

murdered, on a trumped-up charge, the young Duc d'Enghien, all crimes were possible.

The intrigues for the Crown of Spain and the hostility of England for a moment laid aside all domestic questions. Napoleon had his hand full and could not busy himself with details which were, compared with his political ambition, purely secondary. With this agitation the third volume of these Memoirs ends; the period embraced by them is so important, the authoress is so keen an observer of all that surrounds her, and she is so felicitous a writer, that her work is among the most interesting of all that have served to elucidate the history of the First Empire. No man is a hero to his *valet-de-chambre*, and we suppose no monarch is a hero to the *dame du Palais* of his consort. Madame de Rémusat does, certainly, not spare Napoleon, nor for the matter of that, his family. By the light of her pages we see the Emperor rude, coarse, unfaithful, fond of a brutal display of authority. Shy, yet offensive in woman's society; unscrupulous; a great man, so far as the intellectual gifts are counted, but unredeemably bad so far as his moral qualities are concerned. "It must be said of him," remarks our authoress, "because it is true that there is in Buonaparte a certain innate wickedness of nature which has a particular taste for evil, and that shows itself in him in great things as well as in smaller matters." He whipped his little boy before Talma, the actor, because, he said, it amused him to "spank" a future king. At the Court balls his delight was to wander about the rooms and make remarks to such ladies as he was not shy of, that would make them blush. He often cruelly ill-treated his wife. One of his favourite tricks was to inform some unfortunate husband, who dared not reply, that his name was being dishonoured by the conduct of his wife. Truth he openly admitted should be disregarded by all who wish to succeed in the world. Religion, honour, good faith were not in his vocabulary. Yet such was the man who, during the first years of this century, was the tyrant of Europe; who made and deposed kings; who kept every country in a state of anxiety, and whose ambition, if it had not been, under the Divine blessing, for the stern opposition of England, would not have been satisfied until the world was at his feet.



ART. IV.—LOCAL OPTION AND LOCAL CONTROL.

TO any one unacquainted with the Temperance question the phrases "local option" and "local control" convey of themselves no definite ideas. As to what is to be controlled, and in reference to what option may be exercised, the terms

afford no light. To the initiated, however, the words imply a principle which, it is confidently believed, must underlie the satisfactory settlement of any licensing reform in the administration of those laws which have to do with the sale of intoxicating liquors. As in reading the geological records of past ages men find all practical questions affecting strata associated with the boulders which are embedded in their midst, so those who in future years, searching our temperance literature, shall rightly understand these phrases, will have an adequate perception of the temperance problems by which they are surrounded.

So far as it can be traced, the phrase "local option" was first employed by Mr. Gladstone in reference to the licensing question more than ten years ago, when, in a letter on the subject, he remarked that, so far as it could satisfactorily be arranged, he was disposed to "let in local option." The other phrase, "local control," is frequently found in pamphlets of seven and eight years ago, and was brought into currency by those who spoke and wrote on the Gothenburg system of licensing, of which local control is the distinctive feature.

The principle implied by both phrases, broadly stated, is this, that those persons for whose local convenience public-houses in any locality are assumed to be established, shall directly have a voice as to their existence—their numbers and regulation. It has been argued that the phrases are equivalent, and, among others, by Sir Wilfrid Lawson in the House of Commons on the 18th of June last. "Some people," said he, "prefer the word control to option. Well, I don't see much difference between the two words. If you are able to control a horse, you are able to stop him altogether. If you cannot stop him, he is not under control. My object is to give the power of stopping an evil altogether where they wish to do so." The sentence of the witty baronet contains a fallacy. Local option, strictly, has reference to the question *whether it is lawful to have the horse under any circumstances*. Local control assumes the lawfulness, but insists that *those who keep the horse shall have power to ride it*, to control its pace and general movements. If we consult the speeches of those who respectively use the terms, we find that "local option" is the favoured phrase of those who desire the *extermination* of the traffic; "local control" the formula of those who desire its *due regulation*. Those who believe that it is neither right nor politic for the State to afford legal protection and sanction to any traffic which wastes the national resources, corrupts the social habits, and destroys the lives of our people, must seek that the local community should have the power to suppress its existence; and "local option" will be the phrase which fitly expresses their end and aim. Those, on the other hand, who, recognizing the perfect lawfulness of intoxicants as beverages

and as articles of traffic, but equally recognizing the misery which accompanies their excessive use, seek to restrain undue facilities for their consumption, and to allow the people of any locality the power to regulate the number and character of the houses where they are dispensed, will claim "local control" as their special formula.

