

The following extract from an article in the last number of the *American Freemason*, "department of R. W. Bro. Finlay M. King," Senior Grand Warden of the Grand Lodge of New York, shows how little is known of the true state of masonic affairs in this Province, by even the most intelligent of those who undertake to write down the Grand Lodge of Canada.

"The claims of the now body of Masons in Canada, claiming to be an independent Grand Lodge, were elaborately discussed by the Committee on Foreign Correspondence in their report, who submitted a resolution that was adopted, asserting that: 'The Grand Lodge of New York cannot, as at present advised, recognize the body of Masons in Canada claiming to be an independent Grand Lodge,' which was adopted as the views of the Grand Lodge. There is much sympathy expressed in the report above referred to for the brethren in Canada, and a fervent hope entertained that the Grand Lodge of England will deal charitably towards them; but the Grand Lodge of New York is the last body to look to for countenance in a plain infraction of well-recognized Masonic law,—such as has been manifest in the action of our ill-advised brethren in the Canadian Provinces. It would appear from an official paper received by the Grand Lodge of New York from the Provincial Grand Lodge of Canada West, that the delegates who united in the attempted formation of an independent Grand Lodge were not all authorized by their Lodges to take the step which was taken by them. To copy from the paper itself, it appears, 'that in a great many instances the delegates, who voted in favor of the movement, on returning to their Lodges, were not sustained in the action they had taken.' It was not, however, upon this ground that the Grand Lodge of New York declined to receive the new body into fellowship; although that of itself might have been sufficient to have produced hesitation in so important a step. It was upon the broad ground that two independent Grand Lodges in Ancient Craft Masonry cannot co-exist in the same territory; nor can subordinate Lodges rebel against the authority of their superior, while the relations of that superior remain unchanged towards them."

"The Grand Lodge of New York is the last body to look to for countenance in a plain infraction of well-recognized masonic law,—such as has been manifest in the action of our ill-advised brethren in the Canadian Provinces."

High sounding words these; and a very serious charge. But where is their force and truth? What well recognized masonic law—written or unwritten, universal or particular, has been so manifestly violated by the Canadian brethren in forming a Grand Lodge? This is THE question, which it is manifestly unfair in brother King to beg. Let the proceedings of the Canadian masons be shown to be an infraction of well recognized masonic law; and they will be found ready, to a man, to retrace their steps and commence their work anew.

Nor is it true, that in "a great many instances, the delegates who voted in favor of the formation of a Grand Lodge, on returning to their Lodges, were not sustained in the action they

had taken." The instances are very few. And we believe in every case, the Lodges are merely awaiting the decisive action of the Grand Lodge of England before surrendering their warrants and affiliating with the Grand Lodge of Canada. "It was not, however, on this ground, that the Grand Lodge of New York, declined to receive the new body into fellowship." Of course not, for so long as the requisite number (three only) of Lodges were united, it was no legal ground of objection.

"It was upon the broad ground that two independent Grand Lodges, in ancient craft masonry, cannot co-exist in the same territory."

Did the Canadian masons ever say they could? Did they ever attempt to establish a second independent Grand Lodge in Canada? What independent Grand Lodge existed in Canada, previous to October 1855? Was it the Provincial Grand Lodge of Canada West, of Montreal and William Henry, or of Quebec? They were the more creatures of Provincial grand masters—the nominees of the grand master of England, holding office during his pleasure. Possessing none of the attributes of independent Grand Lodges, and sinking into abeyance, the moment the Provincial Grand Master might happen to die, resign, or be removed. Was it the Grand Lodge of England? She was a joint tenant with Ireland and Scotland, and nothing more. But "two," then certainly three, "independent Grand Lodges cannot co-exist in the same territory." Which of the three, then, was the Grand Lodge? England? What, then, has New York been about, that she did not long ago, refuse to fraternize with Irish and Scotch Canadian masons? The only Grand Lodge in Canada making any pretensions to independence is the one formed in October 1855. And the "broad ground" upon which New York declines to receive this body into fellowship, proves, after all, to be exceedingly narrow, so narrow, indeed, as to be just no ground at all.

"Nor can subordinate Lodges rebel against the authority of their superior, while the relations of that superior remain unchanged towards them."

This, no one denies. Nor did the Canadian Lodges in forming a Grand Lodge, any more rebel against the authority of the several Grand Lodges from which they originally derived their charters, than did the Lodges of New York, in 1787; of Connecticut, in 1789; of Vermont, in 1794; of Missouri, in 1812; of Kansas, in 1856; and of many others states and territories, at different periods, rebel against the authority of the Grand Lodges by which they were chartered, in forming their respective Grand Lodges. They exercised an inherent right, which has never, in any other case, been called in question. Dr. Mackey says, that "three or more Lodges in any territory where a Grand Lodge

does not already exist, may unite in convention and organize a Grand Lodge." This has always been considered sound masonic law, and acted upon as such, in the formation of at least one-half of the American Grand Lodges. Are we told that Canada must be precluded from the benefit of this law, because she forms an integral portion of the British Empire? So does Ireland,—so does Scotland. And yet who denies to them the right to have each a Grand Lodge? On what ground can an equal right be denied to Canada?

We had supposed that freemasonry was exempt from national and political trammels; and so she is. Neither England, Ireland, nor Scotland have pronounced their Canadian-brethren rebels, or violators of masonic law. It is only more interested parties, the petty Provincial authorities of Canada, and the Grand Lodge of New York, who have been found capable of this. And the motives and policy by which they are influenced are well understood. Ireland, just and generous Ireland, has pronounced a very different verdict. So has the bright and learned Tucker, and Vermont. So has the great author of the principles of masonic law, Dr. Mackey. So has Charles Moore of Cincinnati, and a host of other distinguished masonic authorities, as well as several Grand Lodges, whose motives of action were above suspicion.

A Temple.

We seldom take up any of our American exchanges without being gratified with the news that somewhere in the United States a new masonic Temple is being erected. That at Philadelphia is a superb structure erected at a cost which, when mentioned to Canadians, appears almost incredible. Our New York brethren too, are at work, and will soon hold their lodges in a building creditable both to their city and to the name in which we all rejoice.

The question which invariably arises in our mind when reading of these achievements, is—When shall we have a masonic Temple in Montreal? We have put it to many of our brethren, and although we find some who think we shall never have one, and others who throw the realization of the idea away forward to the futurity of "some day or other;" still there are, we think, a majority of Montreal masons of opinion, that were the matter taken in hand by a few energetic brethren a very short time would put the craft in the possession of a building, which might with propriety be called a Temple. One which would be at once a monument to the enterprise of Canadian masons and an architectural embellishment to our city.

We may be asked where are the means to come from? A lot of land of proper extent and situation would cost at least £800 or £900, and a building such as masons should own