

nications conveyed by notices, specially stating the business to be transacted. Many of these Lodges, indeed, went further, and adopted resolutions instructing their delegates to "use their influence for the immediate formation of a Grand Lodge."

On the 10th day of October, 1855, the delegates thus appointed met in the city of Hamilton, and, after very mature deliberation, careful examination of masonic law, usages and precedents, and the most solemn and earnest discussion, proceeded to organize a Grand Lodge, adopted a Constitution, and elected a Grand Master and other Grand Officers. On the second day of the following month, November, the Grand Master and other Grand Officers were installed, and the Grand Lodge duly constituted and consecrated by a Past Grand Master of the Grand Lodge of Michigan.

Such was the manner in which the Grand Lodge of Canada was formed. We do not stop here to enquire more particularly into the preliminary proceedings, or the *causes* which more immediately conduced to this result, for although they may have proper weight in determining upon the necessity, propriety, or duty of the procedure, they have nothing to do with the question of its *legality*. Was the Grand Lodge of Canada, *legally* formed according to the laws, usages, principles and landmarks of masonry? If so, it is a "strictly legal and constitutional body of masons," and ought to be universally recognized and treated as such. If not, it is an "irregular" and unconstitutional body of masons, and ought to be discountenanced and "put down," and *down let it go*, the sooner the better. But to prove its illegality requires something more than the mere *ipse dixit* of its opponents.

We have presented in this series of articles an account of the origin of Grand Lodges—the law applicable to their formation, as to both elements and mode—we have particularly described the manner in which a large number of the most respectable Grand Lodges in the world were formed at different periods, and in various countries—and we have stated plainly and truthfully by whom and in what manner the Grand Lodge of Canada was organized. And, we think we have now a right to demand from our opponents, something more than sneers and denunciations. Let them tell us what laws, usages, principles or landmarks have been violated. Let them point out to us, in what particulars, if any, the material of which our Grand Lodge is composed, or the manner of its organization so widely differs from others, as to justify, either the harsh epithets so frequently applied to us, or our exclusion from fraternal intercourse with any and all parts of the masonic world. *Our columns are open*. We have invited, and we still invite discussion. If we are wrong, let those who differ from us act

like masons—show us our error and set us right. Let plain facts, open honest arguments, sound reasoning, and enlightened judgment take the place of ignorance, prejudice, policy and selfishness, and the result will be, ultimate union and perfect harmony.

The necessity for an independent Grand Lodge in Canada is, among Canadian Masons, at least, almost universally admitted, and those who oppose the one which now exists on the ground of illegality, should be able and ready to point out a more proper and legal mode of formation than that which characterized its organization. Thus, they have as yet failed to do. The only answer which can be obtained to the question, "What should that more proper and legal mode be?" is, "Don't know," "not prepared to say,"—"you are wrong at any rate," &c., &c. Even the strong man, Moore, of the Boston Magazine, finds himself, and leaves his readers in a perfect maze upon this point. "Confusion worse confounded," is the result of a perusal of his "hard laboured" articles. Now we maintain that the power of distinction between the right and the wrong, should take precedence of disapproval, violent opposition and bitter denunciation.

We are told that the "movement was premature," the "action too precipitate." But this, even if it were true, *which is not the case*, would be no argument against the legality of our position. If the necessity for a Grand Lodge existed, and a sufficient number of Canadian masons had the *right* to form one, the *time* of doing it, and the degree of decision and promptness with which it was done, can in no way affect the question at issue.

But, say our opponents, you should have petitioned and obtained the consent of the Grand Lodge of England to establish an independent Grand Lodge. The Grand Lodge of England *was* petitioned to allow her Provincial Grand Lodges to elect their own Grand Masters—issue warrants for new Lodges—and to retain and use in the country, the funds, contributed therein, for masonic purposes—and with what result? The petitions were never noticed. The Grand Master of England has lately declared that he considered the prayer of the petitioners so preposterous, that he would neither notice it himself, nor allow it to appear before the Grand Lodge. From 1852 to 1855, a period of three years the petitioners waited patiently, but in vain, for a reply. Nor have they yet received one. What more than this, did due respect and proper courtesy require?

The imperative duty, or legal obligation of the Canadian masons, to petition the Grand Lodge of England, or any other Grand Lodge, to be *permitted* to form an independent Grand Lodge, we wholly deny. If the *right* to do so existed at all, it was inherent in themselves, as regularly warranted private Lodges. Neither the Grand Lodge of England, nor any

other Grand Lodge, possesses the authority to establish an *independent Grand Lodge*. They may appoint Provincial Grand Masters, and, by warrant establish Provincial Grand Lodges, with powers of greater or less extent—but these must ever remain subordinate to, and dependent upon, the authority by which they are created. They possess, and can possess, none of the true elements and high prerogatives of independent Grand Lodges. So that if the Grand Lodge of England had been petitioned until "doom's day," to form an independent Grand Lodge in Canada, and had finally been willing and ready to do so, she could not. She had not the power. Masonry has not, in any age, or in any country, or by any usages, invested Grand Lodges, with the power of creating their equals.—So true is this, that there does not exist upon earth, an independent Grand Lodge, which was created and made such, by the action or authority of any other similar body.

But there seems to be a sort of confused notion in the minds of some few persons, among whom we find our friend Moore, of the Boston Magazine, that because Canada is not an independent political State, but a Province of the British Empire, she cannot have an independent Masonic Grand Lodge at all. She must, therefore, first throw off her political allegiance, achieve national independence, and then she may promote, as best she can, the interests and advancement of our purely non-political and non-national society. The source from which this, peculiarly unmasonic idea emanates, is easily discovered. It is found in the fact, that the achievement of political independence to the several United States, by the American revolution, was followed by a renunciation, on the part of American Masons, of their masonic allegiance to the Grand Lodges of England and Scotland, and the organization of independent Grand Lodges in their several States. And, here we cannot refrain from expressing the opinion, that in view of the eminently moral, social and philanthropic—as well as universal character of our institution; higher, nobler, more appropriate and commendable reasons might have been assigned by our American brethren, and have been assigned by *Canadian Masons* for their severance from the European Grand Lodges, by which they created, than a mere dissolution of political union. But leaving this for the present we observe, that if the argument attempted to be drawn from political connection against the Grand Lodge of Canada, proves anything at all, it proves too much. It proves that at least, *two* of the *three* Grand Lodges which have so long existed in the British Islands, are illegal and unconstitutional. For who will pretend that Canada, is not as separate, distinct, independent a portion of the British empire, as either Ireland or Scotland? Nay is she not more so? She has her own local elective Legislature. She con-