

and invited guests. The lecture was ably given and well received by all present. The brethren are sorry that they did not know sooner that the lecture could be given publicly, or many more invitations would have been issued.

Ontario Lodge, No. 26, G. R. C., Port Hope, has arranged an excursion to Toronto on the Festival of St. John the Baptist, from Belleville and points west, which promises to be a great success.

Owing to unfortunate circumstances, incident to the North-West trouble, and other matters arising out of them, the Drill corps of Richard Cœur de Lion Preceptory has not been favored with as large turnouts as should have been the case. In due time, however, the members of the Corps will demonstrate that an interest is taken in its working which will redound creditably to all concerned.

The Ailsa Craig Brethren have removed from their old lodge room, in the Atkinson building to the upper story of Mr. J. H. McKay's building, where rent is cheaper and ingress and egress more convenient.

A District Lodge of Instruction was held at the Masonic Hall, in Hamilton, on the 29th ult., by R. W. Bro. Gavin Stewart, D. D. G. M., who was assisted in the exemplification of the symbolic degrees by a number of Masters and Past Masters of the city Lodges. The proceedings were of a very interesting character, and were duly appreciated by the large number of Brethren in attendance amongst whom were M. W. Bro. H. Murray, G. M.; M. W. Bro. J. Seymour, P. G. M.; R. W. Bros. Otto Klotz, of Berlin, and H. Macpherson, of Owen Sound; V. W. Bros. H. Bickford, of Dundas; W. Forbes and E. E. Loosley, of Grimsby. At the conclusion of the labors of the day the inner man was regaled in a becoming manner in the commodious banqueting hall of the Order.

### THIN REASONING.

The following article appeared in the London *Freemason* sometime ago, but escaped our notice. The version given of the St. George case is totally untrue, and we quote the article merely to show by what thin reasoning the Montreal Lodges are upheld in their improper conduct:—

We find in the New York *Dispatch*, a quotation from a Canadian paper, which is addressed directly to ourselves. We are asked if the *Freemason* can justify the action of St. George's Lodge, Montreal, in electing as a member a person rejected by a lodge in Toronto? Our reply is very simple, and need be only very short. We are informed, that the applicant was a gentleman attached to one of the railways in Canada; that at the time he was proposed in the lodge at Montreal, he was stationed at Montreal, just as he had been at Toronto; that the lodge knew nothing of his having been rejected in Toronto, and that, as he was a person in reputable circumstances, and was thoroughly and personally recommended, he was duly proposed, balloted for, and initiated. We cannot see in what the lodge of St. George did wrong. Admitting that at one time he resided temporarily at Toronto, it is equally true that he also resided at Montreal, and why the lodge of St. George was to refuse to receive him, we know not. And, in addition, we must also bear in mind, that at the time of the separation, the three lodges in Montreal could accept candidates from any part of Canada, though, of course, it would be better they should be living near Montreal for convenience sake. But there is no law in Freemasonry which limits the residence of respectable candidates for Freemasonry to a particular place. In America, owing to the fact of State and Sovereign Grand Lodges, like the States themselves, the question of residence is jealously regarded; but even in America, cases will crop up,