

maid, who was tender-hearted, and who had put on an old black gown of her own accord. The servants were not to get mourning, which was something unheard of; and they had all received notice, and, as soon as Mrs. Drummond was able to move, were to go away.

For that matter, Helen was able to move then—able to go to the end of the earth, as she felt with a certain horror of herself. It is so natural to suppose that physical weakness should come in the train of grief; but often it does not, and the elastic delicate strength of Helen's frame resisted all the influences of her sorrow. She scarcely eat at all; she slept little; the world had grown to her one great sea of darkness and pain and desolation; and yet she could not lie down and die as she had thought she would, but felt such a current of feverish energy in all her veins as she had never felt before. She could have done anything—laboured, travelled, worked with her hands, fought even, not like a man, but like twenty men. She was conscious of this, and it grieved and horrified her. She felt as a woman brought up in conventional proprieties would naturally feel, that her health ought to have been affected, that her strength should have failed her. But it had not done so. Her grief inflamed her rather, and set her heart on fire. Even now, in these early days, when custom

decreed that she ought to be incapable of exertion, "keeping her bed," she felt herself in possession of a very flood of energy and excited strength. She was miserable, but she was not weak. She shut herself up in the darkened house all day, but half the night would walk about in her garden, in her despair, trying to tame down the wild life which had come with calamity. Poor little Norah crept about everywhere after her, and lay watching with great wide-open eyes, through the silvery half-darkness of the summer night, till she should come to bed. But Norah was not old enough to understand her mother, and was herself half frightened by this extraordinary change in her, which affected the child's imagination more than the simple disappearance of her father did, though she wept and longed for him with a dreary sense that unless he came back, life never could be as of old, and that he would never, never come back. But all the day long Mrs. Drummond sat in her darkened room, and "was not able to see any one." She endured the vigil, and would have done so, if she had died of it. That was what was called "proper respect:" it was the conventional necessity of the moment. Mr. Burton called again and again, but it was more than a fortnight before he was admitted. And in the meantime he too had certain preparations to go through.

ON PAUPERISM AS PRODUCED BY WEALTH.

"Il y avait à Jérusalem des riches et par conséquent des pauvres."—RENAN, *St. Paul*, p. 421.

IT is a patent fact that we have in this country, by the side of great and increasing wealth, a very distressing amount of pauperism. This fact is often commented upon as if the co-existence of these two opposites were something strange and abnormal. It was recently brought forward, for example, by Mr. Harcourt in a speech at Oxford, as imperatively calling for a great reduction in the national expenditure. It seems, therefore, to have not been sufficiently observed by those who have given some attention to economic and social questions that the existence of a wealthy class and of rising prosperity in a country has a direct tendency to generate a certain amount of pauperism. A judicious reduction in the national expenditure might stimulate the increase of wealth, but it might possibly, on that very account, be accompanied by an increase rather than a decrease of pauperism. Accumulated wealth certainly tends for the most part to improve the con-

dition of the poorer class; but it also exerts some influences which have the directly opposite tendency.

Pauperism, or the destitution which makes people seek relief from the rates or from charity, may be referred to the following proximate causes.—Inability to work, or to do any work worth paying for, makes a large number of persons incapable of earning a living. This class includes the sickly, the aged, the very young, and widows with children dependent upon them. There is a second class of those who are able to work, but at a given time and place there is no demand for the kind of labour which they have to offer. We may put together in a third class those who are thoroughly idle and will not work, and those who are perpetually thrown out of employment by drunkenness and other moral faults. Physical weakness, want of employment, and depravity are the three immediate causes of pauperism.

The accumulation of new capital, and the consequent impulse given to production, have an obvious tendency to increase the demand for labour, and so to diminish the number of destitute persons of the second class. The same causes tend also in some degree to diminish the number of the first class, which is immensely the largest. They may have some slight effect, by making work more various and more remunerative, and therefore more tempting, in reducing the pauperism of the third class. But we cannot expect that the highest degree of general prosperity should ensure to every one employment at all times and at all places; or that it should abolish sickness, or old age, or orphanage, or widowhood; or that it should make all the poor virtuous. Pauperism will be reduced to a minimum when there is the steadiest regularity of employment or an equivalent flexibility in turning from one kind of work to another; when idleness and drunkenness and dishonesty become rare; when the poor are prudent enough to look forward to the day of failing strength, and therefore to put by savings, and practise insurance, and delay marriage, and when they hold themselves bound to support their aged and their sick.

Now the abundance and increase of wealth are not entirely favourable to constancy of employment, or to the promotion of a sense of responsibility amongst the poorer people. Without attempting anything like an exhaustive statement, I may specify some of the influences by which wealth unsettles both employment and character amongst the working classes.

