

holds in Canada, and the confidence and self-reliance of its members in their own ability to sustain its prestige, to be recognized merely as a subordinate body of the Great Priory of England; and I am fully prepared to assist in attaining this end by using every lawful means in our power, while discountenancing any hasty movement that would tend to rend asunder ties we have always been taught to consider sacred, nor can I consistently take part in any action for independence unless sanctioned by constitutional authority of the parent body who may themselves desire this separation."

We cannot but suspect that this is but the preliminary step to the inevitable establishment of an independent body of Templars in Canada, for we remember that similar neglect on the part of the authorities in England led to that dissatisfaction which finally culminated in the organization of the Independent Grand Lodge of Canada. We should not regret to see such action, for as Canada now holds an independent position in respect to Ancient Craft Masonry, and also, to the higher degrees, and has a Supreme Council of its own, so should it have a Templar organization free from external control. But let such independence be the result, not of angry revolution, but of calm concession and peaceful compromise on both sides.

Another important subject is discussed in the address which demands a more than passing notice. The Grand Prior refers to the fact that amongst some of the Preceptories in England much discontent and dissatisfaction prevail at the recent changes in the Constitution: objections being made principally to the omission of the word *Masonic* in the title of the Order.

One source of this dissatisfaction appears to have been that the discontents believed that it was the intention of the framers of the new organization to withdraw English Templarism altogether from Freemasonry, and to make it simply a revival of the ancient Order. That there was, or is any such intention, is denied by Sir Knight Moore, and he is undoubtedly right, inasmuch as the possession of masonic degrees is still required as a preliminary step in the creation of a Knight. The omission of the word "Masonic" from the title, is of no importance. In this country it has never been used, and indeed, its employment would seem to be tautological, as there cannot now exist any kind of Templarism that is not masonic in its character.

But it would appear from the address, although the language is somewhat indefinite, that attempts have been made to claim that the order as it now exists is identical with that which existed at the time of the Crusades. Sir Knight Moore says:

"Among other objections raised against the present titles a prominent one is, 'That the Order, under the present designation, tacitly assumes an identity with the Templars of old, which deprives it of its legitimate claim to be treated as an integral portion of the entire system of Freemasonry.'" Should this claim to represent the ancient Order be set aside, the Craft, at the same time, ignoring it as a degree of Masonry, what does it represent?"

And further on he replies:

My own conviction remains unshaken as to the legitimacy of considering ourselves as representing the ancient Order of the Temple.

That the present Templar organization represents, that is to say, *presents to us again*, (but in a changed form) the ancient Order, is almost self-evident, but we think it a great error to suppose that the two Orders are *identical*. The original Order of Knights Templars was organized under and by the authority of Pope Honorius II., and confirmed by Pope Eugenius III., and from that time forth the Templars, as a religious and military Order, recognized the Popes of Rome as their lawful head. Therefore, however we may condemn and even abhor the cupidity and perfidy of the Pope and the King of France, we cannot deny that the bull of Clement V., issued at Vienna on May 2nd, 1304, which abolished the Order and forever prohibited any one from entering it or wearing its habit, was legal and conclusive. It does not follow that it was right. Many things are done under the color of law that are not done under the color of justice.

It is true, Burns says, "though the Knights were spoliated, the Order was not annihilated," and he asserts that "there has been a succession of Knights Templars from the twelfth century down even to these days." But he refers here to the Order of the Temple in Paris, with which neither English nor American Templars claim any affinity or connection, and which derives its authority from the "Charter of Transmission" to Larmenius, a document, whose authenticity Masonic historians have very generally disputed.

Neither are the references of Sir Knight MOORE to the Swedish Templars and to the Knights of Christ in Portugal of any pertinence, because the former trace their existence to a Masonic source, and the latter, being undoubtedly a genuine descent from the ancient Templars, have always disavowed all connection with Freemasonry.

The truth is, Templarism as it now exists must be traced, and indeed can only be traced, to those Knights who after the legal abolition of the Order by Clement, aban-