

Prohibition in New Zealand

Invercargill is one of the few New Zealand constituencies which has tried the experiment of prohibition. It voted against license in 1905, and, therefore, has an opportunity of comparing the license and no-license methods.

Most of the examples of successful prohibition recently cited in *The Pioneer* have been in Canada and the United States, and we are pleased to be able to give our readers some information concerning the working out of the same temperance principles on the other side of the globe.

A New Zealand correspondent of *The Alliance News*, published at Manchester, England, makes a statement concerning the results that have been obtained in Invercargill, and we have pleasure in reproducing his statements in full as published:

Invercargill is a market town of some 13,000 inhabitants, trading with a district which contains a population of 40,000 all told. The chief industry of the area is farming. In the town itself there is a woollen mill, one or two boot and shoe factories, some agricultural implement works, and the usual supply of general shop-keepers. There are two weekly newspapers. Evidently it is a reproduction, under sunnier skies, of a typical English country town, but without the domination of a great landlord just outside and all round its borders, and better still a thousand times, now without the corrupting influence of the landlord of the public-house within its borders.

For three or four general elections—when the reduction and no-license opinions are submitted to the electors—Invercargill voted for reduction. Reduction answered so well that four years ago the town carried no-license by the requisite three-fifths majority,

and 33 licensed houses had promptly to cease selling liquor.

Results of the Change

What are the facts?

By the courtesy of the High Commissioner of New Zealand I have been enabled to gather some of the more salient facts of the case from one of the largest tradesmen in Invercargill, now on a visit to England.

Mr. J. Croshy Smith, F.L.S., is a member of a dry goods firm in Invercargill. He does not profess to be a temperance reformer, he says, but he is a "no-license" man, and believes in it thoroughly as a "business proposition."

As I have indicated, 33 licensed houses were closed as liquor places when the vote was carried.

"What happened to these publicans and their families?" I asked. "Were they turned out on the streets?"

Mr. Smith laughed, thinking I was "pulling his leg."

"Turned out on the streets? Not a bit of it. Most of them went on right away as temperance hotels, for farmers often have to stay a night when visiting the town."

"And what of the rest?"

"Only one house remained closed as long as two months, during alterations. One was converted into a big warehouse for dry goods, another became a bicycle premises, and a third a garage. Still another became a general shop, and two or three were turned into restaurants. But the bulk of them went on with the hotel business. Turned out into the streets?" And again he smiled his incredulous smile. Concerned for his hesitating opinion as to my common sense, I told him I was quoting from "noble lords" and "honorable members" of the Lower House.

"What has been the effect upon ordinary trade?" was my next question.

"Concurrently with the enactment of prohibition," said Mr. Smith, "the cash sales of my own firm, groceries and dry goods generally, went up 25 per cent., and have remained up.

en
Ze
has
can
hea
stip
Thi
lice
lice
odic
ton,
tries
at l
Fo
no-li
cases
after
only
locali