

Laws, are as distinct as are those of either of the other Countries, which with England and Wales make up Great Britain and Ireland. Nay in some particulars they are even more distinct. As establishing this fact of territorial distinction we may mention that one of the members from Wales during the last session of the Imperial Parliament, moved for the abolition of the connection between Church and State in the Principality, as had already been done for the Irish people.

Bearing this fact in mind, the appropriateness of the above illustration will be at once seen. The chief ground upon which our Quebec brethren justify their action in forming a so-called Grand Lodge of Quebec, is that New Brunswick and Nova Scotia have both independent Grand Lodges, and, therefore, Quebec has an equal right to have one. But if that be a good argument Wales has an equal right, seeing that Scotland and Ireland, each having the same relation to the Central Legislature, have their Independent Grand Lodges. We submit this view to the judgment of those of our brethren who are disposed to recognize some shadow of right in the action of the Quebec Schismatics, based upon the existence of Grand Lodges in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick.

We have another impartial testimony to offer, all the more valuable because it appears in a paper that has been disposed to look with some favour upon the Quebec movement, viz: *The Freemason*, of London. In the number of the 25th March, we have a continuation of the history of Freemasonry in Ireland, which Bro. William James Hughan is contributing to that paper, and which is being printed in leaded editorial type with, therefore, the full authority and sanction of the editor. Referring to the unfortunate schism which occurred in the Grand Lodge of Ireland in the early part of this century Bro. Hughan says:—

"Any one at all conversant with the state of freemasonry in Ireland in the early part of this century will be aware that the Grand Lodge was mismanaged to a very great extent. Of course it is not our province to keep this fact in the dark at the present time, for, in attempting to write the history of any period of Freemasonry, defects must be chronicled as well as virtues, seeing that the progress of the Craft is greatly dependent upon the laws and the character of the officers of the Grand Lodge being in harmony with the spirit and scope of the Institution. According to evidences we have had submitted to us, and judging from results, certainly Ireland was nothing like so well govern'd, Masonically, about 1810 as it is now, and even now a little more freedom would be appreciated by many. Although we would never countenance rebellion against a regularly constituted, authority by members who have signified their adhesion to its jurisdiction and laws, and though we consider an obligation taken voluntarily by a brother is binding, and demands obedience to, or withdrawal from, the Society, yet we can quite imagine circumstances that would justify opposition to a Grand Lodge, so long as the brethren objecting refrained from stirring a rival institution. In this respect seceders from the Grand Lodge of Ireland did wrong, as also did the "Ancients" of England. Granting that there were reasons to complain of the "shameful mismanagement" existing in the Grand Lodge of Ireland early in this century, all the evils said to be connected with the government of the Craft would no form a sufficient plea to throw off allegiance and constitute a new Grand Lodge. The obligation of fealty having been taken, it was simply for the discontented to seek a redress of their grievance by constitutional means, and failing in such an attempt, we would rather have withdrawn from the Body than have done wrong ourselves because others had done wrong also!"

Now that view meets exactly the case of the Quebec seceders, and