

for the last three years our whole legislation had been illegal. We may well pause before committing ourselves to an act which would involve consequences such as these, and we must remember also that we are under a solemn obligation to the craft at large to do nothing which will have a tendency to undermine our institution, or be subversive of its ancient and universally recognized principles."

Another communication on this subject but written in a very different spirit, appears in the same journal. In this the writer professes to quote from a letter said to have been written by Dr. Mackey, to Grand Master Wilson, in which he makes this distinguished brother say,—“you are no longer the Grand Lodge of Canada, you will have to organize a Grand Lodge of Ontario!” We would ask why does the writer not publish the whole letter? perhaps it would not have answered his purposes to have done so. All that we feel inclined to say upon the point at present is, that if Dr. Mackey ever did express such an opinion, he must have done so in utter ignorance of our past history, both as a Grand Lodge and as Canadians. The same writer winds up with the following oracular and *fraternal* advice: “Let the Masons of Quebec but be true to themselves, and they will find no one more ready to cry *peccavi* than the Grand Lodge of Canada, and the loudest and most *contrite* among the whole to be the Grand Master himself!” Our seceding brethren may well exclaim “save us from our friends.” Articles written in this spirit may, for a time, “tickle the ears of the groundlings, but must make the judicious grieve,” and if the supporters of the aspiring Grand Lodge imagine that by such reasoning or by such writing they will secure the end they aim at, they will soon discover how much they have mistaken the Masons of Ontario. It has been asserted that the majority of the Lodges now forming the Grand Lodge of Quebec had never been formally summoned as Lodges to discuss the question, but that a majority vote was considered as sufficient authority to change the allegiance of the Lodge. We are disposed to receive this assertion *cum grano salis*, but at the same time the principle involved is one of the greatest importance, and this matter must be thoroughly investigated before arriving at any conclusion, for it is well understood and accepted that the majority of the members of a Lodge have no power, by any act of their own, to resign the Warrant, and that the assembling and working under it remains with the minority remaining faithful to their allegiance. It is also argued by some writers that in cases of this kind, masonic law and usage must not be applied too strictly, that, in fact, masonic law is all bosh!—that Masonry was made for man, and not man for Masonry!—therefore, that Masons have a right to choose their own paths—that Masonry is progressive, and the more rapidly Masons are made so much the better for Masonry. Now, we are not yet prepared to admit the entire correctness of these doctrines, for we firmly