his well-known disposition to maintain an opinion, and "to fight it out out on this line," together with the advantage of a year's preparation, has enabled him (to the casual reader) to present a strong report in favor of his previous proposition "to recognize the so-called Grand Lodge of Quebec." The short time since my reception of his report, and the demands upon my time by the large amount of business in my office preparing for this communication, will prevent me from doing that justice to the subject that its importance demands.

With all due courtesy to your able committee, I think they have failed to bring this subject before the Grand Lodge in its proper light. In their anxiety to support a previously expressed opinion, they have failed to state some of the most important points of the case; and by turning their principle attention to the support of a generally acknowledged law, have given a bearing to the case not authorized by the facts.

Their argument is principally devoted to the support of these two points: "That every independent state or province is entitled to an independent Masonic government," and, "that the act of the English Parliament of 1867 severed the province of Canada into two separate and distinct provinces—Quebec and Ontario.

The first is not the real question at issue in the recognition or non-recognition of the Grand Lodge of Quebec; and the latter, so far as the argument applied to it in the report of the committee, is most certainly not the case.

In regard to the first, "That each independent State is entitled to an independent Masonic government," I assert this is not the point in question. But quoting the words of an eminent brother, M. W. Leslie Peters, the Grand Master of the Grand Lodge of New Brunswick,) one of the provinces of the Dominion of Canada), it is "*the great doctrine of Masonic Grand Lodge sovereignty on trial,*"

In regard to the second, I am of opinion that a subsequent act of Paliament, cannot (in the sense used by the committee) sever that, which had been severed previous to the formation of the Grand Lodge of Canada.

To make plain my opinion I will quote from the address of the above named Ill. Brother, to his Grand Lodge upon this subject, where I find my opinions expressed far better than I can do in language of my own:

"A serious question involving the important subject of masonic sovereignty has arisen within the jurisdiction of the Grand Lodge of Canada. It is a matter of general interest affecting the authority of every independent Grand Lodge.

"In placing the memorials, circulars and documents addressed to the several Grand Lodges, and which have been received at the office of the Grand Secretary in this jurisdiction, before you, I ask your careful and thoughtful investigation of the whole question. All consideration