As, then, the phrases "option" and "control" must not be regarded as equivalents,¹ it is in the word "local" that we must look for the principle which commends itself to the enthusiastic support of all who respectively employ the terms—viz., the principle that the ratepayers of any district shall have a direct say, "yea" or "nay," in the existence of that traffic which more than all other social causes influences the social and moral well-being of that district.

I. Before directing attention to the prospects of the ultimate triumph of this principle and to the position which the Church of England occupies in reference to its adoption, I will ask attention to certain facts which may profitably be considered by those who wish to arrive at a decision on this question.

(a) There are 1,000 parishes in the province of Canterbury in which there is neither public-house nor beer-shop, almost in every case because the rights of property allow the great land-owners the exercise of "local option;" that is, of determining whether such houses shall exist on their estates. The evidence given before the Committee on Intemperance of the Southern Convocation testifies that in consequence of the absence of these inducements to crime and pauperism, the intelligence, morality, and comfort of the people are such as all the friends of temperance would anticipate.

(b) There are districts in Liverpool where no public-houses

¹ When crossing to Holland a few years ago on my way to Sweden, to study the experiment of "local control," I was curiously reminded of the magical effects a mere change of word can produce. The night was delightfully calm, the ship crowded and overflowing the cabins, the floor of the saloon was strewn with prostrate forms of those who, however vainly, sought sleep. Through the long hours of early night, in an adjoining berth, in the ears of a callous, unheeding mother a little child persistently cried "Ma-ma, ma-ma!" With all the metallic sound and mechanical regularity of one of the automaton toy babies constructed to traverse our floors and emit the familiar sound, the child cried on. Irritated beyond endurance, the passengers freely expressed opinions about the mother, whilst others called for the steward. All in vain, until from the end of the ship, and out of the darkness, suddenly from the lips of a foreigner came the advice, "*Little 'oon, try pa-pa, pa-pa.*" Like a peal of thunder rolled forth the roar of laughter from the floor and sides of the ship; then came stillness over the scene, for the "little 'oon" was convinced, and gratefully slept, the passengers—many, I doubt not, in dreams—blessing the unknown "*pa-pa.*" After all, "*tweedledum*" is not "*tweedledee*," and "local control" may succeed where "local option" fails.

can be found. The Corporation, in the land over which it has absolute control, prohibits in its leases any such houses ; whilst in the south part of Liverpool, through the action of Lord Sefton and Mr. John Roberts, a district has been covered with houses in which there live some 30,000 people, among whom not a drop of alcohol can be bought or sold. As a business speculation it is found a profitable investment of capital to exclude such houses from the neighbourhood of workmen's dwellings, inasmuch as the artisans themselves are willing to pay a higher rent for residences in such prohibitory districts. There the working classes migrate as fast as the houses spring up, as to an oasis in the desert ; there the medical officer testifies that the death-rate is exceptionally low ; there the chief-constable bears witness the police have little to do ; and there, when it was proposed to erect a public-house on the boundary line, so as to supply the "poor men robbed by this tyrannous edict" of their beer, a crowd of opponents filled the magisterial court to seek protection against the incursion of a traffic from which they had fled. The question cannot but suggest itself—If great landlords, enterprising builders, and powerful municipalities, by the exercise of local option for the protection of their own interests, can incidentally secure such priceless blessings to the dwellers upon their estates, why should not the people themselves, for whose convenience it is affirmed that such houses are required (and among whom they have been established by the exercise of magisterial discretion), to the extent of three adjoining houses in some instances, have a voice in giving expression to their own wishes ; that is to say, the local option of deciding whether and to what extent they wish such houses to exist in their midst.

