

England and Ireland, but still subject to H. R. II. the Prince of Wales as Grand Master, and the Convent General as the Supreme Parliament of the Order. This wish of the Canadian Frater has been acceded to by the Convent General in the most liberal and cordial manner, and the Great Priory of Canada will shortly be established; thus at once and forever allaying any feeling of discontent which may have heretofore existed in Canada.

To establish an independent body of Knights Templars in Canada would be simply an act of the greatest folly. Correctly speaking there should not be any separate and independent bodies in the Templar Society. The Order is, or ought to be, one and indivisible, and although want of knowledge of the correct principles of the Order in some cases and political exigencies in others, have divided the Order into several branches, holding themselves independent of each other, still the tendency of the present age is to draw together, not to dis sever, and to unite the scattered elements of our ancient chivalry into one harmonious whole. With this in view, would it not be worse than suicidal madness for the Canadian Templars to contemplate separation from England? We hope to see the day when all Templars, at least those of the English Langue, shall be firmly and indissolubly united under one Grand Master, and directed by one supreme representative authority, as was originally the rule of the Order.

Further on in his article, Dr. Mackey expresses his opinion that the Temple Order of the present time is *not* identical with the old Order of the Crusades, and as a reason for so believing cites the fact that the Order of the Temple was abolished by a Bull of Pope Clement V., bearing date May 2nd, 1304. That as a Pope had authorized the formation of the Order another Pope could legally and effectually suppress it, without discussing the position as to whether the Order was *legally* abolished, it appears to us to be of far greater interest to inquire if the Order was *effectually* abolished at that time. If it was, then the Knights Templars of the present day are to a certain extent incorrect in calling themselves Knights Templars at all. If they are *not* the direct and legitimate descendants and successors of the ancient knights who were, we admit, OUTWARDLY suppressed in the fourteenth century, then who and what are they?

It is merely nonsensical for them to call themselves *Masonic* Knights Templars for what authority had Freemasons ever to create Knights or Templars? The present Order of Knights must of necessity be one of two things, either they are true or legitimate Templars or a mere Christian society in imitation of the Templars of old. We hold, and in this assertion we are borne out to a certain extent by history, to the full extent by tradition, that the Order of Knights Templars of the present day are IDENTICALLY the same Order as the one which was outwardly suppressed in the fourteenth century. The argument, that because the Order was abolished by the Bull of Pope Clement V. it was consequently annihilated, does not appear to us to be conclusive. The Jesuit Order was also suppressed by a Bull of Pope Clement XIV. in 1773, but can any one believe that THAT society was in consequence extinguished?

It was outwardly suppressed, as were the Templars, but like the Templars it continued in *secret*, and when after the lapse of forty-one years it was in 1814 again permitted by the Pope to openly exist, it sprung up at once into public view, not a weak sickly remnant of an annihilated order, but a powerful and vigorous organization, that in spite of Papal bulls and censures had NEVER lost its strength or vitality. This comparatively modern example effectually disposes, we think, of the notion that the power of either Pope, King or Emperor can extinguish any society that has within itself the elements of life.

Dr. Mackey says: "There cannot now exist any kind of Templarism that is not Masonic in its character." We would ask in what manner is the Templar Order Masonic? If it is Masonic, then ALL Freemasons should and must be eligible for admission into its ranks, and would have the right to apply for membership, of course submitting to the ballot as they do in passing from the Lodge to the Chapter. But have they this privilege? Every Freemason knows they have *not*. If they are Turks, Jews, Hindoos, or even Christian Unitarians they cannot be admitted into the Temple Order. No one but a firm believer in the doctrine of the Holy Trinity can be so admitted. Consequently, should it not be considered altogether out of place to call a society Masonic, the principles of which debarred a large proportion of Freemasons from joining it? On the other hand, we know that it has not always in modern times been held necessary that an applicant for admission into the Templar Order should be a Freemason. For several years the Chapter General of Scotland permitted non-Masons