

were under England and Scotland continuing so thereafter, if they so preferred.

In the Proceedings of the Grand Lodge of Quebec, p. 73, *re Appendix*, I find that the terms agreed to by the Joint Committee of Canada and Quebec, provided amongst other points:

"2. That in view of the arrangement made between the Grand Lodge of Canada and the Grand Lodges of England and Scotland, by which the former obtained the Masonic recognition of the latter on condition of the lodges then working under the said Grand Lodges of England and Scotland being permitted to continue their work, the said Grand Lodges agreeing not to grant any further warrants within the Province of Canada, and having regard to the fact that there still exist within the Province of Quebec three lodges working under warrants from the Grand Lodge of England, and one lodge working under that of Scotland, in conformity with this arrangement, it is agreed that while every effort shall be made to induce these lodges to surrender their warrants and come under the jurisdiction of the Grand Lodge of Quebec, the said Grand Lodge will recognize the arrangement hereinbefore recited, until the relations of those lodges towards the Grand Lodge of Quebec have been finally decided upon between the said Grand Lodges and the Grand Lodge of Quebec."

The Lodge of Scottish origin elected to join the Grand Lodge of Quebec—wisely so in our opinion—but the three English Lodges still decide not to do so, for which I am very sorry, but clearly they are acting within their rights in so doing, and according to the foregoing agreement, duly signed on behalf of the Grand Lodges of Canada and Quebec, they have the best of authority to continue under England until the matter has been satisfactorily adjusted by the Grand Lodges affected.

I am unable to understand on what grounds our Quebec brethren have

been so wroth with us because we decline to withdraw the three warrants in question. Why should we cancel them? So long as the members of those lodges obey our constitutions we cannot legally do so, but they can surrender their Charters as their own voluntary acts and deeds, and then the difficulty would end. For my part, I much wish they would—to use the words of the agreement aforesaid—dated February 17, 1874—"with the object of restoring peace and harmony and brotherly love in the Craft," and surely it would be for the true interests of all concerned. The agreement was made whilst my esteemed friend and brother, Dr. Graham, whose name is "a tower of strength" in that province to this day, was Grand Master of Quebec.

The official account of the question as entered in the records of the Grand Lodge of England in relation to the regretted edict of non-intercourse by the Grand Lodge of Quebec will be found in the published proceedings for December 3, 1884.—*The (London) Freemason*, April 7.

QUEBEC vs. ENGLAND.

BY P. G. M. BRO. J. H. GRAHAM.

No. I.

In *The Freemason* of April 7, our much esteemed Bro. W. J. Hughan, of Torquay,—with evidently good intent, and with his usual candor and well-known ability,—"restated" from his (and I suppose the generally accepted English) point of view, the case of "England v. Quebec" re the present unhappy condition of their Masonic interjurisdictional affairs.

It may therefore be opportune; and it may also, for certain reasons, appear to Bro. Hughan and to other