

Council of Canada was "*founded by forgery (Frederick of Prussia) and perpetuated by perjury.*" Yet this is the body that arrogates to itself all the knowledge and brain and influence of Canadian Masonry by denouncing members of other Rites, and by acknowledging as *Masonic and legitimate organizations* that are *expelling brethren from Masonry because they are endeavoring to propagate the pure and simple Freemasonry as taught by the Grand Lodges of Great Britain and the United States and Canada.* Arrogance and ignorance should be emblazoned on its escutcheons, so that Craft Masons would the better be enabled to impartially judge its actions and proceedings.

Ottawa Items.

Since I last wrote you, matters in Masonic circles have gone on with that smoothness which distinguishes the Craft generally, so calmly indeed that a "breeze" would probably add more interest to our doings. Still it is a matter for thankfulness that we have no "burning questions" to disturb our ordinary routine, even if the interest evinced by the brethren generally is not so great as I am told it is further west.

Our new Lodge—the "Prince of Wales"—gets along bravely, and may now be considered fairly on its legs. Although at present only working under dispensation, it hopes to receive its charter in due time. Very sensibly its dues are double the amount of most of our Lodges, and which are in my opinion, the basis upon which any Lodge can work with financial satisfaction and give it a greater independence in the choice of candidates proposed for initiation.

Apropos of this question of candidates. I have evidence from various quarters that a greater degree of discrimination should be exercised in their admittance. Although pretty democratic in my opinions and leanings, there does seem some grounds

for the frequent recurrence to this subject by many active and semi-active brethren. Whilst upon this subject, I would like to ask how it is that so many brethren, occupying good social positions, have virtually renounced the Craft? Some set it down to disappointed personal ambition, others to the fact of their having acquired a certain position and then left the ship, rather than continuing to remain among the crew and by their influence and knowledge help the brethren, should occasion arise to need their assistance. The other day I had occasion to ask the pecuniary aid of such a brother to a small extent, and got for my answer that he could not "throw money away for such purpose." On being pressed, he frankly told me that the tenets of the Craft were all right—no doubt of that—but their practice by the brethren generally were—well, not consistent. Another (a merchant) said to me some time ago that in a business transaction he usually came out at the wrong end of the stick with a fellow Mason. Is this inconsistency between profession and practice then the cause why we have, here in Ottawa, so many who are of us but yet *not* of us? So many who are Masons in name only, who are never (well, hardly ever,) seen in a Lodge, and, so far as the workings of the Craft are concerned, are always in the background, who are rarely ever seen in the ranks of the workers, and who, for practical purposes might be reckoned among the things that were? I do not propose to find a remedy, I merely state what are facts. Nor do I suppose that the bringing of the matter up in your pages will effect any practical good—at least here; but I write rather in the hope that, probably, some of your correspondents in other centres may read and, if matters are the same with them, that more "light" may be thrown on the subject, for there can be no doubt that this withdrawal, from whatever cause it