1. The existing conditions of our prosperity make the transfer of industries from one place to another an easier thing than it used to be. Capital is now *mobilised* to an unprecedented degree; and new discoveries or improved means of locomotion may cause the rapid displacement of a manufacture or a trade. An increase of production will be the total result of such changes, but they may be at the same time attended with some local distress. Families cannot suddenly remove themselves to distant quarters; and if they remain in places from which their work has departed, they may be reduced to positive destitution. Changes of fashion, again—the indispensable amusement of a wealthy class—cause fluctuations of employment, and, in the metropolis and other places frequented by them, the migrations of the rich occasion considerable disturbance of the industry of the poor. The wages that are to be had during “the season” attract some workers,

who forget to look forward to the time when the season will be over. There are months when a good many men connected with cabs and stables, and a good many dressmakers and washerwomen, are sure to be out of work in London; and it is the same with painters, whose work is interrupted partly by social causes and partly by the weather.

2. A rise of wages is of itself somewhat disturbing to steadiness of habit amongst the working people. So, at least, experience has occasionally shown in manufacturing districts. It has been complained that higher wages tempt the workmen to enjoy themselves more liberally, to drink more, and to disdain the hard economies which can never become unnecessary amongst the working people. Just as in a richer class thoughtless persons are sometimes led into extravagance by a sudden accession to their means, and are thereby made poorer than they were before, so a body of working people, having no ingrained habit of thrift, and being weak against the attractions of geniality, may take to spending more than the increment of their wages in a good time, and may be drawn into idle self-indulgent ways, in consequence of which some may find themselves let down into destitution. This, I admit, is not likely to be more than a partial and occasional result of commercial prosperity; but some appreciable part of our existing pauperism is probably thus originated.

3. The general influence descending upon the poorer class from the luxurious use of money is in a great degree unwholesome, and expressly unfavourable to the qualities which guard the poor from destitution.

Vice can keep company with poverty as well as with riches; but there is a great deal of vice which is the manifest offspring of idleness and wealth, and which spreads its contagion amongst those who are not wealthy. Prostitution is a constant feeder of pauperism. And the brilliant careers of the fallen women whom only the extravagance of wealth could maintain are far more widely injurious in this way than the struggling existence of the humbler “unfortunate.” The gay life dazzles and corrupts many; it draws the servants of these women, and other dependents, as well as imitators, into its vortex of recklessness. Drinking habits are invariably fostered by it, and it is a tale told to weariness, how the habit of drinking to excess, more surely than idleness, leads to poverty. Another social mischief—it would scarcely be uncharitable to call it a vice—is horse-racing, which depends entirely on the support of the rich. Any one who has

visited a race-course must have some notion of the quantity of blackguardism which is directly produced, or at least attracted and nourished, by horse-racing. But the mischievous effect of this amusement of the rich is not limited to what can be seen on a race-course. It encourages gambling amongst working men to the remotest corners of the land. According to good evidence, betting upon horses for the great races is the interest which, more than any other, occupies the leisure of the working classes. Politics are nothing to it. The other day, when a good many of the delegates—the picked representatives of industry—were absent at a meeting of the Trades Congress at Nottingham, the experienced Mr. Allan inquired significantly whether there was any horse-racing going on in the neighbourhood. It is needless to say that gambling is antagonistic to thrifty providence. I fear it must be added that game-preserving, another special luxury of the rich, supplies its contingent to the workhouse out of the numbers of those whom it seduces from the dull and poorly paid occupations of agricultural industry.

The rich cannot be blamed for keeping domestic servants. But all who have had any experience in the analysing of pauperism, are aware that a considerable proportion of our destitute persons and families consists of those who were once maintained by domestic service. The phrase "pampered menials" testifies to the prevalent impression as to the nature of service in the households of the wealthy. This phrase of course applies to men only; and I do not know that it could be said with justice that female servants of any class fall more easily than other women into the ranks of pauperism. But men servants are undoubtedly pampered, and they are also trained to a servile deference; and neither of these conditions is favourable to a thrifty and provident independence. It makes a great difference whether the ways* of a household are well regulated or not. There are houses of rich men in which the servants are guarded as far as possible from temptation, and encouraged to look forward to the future, and cared for when they are disabled. But there are also too many houses of an opposite character, where profusion and carelessness tempt the servants to reckless and unscrupulous habits, and where the pampered menials are bribed to submit to caprice and insolence by high wages and opportunities of riotous living.

* Perhaps the time will come when servants will require references from those who wish to engage them.

