

occurred in their political organization to authorize them in setting up an independent Grand Lodge jurisdiction without the consent of the mother Grand Lodge, (a principle that came very near being acted upon in our own jurisdiction during "the late unpleasantness.") Nor do I think the Grand Lodge of Louisiana would be justified in supposing, that a Grand Lodge, with whom she has for years been in fraternal correspondence, and whose officers and members occupy so high a moral, social and intellectual position as the Grand Lodge of Canada, would, without good and sufficient reasons therefor, refuse by so large a majority as it did at its last annual grand communication, the request of those, who for *peace sake*, asked for the recognition of the so-called Grand Lodge of Quebec.

Were this, M. W. Grand Master, a question of policy, of whether, in the opinion of your Grand Lodge, it would be better and more to the advantage of the lodges and brethren of Canada to have two instead of one Grand Lodge, then your decision might be in favor of the Grand Lodge of Quebec, and the opinion of the Grand Lodge of Louisiana would have the great weight with our Canada brethren; but, as I before stated, this is *not* the question of *policy*, but the *law or facts appertaining to Grand Lodge jurisdiction*. Your committee state, "that by examination of the last proceedings of the Grand Lodge of Canada, they find the number of lodges holding under the Grand Lodge of Canada, the same as of last report." They might have said further, that in the same proceedings (a few pages further on) that, "letters were submitted from the Grand Lodge of Ireland refusing recognition to the so-called Grand Lodge of Quebec, and from Yamaska Lodge No. 130, Granby, Province of Quebec, to the effect that it had, by an unanimous vote, returned in its allegiance to the Grand Lodge of Canada."

M. W. Grand Master, your committee state that fifteen Grand Lodges have recognized the Grand Lodge of Quebec, and submit it as an argument to influence the decision of the Grand Lodge favorably to the recognition asked for and recommended.

M. W. Sir, the very fact, that in more than two years, but fifteen Grand Lodges have been influenced to recognize it, while others have positively refused, and many unwilling to decide, and that too, in a case where, (as M. W. Grand Master Peters, of New Brunswick, says) "our sympathies are naturally with our Quebec brethren," shows conclusively that grave doubts of the legitimacy of this Quebec body exists among the large body of American Grand Lodges. And I may here say, and in all charity too, that had these fifteen Grand Lodges, and some of our Masonic newsvenders, who, like Micawber, "wait for something to turn up," have been less anxious to meddle in the local affairs of a sister Grand Lodge, that the great probability is, that had the desired change been properly advocated by a considerable majority of the lodges of the Quebec district, and in a *Masonic manner*, that the desired end would have been obtained long ere this; and the craft benefitted by friendly and social intercourse, instead of injury by the wrangling of factions.

If the Quebec brethren were to be benefitted by the desired change, suitable application and earnest support of a just claim would effect that, which a noisy and clamorous demand, as a *right*, would be calculated to lose.

Individually, M. W. Sir, I may say, as a native of the city of Quebec, my sympathies naturally incline me to side with the brethren of my