

ance" states frankly that it stands for no-licence and ultimate prohibition, and it summarily rejects disinterested management in every form.

Though the electoral areas are so small that it is not necessary for anyone living in a "no-licence" area to walk more than a mile or so in order to obtain a drink, the effects of the scheme in a few of the areas have been very striking. For instance, in Lerwick Burgh, Shetland (electorate, 1,825; licences, 17; abolished May, 1921), the convictions for drunkenness in the three "wet" years 1914 to 1916 were 139, 155, and 169 respectively. In the three "dry" years 1922 to 1924 they fell to 13, 27, and 26, or a seventh their previous number. Again, in Kilsyth Parish, Stirlingshire (electorate, 2,687; licences, 17; abolished May, 1921), the convictions for drunkenness in 1920 were 76; 1921, 35; 1922, 5; 1923, 7.*

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS.

The results of the prohibition movements in other countries afford us a considerable body of information, from which we ought to be able to extract much of direct value for our guidance in this country, if only we have sufficient judgment and foresight. From the successes obtained we should learn what to imitate, and from the failures, what to avoid; but we must always remember that the psychology of our people is not necessarily the same as that of others. Indeed, in many cases it is obviously very different, and great allowances have to be made accordingly.

It is probable that the ardent temperance reformer

* J. N. Fudge, *Weekly Westminster*, May 2, 1925; see also "Alliance Year Book," 1928, p. 17.