

"We should be very dull of comprehension, if we did not assume that some of the remarks were intended for us. The cap fits, and we are prepared to wear it. In doing so, we think a few words may not be out of order on this subject of 'Undue Publicity.' In the first place, we would impress on the editor of the journal in question, and on all who would write as he has done, that there is a very wide difference between English Freemasonry, and Freemasonry as practiced in the United States, Canada, and other countries outside our 'tight little island.' What we do here, we are not ashamed of publishing to the world; and we fail to see that any harm can come, either to the brethren in particular, or to the Order in general, by any reference to Masonic actions in a public newspaper; while we may also say, that the outside world reaps no benefit from the information thus vouchsafed. Freemasonry in this country, is so essentially a society for extending the principles of Brotherly Love, Relief, and Truth, that we incline to the belief, that the more the actions of its members are published, the better it will be for mankind in general. We know nothing of politics, of differences of religion, or of the thousand and one controversial subjects on which men disagree; and the fact of our publishing to the world reports of our meetings—even 'literal copies of the official records of Secretaries' though they be—is evidence of our desire to challenge contradiction on these points."

Any thing that might come by the affirmation that English Masons are not ashamed to publish their affairs to the world, is in good degree obviated by a later statement, that American Masons are also straightforward, and do not fear to have their doings known outside the limits of their respective lodges. But there is no qualification of the claim, that a wide difference exists between English and American Freemasonry. Will our esteemed contemporary inform us as to the

points which show this marked divergence? In what essential features is the Freemasonry of the United States and Canada unlike that of England? There are dissimilarities of a minor character, we know; but these would seem to have no bearing upon the question at issue. We think Freemasonry on this side of the Atlantic is as free from politics, and controversies respecting religion, as it is on the other side. It has as little reason for concealment. It has no fear of the light because any of its deeds are evil.

The un-wisdom of publishing the details of lodge procedure is not set aside, according to our opinion, by the devotion of Freemasonry to legitimate objects, or by the high character of members, and the doing of such work, and the transacting of such business, only, as tends to the "benefit of mankind." Admit all this, and it is still a question of expediency, if nothing more, how much of the lodge proceedings shall be given to the world. The secrecy that is thrown upon Freemasonry is one of its attractions. We can but think that the organization will be more likely to maintain its strength and add to its usefulness, as it keeps a good share of its affairs to itself.

We used the word "un-masonic" in referring to what we named as undue publicity. On this point, the *Chronicle* has the following:—

"But our contemporary says it is un-masonic! Here we have ample official evidence to prove the contrary, unless our contemporary desires to assert that its view is the correct one, and the recognized action of almost every Grand Lodge is wrong. There are very few exceptions throughout the world where the Grand Bodies of Freemasonry do not periodically publish reports of their proceedings, wherein appears everything to which our contemporary takes exception, so far as is possible, in connection with a Grand Lodge as compared with a private one. These reports, or whatever they are termed, are certainly not