

answer to the misguided and belligerent brethren of Quebec, and indirectly to Illinois, was not very edifying, it ought to have been instructive, and, in my humble opinion, ought to be convincing, and cause them to halt in their wicked course. It is as follows:—"We have carefully reconsidered our expressed views, as requested by our esteemed correspondent, Grand Secretary Isaacson, but we see no reason to alter those views in any particular. While we regret that the Grand Lodge of Quebec is not now practically supreme over all its territory, and never has been supreme, we cannot endorse the efforts of the Grand Lodge of Quebec and the Grand Lodge of Illinois to boycott the Grand Lodge of England. Boycotting has been judicially declared, by profane courts, to be unlawful; still more should it be deemed so in Masonic circles. The Grand Lodge of England has never invaded, in any manner, the territory of the Grand Lodge of Quebec, but has merely declined to revoke the warrants for its subordinate lodges therein. It has, very properly, as we understand, advised lodges in Quebec to connect themselves with the Grand Lodge of Quebec; but it has declined to compel them to do so, by the revocation of their warrants. We think the Grand Lodge of England has a Masonic right to take the position it has, and, unless we are very much mistaken, the large majority of the American Grand Lodges will so determine, if the question is brought before them."—Editor *Keystone*.

One of the passages in the letter of Right Worshipful Bro. Isaacson, referred to above, is the key to all the misery wrought, threatening to engulf the whole Masonic world, if the suicidal policy of coercion is not speedily suppressed. It is the following:—"The Grand Lodge of Quebec was regularly and properly formed and established, in strict accordance with Masonic law and usage, in 1869. Since then it has been recognized by

sixty-four sister Grand Lodges (including Pennsylvania) as being the only Masonic governing body in and over the territory of the Province of Quebec."

Now, whether it was "regularly and properly formed and established in strict accordance with Masonic law and usage," depends upon what this law and usage is. Our Quebec brethren maintain that a majority of lodges in a territory can combine in the formation of a Grand Lodge, and then coerce the minority not assenting into obedience and affiliation therewith; and this view is shared by leading brethren in this grand jurisdiction. In a preceding communication published in this journal, under the *nom de plume* of "Lux e Tenebra," I denied the soundness of this proposition, and gave my reasons, which, I believe, are unanswerable. So far they have not been assailed, certainly not overcome; and I am pleased to see them powerfully supported, in almost the same identical phraseology, by *Kansas Light*, endorsed by and published in *The Keystone*, of Philadelphia, in the issue of August 21st, as follows:—"The position of the three lodges in Montreal and the two Encampments of New Brunswick, are identically the same. At the time of their formation, the entire British territory in North America was Masonically unoccupied; any Masonic power was at liberty to enter the field and establish bodies therein in accordance with its own statutes, and the bodies thus created were amenable only to the power which created them. And when, in due time, all the bodies jointly occupying a certain political jurisdiction, are unanimous in their desire for self-government, then, and not until then, should a governing body be established. The foundation of all free States is consent of the governed; the entire theory of Masonic government is based on free will and accord; the member of a Masonic body is amenable to the rules and regulations of