

territorial limits are coincident with those of the State. In British North America—exclusive of Newfoundland, which remains under the jurisdiction of the Grand Lodges of the United Kingdom—there are seven separate and independent Grand Lodges, each with its territorial limits clearly enough defined, but in Nova Scotia there is one lodge, and in the Province of Quebec three lodges, which have elected to remain in their old allegiance to the Grand Lodge of England. Turning our attention to the Craft at the Antipodes, we find one lodge in New South Wales and one in Victoria still remaining in allegiance to the Grand Lodge of England, and in South Australia one which retains its connection with the Grand Lodge of Ireland; while as showing that we adopt towards other Masonic powers the principle we have laid down for ourselves, there is in Cape Colony and adjoining territories a considerable body of Dutch lodges under the administration of a Deputy Grand Master, notwithstanding that Cape Colony has been British territory ever since the early years of the present century.

Up to this point we imagine that the editor of the CANADIAN CRAFTSMAN and ourselves would have been in perfect accord; indeed, we do not see that it is possible for exception to be taken to what we have said thus far, seeing that we have confined ourselves wholly to statements of fact which are incontrovertible. The divergence, however, would begin from this point. Our contemporary would lay it down as a principle—or as he has before designated it, a *Landmark*—that the moment a local Grand Lodge is established, all lodges situated within the territorial jurisdiction of such Grand Lodge *must* acknowledge its sovereignty and enrol themselves under its banner under penalty of being declared irregular or clandestine. As we understand it, the American doctrine of Exclusive Jurisdiction lays it down that when a local Grand Lodge has once been set up by a majority of the

lodges located within a certain territory, the lodges constituting the minority, though deriving their warrants from the identical Grand Lodge or Grand Lodges which set up the majority, cease, *ipso facto*, to have any will of their own. They are no longer free agents, nor have they the right to say—We derive our existence from the Grand Lodge of England, Ireland, or Scotland, as the case may be, we have flourished under her banner, we desire no change, much less do we wish for a severance of the connection with our parent Grand Lodges. You claim the right to secede and set up your own Grand Lodge, and we trust you may have before you a long and prosperous future; but we claim, with equal right, to remain as we are and as we have been from the very outset of our existence. The laws of the Grand Lodge or Lodges which warranted us sanction our adoption of this course, nor will those bodies accord you recognition as a supreme authority unless you allow us that freedom of action which you are exercising for yourselves. But we demur emphatically to the claims thus set up in favour of this law of Exclusive Jurisdiction. We say that in the form which it is now sought to give it, no such general law has ever existed in Freemasonry. It may or may not be accepted as such among the Grand Lodges of the United States, but it does not follow that, if or because it is so accepted, all the other Grand Lodges in the world must accept it likewise, and so elevate it to the dignity of a universal law of Masonry. Bro. Crawley has shown that the law of territorial jurisdiction was enacted in the first instance by the Grand Lodges of England and Ireland, while the interpretation placed upon the law by the bodies which enacted it has been consistently the same as shown by Bro. Speth in the case of the Grand Lodge of the Netherlands in 1770, and by the course adopted by England and Ireland when recognising the Grand Lodge of Canada and Grand Lodges of later creation. As Bro. Crawley very per-