

POLITICAL SECTION.*(Scheme of Subjects for Papers.)*

- 1—**Parliamentary Enfranchisement of Women.**
- 2—**Responsibilities and Duties of Women in Politics.**
 - (a) In personal action.
 - (b) In organised work.
- 3—**Women's Status in Local Government.**
 - (a) In local franchises.
 - (b) Electoral and administrative disabilities.
- 4—**Administrative Work.**
 - (a) In the poor law and other forms of State relief.
 - (b) In education.
 - (c) On urban and rural governing bodies.

SOCIAL SECTION.*(Scheme of Subjects for Papers.)*

- 1—**Prisons and Reformatories.**
 - (a) Treatment of Women in Prisons.
 - (b) Treatment of Children in Reformatories.
- 2—**Preventive Work.**
 - (a) In the United States.
 - (b) In Europe.
 - (c) In Great Britain.
- 3—**Rescue Work.**

Methods of Work.

 - (a) In Homes.
 - (b) Outside Homes.
- 4—**Treatment of the Destitute Classes.**

(In conjunction with the Legislative Section.)

 - (a) In the United States.
 - (b) In Germany.
 - (c) In France.
 - (d) In the British Colonies.
- 5—**Social Settlements.**
- 6—**Women's Clubs.**
 - (a) Social Clubs.
 - (b) Girls' Clubs.
- 7—**Emigration.**
- 8—**Protection of Young Travellers.**
- 9—**Provident Schemes.**
 - (a) Friendly Societies.
 - (b) Pension Schemes for Old Age.
- 10—**Temperance.**
 - (a) General Principles.
 - (b) Public Control of the Liquor Traffic.
- 11—**Amusements.**
 - (a) The Ethics of Amusements.
 - (b) The Public Control of Amusements.
- 12—**Social Necessity for an Equal Moral Standard for Men and Women.**

A Book of the Week.**"No. 5, JOHN STREET."***

MR. RICHARD WHITEING, like M. Zola, indicts society, as now constituted. It would almost be true to say that, in the difference between "Paris" and "No. 5, John Street," one saw the intrinsic difference between France and England.

For Mr. Whiteing does not revel in his styte; he does not direct the eye to all the dirtiest corners, and minutely describe the appetites of the maggots that crawl in the filth; he simply says, "Do you see this styte? Would you like to live there? Do you wonder, when you give your mind to the subject, that the inhabitants have only a partial grasp of the Decalogue?"

And this attitude of his, renders all the part of his book that deals with John Street, very impressive indeed. He is less successful when he carries us to Mayfair; and that this should be so, is only in the nature of things; for he has a moral to point, and a contrast to emphasize; and so he must only present one to the Gorgius Midas of the hour, and to the be-valeted gilded youth, and the very much titled lady who plays at philanthropy.

Books of this kind are, of course, misleading. Society is not made up of millionaires and the starving poor. They do co-exist, and within a few streets of one another; but they form, together, the merest fraction of the nation that works, and struggles, and thinks, and educates itself with self denial and difficulty, and earns its few pleasures by weeks of anticipation, and overcomes difficulties, and carves out empires, and carries the gospel to the heathen, and lives and throbs, and lets the world know that this is England. In every great brewage, such as that of nations, you have sediment and you have scum. The bestial poor are the sediment, and the dishonest millionaire is the scum. In Republics, such as France and America, this scum is almighty, and rules everywhere, so that government itself, becomes a mass of corruption, a thing that men with clean hands will not touch. But in England, so far, the dollar is not almighty yet, though the tide seems setting in that direction; we still know that the greatness of the plutocrat is of a severely limited description; we have not yet forgotten that the only things that are worth having are the things that money cannot buy.

"Sir Charles," the otherwise unidentified hero of the book before us, determines to see for himself how the other half live. He determines to live on half-a-crown a day, and earn it. It is only natural that the life, viewed from his standpoint, should be destitute of beauty. We know well, that it is, in itself, hideous, we know that those who patiently endure it, ought not to endure it for a moment; and yet I think that the author sometimes, for the sake of pointing and emphasizing his contrast, falls into the Bellamy error which, at the close, he so sharply and justly criticizes—namely, that happiness consists in the things you have; and that enough trousers and polo-ponies, and marble halls, will make people happy and good, and that without these is no true peace.

But indeed, and indeed, this is a book to make one think; and who shall overpraise its delicacy, its ring of human fellowship, its absence of theatrical effect? Some of his satire too, is very clean-cut, in its absence

* By Richard Whiteing. Grant Richards.]

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)