

would have your readers believe that the efforts of the A. Y. Rite party to prevent themselves from being wiped out of existence, (evidently the Kennedy party started out with this object in view) was *forcing* their opinions *indiscreetly*, and hold me responsible for the "unfortunate crisis." In his opinion the question was "in reality of no importance to the craft whatever" whether the A. Y. Rite existed or not. The advocates of that Rite, he says, should "patiently wait." Yes! should have waited patiently, I suppose, till a sufficient number of votes had been manufactured by the Prince Rupert's Lodge process, which process he "cannot help thinking" should be recognized, to have placed the Kennedy party in the majority, so that another opportunity might be afforded them to enforce the ritual of their choice.

"G. F., Jr.," enters upon his "impartial criticism" by stating that the difficulty between Bro. Conklin and myself "in re a certain edict" had been "happily adjusted," and informs your readers that "there were faults on both sides." Had he been partial in his criticism upon this point he would, probably, have intimated what these faults were upon my part; as he did not, I think I may rest assured there was no evidence that I again displayed "partizanship" in this matter.

Regarding Lisgar Lodge offenders, no condolence is proffered, and I pass on to the alleged "mystery" which P. G. M. Kennedy has created on the mind of "G. F., Jr.," by the delay of the report of the Committee on Credentials. In this matter there appears to be a disposition on the part of Bro. Kennedy, or "G. F., Jr.," or perhaps both, to grasp at a shadow, if indeed there be even a shadow. I should be glad to please "G. F., Jr.," but I "cannot help thinking" that, as the action of the Committee does not differ materially from that of many sister Grand Lodges; as there was not one dissenting voice to the reception or

adoption of any of the reports (the "great deal of important business" alluded to by P. G. M. Kennedy, in his address, described by "G. F., Jr.,") or any objection raised as to who were entitled to vote, candid criticism "should not be excluded for mere technical reasons."

In the matter of Assiniboine Lodge, which appears to "G. F., Jr." as irregular, I would say that an application from that Lodge was received several weeks before the meeting of Grand Lodge, asking permission to hold their *regular* meeting in Winnipeg, so that in the event of a Charter being granted the Worshipful Master might be installed, and thus avoid the expense and inconvenience of Grand Lodge officers going to their Lodge room.

The dispensation was granted, the business done as per proceedings, and if such a course on the part of Assiniboine Lodge or myself was "irregular," "improper," "foolish," or even "high-handed," your CRAFTSMAN, of April 15th, 1878, is partly responsible.

"Evidently," says "G. F., Jr.," there was some "hitch anent the Past Masters of Prince Rupert's Lodge" which he "cannot understand at this distance." Allow me to state that certain of them had been *irregularly affiliated* according to the Constitution, and improperly returned to the Grand Secretary, as the proceedings show. Still "G. F., Jr.," cannot help thinking "that they should not be excluded for merely technical reasons." Compare his thoughts with P. G. M. Kennedy's, when the latter stated that "the Constitution should be burnt up." These opinions might properly be hitched together.

In allowing Grand Lodge to decide when the election of officers should take place, instead of exercising my prerogative in opposition to or in favor of Kennedy's motion to elect officers on the evening of the 13th June, 1878, does "G. F., Jr." consider that I displayed partizanship? When