

In the face of these facts, how can the English Council contend that it has *exclusive* jurisdiction in the Colonies? And had the Congress at Lausanne had these facts before it, I do not believe it would have come to the conclusion it did. But, of course, if it thought fit to legislate for the Supreme Council of Scotland in its absence, and without notice of any kind to it that such questions were to be raised, no wonder it went very far wrong.

With reference to the two concluding paragraphs of the letter from the Supreme Council of England, I am instructed to state that this Council deeply regrets the position there taken up, as it naturally leads to unseemly differences between Brethren in the same Kingdom, who should be closely allied, but this Council is bound to defend its position, be the consequences what they may. It never agreed to refer any such questions to the Lausanne Congress. It disputes its power to deal with them, and it will adopt such measures as it deems best to protect itself from the effect of them.

I remain,

M. P. and Dear Brother,

Yours fraternally,

† L. MACKERSY, 33°,

*G. G. Secy. H. E.*

---

From the Sup. Co. of England, Wales, &c.

---

ORDO AB CHAO.

---

From the East of the Supreme Council of the Sovereign Grand Inspectors General of the 33d degree of the Ancient and Accepted Rite of Freemasonry for England and Wales and the Dependencies of Great Britain, under the C. of the Zenith near the B. B., answering to 51° 30' N. Lat. and 6° W. Meridian of Greenwich.

To Ill. Bro. J. W. MURTON, 33°,

*Gr. Secretary Gen. Sup. Co. for Canada.*

DEAR AND V. ILL. BRO.:

In consequence of the action taken by the Supreme Council for Scotland in sending a circular letter to several of the Supreme Councils of the world, commenting upon the action of the Congress of Lausanne with regard to the definition of the words signified by the letters G. A. O. T. U., and in the confirming of the jurisdiction of the Supreme Council for England over the Dependencies of