

quoted, and we feel our inability to do it full justice. But here's at him anyhow.

We are pained to hear so intelligent a Sir Knight as he use such language as is contained in the following extract, for it shows a restiveness under authority, and unwillingness to obey sacred vows, and a carping disposition which are highly discreditable to one who, as a Grand Officer, has so frequently and so well inculcated the necessity of obedience to constituted authority.

"Companoon Miles 'notes a little disloyalty' in our review as Committee on Correspondence, when we said that 'next best to no Grand Encampment is one that does nothing,' &c. To which we can only reply by saying that we have never professed 'loyalty' to either one of the central bodies. What we have elsewhere said about the General Grand Chapter we consider equally true of the Grand Encampment, and the sooner they can be rolled up and laid away among the well preserved antiquities of the Craft and allowed to quietly moulder to dust, the better. The duties of life and the earnest labors that men now-a-days are called upon to perform, but all comport with the militia-musterings and the display of man millinery, to the exclusion of sober thought or serious labor, that mark these triennial gatherings. Child's play is good among children—for grown men to 'play soldier,' or ride canes, is an exhibition to make the gods weep. If we are ever disloyal to the Grand Encampment, it is only when loyalty to it necessitates disloyalty to duty."

How it is that he never "professed loyalty" to the Grand Encampment, we do not understand. If he did not, then he received his accolade and took upon himself Templar vows in a different way from what they were conferred upon us. He and I will be dead and forgotten long before the Grand Encampment of the United States is "rolled up and laid away." His foolish talk about "militia musterings," "man-milliners," "playing soldier," and "riding canes" applies with as much force to Grand and Subordinate Commanderies as to the Grand Encampment, and to intelligent minds they have no weight in either case. We do not believe that he would advocate or encourage insubordination to his Subordinate or Grand Commandery, and yet he is guilty of the same Masonic crime to a Body to whose edicts he has promised to submit. His sophistical reasoning shows the absolute necessity of having over us a governing power which we must obey, unless we would ostracise ourselves from our fellows.

Speaking of the exercise of authority by the Grand Commandery of Missouri, he very naively says: "We are glad we do not live there." Very possibly the Missourians may entertain the feeling. Was it not Burgess, of Rhode Island, who said of John Randolph, of Roanoke, "One such is enough for a world—too much—how much too much for this nation!" Missouri has her Gouley, and that is enough for her to manage. Put Langridge there also, and the Grand Commandery of Missouri would lose all her power and "go up in a balloon" instant.

Langridge has unwittingly given an excellent pen portrait of himself when he says "a large majority of men would rather by far talk nonsense themselves than listen to seraphic eloquence from another." For once he is in the "majority," and we warmly congratulate him—as we have heretofore commiserated him for being in the minority.

His notice of New Jersey is very kind, and he says of us (we avert our face that the tell-tale blushes may not betray our feelings):

"He tries often to be severe on somebody; but, like a storm-cloud in April, when one looks for a terrible commotion, out comes the sun, and all is bright and laughing again."

Well, that sprags our wheel. After all the scolding that we have administered to him—and he hasn't taken the whole dose yet—his com