

rates of admission and of annual contributions, being left to the discretion of the several subordinate lodges, are very numerous and varied (the admission fees ranging from two dollars to fifty, or even upwards); and the system generally adopted with regard to the admission of a member from another lodge, is to require payment from him of one half of the admission fee, as regulated for newly initiated members. Under these circumstances it must, I think, be obvious, that the admission of members from the Manchester Unity into the American lodges at a *fixed* rate—even though ten times what might be required of them in their own Order—would be an act of injustice to the members of that Order with which those lodges are more immediately connected, and would tend to the injury of the *high-priced* lodges, which, charging their own members high rates, and giving in return high benefits, would be obliged to grant the very same benefits to those who had paid, it may be, but a tithe of the usual contribution. In such a case, jealousies and contentions would be inevitable, and of this the brethren in British North America and the United States are so well aware, that I am convinced they will never consent to the adoption of any fixed rate, to apply to all lodges indiscriminately. All that I conceive can, in justice, be demanded from them is, that they should admit the members of the Manchester Unity on precisely the same terms and conditions as their own members—and thus they are most willing and anxious to do.

"But," it may be said; "it is unfair to charge the members of the Manchester Unity such high rates, while members from America, joining the lodges in Great Britain, would be only required to pay the comparatively trifling amount of one shilling and sixpence." The objection is a valid one, and I at once admit its full force and urgency. But why, I would ask, should the alteration requisite to restore a balance be necessarily sought for on the American side, when a very simple regulation on your own would obviate all the difficulty? Why not adopt the same principle with regard to the admission of our members into your lodges, which we have found to work so successfully in our own, and which, in the event of a union, would be applied to your members seeking admission among us? I will venture to assert, that there is not a single Odd Fellow, under the jurisdiction, either of the Grand Lodge of British North America, or of that of the United States, who, should he remove his residence to this country, would hesitate to procure admission into a lodge of the Manchester Unity, at one half of the fee charged to original entrants.

As all the other points necessary to a thorough union were so fully discussed at the Conference held at Wigan in 1842, I have thought it necessary to enter into detail with the single one on which any material difference of opinion then existed. In the event of a negotiation for re-union being formally opened, I can safely pledge myself, that the proceedings on the part of the Grand Lodge of British North America shall be characterized by the most earnest desire to meet, as far as possible, the wishes of their brethren of the Manchester Unity, and by the most anxious endeavours to render Odd Fellowship—what, in order to be in any great measure serviceable to mankind, it must eventually be

—ONE AND UNIVERSAL.

I remain, Worthy Sirs and Brothers,  
Yours, in Friendship, Love, and Truth,  
H. E. MONTGOMERIE.  
Adelphi Hotel, Liverpool, April 19, 1847.

#### THE ODD FELLOWS IN SCOTLAND.

A very important decision, affecting the constitution and permanency of the Lodges of the Independent Order of Odd Fellows of the Manchester Unity, was decided last month in the court of the Sheriff of Perth-

shire. Procedures were instituted at the instance of George Campbell, and about sixty members of the Loyal City of Perth Lodge of Odd Fellows, No. 2320, against James McEwen, Perth, the Noble Grand, and other office bearers and members of the said Lodge, which was composed of about 200 members in all. The proceedings originated in an alleged resolution to dissolve the Lodge, passed at a meeting of the Lodge by the dissentient members, who happened to compose the majority of that meeting, followed by an application to the Court for interdict against the office bearers who had the custody and control of the funds, amounting to about £400, from parting with any portion thereof, until each of the pursuers should procure the means of obtaining in judicial form a division of the funds. They plead that any voluntary society may be dissolved on the larger portion of the members desiring its dissolution, on due notice. The Court decided that majorities could rule only so long as they kept within the powers legally committed to the vote; that whatever opinion may exist as to the applicability or even absurdity of the name assumed, the necessity or policy of secret passwords, to the soundness of the rates of calculation of contributions of relief, or to the extent and limits of locality and membership, there exists no ground whatever for holding the Association in its general or branch operations as inconsistent with the law of the land; but on the contrary, *the final objects thereof are highly praiseworthy, and the rules generally wise and wholesome for good government, and with prudent management and concord among its extended membership, calculated in no small degree to confer much public benefit.* Finds, that so long as the Association adheres to principles on which it is founded, and applies its funds to the purposes intended, it is not in the power of a majority of its members to dissolve the Association, and to seek a distribution of the funds for their own private use, contrary to the original intention thereof, and in violation of the agreement under which they became members, and on the faith of the integrity of which others became members, and whose rights and interests are thus not liable to be disturbed and destroyed at the will or caprice of their co-associates; who, if repentant of becoming members, or dissatisfied with the management, may quietly withdraw themselves, or seek to obtain better management in any manner of which the rule of the Association or the common law may afford them an opportunity.

#### ODD FELLOWS' JURISDICTION.

A case of some interest was recently decided in Baltimore by Judge Purviance, which gives the Order of Odd Fellows a right to decide controversies arising within it, agreeably to its own laws.

The questions involved are simple, but important to the institution of Odd Fellowship, and may be briefly stated as follows:—Crane was reported sick to the Lodge, on Monday, the 22nd February, 1847, but it being made apparent to the Lodge that he had worked at his trade up to the preceding Saturday, the benefits claimed were refused, in accordance with the by-laws, which granted no benefits until the party applying had been sick at least one week.