(c) There are districts in England in which, through the will of the landowner, the trade has been allowed, but restrained and regulated after the following fashion (quoted from Dr. F. R. Lees' Sequel to his Prize Essay) :—

Lady Noel Byron has suppressed all drinking houses on her property at Kirkby Mallory, Leicestershire, save one. That was let under stringent restrictions to a publican, but manifest mischief still followed, and her ladyship at last took the inn into her own hands, appointing a respectable person to conduct it at a fixed salary, so that profits might not induce the seller to wink at drunkenness, or to drive as near to the precipice as may be. Over the door of "The Wentworth Arms" the passer-by may read the following inscription :—

" May he who has little to spend, spend nothing in drink ;
May he who has more than enough, keep it for better uses ;
May he who comes here to rest, never remain to riot ;
And he who fears God elsewhere, never forget Him here."

Although things were not completely satisfactory, a great and

striking improvement, we are informed, followed this experiment, both as to property and as to people.

(d) There are nations among whom a similar experiment has been tried on the larger scale with the most cheering results. The state of Sweden fifty years ago, in consequence of free trade in the production and sale of spirits, was thus described by Mr. Laing in his "Tour in Sweden":—

Notwithstanding this powerful, effective, and complete Church establishment, and notwithstanding the very wide diffusion of education and religious instruction by an extensive and efficient national establishment of schools suited to all classes, the Swedish nation stands amongst the lowest in point of morality; no other three millions of moral beings in Europe appear to commit within a given time so large an amount of crime and moral transgressions.

To remedy this terrible state of things the Swedish Diet passed a great measure of licensing reform in 1855. By that Act the parochial authorities in the country, and the town councils in towns (subject to confirmation by the governor of the province), fix annually the number of retail shops and public-houses. These licenses are sold separately or collectively by auction for terms of three years. As there is no minimum fixed for the number of licenses, it is possible, subject to the sanction of the governor, to prohibit the trade entirely. The direct result of this Act was to reduce the distilleries from 4,500 in 1850 to 457 in 1869, and the production of spirits to less than one-fourth of its former production. How extensively the Swedes have employed this Act to reduce the number of public-houses is seen when it is stated that, among three and a half millions of people living outside towns—that is to say, seven-eighths of the population—there were in 1876 only 450 places for the sale of spirits, or one house for every 8,000 of a scattered population.

The marvellous change which has taken place in Sweden is not, however, wholly to be explained by the Act of 1855. The town of Gothenburgh has had the great honour of developing one section of that Act into a scheme known as "the Gothenburgh licensing system," of which the chief features are as follows:—The purchase, by a company formed for the purpose, of all existing public-houses; the subsequent reduction of their numbers to a point considered reasonably necessary for the wants of the people; their conversion from mere drinking to *bonâ fide* victualling houses; the refusal to sell spirits on credit; the managers of such houses being allowed a profit on the sale of tea, coffee, cooked food, but none for the sale of spirits; the payment of all profits on sale of spirits, after expenses and 5 per cent. on capital invested, to the fund for town purposes. Further details may be seen in the evidence

given before the Committee of the House of Lords on Intemperance, as well as in the publications of Mr. Alexander Balfour, of Liverpool, and of the present President of the Board of Trade. Such, however, have been the beneficial results, that Stockholm and all other towns in Sweden, save one, with a population over 5,000, have adopted the system.¹ Whether in our own country such boards for the local control of the liquor traffic should be, as proposed by Mr. Chamberlain, in towns, the Town Council, or, as strongly advocated by Mr. Balfour, and as is actually the case in Sweden, boards expressly formed for this one purpose, are matters of detail. In either case we should have the principle of local control. And it is matter for extreme regret that when Mr. Chamberlain had carried the necessary consents in Birmingham, Parliament did not grant the sanction to an experiment in that midland capital which would have been watched with the deepest interest by the civilized world. The clause in the Lords' Report which bears on this subject will command the hearty assent of all:—

