objections to their use do not apply. In conclusion, allow me to add that I ac-

THE EAST-END.

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE DAILY TELEGRAPH."

SIR,—The concluding sentences of your article on the Whitechapel murder in *The Daily Telegraph* of to-day may be supplemented by some observations of mine. Will you kindly allow me for ten years was rector of Spitalfields, and is still parochially connected with the district, I feel that I am not only justified in saying that the failure of the Council not one single appeal against the recommendations of the Committee has been made, and, indeed, although the parties aggrieved have the power of appealing to the Home Secretary for the appointment of an arbitrator if they conceive themselves to have been unfairly treated.—I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

T. O. PARDELL, Chairman Theatres, &c., Committee.

March 7.

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE DAILY TELEGRAPH."

SIR,—The thanks which the theatrical profession owes to *The Daily Telegraph*, for the attention it always bestowed in its columns upon theatrical affairs, have never been more thoroughly exemplified than in the eminently fair way you have given to the latest escapade of the London County Council. Whilst it is the duty of true citizenship to govern the world with as few laws as possible, it appears to be the endeavour of the County Council to increase the maximum of legislation with which existence can be encumbered. It was the boast of the late Government that no multitudinous and comprehensive were the statutory privileges which he might accord for the administration of Manchester that nobody could blow his nose in the streets of that city without first consulting the town clerk. The Council seems desirous of emulating the administrative zeal of Sir Joseph Heron, and I question whether its powers would be exercised with equal forbearance. What need is there for legislation on the laws of theatres? Who, except myself, is dissatisfied with the existing situation? Mr. Beerbohm Tree, I presume, is not under the jurisdiction of the Lord Chamberlain in an insult and an injury to art, with to be subjected to the ordeal of a visit of Mr. Beerbohm-Tree and to admit that this jurisdiction is in any manner unsatisfactory, unhilarious, unpleasant, and artistic sympathy as to reduce the evil to a minimum. Indeed, it is the very dissatisfaction with which an absolute despotism is administered which blinds the majority to the evils which it entails. It is especially stressed from trade, I should be among the last to advocate any protection of the interests of mere commercial speculation in the music halls, and I should hail with pleasure any proposal calculated to induce the Council of intimate interest into the performances at these temples of tedium. But the proposals of the County Council are not in the interests of the public, but are calculated to the protection of the music halls against the legitimate competition of the drama. So far as the public are concerned, the purveyors of drink and tobacco are accorded a distinct advantage over the purveyors of mere intellectual entertainment. This is a gross injustice to the theatrical caterers, and they ought not to permit it. They have done so unanimously and eloquently in your columns, but the public have not yet moved. Let them do so in the interests of the County Council, and will not proceed to annex the stage itself? Has not Mr. Tree already exercised the ultimate catastrophe? The present bill is our old friend, with the kind of the Council. As, when the provincial Puritan comes to London, his first visit is to the Empire Palace of Varieties, so the gentlemen of the London Puritan County Councillor. His ultimate aim is the suppression of the drama itself. This bill is the harbinger of an assault by soon-ranged sentries upon the very bases of our art; and if they should ever regain their ascendancy it will inevitably be succeeded by the open attack on the Establishment.—I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

SYDNEY GRUNDY.

Kensington, Feb. 28.

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE DAILY TELEGRAPH."

SIR,—The article in your issue of Feb. 25, commenting upon the London County Council theatre bill, has excited the attention of many theatrical proprietors and others, with which I ask your leave to deal shortly. That bill, as it is known, proposes to give to the right to music-hall proprietors to vary their entertainments without permission of the Council, and is limited as to time and *dramatis personæ*. For nearly twenty years past the restrictions at music halls without obstruction, but the suggested legislation will, if their proposals be adopted, apparently created a spirit of hostility against the proprietors of music halls, and especially from the leading theatrical proprietors. Messrs. Irving, Harr. Tree, and Conquest have taken up the cry, and it is evidently intended to be one of "prodigate" style. The same clause last year met with the approval of the Executive Committee of proprietors, who now see therein so dangerous an attack upon "Art" as to compulsory interest and sympathy. Their arguments in two—art will be damaged; the result, says Mr. Tree, will be that "we shall not have a single play left to be licensed." Secondly, the music-hall proprietor, it is said, will be the attractions of drama and one-act drama during the performance, would starve out the less fortunate theatre owner who could not afford the expenditure in "Art."

Now, Sir, as to the first argument. It is clearly a question of interest, and not of a second argument in favour of the theatres whose business earnings might be lessened. The production of a Shakespearean play, or a Lyceum representation of Shakespeare, or a Haymarket one of "The Dancing Girl," or a Comedy one of "Jane" (an abnormally Art), would be one whit hampered by legislating the recognition of a dramatic license to the music-hall stage. The improvement of music-hall performances has been no less seemingly than the improvement in theatres proper, and why, when the music-hall proprietor has won recognition, and lately invest money in the better performance, should the result be a deterioration? Whatever the theatrical proprietor may say to music-hall proprietors, the needs of society will not be satisfied by an entertainment of demoniac music for whom we work, that the opposition to music-halls is based upon the attractions of drama and not on any misleading or meaningless phrases, such as abound in Mr. Pinero's contribution to this question.

Apart from structural safeguard, immorality is not the province of the theatre. We are perfectly justified by our history, and if such enlargement injuriously affects a weak monopoly, it is common justice that it should be so. The enormous mass