

only, in those acts, simple, unmitigated, unalloyed despotism. It is receding to the age of darkness and of iron. Masonry is too intelligent and enlightened to sanction it. If the Grand Lodge of England yields to it, she has arrived at the hour when the rising sun of her East should be transferred to represent the setting sun of her West, and in that changed position it will most appropriately emblematically her declining masonic glory.

I am not ready to say—and I, by no means, intend to say—that neglect and oppression by a Grand Lodge of her subordinates, will in all, or in a majority of cases, justify revolutionary measures. I design always to distinguish between that which is justifiably right, and that which is obviously wrong. And I think that, in most cases which arise, there is usually a well-marked line of distinction, which a well-informed and dispassionate man will experience no great difficulty in finding. I think, for instance, that I can perceive a very plain difference in the relations between a Grand Lodge and its subordinates existing in a single state or territory, and a G. Lodge and its subordinates existing in different countries, thousands of miles apart, and separated by an ocean. I think I can appreciate the existence of a very clear distinction between the difficulties of a few years ago with the Grand Lodge of New York and a portion of her subordinate lodges, and of those existing in 1855 between the Grand Lodge of England and her subordinate lodges in Canada. In the first case the disaffected lodges, in the outset, formed a part of the Grand Lodge of New York. They were represented upon its floor, with as full privileges as to being heard, as their associates; and, if injured, with the undoubted right of renewing the consideration of the subject matters of difference, from time to time, and of laboring to bring the majority to their views, and of convincing them by fact and argument, if they could. Thus situated, they preferred secession, and formed a new Grand Lodge for themselves. This was *revolutionary* beyond doubt, and so has the masonic world at large almost unanimously decided. But there is no fair parallel to this state of things in the case of Canada. The subordinate lodges of Canada had no representation in the Grand Lodge of England. They were in a state of complete and absolute dependence and pupilage. They could only appear at the door of that Grand Lodge as humble suppliants for their rights by written petition, without a single voice of their own upon its tessellated pavement to sustain and enforce their supplications. Their prayers of years were unheeded, their solicitations scorned, their injuries unredressed, and even their money taken from them without acknowledgment or notice. Are these cases analogous? It would be the most palpable and wicked mendacity to say so. Wrongs, such as I have named, could not be borne for ever. They

left the Canadian Lodges but a single alternative, either to give up masonry wholly and entirely, or to raise an independent masonic standard. The impassible point had been reached; the last drop of the cup of forbearance had been drained; and—unwilling to be *forced* from the privileges and enjoyments of the order—they made the selection of honorable independence, and appealed to the justice of a world-wide masonry for sanction and brotherhood. This, in my judgment, was *not* revolution, but the exercise of a proper, necessary and just right; and the masonic world will so decide, unless it is prepared to hold, that there is not, *in any case whatever*, a remedy for masonic oppression.

Upon both grounds then, my brethren, as I view this subject; of the *inherent* right of every state, territory, or country, to establish a Grand Lodge of its own, and the right of a country holding its masonry from a foreign source, to make a severance for unmitigated oppression, I maintain, that the independent Grand Lodge of Canada, established at Hamilton on the 10th day of October, 1855, is legitimately and masonically established, and is entitled *justly and of right* to the sanction, countenance, and support of all the Grand Lodges in the world.

Within a few days after the masonic action of the forty-one lodges at Hamilton, the then Grand Master of the Grand Lodge of New York seems, evidently, to have become alarmed. Before the infant Grand Lodge of Canada was fairly invested with its swaddling-clothes, he appears perfectly prepared to strangle it in its cradle. Seven days only were suffered to pass before he stigmatized many as good men and worthy masons as the world can elsewhere boast of, as being guilty of masonic "rebellion," and then sounded the old atabal alarm of "rebellion" at home. Without taking the trouble to distinguish between Canadian and New York "rebellion," he seized upon the matter a *petitio principii*, assimilated the two unlike cases by a single dash of the pen, raised from their quiet graves the long laid skeletons of "heresy and schism," looked anxiously across the Atlantic to the long-withheld patronizing smile which had a few years past almost emblazoned the waves of old ocean in its passage from London to New York, and concluded that it would be the "height of ingratitude" to England to do any thing less than proscribe the new and independent Grand Lodge of Canada. The same panic alarm seized upon his Committee of Foreign Correspondence in June following. Leo the Tenth and the Cardinals of the Vatican could hardly have been more alarmed at the appearance of the new dogmas of Luther. The shadows of "heresy and schism" triumphed, and glorious New York, at the hands of her strong and great men, chose to confine her masonic sympathies to her own side of the St. Lawrence.

Not thus did the masonry of the empire state reason when she formed her own independent Grand Lodge. She did not rely upon the "implied or express consent of England," nor seek the sanction of any Provincial Grand Lodge which had chartered local lodges in her territory; nor did she then understand that *rebellion* and *independence* were synonymous terms. She then felt the ability to stand up and walk in her own legitimate inherent strength; she threw the crutches of English dependence in England's face, and marched on triumphantly to her own high and glorious masonic destiny. When I assert this I do it upon the authority contended for by the legitimate Grand Lodge of New York, which has always claimed that "in 1785 it adopted a new constitution, and thereby *threw off all allegiance* to the parent body." Unless this be true, I see no escape from the position contended for by the revolutionary Grand Lodge of that state, which I understand to hold, "that, down to 1849, the Grand Lodge of New York continued to be *Provincial* to the Grand Lodge of England."

Before the declared independence of the Grand Lodge of New York, by the alleged action of 1785, that grand body had, for several years, been independent *de facto*. Her Provincial Charter required her to make returns of her proceedings to the Grand Lodge of England, and allow appeals to be taken thereto. But from and after September 1777, she made no returns, and suffered no appeals to be taken; styled herself the Grand Lodge of New York, and not the Provincial Grand Lodge, and claimed the independent title of *Most Worshipful* instead of *Right Worshipful*, the latter being the title of all Provincial Grand Lodges. For the term of about eight years, then, she acted independently, without declaring herself so, and her action, during that interregnum between dependence and undeclared independence, she has always claimed to have been correct and legitimate, and the masonic world has not denied it. Upon principle, however, it would be difficult to find anything as irregular as all this in any of the acts and doings of the forty-one lodges of Canada.

Missouri, in refusing to acknowledge the independent Grand Lodge of Canada, offers no argument but the first impressions of her Grand Master, acquiesced in, apparently *pro forma*, by a Committee. The decision of Virginia, I only know by a statement in the *Freemason's Magazine* of Boston. I have not yet seen her proceedings; but if the Grand Lodge of that venerable old state is perfectly satisfied with the facts and arguments on which her own independence was established, it is not easy to understand her want of appreciation of those which exist as to the independent Grand Lodge of Canada.

I have read the Report of the Committee on this subject, adopted by the Grand Lodge of