

No. IV.

Quebec maintains that private lodge existence prior to Grand Lodge formation, does not give the right of continuance at will of original Grand Lodge obedience,—but that private lodge obedience is due to the regularly established local Grand Lodge.

In support thereof, Quebec relies not only upon ancient British constitutional enactments, but appeals also to other historical facts, of which the following are a part,—showing how “the fathers” interpreted and applied the inherent principles and ancient regulations of Freemasonry *vs* private lodge obedience and exclusive territorial Grand Lodge jurisdiction.

In 1768, one hundred and twenty-five years ago,—forty-six years after the formation of the “first Grand Lodge” in London,—thirty eight after that at York,—thirty-four after the founding of the Grand Lodge of Ireland,—twenty-seven after that of Scotland,—about ten years after the formation of the Grand Lodge of the “Ancients,”—and just fifty years before the establishment of the present United Grand Lodge of England,—even during this period when the doctrine of exclusive Grand Lodge jurisdiction was, as it were, “inchoate” and “uncrystallized,”—and when, in England, “a struggle for supremacy was (being) waged between two antagonistic Grand Lodges” (Hughan’s Masonic Register); even then (1768) the Grand Lodge of Scotland refused to grant a “Charter of Constitution” to certain brethren residing in London,—“in regard it would interfere with the

jurisdiction of the Grand Lodge of England,” (“Moderns.”)

In 1779, thirty-four years prior to the establishment of the present Grand Lodge of England, the Grand Lodge of Virginia, U. S. A., “ordered” all lodges within her territory, holding charters from England, Scotland, and Ireland, to become enrolled on her registry.

In 1782, the Grand Lodge of Massachusetts was formed and the St. Andrew’s Lodge, Scottish Constitution, Boston, not having voluntarily become of its obedience, the Grand Lodge in 1796 (17 years before the formation of the now Grand Lodge of England) adopted the following “resolution,” or rather “permanent regulation:”

“The Grand Lodge (of Massachusetts) will not hold communication with, nor admit as visitors, any Masons residing in this State, who hold authority under, and acknowledge the supremacy of any foreign Grand Lodge; or who do not by their representatives communicate with, and pay dues to this Grand Lodge.”

The Grand Lodges of Connecticut and of Pennsylvania passed identical resolutions shortly thereafter.

In 1815 the Grand Lodge of Ohio declared a certain lodge within her territory, and refusing allegiance thereto, “to have forfeited her privileges to labor, and to have become an unauthorized lodge, and that no person thereafter initiated in said lodge under its foreign charter, should ever be considered and acknowledged as a Mason by virtue of such initiation;”—and throughout the century now drawing to a close, the same doctrine and practice have prevailed in the United States.

This procedure, in my opinion was, and is, in strict accordance with