

and unanimously elected the Supreme Grand Master of the Great Priory of Canada at the session held in St. John, N.B., in the end of August last.

Most Em. Fratre Whyte has also received the degrees of the A. and A. S. Rite up to the 32 and for some years was the T.P.G.M. of the Lodge of Perception 14. He is also one of the Charter Members, and a Director and Secretary of the new Masonic Temple in Montreal.

M. E. Sir Knight Whyte visited Boston the week of the triennial Conclave of the Knights Templar of the U.S., by invitation of the Grand Master, M. E. Sir Knight McCurdy. He took part in the Grand Templar parade with the officers of the Grand Encampment and paid an official visit to that Grand Body during its session, receiving a very courteous and friendly reception. At both functions he was accompanied by Past Grand Master M. Em. Sir Knight E. T. Malone of Toronto.

V.W. BRO. CUTHBERT'S "OPEN LETTER."

The London *Freemason*, has the following editorial remarks in regard to an "open letter" addressed to the M. W. Bro. White, Grand Master, by V. W. Bro. Cuthbert, published in the *Toronto Freemason*.

It is to be regretted that the *Toronto Freemason* should have found a place in its columns for the "Open Letter" addressed to Bro. W. R. White, Q.C., M.W. Grand Master of Canada (Province of Ontario) by Bro. Robert Cuthbert, P.G.S.B. The latter's grievance appears to be that he was interrupted in his speech when proposing a certain motion at the recent annual communication of the Grand Lodge of Canada. On the strength of this grievance Bro. Cuthbert has addressed to Grand Master White this "Open Letter," which, for its objectionable character, has rarely, if ever, been equalled by any

similar communication within our experience.

Bro. Cuthbert, having in the first paragraph of his letter been guilty of what is, comparatively speaking, a slight impertinence towards Grand Master White, goes on to ascribe "the unseemly and discourteous treatment" he had received when attempting to address Grand Lodge, to the "undisguised hostility" of that distinguished brother. Our *Toronto* contemporary refers to "the lack of courtesy shown to speakers," but considers it a mistake to attach blame "to the Grand Officers and those surrounding them," and it adds "while it is true that M.W. Bro. White did not use his gavel as frequently and firmly as some of his predecessors, yet we believe the rank and file of Grand Lodge are solely to blame for not observing the regulations of the Craft when in Grand Lodge assembled." Here then it is admitted that Bro. White might have been firmer and more insistent in his efforts to maintain order and decorum in Grand Lodge. But lack of firmness on the part of a presiding officer is very far removed from "undisguised hostility" towards a particular speaker.

In subsequent paragraphs the writer tells Bro. White that it was his "manifest duty" to obtain for him "the ordinary amenities on the occasion that should characterize gentlemen," and "that he would neither suffer him nor Grand Lodge under his inspiration to insult him with impunity." Such remarks as these, resting as they must necessarily do on the very unsubstantial basis of an imaginary wrong, ought never to have been addressed by one Mason to another, much less to one who occupies so exalted a position, as that of head of one of the most reputable Grand Lodges in the world. We repeat that it has rarely, if ever, been our lot, in a not inextensive course of reading of Masonic literature of all kinds, to meet with such a letter as this, and we are confident it will be a long time ere we shall find its equal.