When an improvident butler or footman loses his health or his character, what is to become of him? He is one of the most helpless of men. And he often has a wife and children, sometimes unacknowledged, to whom he has supplied precarious support out of his wages, and who are inevitably dragged down with him. I know of cases in which very liberal help has been given by rich persons to servants, who have been in their households for longer or shorter periods, and who have fallen through some misfortune into poverty; but these cases are not so numerous as they ought to be, and I am now referring to destitution caused by folly and error more than by misfortune.

I must further mention under this head, that general habit of looking up to the rich and depending upon them, that respectful and somewhat servile attitude of mind, which is encouraged in the country districts by the existence of a patronising landlord class, and elsewhere by the willingness of the rich to pay for civility. When we compare the common people in England with the same class in some other countries, we observe here a much greater humbleness of demeanour towards the upper classes, and a painful want of manners in their behaviour towards one another. It has actually come to be supposed, even by persons of the intelligence of Mr. Auberon Herbert, that when the Catechism teaches children to order themselves lowly and reverently to all their betters, it is meant that the poor ought to be lowly and reverent towards the rich—as if the Catechism were not to be learnt by the children of the aristocracy. I confess I do not see why, if I walk along a country lane, a respectable father of a family should humbly touch his hat to me whom he does not know, or his children elaborately make curtsies to me, whilst I and my children do not pay the same homage to a duke or a marquis. The truth is that this civility is the expression of a habit of dependence; and, as Lord Nelson courageously testified amongst his own tenantry not long ago, we cannot have the virtues of independence along with the instincts of dependence. Lord Nelson, to his great honour, declared that the rich ought to reverse their customary policy; instead of trying to keep the labouring class dependent, they ought to do their best to compel them to be independent. If any progress could be made in this direction, the rich would lose a part of one of their pleasures, but their wealth is sure to enable them to purchase still too much civility.

There is another attitude of mind towards the rich, not to be wondered at in those who, being themselves poor, observe the free expenditure of the wealthy classes, which is also unfavourable to economic providence. It is that which finds expression in complaints like this: "Why should I pinch myself to save out of my paltry wages, when my labour goes to support all this luxury?" Or, to quote more vivid words, "Why should the English workman live on potato parings, leaving the mealy morsel for his wealthier brother?" It is true that the wealth enjoyed by some is not a good reason why others should allow themselves to sink into dependence; but it must be admitted that a careless disposition may be tempted to find a mischievous excuse for itself in a comparison of the condition of the labouring classes with that of the rich.

4. But the chief way in which wealth breeds pauperism is by administering relief, whether this be done under the poor-law or by voluntary charity. How are the rich—not being cruel or hard-hearted—to see the poor want, and refrain from relieving their distress? That is the question which the pauperism of this country chiefly forces upon us.

It is perfectly certain, clear enough *a priori*, and proved by incessant practical evidence, that if the poor find help liberally afforded to them whenever they are in want, they will not make painful and difficult efforts to provide for themselves. Why should they? But it is equally certain that it requires a strong conviction of duty in the minds of those who are themselves comfortable and well off to restrain them from feeding the hungry, and clothing the naked, with ready kindness. The wealth of this country is so great that we could easily spare much more than we now contribute to the support of the indigent. I have made some attempts to ascertain the relation between the poor-rate—I mean the poor-rate proper—and incomes in London; and I believe I am safe in stating that it is not usual to pay so much as one per cent. of income in poor-rates, and that it is so rare as to be virtually unknown for any one to pay as much as two per cent. Now it cannot be said that it would be at all hard to double this payment, if we could thereby add greatly to the happiness of the suffering poor; still less, that it is urgently necessary, for the lightening of the burden on the ratepayers, that the present amount should be diminished. We can afford to relieve the poor liberally, and our kind feeling prompts us to do so; and the con-

sequence is that the poor are encouraged to trust to the poor-law and to charity, and many are thus pauperised.

