

alcoholic liquors. We venture to say there is not a single Masonic lodge in the country which will not discourage, by every means in its power, the presence at its meetings of any brother who may indulge in drinking to excess. If Bro. Dr. Richardson and his brother teetotalers of the lodge of King Solomon have made up their minds to fight the demon of drink, they must do so, not as Freemasons, but as individual members or a section of the great British Commonwealth. Their purpose is laudable enough, but their proposed plan of campaign is most objectionable, and wholly incompatible with the tolerant principles of Freemasonry. They proceed on the assumption that there is only one way of conquering the demon, that is, by total abstinence from all intoxicating liquors—which, by the way, are only intoxicating when they are taken to excess. In other words, these brethren—who it must be remembered are quite as intemperate by reason of their abstinence as their opponents are by reason of their excess, only their intemperance manifests itself differently and unobjectionably—we say, these brethren have the bad taste to place the temperate use and the intemperate abuse of drink on precisely the same footing. This idea of temperance and this mode of combating a particular form of intemperance are not provided for, either in the Ancient Charges or the modern Constitutions of Freemasonry, and we shall deeply regret if ever the day arrives when the perfection of those Ancient Charges and modern Constitutions is destroyed by the intrusion into the provisions of either of the teetotaler's creed. We have, as in duty bound, ascribed to these good brethren a most praiseworthy desire to promote the well-being of the community, but we are fully persuaded they have made a capital mistake in mixing up the pursuits of teetotalism and Freemasonry together, and the sooner they set about rectifying their mistake the

better it will be for teetotalism and Freemasonry, but especially for the latter.

A MASONIC SHAME.

It is assuredly harrowing to the feelings of a pure and sensitive Mason to peruse the last official report of our board of relief to the Grand Master, and to ponder upon the deplorable condition of the widows and orphans of deceased brethren. We quote from its text:—

“Could you, Most Worshipful Sir, see such cases of hardship and poverty of widows who are past the allotted three score years and ten, as have come to the notice of this board, we believe that you would at once see the necessity of present action. Many who are now suffering, will go to their silent home long before the income from this Temple can be applied to such purposes. If the corner stone of our institution is charity, should these helpless sufferers be made to wait until relief can be granted on a large scale?”

The board thus suggests the establishment of an asylum to be created by voluntary contributions, and maintained by a small annual assessment upon each member of the Craft. Now, when a man opens his mouth in denunciation of the shortcomings and abuses of our Order, and ventures to advocate reformation, he is at once set upon by a pack of baying hounds and stigmatized as an enemy to Masonry. Should he venture to insinuate that our fraternity has a canker at its heart, and practically belies its implied pretensions, he is forthwith taunted with a desire to do injury to the “most venerable and charitable of human institutions.” In this way is stifled all investigation, and the acts of our fraternity exist merely in the creation of imagination, claiming and receiving credit for that which has no basis in reality. In this century benevolence must have a living existence founded upon right