

does the change of the name to Quebec and Ontario, without any change of boundary, and giving them back a separate legislature, (which they previously had, as Lower Canada and Upper Canada,) at all justify some of the lodges in one of the provinces in erecting an independent Grand Lodge, within the constitutional and recognized boundary of the Grand Lodge of Canada without its consent.

This, M. W. Grand Master, is the real question at issue in the case, whether a new Grand Lodge may be erected within the *recognized jurisdiction* of a Grand Lodge without its consent, and not the right of an independent State or province to have an independent Masonic Government, a right recognized by the Grand Lodge of Canada, as well as by us. In the case of Virginia and West Virginia, this Grand Lodge decided this question, and your committee in their last year's report say the principle involved is the same; they might further have said, that the differences that do exist in the two cases, were in favor of the Grand Lodge of Canada. A portion of the jurisdiction of the Grand Lodge of Virginia, during the civil war, was erected into a new State, and the lodges therein created a Grand Lodge, which this Grand Lodge refused to recognize, until it acquired the recognition of the mother Grand Lodge. Why? because it was erected out of the territory *within* the recognized *Masonic jurisdiction* of the Grand Lodge of Virginia, and yet, it was an independent State to all intents and purposes; and if the argument of your committee were to obtain, it had the right to demand the recognition of the Grand Lodge of Louisiana and all other Grand Lodges. On the other hand the Grand Lodge of Canada was formed by lodges of *two separate and distinct provinces*, and recognised as including both provinces in her jurisdiction, and met alternately in each. These provinces are the same to-day as they were in 1855, (under other names;) the addition of the provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick to the general government of the Dominion, not affecting the question at all, and no good reason has been advanced, why the jurisdiction of this Grand Lodge should be severed without her consent any more than in the case of the Grand Lodge of Virginia. Nor can the Grand Lodge of Louisiana decide differently in this case, without abandoning the principle heretofore maintained by her—the *sovereignty of Grand Lodge jurisdiction*—a principle of very great importance to all American Grand Lodges. The very decided manner in which the Grand Lodge of Louisiana has heretofore expressed her opinion in favor of the inviolability of Grand Lodge jurisdiction, should make her exceedingly careful, in my opinion, not to express an opinion in opposition to her previous decisions, and calculated to weaken a principle of Masonic jurisprudence fast becoming universal in this country.

Should she do so, she will not only decide contrary to her previous decisions, but will thereby decide that a portion of the lodges in a Grand Lodge jurisdiction may at their pleasure say, that a sufficient change has