

have otherwise remained at a perpetual distance." We cannot, therefore, make ourselves the opponents of any creed or of any religious organization. We would gladly be in charity with all mankind; we would gladly be counted, in every place, as the friends of truth and the enemies of all injustice; but against no church do we protest.

Such, brethren, are the purposes, and such the limitations, of our society. These principles the fathers command us "carefully to preserve and not to suffer them, on any pretence, to be infringed." I pray you to join me in the purpose to be faithful to this trust.—*Freemasons' Repository*.

TEETOTAL LODGES.

The London *Freemason's Chronicle* says on this subject:—

We are inclined to think the parade that was made the other day about the consecration of the King Solomon Lodge was not only a great mistake, but, seeing that Freemasons are presumably governed in what they do and say by temperance, it was also a slight, approximating very closely to an insult to the Craft. No particular body of brethren, such as the charter members of this new lodge, have a right to ascribe to themselves, as their special characteristic, the exercise of a particular virtue. There are none among us who can truthfully affirm they have as it were had granted to them letters patent securing them the sole right to proclaim the merits of such virtue and enforce their observance. We are all of us, as a body, temperate men, and it is a libel on our fair fame to suggest we are otherwise. No doubt, Bro. Richardson and his associate brethren have been actuated by the best motives in what they have done; but even well-intentioned people should be put on their guard, lest in their anxiety to confer a benefit in one direction, they are so unfortunate as

to do an injury in another. Any slight good that might be effected on the outside world by the teetotal example of King Solomon lodge must be more than neutralized by the harm done to Freemasonry itself. There is no room in our fraternity for any of these numerous classes of extremists with which society has the misfortune to be encumbered. There is no difference in degree, whatever there may be in kind, between the intolerance of the religious or political bigot and the intolerance of the social bigot. Hitherto, we have succeeded in keeping our mystic circle free from the demoralizing influences of the former, but if the authorities are so unwise as to go on sanctioning the establishment of Masonic teetotal lodges, we shall sooner or later be subjected to the equally or even more demoralizing influences of the latter. Of all the tyrannies that were ever practiced of man, the most degrading, because at the same time the most revolting to our sense of justice and decency, is the social. We are only occasionally brought face to face with the religious or political tyrant, but the social tyrant is with us nearly always and everywhere. But what will become of our boasted good fellowship, which it is the object of the banquet to cultivate, if in certain lodges it is to be in the power of one man—the W. M.—to dictate to the guests what kind of refreshment they shall or shall not be permitted to take? It will of course be retorted that we are under no sort of compulsion to visit these lodges, but we have always understood that the interchange of friendly relations between the members of different lodges, as being one of the likeliest methods of promoting good fellowship, was one of the ancient landmarks of our society. In any case, if we are to have some lodges teetotal and others non-teetotal, we shall not only set up as it were an impassable gulf between them, but we shall do worse still, by establishing invidious distinctions be-