

be," but sometimes a flea will annoy an elephant.

What opinions I have heretofore expressed in regard to the Grand Chapter of Quebec, as having exclusive jurisdiction within her own territorial limits, I reiterate, and would apply them to the Grand Lodge, as well as to the Grand Chapter.

If the Grand Lodge of Quebec is to be anything amongst her sister Grand Lodges, she must be everything. If she is to stand before the Masonic world as an independent Grand Lodge, she must have exclusive jurisdiction within her own territorial limits, and not share her territory with another Grand Lodge.

Concurrent jurisdiction is a thing of the past, on this side of the Atlantic; it may do for our English, Irish and Scotch brethren, who cling to the principles that have been weighed in the balance and found wanting; if they wish concurrent jurisdiction at home, no one has the slightest objection; but the Masons of America do strenuously object and earnestly protest against their forcing their particular opinions and laws upon jurisdictions not their own, and whose Grand Lodges have solemnly declared that exclusive Grand Lodge sovereignty is the true principle.

The question of Grand Lodge sovereignty has been ably discussed, both pro and con, for the past fifteen years, and the universal verdict amongst American Grand Lodges is that each Grand Lodge shall be sovereign within its own territorial limits, and no further.

The plea that those three lodges that are the cause of all this trouble, received their charters in 1824, 1836 and 1854, respectively, and before the formation of any independent Grand Lodge in British North America, and because they were so chartered that they must forever retain their allegiance to the Grand Lodge of England, sounds about as nonsensical to American ears as nonsense can be. It certainly looks as if the adherents of

those lodges were so exceedingly hard pressed for arguments to bolster up their cause that they catch at anything and everything, no matter whether sense or nonsense. Supposing that they were organized at the dates mentioned. Does that give them the right or authority to openly and defiantly defy the authority of the Grand Lodge in whose jurisdiction they are located? By no means. The Grand Lodge of England chartered lodges in the United States about A. D. 1731. Does it look consistent that those charters should remain in force to-day? Certainly not? It is a strange doctrine that, because the Grand Lodge of England is the Mother Grand Lodge of the world, that charters granted by her must be perpetual. Have they the power or authority to grant a lease that extends through all time? If so, from what source do they derive their authority? What gave them that power? Is the Grand Lodge of England that supreme that the whole Masonic world must obey her behests?

The lease of those three malcontent lodges expired just the moment that an independent Grand Lodge was formed and recognized by the Masonic world in the territory in which they were located. That lease expired when the Grand Lodge of Quebec was formed and recognized. Very true, the Grand Lodge of Canada, out of whose (once) jurisdiction the Grand Lodge of Quebec was formed, wrongfully, we think, renewed that lease as far as they were concerned themselves; but they had no power to bind territory, that, by a political change, passed out of their hands. The Grand Lodge of Quebec is not the heir-at-law, or even successors of the Grand Lodge of Canada; consequently, under no legal or moral obligations to carry out agreements made by the Grand Lodge of Canada.

The Grand Lodge of Quebec became the lawful possessors of that portion of the old Upper and Lower Canada that is now the Province of