

be concentrated in any one person? Yet, it was so personified in the brother spoken of.

If there is so little to learn of Masonry, that one can learn it within the short space of time allotted man on earth, pray tell me why it is that there are no less than twelve distinct theories advanced by able minds as to the true origin of Masonry? Surely, if the whole is so easily to be learned, that vast diversity of opinion would not exist.

We find able writers that place the origin of Masonry back to the antediluvian period; others, to the Egyptian mysteries; others, the Pagan mysteries; others, the Dionysian mysteries; others, the building of King Solomon's Temple; others, to the days of Numa Pompilius, in the School of Architecture which was founded by him; others, to the Mound Builders, and not a few to Dr. Desaguliers and his co-workers in 1717. In theory, a period from before the flood to A. D. 1717, is embraced. Now, what period is the fact? Answer it who can. Let those, who in their egotism think that there is nothing to learn, or, that they have learned the whole, prove by facts, not fancies, which one of the twelve theories mentioned by Dr. A. G. Mackey is the correct one, and I for one, will at once say that I have found a teacher, and that he is indeed a learned Mason. For myself, I am free to acknowledge my ignorance, and I do not expect ever to be able to place the time, when, where or how Masonry originated.

It is not, however, research after the origin of Masonry that must wholly engross our attention; suffice it to say, that it has an existence; that it originated somewhere, and that to-day it stands second to none outside of religion. It is its present and future that we must look to, not its past. Let us correct the errors of the past, as far as we know them, and in the future live more closely to

the fundamental principles of our institution.

The past records of Masonry speak for themselves, and that, too, with a voice that every Mason may well be proud of. Then let us, one and all, have the records of the future excel those of the past, in brotherly love, relief, truth and charity. Let brotherly love unite us more closely together; let relief to all who are in distress be ever in our thoughts and acts; with truth as our motto, we will throw the broad mantle of charity over all of God's creatures.

Again, how about the ritualistic work of Masonry? If it is so easy to learn the whole, why is it that there is such a wide difference in the work, even in the United States? Why is it that there are so many genuine simon pure Preston-Webb-Cross words in vogue? Now, which is the correct Webb work?

Again, why that vast diversity of opinion in regard to many of the laws of Masonry? If its legal features are so easily to be learned, why is it that the best legal talent are at variance on many of its vital points? As for instance, the number requisite to form a Grand Lodge in unoccupied territory; whether three, or a majority of the lodges, or all of them; perpetual jurisdiction over rejected material; the physical qualifications requisite to become a Mason; the prerogative of a Grand Master to make a Mason at sight, as well as many other, as yet undecided questions.

The question of exclusive Grand Lodge Sovereignty, as far as American Grand Lodges are concerned, has been effectually settled, the verdict being that each Grand Lodge has exclusive jurisdiction within its own territory; neither will those Grand Lodges allow any infraction on that law; no matter whether it be an old and powerful Grand Body that would infringe upon the rights of its younger and weaker sister Grand Body, or *vice versa*.

European Grand Bodies, however,