solid utterances of able Masonic teachers like Bros. Hughan, Mackey and others, rather than columns of "leaded" stuff, while at the same time we have double the amount of good reading in the same space. We make no reflections, and have no fault to find with the *News*, beyond the fact of its being misled by the notion that we were jealous of its prosperity, while all the time it was apparent it intended us no good in ignoring the existence of the CRAFTSMAN.

BROTHER NORTON ON MASONIC MYTHS.

THIS worthy brother of the Jewish persuasion, who has done good service in his day, and is now endeavoring to relegate to the shades of oblivion what he regards as the mythical portion of Masonic history, has fallen under the displeasure of some of our contemporaries. It is but right that every Mason should be jealous of the good name of Masonry, and do all he can to prevent its being brought into disrepute. In doing so, however, it is not necessary that unjust aspersions should be cast upon a brother, who, whether right or wrong, is conscientious in the attempt to make what he believes to be an exposure of the romantic character of the Masonic history given from time to time. Bro. Norton is thoroughly in earnest, and he does what he can to impress his readers with the truth of what he writes. That he is correct in his assumptions we will not undertake to say, yet we cannot think that he writes solely with the view of misrepresenting the Order. As a member, it is his duty to be faithful to the landmarks of our Masonic history, but he has somehow or other got it into his head that fiction has in a measure usurped the place of fact, and thus persists in declaring his belief that there is little reality in the accounts we have of the original history of Masonry. For doing this Brother Norton is unsparingly denounced, but we see no cause for such denunciation, as there is no intention of lowering the Masonic standard in all that he says.

It seems to us that Bro. Norton is fully impressed with the belief that the history of Masonry is apocryphal, and he delights in making it appear so. The fact of his being a Jew has the most to do with his believing as he does, for he cannot bear the thought of the two Saints John being in any way associated with Masonry; that would give it too much the character of a Christian institution, and such a thing he could not possibly submit to. It is true that he is occasionally violent in his language, but he is only riding a hobby after all. It would be absurd to suppose that he means any harm to the Order, he is simply carried away with the notion that Masonry as practised in the United States, is sectarian. We have done something to disabuse his mind of such a thing, still he clings to it with the most wonderful tenacity, and we have little doubt he thinks his race is in a measure proscribed. Fortunately such is not the case, for no matter whether a member is a Jew or a Christian, so long as he is not atheistical he is admissable to the ranks. Men of all creeds meet in the lodge, and whatever Bro. Norton may say to the contrary it is sufficiently apparent that sectarianism has no influence. There are some men who are never satisfied unless they are in opposition, and we take Bro. Norton to be one of that class. He is just now arguing the Colored Mason question, and in spite of the well known fact that all colored Masons are clandestine, he insists that they should be recognized. He loses sight of the constitution, in order that he may have his say. We see no other way of accounting for the course he takes.