

vote has been very much misunderstood in this country, and that if the whole circumstances were known, the conclusion to be come to would be very unlike that which has been expressed by some in all the confidence of ignorance.

Let us take the case of Massachusetts. We in this country are prone to suppose that the vote there lay between prohibition and such an iron-bound system of licensing as we have in this unfortunate country. Very much the reverse. For long Massachusetts has had a law which confers local option on the towns and counties. Many other states have a similar law. And in Massachusetts, under the influence of local option, the sale of drink has been prohibited in many parts of the state. And the recent contest was in effect a contest between local option and universal prohibition. Many of the friends of temperance believed that more good could be done at present under local option than under universal prohibition. They saw the difficulty of enforcing prohibition in such a city as Boston. They deemed it unwise to try what could not be carried into effect. The whole matter is explained in the subjoined extract from an address by Rev. Dr. Cuyler of Brooklyn :—

“A certain number of people, and good people, were not prepared to touch the constitution of the old commonwealth, and they said, ‘If there be temperance legislation, put it on the statute book and not in the constitution.’ That carried a certain number of temperance men undoubtedly. Then again there were large numbers of temperance towns now living and working under local option that have shut up every dram-shop, who felt that they were to gain nothing, perhaps, by the constitutional amendment, and felt there might be some risk of losing what they had gained ; at any rate, in good faith, according to their judgment, they voted against the amendment. Why, Cambridge, that refused to license a single rum-den, gave two thousand against our