

We might proceed to argue this point of etiquette, but why do so when so many interests are at stake? Admitting that we were justified in the act, yet can we not without in any degree affecting the dignity of this Grand Lodge, reconsider the action of last year; and in that spirit of charity, which covers a multitude of short comings and a wide difference of opinion, say to the Grand Lodge of Connecticut, we propose to meet you on your own ground?

We should be willing to do much to restore peace and harmony, and unite the Grand Lodges of this country into one harmonious whole.

In taking the stand which we have for the maintenance of a vital principle, we are convinced that we are in the right. We are further convinced of that fact from the assurances which have come to us through the reports of committees on foreign correspondence from most of the Grand Lodges on this continent. To be sure, these are but the expressions of individual masons, and in no sense to be accepted as the voice of the grand bodies which they represent, and yet the almost unanimous expression of their disapproval of the position assumed by the Grand Lodge of Connecticut cannot but have its weight.

While we are thus upheld in our position on the question of the principle involved, there is not such an unanimity of opinion as to the course adopted in suspending all masonic intercourse.

The point at issue between the two Grand Lodges is briefly, can the Grand Lodge of Connecticut, by the operation of its own laws, sever the membership of a member of a New York State Lodge? We say they cannot. Eminent craftsmen in other States who, as members of committees on foreign correspondence have officially reported, say they cannot. The verdict as far as opinion goes is in our favor.

Being convinced that we are right, shall we be strenuous upon a question of etiquette, and say that we will not yield the point? Does the dignity of this Grand Lodge require that we should not recede from our declaration of non-intercourse?

I am as strenuous as any one to maintain our rights and occupy the position to which we are entitled, as sovereign in our own jurisdiction, and yet I do say, that I think it would be to our credit as masons, and in no sense be considered as lowering the dignity of this Grand Lodge, to recall the edict of non-intercourse, and say to the brethren of Connecticut—to its Grand Lodge—we propose to submit this question of principle to arbitration by our peers.

Earnestly desiring as a member of the craft, that a council of our peers should pass in judgment on the case at issue, I do recommend that this Grand Lodge consider whether it is not our duty to pick up the key and unlock the door, which the Grand Lodge of Connecticut now assumes, stands as a barrier between them and arbitration.

The Grand Master afterwards announced that the edict of non-intercourse with the masons of Connecticut is now terminated.

WASHINGTON—Committee on foreign correspondence says: To say that the Grand Lodge of Connecticut cannot constitute masons residing within its territory into new lodges, according to its own constitution and laws, because some of them are members of a lodge situate in another State, and because by law of that State membership cannot be terminated except in a particular way, is not in effect giving

for  
Yor  
ritor  
own  
its p  
In  
that  
balli  
cally  
consi  
its te  
it as  
who,  
in co  
const  
quali  
exerc  
absol  
ancie  
cise o  
limits  
this l  
bers o  
Lodge  
Conne  
tion, a  
limits  
To  
clusior  
in this  
to whi  
So  
with N  
great n  
soon b  
M  
jurisdic  
Grand  
clearly