

Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

The Institute has attempted to obtain the best original copy available for filming. Features of this copy which may be bibliographically unique, which may alter any of the images in the reproduction, or which may significantly change the usual method of filming, are checked below.

L'Institut a microfilmé le meilleur exemplaire qu'il lui a été possible de se procurer. Les détails de cet exemplaire qui sont peut-être uniques du point de vue bibliographique, qui peuvent modifier une image reproduite, ou qui peuvent exiger une modification dans la méthode normale de filmage sont indiqués ci-dessous.

Coloured covers/
Couverture de couleur

Covers damaged/
Couverture endommagée

Covers restored and/or laminated/
Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée

Cover title missing/
Le titre de couverture manque

Coloured maps/
Cartes géographiques en couleur

Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black)/
Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)

Coloured plates and/or illustrations/
Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur

Bound with other material/
Relié avec d'autres documents

Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion along interior margin/
La reliure serrée peut causer de l'ombre ou de la distorsion le long de la marge intérieure

Blank leaves added during restoration may appear within the text. Whenever possible, these have been omitted from filming/
Il se peut que certaines pages blanches ajoutées lors d'une restauration apparaissent dans le texte, mais, lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont pas été filmées.

Additional comments:
Commentaires supplémentaires:

Coloured pages/
Pages de couleur

Pages damaged/
Pages endommagées

Pages restored and/or laminated/
Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées

Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/
Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées

Pages detached/
Pages détachées

Showthrough/
Transparence

Quality of print varies/
Qualité inégale de l'impression

Continuous pagination/
Pagination continue

Includes index(es)/
Comprend un (des) index

Title on header taken from:
Le titre de l'en-tête provient:

Title page of issue/
Page de titre de la livraison

Caption of issue/
Titre de départ de la livraison

Masthead/
Générique (périodiques) de la livraison

This item is filmed at the reduction ratio checked below/
Ce document est filmé au taux de réduction indiqué ci-dessous.

10X	14X	18X	22X	26X	30X
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12X	16X	20X	24X	28X	32X



“Memor et Fidelis.”

VOL. I.]

MONTREAL, MARCH 2, 1857.

[No. 10.]

Address of the M. W. Philip C. Tucker, Esq., Grand Master of Vermont, D. G. H. P. of the General Grand Chapter of the United States, &c., &c., to the Grand Lodge of Vermont, on the Canada question, January 14th, 1857.

READ IT.

MY BRETHREN,—During the past year the important question relating to the Grand Lodge of Canada—and which this Grand Lodge passed upon, to its own entire satisfaction, at its last annual communication—has been agitated in other Grand Lodges, with differing results. The Grand Lodge of Ireland, and the Grand Lodges of Kentucky, South Carolina, Louisiana, Iowa, the District of Columbia and some others, I am advised, agree with the decision made by Vermont. The Grand Lodges of England and Scotland, abroad, and those of Massachusetts, New York, Missouri and Virginia, at home, hold adverse opinions to ours. The Grand Lodges of Maine, Wisconsin, Connecticut, and some others, have the subject under consideration, and some of the Grand Lodges of the United States, have not, so far as I am informed, yet taken it up for consideration at all.

It is not to be doubted, that if this Grand Lodge saw even specious reasons to sustain the opinion that its action had been premature on this important subject, it would, from a sense of duty, review it. Assuredly, if I had been convinced; or—even less than that—had I seen any strong reason to create doubt as to the entire correctness and soundness of our action of last year, I should feel it to be my duty now to recommend a new investigation. I have endeavoured to obtain all the information in my power, and to examine carefully and impartially all the argument which has come to my hands during the year;

and so far from finding any weakening of my opinion, the result has been to strengthen and to confirm the judgment I had previously formed—that both as matter of duty, of honor, of policy, and of sound masonic principle, the Lodges of Canada which assembled at Hamilton on the tenth day of October, 1855, and formed an Independent Grand Lodge for Canada, acted lawfully and right, and upon every correct principle of masonic law, usage, practice and precedent—as well as brotherhood—ought to be sustained by the Grand Lodges of the United States.

In the differences of opinion which have arisen out of the consideration of this subject, one Grand Lodge—out of great caution—has reviewed its action of last year. Massachusetts, with her aged Grand Lodge and her acknowledged masonic bearing and talent, staggered the District of Columbia by her adverse action; or rather, perhaps, shook the opinion of its Grand Master. A re-investigation was directed by that Grand Master, the Chairman of the Committee for the purpose, being that enlightened, learned, and well-informed mason, Brother Benjamin B. French, of the City of Washington. The result is before the masonic world. A thorough re-examination of the subject confirmed a most intelligent committee in the former view taken by that Grand Lodge, and their views were confirmed by it, supporting the decision which had been previously made. Brother French and his associates are among the most intelligent masons of the United States, and they are brethren who can never be justly charged with lending their sanction to law-breaking or revolution in the masonic world.

When this subject was under consideration in our own Grand Lodge, at its last annual communication, I studiously withheld any ex-

pression of my own opinion; nor was that opinion known beyond myself, until you, my brethren, had, by a unanimous vote, extended the right hand of masonic fellowship to the independent Grand Lodge of Canada. As I was not heard, in argument, then, I anticipate your willingness to hear me patiently now, when the correctness of your action has been questioned elsewhere.