Let me briefly mention two or three illustrative cases which have recently come under my personal knowledge. First to show how relief is given. S. is a gentleman's coachman; he has married a respectable wife, and has a large family. He falls ill, and goes into a hospital. The wife applies to the parish. Their character is good; there are many young children, and the income of the family is suspended. The guardians humanely allow 10s. a week. How can we help being glad of it? F. is a labouring man, a little over sixty, still strong and able to work, with a wife of about the same age. They have now only themselves to keep, but Mrs. F. states, with pardonable pride, that she has had fifteen children in addition to five mis-carriages, and that seven of the children are alive and grown up. The man has an attack of bronchitis; they immediately apply to the parish, and within three weeks of his leaving off work they are allowed 3s. 6d. a week. Now if S. or F. had belonged to a club, he would have had a still larger allowance during sickness without the necessity of applying to the parish, and if F.'s seven children had made a combined effort, they might have done something—at least for a few weeks—to help their parents. But to subscribe to a club would have cost them some weekly pence, and some trouble; and grown-up sons and daughters in this country are not expected, if they are themselves poor, to succour their parents. Now let me mention a case of an opposite kind. Mrs. P. is a widow, whose husband died four years ago, at the age of twenty-nine. He was a brick-layer, and not always in work. But he was a member of a Foresters' club, and paid the extra subscription to its "Widows and Orphans" fund. His total payment was 7d. a week. In return for this weekly payment he received 14s. a week during sickness, £12 were paid at his death to his widow, and she has had a permanent allowance of 2s. a week for herself, and 6d. for each child up to twelve years of age. Having five children, she thus received 4s. 6d. a week. One of the children was born between her husband's death and burial, and the eldest at that time was eight years old; but with these club allowances, and the earnings of a mangle, she has managed to get on without even applying to the parish, the only regular assistance she has received being the payment of her children's school fees. Why she has not

asked help from the parish I cannot understand, for she would have been sure to get it, and her life must often have been a painful struggle. But if we compare this case with the two former, we can see, on the one hand, what can be done by the poor when they are determined to be independent, and, on the other hand, what inducements they have for thinking it not worth while to practise provident self-denial. If our wealth and our humanity make it impossible for us to refuse relief, except on hard terms, to indigent applicants, or to allow worn-out parents to be a burden to their children, we must do as our feelings prompt us; but then let us not hide from ourselves the fact that a large part of the pauperism we deplore is of our own creating, nor delude ourselves with the hope that if we grow richer and more humane this pauperism will disappear.

The encouragement given by charity, with its apparatus of coal and bread tickets, soup-kitchens, and the like, to mendicancy and

falsehood and drunkenness, as well as to improvidence, is too trite a subject to enlarge upon. People listen to the proofs of it, and do not attempt to refute them; but after a while they say to themselves, "How can I enjoy my own comforts, if I refuse a ticket to that poverty-stricken creature?" and in spite of what they have heard, they go on giving the doles which are inadequate to afford real relief, but which unfortunately have power to tempt and degrade the receivers.

These are ways in which general prosperity—which does so much to improve the condition of the working classes, as well as to enrich capitalists—may nevertheless be allowed to engender pauperism. If we earnestly desire to repress pauperism, we must not trust to the natural operation of good times only, but must strive against all influences which we see to be prejudicial to the self-respect and sense of responsibility of the poor.

J. LL. DAVIES.

THE IDIOT COLONY AT CATERHAM.

HAVING received permission from the Metropolitan Asylum Board to visit their establishment at Caterham, I left London one fine morning in last December for the purpose of examining the building and inquiring into the management of the institution. Possibly the reader may conceive that a desire to occupy myself for a whole day in a building containing one thousand six hundred imbeciles and harmless lunatics, whose misfortune I was incompetent in the slightest manner to relieve, betrayed somewhat of a morbid taste. This, however, was hardly the case. I was actuated rather by a desire to witness the gigantic efforts which I had been informed were made at Caterham to relieve such an immense amount of human suffering. Indeed, I laboured under a certain alarm lest the scenes I should witness might prove too painful to me. This alarm increased as I neared the building, till at length it became positively oppressive. My fear, however, was groundless. True, there was a vast amount of misery within the walls of this immense establishment; but the painful sensation which I had felt in a short time became lost in the interest and admiration excited by the untiring humanity, and the admirable skill and discretion displayed in the management of the patients.

I will not stop to give any lengthened description of the building itself. As the reader may imagine, it is of immense size. The façade, though destitute of that meretricious ornament which architects of the present day are inclined to heap on buildings intended for charitable uses, is in good taste and by no means unpicturesque. The blocks of buildings in the rear, dedicated to the use of the patients, are unpretending so far as architectural elevation is concerned, but they seem well constructed; each being three stories in height, with numerous long windows, so as to insure a perfect ventilation. On entering the building I was soon joined by Dr. James Adam, the physician and principal official of the establishment, and Mr. George White, the superintendent. Having delivered my credentials, the doctor proposed that I should at once visit the building-wards and offices, and have their uses explained as we proceeded. All questions that I might ask, he assured me, should be fully and candidly answered.

As the dinners for the patients were now ready, it was suggested that I should first visit the kitchen. This is a vast lofty hall in the centre of the building. Had it not been for the smell of cooked food which pervaded the place, and the fact of my having