

Had I been the "strong supporter" that "G. F. Jr." would have your readers believe me to be, P. G. M. Kennedy *could not have negatived* the amendment of Bros. Symonds and Harris—page 38, same Proceedings. But such action on my part would have deprived P. G. M. Kennedy of the pleasure of supporting Bro. Conklin's protest—by ruling the motion objected to by Conklin out of order—at the second Annual Communication, *against* the opinions of more than two to one, seeing the question could not *then* be negatived.

When unexpectedly called to rule upon the question disposed of *impromptu* by P. G. M. Kennedy, I "called off" Grand Lodge and obtained by telegram, at considerable expense, an interpretation of the clause in the Constitution upon which Bro. Conklin based his objection, from one of the best authorities in *Canada*, in order to avoid the possibility of doing injustice to any. Did that course indicate that I was a "strong supporter of the A. Y. Rite."

"G. F., Jr." alleges that I "displayed partizanship" by ruling Bro. Col. John Kennedy's motion to rescind out of order. This is a mere assertion without a particle of proof. Had he consulted the best authorities on Masonic Jurisprudence he would have discovered that I could not properly do otherwise. I ruled, as I then and now believe, correctly. It is a well established principle that a question disposed of at one Communication cannot come up again during the same Communication by a notice of motion to *rescind*. Had he proved by citing A. G. Mackey, M.D., or any other recognized authority that I ruled improperly on this question, he would have written to some purpose. As he did not, I am justified in *charging him* with displaying gross "partizanship" in his communication, and utter ignorance of that whereof he undertakes to inform the Masonic world.

I am accused of giving a *strong support* to the A. Y. Rite party and of

"a determination to retain office for myself and friends." In the face of the facts, (1) that I delayed the election of officers till one of the Kennedy party, so-called, pressed for the vote; (2) that owing to certain interruptions caused by supporters of that party entering the Lodge room, I caused the ballot to be distributed a *third time* that they might have the opportunity of voting against me for Grand Master, thus delaying that election till nearly an hour after the time appointed, I think I may very properly accuse my assailant with "a determination" to vilify me for his personal gratification and to gain the applause of his friends.

"G. F., Jr.," fails to understand why a motion to amend the report of General Purposes should have been "ruled out of order." I am not surprised at that, for it was *not* ruled out of order, but I certainly did question the propriety of the Grand Lodge pronouncing upon a question of fact—the admission of McEwan—*without* an examination of the evidence that led to the finding of the Board of General Purposes. To quote from the proceedings of Grand Lodge I doubted the wisdom of the amendment on the "ground that members of Grand Lodge not seized of all the facts were not competent to deal with such an amendment." The amendment was then withdrawn, its promoters probably preferring this course to an examination of the facts and papers in full lodge.

It may be understood from "C. F., Jr.'s," communication that it is "impolitic" and "discourteous" for a Grand Master to differ in opinion from his predecessor, but it does not state whether the rulings of P. G. M. Kennedy or myself best accord with Masonic jurisprudence. That I think is the most important question to decide.

Having honored P. G. M. Kennedy and myself with titles that are new in Masonry (thanks for having given me the most extensive title) "G. F., Jr."