

but in prominent points it is generally consistently correct, therefore, in trusting to tradition we are not leaning upon a broken reed, but we are rather resting upon a staff, strong and trustworthy, and in the absence of all proof to the contrary, a tradition of old and universal acceptance, as the connection of Templary with the Masonic body is, must be, of great value, and accepted as of incontestable authority. Trusting, then, to the Masonic traditions, and giving probabilities an impartial consideration, we are very much inclined to the belief that the Order of the Temple as existing in Great Britain and Ireland, as well as in Canada and the Colonies, is a true and legitimate descendant, not an imitation, Masonic or otherwise, of the old Order. It has been practiced and conferred amongst Masons from time immemorial, as the phrase is,—that is, long anterior to the memory of any living person. It was introduced on the continent of America, at Boston, in the year 1769, by members of Masonic Lodges belonging to British regiments stationed there at the time, not as a newly invented Masonic degree, but as an Order regularly handed down to them attached to Freemasonry. The Order of the Temple, then, as connected with Freemasonry, resembles the family of Douglas, in Scotland, of which it was said, "You might see it in the grown tree, but you cannot trace it in the twig,"—our records show it to have been, so far as we can go back, a full grown order; our traditions say it is the old Order, one and the same, and we have a right to hold on to our traditions until it is overset by positive proof, and not by the special pleading of an astute lawyer.

We certainly disagree with Sir Patrick in his remark, page 128, that the attempt to establish the existence of Speculative or Symbolic Freemasonry anterior to the first years of the eighteenth century is untenable, and that "Ashmole," the great antiquarian, was its founder. Now, we know that Ashmole was made a Mason in 1646, and being of good social position, and not a handicraft, must have been a speculative Mason (not operative), and therefore speculative Masonry must have existed long before his time, consequently the argument based on the modern origin of *Symbolic Masonry*, "that there could have been no connection between Freemasonry and the Templar Order fall to the ground." The author's opinion of the obsolete "Ordre du Temple," of France, is without doubt correct; he has proved the pretended charter of "Laxmenius" to be a forgery, and he is also correct in repudiating the "Kadosh" as true Templary. The "Kadosh" is merely a modern Masonic appendage to Templary, and all Masonic writers fix its origin in the year 1743, when it was first introduced at Lyons, in France—but

in denying that the modern English Order of the Temple has no claim to be considered aught but an imitation, is going further than our present knowledge of its history, limited though it be, warrants him in doing.

Sir Patrick merely goes back to the first Knight Templar warrants that he can discover, and assumes that the present Order then originated; but to whom were those warrants granted? Why, to Masons, who were already Templars, having received the Order from older Masons who were also Templars, as they from others long before them, and so on until all trace of the origin is lost. If an imitation Order, when did the imitation commence? certainly not so late as seventy years ago, as asserted by him. In all other degrees foisted on the simple Craft system of original and ancient Freemasonry, we are able to fix a time and place of origin; but for Templary, we can say no more than there it is, and for all we can tell or positively know to the contrary, always has been. Sir Patrick denies the validity of any testimony offered in proof of the true descent of the modern Order; but one thing is very sure, he was very anxious to make the revised ritual lately issued by the "Convent-General" of the Order in England conform to all the ancient Knight Templar customs and usages. At page 40, the author informs us that, outside of the United Kingdom, Templary is only practiced in Sweden and the United States of America, both of which countries derived their system from England. In the former country it is the highest degree of the Masonic Order, of which the King is Grand Master, and confers a status at the Court of the Sovereign. In the United States the organization has been altered from the original to suit their own peculiar views, discarding the necessity of requiring a profession of the doctrine of the Trinity from its candidates, one of the great characteristics of the old Order, and otherwise changing it into a modern semi-military society attached to Freemasonry.

In conclusion, we can recommend "The Concise History" as a most interesting historic record, which should be in the possession of every member of the Order, and can be procured from Bro. Geo. Kenning, Editor of the *Freemason*, 198 Fleet Street, London, England, price 2/6.

Ottawa Correspondence.

Our new Lodge—Prince of Wales—has had its first communication under dispensation, which was well attended by both its own members and visiting brethren. The officers are as follows: W. M., V. W. Bro. Samuel Rogers; S. W., Bro. A. H. Taylor; J. W., Bro. W. J. Whiteford; Treas., Bro. John Stewart, Secretary, Bro. James