

to be made Knights Templars although they have now returned to the Masonic qualification; and instances are on record of the same having taken place during the last century in England.

The Order du Temple in Paris, of which H. R. H. the late Duke of Sussex and other prominent English subjects were members, does not exact the Masonic qualification, neither does the Order of Christ of Portugal, both of which Orders we acknowledge to be true branches of the Temple Order. The Order in England, Ireland, Germany, Sweden and the United States always we believe required their aspirants to be Freemasons. As respects internal evidence of the identity in character between Templary and Freemasonry we appeal with confidence to all who have belonged to both societies. Is there any connection, near or remote, between the reception ceremonies of the Freemasons or the Knights Templars? We confidently promise that there is *not*, and if there should be some seeming resemblance in mere words or phraseology it has been brought about by the misdirected efforts of those who believe Templary to be nothing more than a Masonic degree, one of the series of the York Rite of Masonry. But a careful study of the subject will readily show that the whole scope and object of the Templar novitiate ceremonies are entirely distinct and separate, and indeed in some degree in opposition to the Masonic initiation; and we must say, that in our opinion, the Templar Order is *not* in any degree Masonic. The only connection between the two Orders is protection on the one side and gratitude on the other. To the Freemasons the English Templars owe that they were enabled at the time of their direst need to preserve their lives from destruction and their Order from annihilation. And it is as a mark of their grateful remembrance that they have *always* from the time of their outward suppression required that all aspirants for the honor of their pure and ancient Christian chivalry should be Freemasons. This, and this only, is the connection that exists between Templary and Freemasonry.

CORRESPONDENCE ON LONDON MASONIC MUTUAL BENEFIT ASSOCIATION.

WE have been requested to publish the following correspondence, which speaks for itself:

LONDON, ONT., December 17th, 1875.

To the Editor of the Craftsman :

DEAR SIR AND R. W. BRO.—I cannot better answer your memo. on Bro. Deacon's request, than to have his statement published in the CRAFTSMAN, as to why this Association did not grant his claim under the Disability Clause: If the Board would but grant such as these, the calls would be mostly for disability, *instead of death*. The By-law is very plain on this: There must be a "TOTAL LOSS" of hand, arm, etc.

Hoping these few lines will place the matter in the fair, true light,

I am,

Yours fraternally,

H. A. BAXTER.

NEW LOWELL, ONT., 29th November, 1875.

To the Editor of the Craftsman :

DEAR SIR AND BRO.—Please insert this in the CRAFTSMAN for the benefit of all whom it may concern.

I have been a member of the London Masonic Mutual Benefit Association for some time. I got badly hurt, and am disabled for life. With all the doctor's reference that they required of me, I applied to the Association for the benefit which they advertise to give, and, to my great surprise, they rejected my claim. I therfore, would caution all my brethren against having anything to do with the London Masonic Mutual Benefit Association.

I remain, dear sir, yours fraternally,

JAMES ARTHUR DEACON.

LONDON, ONT., December 11th, 1875.

DEAR SIR AND BRO.—Yours of the 25th ult. together with your Policy, No. 2378, and an application for disability, caused by a fall from a buggy, &c., has been laid before the Directors, at their monthly meeting, on the 10th inst. I am directed to state that such disability does not come under the By-laws of this Association; therefore they