

## The Canadian Craftsman.

Port Hope, July 15, 1882.

### TITLES NOT MASONIC.

The *Masonic Advocate* has a rather silly article, under the heading of "Titles Not Masonic." It says:—Masonic journals, like Masonic lodges, should exclude all titles that exalt one Mason above another, except such titles as have been conferred in a Masonic way. The Prince of Wales is not 'His Royal Highness' in a Masonic lodge, and his name should appear in Masonic journals with the prefix showing his rank as a Mason, and nothing more. Who ever heard of 'His Royal Highness' King Solomon, and yet this use of the title would be no more absurd than the practice of these Masonic journals in thus speaking of the present Grand Master of England." Now, the *Masonic Advocate* cannot understand that in Great Britain and the Colonies there is no other way by which either the gentry or the populace would think of addressing their future sovereign. It would be very absurd to say "Most Worshipful Brother Albert Edward" was present at such and such a meeting, or "Bro. Wales" moved such and such a resolution in Grand Lodge. We really do not see in what other manner the heir-apparent to the throne could be addressed.

We fully agree with our contemporary that it is not advisable in Masonry to use any but Masonic titles, though we think it is as common on this side of the water as it is on the other. We constantly see "Bro., the Rev." "Rt. Wor. Bro., the

Hon. A. B.," "Bro. Colonel so and so," and "Bro. Dr. Smith," or "Bro. W. Jones, M. D., 32°," or "Wor. Bro. Ailming, LL. D." etc. These, in our humble opinion, are far more objectionable than "His Royal Highness," a title the eldest son of the British sovereign has possessed for centuries, and may be almost regarded as part of his name. We fail, however, to understand the *Masonic Advocate*, when it says that "such expressions grate harshly on the ears of those who have been taught that as Masons we 'meet upon the level.'" If the *Masonic Advocate* understood British titles, it would know that the title of "H. R. H., the Prince of Wales," is really nominal, and confers no rank on the bearer, since under that title he is only a private gentleman, and not even a peer of the realm. He has to sit in the House of Lords through his dukedom, and consequently there should not be anything to "grate upon the ears" of anybody when we speak of the Grand Master of England as "His Royal Highness." Every nation has its own peculiar views, and if Englishmen love "a Lord," Americans are mighty fond of "Honorable," "Generals," "Colonels," "Doctors," etc. An English Mason thinks no more of addressing his Grand Master as "His Royal Highness," than an American brother does of saying "Bro. Doctor So-and-so," or "The Hon. Rt. Worshipful Blank." On this question, therefore, we think "honors are easy."

A charter was granted to Palestine Commandery, Belfast. Grant's tactics were adopted.