When great communities—deeply sensible of the miseries caused by intemperance; witnesses of the crime and pauperism which directly spring from it; conscious of the contamination to which their younger citizens are exposed; watching with grave anxiety the growth of female intemperance on a scale so vast and at a rate of progression so rapid as to constitute a new reproach and danger; believing that not only the morality of their citizens, but their commercial prosperity, is dependent upon the diminution of these evils; seeing also that all that general legislation has been hitherto able to effect has been some improvement in public order, whilst it has been powerless to produce any perceptible decrease of intemperance—it would seem somewhat hard, when such communities are willing at their own cost and hazard to grapple with the difficulty and to undertake their own purification, that the Legislature should refuse to create for them the necessary machinery, or to entrust them with the requisite powers.²

II. It was assumed in the early paragraph of this Article that the principle common to Local Option and Local Control will lie at the foundation of that measure of licensing reform which it is agreed by all cannot long be postponed. This assumption

¹ Experiments in Scandinavia in connection with "the drink problem" must possess an especial interest for ourselves in consequence of the similar conditions and difficulties of race, customs, and climate. The frequency of rain and dampness reminded me of our English November days, when at home our public houses become a fatal refuge. My own visit was practically curtailed by many days of incessant downpour. At Christiania I was much amused by a desponding Frenchman, who came to me in the hotel, wringing his hands as he exclaimed, "What shall we do? Here are no theatres, no distractions. This place ought to be called '*Tristeiania*' and not Christiania!"

² The Select Committee of the House of Lords' Report on Intemperance, Session 1878-9, par. 36.

will be seen to be well grounded when certain facts have been enumerated which plainly point to *the prospect of a speedy triumph of this principle.*

(a) Let it first of all be remembered that this principle has been recognized in all the recent proposals, from whatever quarter suggested, which have had to do with licensing reform. It is seen in the proposals of the United Kingdom Alliance, which would empower certain districts having the necessary majority of votes to rid themselves of these houses—in Lord Aberdare's Bill of 1871, which gave power to the ratepayers to demand a poll, and by a majority of three-fifths to negative the proposals of magistrates to license a number of houses if exceeding certain proportions to the population—in Mr. Cowan's Bill for the creation of a licensing board, to be appointed solely by the ratepayers—in Mr. Chamberlain's proposed scheme investing the municipal authorities with powers as a local board to carry on the trade so far as they shall see fit—as well as in all the proposals which from time to time have had the sanction of the Church of England Temperance Society.

(b) Again, let it be remembered how rapidly the principle has made its way within the circle of practical politics. It would not be difficult to adduce evidence that this question, as much as any, decided the complexion of the present Parliament. At the recent election the Licensed Victuallers' Association, through their chairman, stated that very complete arrangements had been made for dealing with candidates at the general election: To every gentleman who sought their suffrages four test questions would be submitted, and the way in which those questions were answered would decide their action towards the candidate. Among the questions came first the inquiry—"1. Will you, if returned to Parliament, oppose every bill or measure which aims at transferring the licensing powers from the present authorities (the Justices of the Peace) to periodically elected local boards or bodies, municipal, parochial, or the like?" How this challenge was received by the great body of the electors those associated with the brewing interest learned to their cost. Names honoured by all for philanthropic and munificent deeds were banned through this ill-advised action on the part of the Licensed Victuallers' Association.

(c) The temper of the new House of Commons was speedily made manifest. The month of June not only saw Mr. Pease's resolution in favour of partial Sunday Closing in England and Mr. Roberts' resolution in favour of total Sunday Closing in Wales carried, but also Sir Wilfrid Lawson's *Local Option resolution*. Amid the greatest enthusiasm, and exceeding the most sanguine anticipations of all its friends save a few, in a full House, on the 18th of June,

