



“Memor et Fidelis.”

VOL. I.]

MONTREAL, JULY 1, 1856.

[No. 2.

The Boston Free-mason's Monthly Magazine for June has devoted about a dozen of its pages to what its Editor is pleased to term "The Schism in Canada." From the character which that periodical has hitherto enjoyed we expected that at least before he would have evinced such decided hostility to the Grand Lodge of Canada, he would have made himself carefully acquainted with every particular connected with the movement of that body which he so unhesitatingly designates as rebellious; have stated the facts correctly; and have drawn his conclusions from well established premises. Had he done so his readers would have been enabled to form an impartial opinion as to the points at issue between the Monthly and the Canadian brethren. Our brother, however, in an elaborately written article, founded on erroneous data, misstates many of the principal features of the question, lays before the masonic world a case totally at variance with the real one, and then by a long tissue of special pleading proceeds to demolish the structure his own imagination had set up.

Our object in this article is mainly to expose some of the most glaring fallacies of our Boston contemporary. To follow him through all his assertions and ill-grounded conclusions, and to set him right in the many errors he has fallen into would require more space in our columns than we feel disposed to give. We fear, moreover, from the animus shewn by our brother throughout his entire article that any amount of reasoning with him would be but a waste of time and paper; he commences his remarks by denying that the brethren in Canada who have taken part in the formation of the Grand Lodge of Canada have established sufficient reasons for a full justification of their conduct in separating

themselves from the Grand Lodge of England. These reasons are before the masonic world, and have been deemed satisfactory by the most learned and intelligent of the fraternity throughout the United States, Canada and Britain. So that the mere assertion of the Monthly to the contrary is not likely to seriously affect their importance or sufficiency. Our contemporary admits that our Lodges have been subjected to great inconveniences which he says have retarded their progress and embarrassed their operations, but these he tells us we must submit to, because, forsooth, they are in common to the Lodges in all the English Provinces. Surely it is unnecessary to notice such a reason.

The Monthly next pretends to doubt that the Provincial Grand Lodges of Canada hold "the equivocal position of being irresponsible to and independent of the craft of Canada" and tries hard to prove the contrary. It requires, however, no great amount of logic to shew this "equivocal position," and we shall in a few words do so, and in so doing dispel his doubts and overthrow his reasonings. Under the Constitution of the Grand Lodge of England, the Provincial Grand Lodge exists *de facto* only in the person of the Provincial Grand Master, who is the nominee of the Grand Master of England and is responsible to that officer alone for his acts. He is named for life, the craft over whom he rules have no say or vote in his appointment and be he ever so unpopular or incompetent cannot effect his removal. Is our contemporary prepared to deny this? if not he cannot do aught but admit that the complaint of "the equivocal position" is fully substantiated; his argument of "if it is a grievance in Canada it is no less a grievance in England," is absurd and childish, *It is a grievance in Canada*

probably one in England, and as such should be discountenanced and removed. It has been well said—

"He jests at scars that never felt a wound." So our American brother enjoying the full benefit of the elective principle where every officer knows that if he does not faithfully perform his duty he will at the next election be turned with ignominy from the honorable position in the craft he occupies, can but little understand or sympathize with those who have suffered from the fantastic tricks of "proud men dressed in brief authority, most ignorant of what they must assume."

We are not disposed just now to join issue with the *Monthly* on his exposition of masonic jurisprudence and his application thereof to Colonial dependencies. It may be sufficient for the present to say that we differ from him materially in his conclusions. In his evident desire to prove the Grand Lodge of Canada an illegal body, he is to use his own quotation.

"Puzzled with mazes and perplexed with errors."

A position from which we are not disposed to relieve him.

The *Monthly* thus condenses his statement of the "schism" as he calls it—

As we understand the case, the disaffection is mainly confined to Canada West,—the lower Province taking little or no part in it. But whether this be so or not, is not very material. We are told that forty-one Lodges have seceded from their allegiance to the Grand Lodges of Great Britain, and united in forming an independent Grand Lodge for Canada. Now, this may or may not be true. The names of these Lodges are not given in any account of the proceedings that has fallen under our eye, nor are we informed in what manner the delegates to the Convention at which the new body was formed, were appointed, nor by what authority they claimed to represent the "forty-one Lodges" from which they are said to hail. Were they appointed and properly commissioned by those Lodges acting in their corporate capacity, and at meetings called to the purpose? Or were they self-constituted delegates, acting on their individual