

Quebec will soon be terminated, and that at an early date we shall be able to congratulate Bro. Graham on having been the means of bringing to a peaceful and satisfactory close the unfortunate differences which have so long been experienced in our sister Province.

Grand Lodge Jurisdiction.

Let us bring this subject to the crucial test, and then let us see if it be a Masonic truth that there must be *unity* in the organization to constitute a legal Grand Lodge in any unoccupied territory.

First. The history of the formation of the Grand Lodge of England, the first one ever formed, shows us that only four of all the Lodges in England constituted that Body. The Lodge, at least one, which fills the bill of Bros. Brown and McCalla, at York, if there were not many more there, and all the Lodges in the north of England—all the Lodges in Scotland, and there were very many there, did not unite in that movement. That, according to Bros. B. and McC., the Lodges in Scotland should have united is evident, because, as Great Britain is composed of England, Scotland and Wales, so far as the argument is worth anything at all, it was necessary to include the Lodges in Scotland.

Sometime between 1738 and 1745 the seceding Grand Lodge took its start, and after the call to its assistance of Dermott, he invited the countenance of the Grand Lodges of Scotland and Ireland, which was granted to them, and the Duke of Athol, who was or had been Grand Master of Scotland, assumed the Grand Master's office of the Dermott Body. From that Body, formed partly of seceders and partly of other Lodges, instituted by the seceders without charters, sprang largely the charters in several of the colonies, among them conspi-

ciously the charters for all the Lodges in Pennsylvania. Not a single charter in that colony, as we are informed, came from the Grand Lodge of the Moderns in London. So several were granted in Massachusetts and in South Carolina, and at one time the Ancients in the last State had a distinct Grand Lodge, as did also the other party.

As to Scotland, the Grand Lodge was organized in 1736 without unity.

Bro. Murry Lyon says, page 172:

"On completing the sederunt, thirty-three of the hundred Lodges or so that had been invited were found to be represented, each by a Master and two Wardens."

At this Assembly the Earl of St. Clair resigned his perpetual Grand Master's office and was immediately thereafter elected Grand Master, under the constitution then adopted, for the year 1737.

In this we have a clear demonstration against the doctrine, even of the requirement of a majority, for only one-third of the Lodges of Scotland were here represented. Suppose there were nine Lodges in any territory, three could form a Grand Lodge.

The same was the result of the formation of the Grand Lodge of Ireland in 1729, the Lodges in Dublin only being present.

We now refer to France, and what do we find to be the history of Masonry there? Simply that no such idea ever prevailed, that every Lodge in the kingdom must unite to form a Grand Lodge. In consequence of the opposite idea prevailing, a minority of any number not less than three had a right to organize a Grand Lodge.

This was the general continental view; hence if we refer to the history of the formation of the several Grand Lodges in Europe during the eighteenth century we find in every case that there was no unity insisted upon, but in some instances several Grand Lodges were formed, as in Berlin, where to-day there exist the three