including tellers and pairs, 245 members voted in its favour, whilst 219 were opposed to its adoption. Three months before, in the last days of the expiring Parliament, only 114 votes could be rallied in its favour, whilst 166 were given against it. In the majority were no fewer than *nineteen members of the Ministry*, including the Home Secretary, the President of the Board of Trade, the Chief Secretary for Ireland, and the Vice-President of the Council on Education. Even more significant was the fact that, though the Premier, Mr. Gladstone, voted in the minority, he gave the following pledge:—"Among the great subjects to which the attention of the Executive Government shall be directed as early as the pressure of business will allow, will be the task of reforming the licensing laws, and I believe that in that reform, which is so loudly called for and favoured by the circumstances in which we now stand, *we shall take as an essential principle the motion of my hon. friend.*" This remarkable pledge is one not likely to be forgotten by the statesman who has declared—"Greater calamities, it has been said, are inflicted on mankind by intemperance than by the three great historical scourges, war, pestilence, and famine. Though this is not true for civilized countries in general—certainly not for Italy, for Spain, and for Portugal—it is true for us, and it is the measure of our discredit and disgrace." Assuredly the pledge will not fade from the minds of those who plead for "local option" and "control"—the great masses of our working classes, who cannot see why, when the upper classes in their squares and crescents can keep away the nuisance of a legal but dangerous traffic, they, who of necessity must live in crowded streets, should have no power to exclude from the frequent corners those polluted beershops and glaring gin palaces which, to their growing boys, their tempted girls, their toiling wives, mean temptation in a thousand forms. There are many strong politicians, it is believed, wholly opposed to the principles of the present Ministry, who are reconciled to their present occupancy of the Treasury in the belief that, under their term of office, this vexed question of licensing reform will at length have its solution in some measure of local control.

In conclusion, *the position which our own Church occupies* in reference to this great question is one which reflects the greatest honour upon her as the friend and pioneer of all movements which can promote the social and moral well-being of the people of this country. The Church, more than any other body, has moulded public opinion, and brought it round to the furtherance of this great principle. The recent resolution of Sir Wilfrid Lawson, with the exception of the last sentence, he has again and again declared, was taken by him from the eleventh recommendation¹

¹ "11. Your Committee, in conclusion, are of opinion that as the ancient and avowed object of licensing the sale of intoxicating liquors is

made by the Committee of Convocation of Canterbury in 1869. It is the same principle which was endorsed by the memorial to the archbishops and bishops which was signed by 13,600 clergy of the Church of England, and which had for its issue the Committee on Intemperance of the House of Lords. It is the principle, under the modified form of "local control," which is being introduced into Parliament by the Church of England Temperance Society, in their Bill which provides that licensing boards shall be formed, in which representatives of the rate-payers shall be associated with the magistrates in equal numbers, and to which the power shall be given of reducing by an equitable provision the number of existing public-houses. The question is one which is prominent in the programme of the ensuing Church Congress, and by the discussion which it will then receive, and the wide distribution and consideration at our Diocesan conferences in the coming autumn of the Bill which the Church of England Society, under the experienced leadership of Canon Ellison, has prepared, I am not without hope that, in loyal co-operation with other temperance reformers, it will be the crowning privilege of our Church to have the chief place in settling this great question, on the principle which she was first to propound, and on the lines which she has carefully and equitably laid down.

In the enforcement of all those principles which seek to promote temperance by moral suasion, the Church has recently been honourably conspicuous, believing that—

'Tis more heavenly
First by winning words to conquer willing hearts,
And make persuasion do the work of fear.

It now remains for her to exercise her due influence in the introduction of legislative measures on such foundations that peace and happiness, truth and justice, religion and piety, may be established among us for all generations.

JOHN W. BARDSLEY.

to supply a supposed public want, without detriment to the public welfare, a legal power of restraining the issue or renewal of licenses should be placed in the hands of the persons most deeply interested and affected—namely, the inhabitants themselves, who are entitled to protection from the injurious consequences of the present system."—*Convocation of Canterbury Report on Intemperance, 1869.* Sir Wilfrid Lawson's resolution consists of the above recommendation, verbatim, and the addition of the following words to the last clause, "by some efficient measure of local option."