

original number that had seceded; bitter feelings, instead of being alloyed by time, as was prognosticated they would, became intensified; irritating, personal, and offensive articles, appeared in the public papers; Masonry was, by the profane, held up to scorn and derision, and it soon became evident that one of the greatest blunders ever committed in Grand Lodge, was to prevent a free discussion on the subject of separation, the worst result of which could hardly have been as bad as that caused by a refusal, as it is now presented to the world.

The time for acting upon abstract principles has passed, and the chance for so doing is irretrievably lost. No matter how logical our reasoning may be as regards the exploded and erroneous idea of unoccupied territory, the Grand Lodge of Quebec is now an established fact. They have taken possession of that territory; we cannot drive them out of it, nor can they drive us out of it by force; one party has to yield; they are determined to hold what they acquired, as they and others say, by right,—as we say by usurpation; they are the younger, the weaker,—we the other, the stronger body; they have erred in judgment,—we have been harsh in treatment; they are the offspring,—we the parent; they are Masons and we are Masons; we each and all claim to be the children of light, the advocates of peace and goodwill to mankind,—then let us, by example, show what we advocate by precept; let eminent brethren, who in private conversation have candidly expressed their opinion on the subject, come out at once openly and free, take the lead, and propose that by-gones shall be by-gones, that we will one and all accord a fraternal greeting to the Grand Lodge of Quebec, leave the arrangement of minor affairs to a joint committee; and we may then once more have the pleasure of witnessing the grand triumph of the principles of Masonry over the passions of frail human nature, as we, or at least many of us, witnessed at Toronto in July, 1858. So mote it me!

OTTO KLOTZ.

PRESTON, 15th April, 1870.

THE GRAND LODGE OF QUEBEC.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CRAFTSMAN.

SIR,—Availing myself of your kindness in offering still further the use of your columns for anything we may have to say on this subject, I desire to supplement my former communication with a few remarks more general in their scope. Permit me, however, first to observe that you altogether misjudge my motives in writing as I did. My desire was—as I think I clearly enough indicated—not to discuss the constitutionality of the question, but simply to place before our Ontario Brethren the incontrovertible evidence that we had not—as we had been almost universally, outside of our own circle, accused of—rashly and precipitately formed the G. L. of Quebec. So far as your comments go on the subject matter of my letter, I cannot but express myself well satisfied therewith. I might join issue with you as to your plea of “not guilty” to my “charge” of being one-sided, but I shall allow your readers to decide that point for themselves. In replying to my remarks, however, you have raised one or two important points which seem to me worthy of discussion. You assert that the “main question,” viz., “the right of our Quebec Brethren to erect a Grand Lodge,” “has been already fully and carefully considered and decided by Grand Lodge,” viz., in December last. Now if this were true, there would be some excuse for the continued determined opposition on the part of Grand Lodge of Canada officials and their sympathizers, to an approach to an amicable settlement of our differences, and if the fact of our lacking such “right” was so easily and so clearly demonstrated in December last, then there must be on the part of those numerous Masonic Jurists