

in force, whatever they may be, its strength can always be tested by means of a referendum. This opportunity for legal remedy removes the feeling of compulsion which is so apt to incite evasion of the law, and the Canadians are for the most part a law-abiding people, and are very temperate. They have progressed much further than we have in the direction of controlling or prohibiting the sale of alcoholic liquors; but I think that the chief moral to be drawn from their methods of control lies in the scope they afford for trying experiments and subsequently for testing public opinion by means of a referendum.

We have seen that in Great Britain a small step in the direction of testing public opinion at regular intervals has been made in Scotland, but the local option areas are too small, and the choice of options is too limited. Areas of larger size ought to have the right to choose, not only *limitation* or *no-change*, but schemes of reform such as that now in force in the Carlisle area. *No-licence*, on the other hand, because of its drastic compulsion, should be allowed only if desired by an overwhelming vote, such as a three-fourths majority.

If an area does succeed in introducing a scheme of reform, with improved public houses controlled by disinterested management and other methods on some such plan as those now in force in the Carlisle area, what effect will it have upon the sobriety of the inhabitants? We have seen that the evidence obtained at Carlisle, though not absolutely conclusive, does point to a distinct improvement of sobriety, especially during the last few years. This improvement appears to depend chiefly on the fact that no pressure is brought