

precedent for the action of Quebec. We were rather in the position that the Quebec masons were, when they united in the erection of the Grand Lodge of Canada. The great doctrine of Masonic Grand Lodge Sovereignty is on its trial, and I trust that the result will prove that constitutional rules cannot be infringed with impunity. Each Grand Lodge has its duty in this matter, let us therefore carefully consider and calmly discuss the whole question that we may arrive at a correct decision.

"Great diversity of opinion has been expressed among eminent members of the fraternity in sister jurisdictions upon the Quebec question. I have carefully read the published communications on the subject, and it has appeared to me that too much reference is made to the proposed settlement of the difference by a recognition of a Grand Lodge of Quebec for the sake of peace. A peace purchased at the expense of masonic principle and right, cannot be productive of ultimate good. Indeed if such an argument—if it may be called an argument—is to prevail, all ancient landmarks may be ultimately swept away.

"The *expediency* of yielding to the wishes of the masons of Quebec, and permitting the organization of a Grand Lodge for that Province, is a question for the consideration of the Grand Lodge of Canada alone, With that *we* have nothing to do. In the Grand Lodge of Canada alone can the desirability of dividing the jurisdiction, and erecting a Grand Lodge of Quebec, and a Grand Lodge of Ontario, be discussed and resolved on. There, if separation be thought expedient, the terms can be arranged. But the lodges of either Province are in my opinion powerless, legally, to establish an independent Grand Lodge without the action of the Grand Lodge of Canada, which they united to erect and to whose masonic government they equally owe allegiance. * * *

"In the meantime, putting aside all questions of *expediency*, I leave the important matter of masonic right and law for your decision satisfied that you will not act hastily, but that you will calmly enter on the consideration of a question so important to the best interests of our ancient and honored fraternity.

The committee say that "the Grand Lodges of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Quebec have as much right to assume the name of Grand Lodge of Canada, as the body that now claims it." You can judge what the Grand Lodge of New Brunswick thinks from the extract just read. and I need only say it is nowhere deemed a necessity, for the title of a Grand Body, to express either its nationality, or locality, though with us in the United States, I believe the latter is universal. The Grand Lodge of Canada is, like some of our State Grand Lodges, "Itinerant." It has since its formation, in 1855, met in Hamilton, Montreal, Toronto, Kingston, Ontario, London, St. Catharines, Belleville and Odessa, nearly alternating in the two provinces of Quebec and Ontario, yet your committee say, "it is located at Hamilton, Province of Ontario." and "is in fact the Grand Lodge of that province." This is but half the fact. It is the Grand Lodge of Ontario, and in *addition* the Grand Lodge of *both* provinces, (these two provinces forming but one masonic jurisdiction,) it having been formed by the lodges of the two provinces when called Canada East and Canada West; nor