

suburban area, and it had but one hotel. The No-License districts are completely surrounded by License districts, and we may take it that if the residents in them procure liquor outside the boundaries of the No-License electorates, they get it within these three provinces.

The population of these partly dry provinces in 1901 was 316,401, and the number of arrests for drunkenness in them was 3042. Clutha was then the only dry area. By 1906 the population of the three provinces had risen to 340,080, and with four additional dry areas the arrests for drunkenness had fallen to 2424, a decrease of 618. In the wet provinces during the same period the arrests for drunkenness rose from 5015 to 6786, an increase of 1771. The arrests for drunkenness per thousand of the population were as follows:—

	1901.	1906	1908.
Provinces "wet" ...	11	12.3	13.5
Provinces partly "dry" ...	9.6	7.1	6.9

Here, I think, we have positive proof that No-License does reduce drunkenness and diminish the consumption of liquor in the areas it affects.

The increase in the total number of arrests, periods 1901 and 1906, is made up as follows:—

Provinces "wet" ...	1771	increase
Provinces partly "dry" ...	618	decrease
—		
Dominion ...	1153	increase

Subsequent to 1908 six new electorates carried No-License, and as these are scattered very widely over the Dominion it is impossible to continue the comparison on the above lines, because quite a number of provinces would, like Canterbury, have one No-License electorate within their boundaries. The only possible comparison now on provincial lines is that of the two southern provinces with the rest of the Dominion. This comparison will be instructive because Otago and Southland have one No-License electorate to every 39,000 of population, while the proportion for the rest of the Dominion is one to every 127,000 of population. The total arrests for drunkenness in the Dominion in 1911 were 11,699, and in 1912 11,884, an increase of 185.

Otago and Southland, with five No-License electorates and a population of 191,130 (1911 census figures) had 1075 arrests for drunkenness, and in 1912 the mean population was 196,672, and arrests for drunkenness 1013.

The figures for the rest of the Dominion, with seven No-License territories, are (1911) population 866,668, arrests for drunkenness 10,624, and (1912) population 892,188, and arrests for drunkenness 10,871.

The figures may be stated thus:

ARRESTS FOR DRUNKENNESS.	
Otago and Southland: 1911,	1075;
1912, 1013—62 decrease.	
Rest of Dominion: 1911,	10,624;
1912, 10,871—247 increase.	
Dominion: 1911, 11,699;	1912, 11,884
—185 increase.	

The arrests per thousand of population are:—

	1911.	1912.
Otago and Southland ...	5.6	5.1
Rest of Dominion ...	12.18	12.25

The above figures, with roughly a 2½ to 1 advantage for Otago and Southland, bear a striking relationship to the figures given higher up, namely, 127,000 and 39,000, or roughly three to one. The relationship is almost mathematical when it is borne in mind that No-License is not Total Prohibition.

Analyse the figures how you will and compare one set with another, the evidence is conclusive that No-License does diminish drunkenness, and if local No-License under disadvantageous circumstances and with all its limitations can accomplish so much, what may New Zealanders not expect from National Prohibition?

The total amount of intoxicating liquor that went into the No-License areas in 1912 exceeded three hundred thousand gallons, and, taking the average of five persons to a household, the consumption of liquor in the No-License areas would work out at nine gallons per annum per household. The No-License law permits, under certain restrictions, the importation of liquor into No-License areas, hence these three hundred thousand gallons, which, from the point of view of Total Prohibition, is three hundred thousand gallons too much.

But the amount of liquor which goes into No-License areas is not to be compared with the volume consumed in License areas. The total consumption in the License areas exceeds eleven millions seven hundred thousand gallons, and works out at fifty-nine gallons per annum per household of five persons, or over one gallon per week per family.

Considering the number of households into which no liquor enters, the

weekly consumption in some must be very considerable, and be fraught with untold misery to thousands of innocent children. The 11,851 arrests for drunkenness—large as that number is—give only a faint idea of the number of families that are cursed by the liquor traffic, because only hopelessly incapacitated persons are arrested, and numbers of hopeless drunkards, the despair of their families, have never been before the Court.

The magnitude of the drink evil and its damage to the moral and economic well-being of the people is not fully realised. Eugenics, the latest and the greatest of our sciences, is beginning to reveal to us, among other things, the damage to the race and the deterioration which is directly caused by alcoholism. One of the greatest problems that confronts the Western nations is how to deal with this racial poison.

Opium is another poison which results in race deterioration, and it is to the credit of patriotic Chinese statesmen that they are definitely tackling it along the lines of total prohibition.

With ocean-girt boundaries and an enlightened people, New Zealand is an ideal place to try the only logical and complete remedy—that of National Prohibition.

DRINK BILL PER HOUSEHOLD.

(Family of five, all ages.)

	£	s.	d.
Dominion ...	18	14	9
License areas ...	21	5	3
No-License areas ...	4	12	5

GALLONS.—Drink Consumption per Household.

(Family of five, all ages.)

License areas ...	59	gallons
No-License areas ...	9	gallons

The "Brewers' Gazette" is greatly alarmed at the prospect of Women's Suffrage. "The admission," it says, "of millions of women to the polling booths would impart a new element of insecurity to licensed interests."

ENLARGED PHOTOGRAPHS

(about 15 x 12),

Of MRS. COLE may be ordered from MR STEFFANO WEBB,

Photographer, High St., Christchurch. Price, 20s, postage extra.

Cash should accompany order.