

besides the two now claimed to be in existence, would the P. G. M. have organised by these five private lodges?

Nor is the scheme one whit more applicable to Western than to Eastern Canada. It is not *division* but *union* which Canadian masonry requires. The Provincial Grand Lodge of Canada West has already repudiated this splitting-up plan, and expressed the strong conviction that nothing short of "entire masonic independence" will satisfy the wants of Canadian masons. The sooner this fact is conceded and acted upon by all parties, the better will it be for masonry,—not in Canada alone, but in England and the world over.

### AN ANTI-BILLIOUS PILL FOR MASSACHUSETTS.

Though we have been favoured, since our last Report, with no direct communications from the new Grand Lodge of Canada, yet many outside of that Province had taken up the subject of their recent organization; and hence, in view of our remarks of last year, we feel called upon to notice it. Your Committee, towards the conclusion of their Report of last year, embodied in full the communication from Canada, and say, that "taking all that is stated in the Canada document as strictly correct, (as we fully believe is the case,) we think the organization of the Grand Lodge of Canada, right and proper, and that this Grand Lodge ought at once to tender to her the right hand of fellowship." But as our Report of last year was made after the close of the Grand Lodge, it had no opportunity to express its views thereon. Since that Report, we find that the Grand Lodge of California has declined to express an opinion; that the Grand Lodge of the District of Columbia, after recognizing its organization, reconsidered its action, and further expressed no opinion, waiting for further information\*; and several of the other Grand Lodge have pursued a similar course. By the Grand Lodge of Massachusetts, however, a charge of rebellion has been made against our Canadian Brethren, and all Masonic intercourse strictly forbidden with that Grand Lodge, or any Lodge or individual having any connection therewith. The Report of the Committee of the Grand Lodge of Massachusetts, to whom the subject was referred, occupies nine pages, and probably contains all that can be said on that side of the question, and as we are disposed to take the opposite side, we shall, in reviewing it, give our reasons at some length.

After giving a sketch of the reasons which led to the movement, and the transactions incident thereto, taken, in the main, from the communication published in our last Report, the Massachusetts Committee say "that here is a case almost new in our Masonic experi-

ence, involving principles of the highest importance—appealing strongly to our sympathies as freemen—and requiring that prudence and caution whereby we may avoid being led through those sympathies into a course inconsistent with those well-tryed principles, which have so long secured peace and tranquility within the borders of this Grand Lodge."

This is all very well as a self-given caution; now, let us see how well it is followed. They say, "the naked question to be met is briefly as follows, viz.: whether it is consistent with the recognized laws and customs of Freemasonry, for any portion of the Lodges under a particular jurisdiction to secede from its parent body, without its consent, and to form of their own authority, a new body, having an independent existence and independent powers." Though this question is not exactly fair, we will, for the purposes of the argument, take it as it is put. As a preliminary, "the principles which have always, by common consent, governed the relations of the various Grand Lodges of this country with each other and with foreign countries," must be defined. Let us see how this is done by the Committee. They say that "the leading principle is, that each Grand Lodge in the United States rules and governs, without interference from any other, all Lodges within the civil jurisdiction of the State in which she is situated, holding the Territories as common ground, wherein each Grand Lodge is free to charter Lodges at pleasure, until each Territory, by being regularly admitted into the Union as a State, acquires the right to form a Grand Lodge for itself." The first portion of this principle is correct,—no one disputes it,—but it is wholly inapplicable to the case in hand, so far as we can perceive, without the addition of the clause, "until each Territory, by being regularly admitted into the Union as a State," etc., put by us in italics, and the correctness of which we distinctly deny, and the assumption of which as correct by the Massachusetts Committee, is simply begging the question, and is the point to be proved. To-be-sure, they go on to say that they "are aware that this (that is, the formation of a Grand Lodge) has sometimes been done before admission as a State; but although it may be alleged in excuse that Territories are States in process of formation, we still think the practice illegal, and not to be justified in any case." What has become of "the principles which have always, by common consent, governed? Where is an indication of the common consent to be found? What has been the common practice but directly the opposite of what the Massachusetts Committee state? There is nothing to support the principle claimed but the simple *ipse dixit* of the Massachusetts Committee. Who ever heard it declared that the Masons in Florida, Minnesota, Oregon, and Kansas were in open rebell-

on? Whose consent have they ever obtained but their own to the formation of their Grand Lodges? Whose did they require? And have they not been recognized—yes congratulated even—by nearly every Grand Lodge in the world, including the Grand Lodge of Massachusetts, on the formation of their Grand Lodges? And has that Grand Lodge ever dreamt of suspending all Masonic intercourse with these, our sister Grand Lodges, their constituents or members, for open rebellion or any other cause? Of course not. As we in substance have said before, we most emphatically deny that it is a principle universally received by common consent, that until each Territory has been regularly admitted into the Union as a State, the masons therein have not the right, if sufficient in numbers, to form a Grand Lodge for themselves. It is the opposite doctrine which has always been acquiesced in by common consent, and the Massachusetts Committee are the first to declare it illegal, when it has become necessary for them to do so to sustain what otherwise would be an untenable position. The argument might here be closed, but as the Report under review abounds in other fallacies, we propose to follow it through.

The Committee say that "with regard to the Lodges of Great Britain and Ireland, the case is exactly analogous to ours. Neither of these Grand Lodges charters Lodges within the bounds of the others, though all do so in the Colonies, just as we do in the Territories." This point is correctly stated, but did not the Committee see that it was fatal to the conclusion at which they wished to arrive? But their inconsistency still continues, for in the very next paragraph but one, they say, "We are now called upon to recognize, as a Grand Lodge, a body formed on different principles from our own?" How so? Was not Canada common territory to the Grand Lodges of England, Ireland and Scotland, just as our Territories are to our sister Grand Lodges? Was it not occupied by the three Grand Lodges in common, as the Grand Lodges of the several States occupy the Territories of the United States? And is not Canada more on an equality with Ireland and Scotland, in civil and political rights and privileges, than Minnesota is with Massachusetts? What body of Masons in a Territory or new State did ever ask the consent of their several parent Grand Lodges to the formation of a new Grand Lodge. On the contrary, they first organized their Grand Lodge, generally so soon as three Lodges would consent, whether a Territory or State—proclaimed themselves as the equals, the peers, of the oldest Grand Lodges in the world—took their stand as such, and were maintained in it. What have the Masons of Canada done more than this, except to bear, for a long number of years, with a Grand Lodge who cared for them only as a source of tribute and extortion?—who never listened to any of their calls for redress, and never took any special notice of them, except to send men to rule over them. We say, then, that we are called upon to recognize, as a Grand Lodge, a body of Masons formed "on exactly analogous principles to

\*This is an error. The Grand Lodge of the District of Columbia re-affirmed its resolution recognizing the Grand Lodge of Canada.—E. M. P.