

THE "CRAFTSMAN'S" OPINION AT LAST.

In our comments on the article which appeared in the *Craftsman* on "our Quebec Brethren," we alluded to the unwillingness of that Journal to discuss the *legality* of the Grand Lodge of Quebec. We find, however, on perusing its remarks on the action of the G. L. of Maine, concerning that question, that it has unmistakably laid down its views, though perhaps in a rather informal manner.

The following is the part of it to which we wish to draw especial attention :

"Into the question of the legality of the proposed recognition we need not enter, further than to recommend to those who counsel it a careful consideration of the address of M. W. Bro. Richard Vaux, delivered at the last Annual Communication of the Grand Lodge of Pennsylvania, in which the whole subject is reviewed with masterly perspicuity, and in which the principle for which we have consistently contended is thus tersely laid down: "*The consent of the original jurisdiction must be first obtained before recognition is Masonically lawful.*"

So the last two lines are the only clue we have of our contemporary's opinion on this point. We certainly might have expected to have been favored with its reasons for withholding to us its support a little earlier in the day, as it seems to us that this savors of locking the stable door when the horse is gone.

We would like to ask a few questions of our contemporary in relation to this its stand point.

When according to the judgment of the great majority, and most eminent of the Masons of a separate territorial jurisdiction, every effort has been made to secure a recognition of their rights, and such efforts have been uniformly unsuccessful, is it not perfectly within their province to take steps to secure such result, notwithstanding the opposition of the parent Grand Body?

Is it not a fact that the G. L. of Canada, and in truth a majority of the G. L's. of the United States have been formed, and in some cases almost unanimously recognised by the Grand Lodges of the world before "the consent of the original jurisdiction" had been first obtained?

Does the fact that a G. L. is first recognised by G. Bodies other than the parent authority in any way affect the *status* of such Grand Lodge?

These questions we respectfully submit, naturally come up when perusing the "tersely laid down" opinion of our contemporary, and we trust that our brethren of this Province may be enlightened to this extent, if no farther.

The whole thing, in our mind, resolves itself in a nut-shell. Does the *abstract right* exist for the Masons in this Province, to form a Grand Lodge? If so and we think there can be little doubt on it, then we say that such formation cannot require the permission of the parent Grand Body or any other, but that it simply demands, as of justice, recognition from all alike. and we seriously caution our contemporary not to allow what may now seem to be the interests of the G. L. it so well advocates to interfere with a well settled law of Masonic comity and jurisprudence.