

much more difficult than it otherwise would have been. Since that period, it is within my knowledge, that some brethren of eminence who then entertained such views as those above indicated, have, on mature reflection and a closer study of the case, been led to the conclusion that the political changes which took place in connection with the Confederation scheme, did not, in any manner or degree, alter or affect the status or position of the Grand Lodge of Canada. The name may be anomalous,—(though there are good and sufficient reasons why even this should not be changed)—the jurisdiction and authority remain precisely as before. That this must be so, will be manifest when we consider the self-evident truth, that an Act of Parliament can neither create nor destroy a Grand Lodge of Free Masons. If this be correct, and I maintain it is, then it follows as a natural consequence, that the Confederation Act, passed by the Imperial Parliament of Great Britain and Ireland, did not, in the most remote degree, interfere with the standing, position or operations of the Grand Lodge of Canada, and the same may be said respecting other organizations existing in this country, apart from and wholly independent of Governmental support or control. The Canada Presbyterian Church, for instance, is still the Canada Presbyterian Church, notwithstanding that the territory, within which its operations are carried on, is now known as Ontario and Quebec, instead of as formerly Upper and Lower Canada. The Canada Wesleyan Methodist Conference is another case in point, and many of others could be added.

I am well aware that it is held as a general principle, by eminent authorities on this continent, that Masonic boundaries should be coterminous with political boundaries. This has been the rule in the establishment of Grand Lodges in the United States. But the United States furnishes no parallel to the case under consideration, and therefore comparison is entirely out of the question. The arguments which would be applicable to a number of separate, independent, and sovereign States, claiming to exercise exclusive legislative authority and supreme governmental control in all matters, except such as they themselves reserve and depute to the general or United States Government, lose all their point and efficacy when applied to our subordinate Colonial or Provincial condition, where all the power is vested in the General or Dominion Government and Parliament—where only local matters (or such as are in the U. S. termed Municipal) are entrusted to the local governments and legislatures, the Lieut.-Governors of the various Provinces deriving their appointments from the Governor General of the Dominion. In our case, which would be the political boundary to which masonic government would require to conform? The Dominion or the Provincial? If the former, we possess not the power, as there are two other Grand Lodges established within the Dominion, whose existence could not be ignored, and whose co-operation we could not at present expect to obtain; if the latter, then every new division of territory, or change of name which might take place in either of the Provinces, would necessitate similar changes in the jurisdiction and names of the respective Grand Lodges. Would this be wise? Would it be expedient? Would it be common sense? Surely there are few to be found prepared to answer in the affirmative.

I can easily understand, that in the organization of a Grand Lodge for a particular Kingdom, State or Territory, it is well to conform to the name of the Kingdom, State or Territory over which that Grand