We take this opportunity of saying to our brother of the *Gavel* that "A Grand Officer's" letter *had* appeared in the CRAFTSMAN, although its alleged non-appearance is given as the reason of its publication in the *Gavel*. Our brother refuses "positively to soil his pages by attempting to rectify" our many errors. We bear no ill will on account of this withering expression, and we trust he will not refuse to rectify this error, seeing that *it is his own*, even though his pages should be soiled in the attempt.

To the Editor of the CRAFTSMAN :

I have to thank you for allowing my former letter of the 9th January a place in the CRAFTSMAN, and as I am writing in the interests of truth, and with a hope of saying what may tend to a restoration of a proper relation between the Grand Lodges of Canada and Quebec, I trust you will kindly continue to accord me the same privilege.

In your very excellent notice, in the January number of the CRAFTSMAN, the Masonic life of Past Grand Master Simpson, who is held in the highest esteem by all Quebec Masons, I find an account of the proceedings taken in connection with the formation of the G. L. of Canada. As this account is from your own pen, of course, you consider it to be a correct one. Assuming it therefore to be correct, I find the circumstances of the case to be as follows :—

1. "There was a growing feeling of dissatisfaction at the course pursued by the G. L. of England towards the fraternity in Canada."

2. "In consequence of this feeling of dissatisfaction, the fraternity in Canada began to take the measures necessary to an independent organization."

3. "With this end in view a Convention of the Brethren in attendance on the Pro. G. Lodge, without having obtained the concurrence of the G. L. of England, was organized, at which, it was resolved to call a general convention of representatives of Lodges in Upper and Lower Canada, to consider, not the expediency of petitioning the G. L. of England for leave to form a Grand Lodge, but *to consider the expediency of forming a Grand Lodge.*'

4. "This Convention was accordingly held on the 10th October, 1855, and resulted in the formation of the Grand Lodge of Canada, by that Convention."

These, according to your own account, are the material facts connected with the proceedings that led to the formation of the Grand Lodge of Canada. As you have been urgent in condemning the Grand Lodge of Quebec, and still persist in styling it a "so called" G. Lodge, will you, in the interest of truth and charity, have the goodness to point out wherein these material facts essentially differ from those that led to, and are connected with, the formation of the latter Grand Body ? And if they do not essentially differ, will you explain how it has come to pass that the G. L. of Canada, now so loudly denounces what she herself sanctioned only 15 years ago in her own case? In both cases, if the account given by Brennan, in his 'General History of Freemasonry, translated and compiled from the Masonic Histories of Rebold, (Vide p. 56, 97, 312,) be correct, the method of proceeding adopted in the formation of the G. L. of England—the parent oi all modern Grand