

THE CANADIAN CRAFTSMAN,

AND
MASONIC RECORD.

J. B. TRAYES, P.D.D.G.M.,
Editor & Proprietor.

"The Queen and the Craft."

\$1.50 per annum
in advance.

VOL. XXII.

PORT HOPE, ONT., JUNE 15, 1888.

No. 6.

QUEBEC vs. ENGLAND.

BY P. C. M. BRO. J. H. GRAHAM.

No. III.

England alone of all the regular Grand Lodges of the world, now expresses non-concurrence in the claims of Quebec, hereinbefore set forth; and bases her objections on the ground that there exist three private lodges of her institution in the city of Montreal, within the territorial jurisdiction of the Grand Lodge of Quebec; and she claims for them, by priority of existence to our said Grand Lodge, the right of continuance at will, as lodges of her obedience, and thus perpetuate a Masonic *imperium in imperio* with all its actualities and possibilities.

Now, since the provisions of the British Constitutions exclude from recognition, and debar from all Masonic privileges, every lodge (and the individual members thereof) within their respective territories, because not on their "Registries,"—how can England or Scotland Masonically maintain that the same law should not also apply to all private and Grand Lodges in the "self governing" Colonies and National Dependencies of the Empire? Is that which is Masonically right in England wrong in the Colonies? Should that which

does not accord with ancient constitutional enactments thereanent, be suffered by mere repetition to become a course of procedure, until some good brother may be of the opinion that it can be "sheltered" under the sacred name of "land-mark," and hence seek to justify its continuance irrespective of consequences?

Quebec, on the contrary, affirms "that it is the duty of every private lodge situated within the territorial jurisdiction of a regularly formed Grand Lodge, but which through any cause was not represented at its organization, to become at an early day thereafter, of allegiance to the new Grand Body, and be enrolled on its registry; or upon its refusal, it may be deemed and declared (as in Great Britain even) to be an irregular lodge in not submitting to the lawfully constituted Masonic sovereignty of the country."

The case of "Quebec vs. England" appears therefore to be narrowed down to the foregoing, and hence in what follows, I shall fraternally request the candid consideration by our English brethren, of some of the Quebec views and contentions *in re*.

Richmond, Quebec.
Canada, May 9, 1888.