

as Master Masons, to which degree they all must necessarily belong. W. Masters of Craft Lodges, and the Grand Master himself, may not have gone beyond the Craft degrees, and are not supposed to be cognizant of, or recognize in Craft ceremonies, any but Craft Masons. I am as much opposed as Bro. Klotz can be to any deviation or innovation on long established usages, and look upon all pagantry and show, when carried to the extent it has now assumed, as detrimental to the true interests and object of Masonry, considering them as the offspring of childish vanity, unworthy the serious attention of the Masonic brotherhood, detracting from its legitimate purpose and entailing a lavish expenditure, which ought to be better applied.

Our Bro. Klotz is entirely wrong if he supposes that I, as head of the Templar Order in Canada, wish to disclaim all connection with the Craft, and had he paid sufficient attention to the history of the modern Order he could never have fallen into such a mistake. Although Templary is not derived, or its ceremonies at all connected with the Craft, it has been permanently attached and fostered by it, and is the ally of speculative Masonry, and so engrafted as to require that all its postulants must be Master Masons as well as members of the Royal Arch degree. Craft Masonry being the foundation on which all other rites, degrees and orders of the Masonic system are built up, to strike at the foundation, by ignoring the Craft, would place the whole structure in danger of being dissolved, and as in our pure old English rite of Masonry, the Christian Order of the

Templars completes the system, it would necessarily be included in the ruin.

I am fully aware of the objections raised to the degrees of Christian Masonry that follow the Royal Arch, as being considered inconsistent with genuine and ancient Masonry, and it has been said they are contrary to the probationary degrees, it being pretended that with the Royal Arch the science of ancient Masonry is complete.

It must be admitted that Masonry had its origin in Egypt, and was afterwards patronized by the Princes of the House of David, and tribe of Judah, but what became of it after the destruction of the second temple? for neither the Hebrews nor Egyptians followed up the Rites of Freemasonry, —but we do know, that in the dark, as well as the middle ages, the Ecclesiastics were the only learned and scientific body, and who amongst themselves preserved the mystical knowledge of Freemasonry. To whom, then, are we indebted for the remains of genuine Freemasonry?—They, within their cloisters exercised the Rites of that noble institution, and admitted those only of their brethren who were deserving, and with equal caution as the ancient philosophers communicated their mystical knowledge to their disciples.

These Monks or Priests also studied and practised operative as well as speculative Masonry, and promoted its original design—the noble and magnificent temples of worship erected by them bear witness to the present day of their devotion and zeal. Still further, in the hour of need forming themselves into distinct fraternities,