

that they do more harm than good. The introduction of national prohibition in America affords a case in point. In some of the States prohibition schemes had been tried for forty or sixty years, and though prohibition was not always carried out effectively, so that determined drinkers could usually get what they wanted if they were prepared to pay for it, yet the younger generation had for the most part failed to acquire the habit of drinking. Consequently the introduction of national prohibition was no hardship to them, and they readily acquiesced in it. The dwellers in the other States, especially those on the coast, had not lost the habit to any great extent, so that the compulsion entailed by the law stirred up a violent reaction, and determined them to obtain alcoholic liquor at any cost, by smuggling, moonshining, and in other ways. It is generally agreed that a more gradual introduction of prohibition would have been more successful in the long run. No one defends the saloon, and very few support the consumption of spirits, so it seems highly probable that regulations permitting the sale of beer and light wines would have been acquiesced in even by the border States, whilst the central States might have adopted the sale of beer of non-intoxicating strength.

Canada is more fortunate than the United States in that her several provinces can legislate independently. They have individually tried various schemes of prohibition, but complete prohibition has been found to be too drastic, and all the provinces, with one minor exception, have now abolished it. There is still close Government control, especially over the sale of spirits, but if substantial opposition develops to the regulations