

other places, join a new organization to help things along; but they also run against rocks. In their zeal to steer by the statutes, they incur the enmity of those whom they seek to set right. In every lodge are to be found those who are ignorant of the statutes, and when they find a negative to their proposition then dissatisfaction follows. You cannot always enforce the law without hurting someone's feelings, and the statement is sometimes heard that it were better not to have such laws. But they are there for a specific purpose, and, as they are studied, instead of being arbitrary, they will be found to be liberal in their construction. Because the statutes do not say "Thou shalt not" for every possible contingency, it is no reason why any brother should feel hurt if his views are not covered by legal sanction. "Pity 'tis, 'tis true," but he who seeks to work the ritual and laws by the letter, generally finds himself most unpopular with his fellows. Better for to have fewer members and have them live up to their obligation to observe the statutes, than to have a host who move as fancy dictates. Don't you think, Mr. Editor, that a small book, of pocket size, containing the constitution of the Order, and the Grand Statutes, to be given each candidate upon initiation, would tend to lessen the friction?

There is another question which suggests itself here, and that is: The making of lodge meetings more interesting. In seeking new membership nine times out of ten, the beneficial side of the Order is advanced to the exclusion of the fraternal aspect of the case. This is a great mistake, for the result goes to show that conventions become very perfunctory and tiresome in their routine, little if any heed being paid to "Good of the Order" items. In time members become weary and their enthusiasm wanes, and dry rot sets in. Too much attention cannot be paid to the fraternal part of the proceedings. It benefits the members intellectually, gives them more zest to attend the meetings, and lends an air of cheerfulness to everything.

Bro. E. Shanon has just made a raise of \$1,000 cash in selling mining interests. Good boy, Ed.

It is a source of satisfaction to the Knights here to learn of the great prosperity attending the workings of the Trail Lodge. New Denver wishes them every success, as well as the prospective Lodge for Revelstoke.

1899 seems to promise great things for Pythianism in British Columbia. May it be so.

New Denver wishes her sister lodges a bright and prosperous New Year.

Bro. C. McNicholl, of this Lodge, and Bro. G. Spencer, of Sandon, have just disposed of a property they are interested in on the Galena Farm, for a bond of \$35,000. May good luck always follow them; they deserve it.

Bro. Walt Spaul, P. C., of New Denver Lodge, now living in Robson, committed matrimony on January 2nd. Miss A. Purviance, sister-in-law of Bro. Stege, was the fortunate lady. The bride is one of the best known and respected ladies in this district. The best wishes of the Lodge boys go with them.

C. E. SMITHERINGALE,
New Denver Lodge, No. 22.

FROM GRANVILLE.

To the Editor of the True Knight.

Bro. John N. Evans, of Duncan, B. C., in his letter to the True Knight in the December issue, states that he favors the abolishment of the sick benefit in our Order, and advocates that the members of this grand domain move in this matter and instruct our S. R. to move in the next session of the Supreme Lodge that the sick benefit be made a side rank in the subordinate lodge, or, in other words, that such laws be enacted by the Supreme Lodge as to make it optional with individual members as to whether they will be sick-beneficiary members or not. Now, Mr. Editor, it seems to me that Bro. John N. Evans labors under a misapprehension as regarding any laws re sick benefit and believing that there are other brothers who may believe that the subordinate lodges are compelled to pay a sick benefit, I desire to state that there is no law, either in the Supreme Statutes or in our Grand Statutes, that compels a subordinate lodge to pay any sick benefit; but it leaves it optional with the subordinate lodges to pay sick benefits or not as they see fit. So it seems to me that the laws that Bro. John N. Evans would urge upon the Supreme Lodge to enforce are, and have been, the laws of our Order since the Supreme Lodge session in Washington, D. C., in 1894, and any lodge of our Order is at liberty to adopt a by-law to suit the particular case as advocated by Bro. John N. Evans. It was not my intention to reply to Bro. Evans' letter, but not seeing any reply by any of our Grand Lodge officers to said letter in your January issue, I have taken the liberty of making above statements.

Granville Lodge is doing nicely in every respect, and on Jan. 4th, 1899, the officers for the current term were installed and are as follows: C. C., Chas. Rummel; V. C., L. V. Evans; P., John Jeffers; M. of W., Geo. Williams; K. R. & S., G. Thomas, Jr.; M. of F., Rev. Jas. Irvine; M. of E., C. L. Behnsen; M. at A., E. Palmer

When in
VANCOUVER

CALL AT

The . . .
Royal Cafe

Best Place in Town
to get a good

BROILED STEAK
CHOP or
CHICKEN

161 Cordova St. Open Night and Day