Grand Lodges, as they exist at the present time and as they have existed from the year 1717, are wholly *new* institutions. They are not institutions of ancient date, and have no odor of antiquity about them. In the olden time every single Lodge was wholly independent, and the privilege of practising the masonic rites was *inherent* in masons, when assembled together in due form, as individuals. The Charter obtained, not far from the beginning of the fourth century, “from the King and Council,” by Saint Alban, empowered those masons simply to hold a “general council,” which was called an “Assembly.” That “Council” or “Assembly” did not consist of members by delegations from Lodges. It was a *general* one, embracing the craft, as it then existed, in England, *at large*; and it was the duty of every mason to attend it, if he lived within fifty miles of the place of assemblage, and had “proper warning.”

Nor was the gathering of the masons at the City of York, under Prince Edwin, in 926, a *Grand Lodge*, in any fair modern understanding of those terms. It was a “congregation” of masons only, who composed a “*General Lodge*,” of which he was Grand Master. He was Grand Master of *Masons*, but not of a *Grand Lodge*, as now understood; for no such *Grand body* then existed.

It is doubtless true, that the York “*Assembly*” exercised jurisdiction, in its day, over

all the masons of England, probably from 926 to 1567, but such jurisdiction was not considered, by those masons, as *exclusive*. It was not thus acknowledged by them; for in that same year 1567—without reference to the York "Assembly" at all—the masons of the Southern part of England placed themselves *independently* under a new Grand Master, and there was, for a long period of years, two Grand Masters of that kingdom.

In the early part of the 18th century, masonry generally in England had fallen into disuetude. In the year 1715 four London Lodges assembled upon their own motion, and by their own voluntary action constituted themselves a "*Grand Lodge, pro tempore*." At the annual assembly and feast, on Saint John the Baptist's Jay, 1717, these same Lodges, thus, by self-action constituted into a Grand Lodge, for the first time adopted a regulation to restrain the old unlimited manner of masonic meetings, and to establish Lodges in certain places, which should be legally authorized to act by a warrant from the Grand Master, with the consent and approbation of the Grand Lodge, and that, without such warrant, no lodge should thereafter be deemed regular or constitutional.

Here, then, we have four lodges, arranged upon the *old* system, congregating themselves together to inaugurate and establish a *new* one. The whole history of things at York was unheeded by them; no consent is asked from that quarter, nor is even the *then Grand Master of the Masons of England* consulted, who was living in that same city of London, and who did not pay the debt of nature until the year 1723.

From this action sprang the Grand Lodge of England, which has come down to our times. Ireland followed first, and Scotland succeeded her. I do not refer to any masonic organizations of this kind upon the continent of Europe, because with them we have no common policy, no long connexion, and especially because, upon this continent, we have never looked to that quarter for masonic precedent.

The beginning of Grand Lodges, as we understand these institutions in our own day, was established at the London meetings of the four Lodges of 1715 and 1717. Ireland followed the path made by them. Scotland followed in a manner, though not *identical*, quite as *independent*, and the Grand Lodges, on this side of the Atlantic, have found no occasion for widening and enlarging the precedent of 1715—17.

I do not mean, for a moment, to doubt the *wisdom* of the action of 1715—17, or the *right* of the four London Lodges to do precisely what they *did* do. I intend to claim, however, that *other* masonic action, equally legitimate, equally worthy, and equally important, is as *equally* to be recognized, at this hour, as it had the sanction of one hundred and forty

years to strengthen the foundation of its *right*. I am not aware that any intelligent mason desires to disturb a system of action which has been sanctioned by long acquiescence and which has resulted in the harmony and happiness of the order. I yield to the power of a precedent, however established, which settles a wise course of future action, but I can never agree to see a *mere* precedent tortured into working the highest practical injustice.

The Grand Lodge of Ireland dates from 1730. It was formed in "imitation of the Grand Lodge of England," and chose for its first Grand Master a brother who had been, the previous year, Grand Master of the Grand Lodge of England. The Constitution and usages of the Grand Lodge of England were adopted by it.

The Grand Lodge of Scotland was formed in 1736. Masonry had then existed in that country for centuries; but not until November the 30th—Saint Andrew's day—of that year, did the Lodges of that country assemble to organize as a common body, and choose their own Grand Master. Previously the Grand Mastership of masons for Scotland had been hereditary in the family of Roslin. William Saint Clair of Roslin, having intimated to his masonic brethren his wish to resign his hereditary Grand Mastership, assembled his brethren of the Lodges in and about Edinburgh, and wished them to determine upon a plan for the *election* of a Grand Master. Thirty-four Lodges appeared or were represented by their proxies, and, at this meeting, the office of Grand Master in Scotland became, for the first time, *elective*. This Grand Lodge had the assent of the *Grand Master of Masons of Scotland* for its formation, differing, in this particular, from the Grand Lodge of England.

The entire history of the formation of these three Grand Lodges is overwhelming—I had almost said omnipotent,—to prove, that they were all *voluntary* masonic associations, growing naturally out of the necessities of the order, and assuming, as associations, the power of proper organization as an *inherent right*. It was never claimed—and it never can be truthfully claimed—that any *ancient constitution* conferred the right which was exercised. Old constitutions and charges may be studied for that in vain. The right to form such bodies was *assumed*, and the *extent of jurisdiction* was also *assumed*, and engrafted upon it, as well as the form and manner of masonic government.

Neither of the three Grand Lodges thus formed, went so far as to assume *exclusive* masonic jurisdiction out of England, Ireland, and Scotland. The only *exclusive* power assumed was to their own respective territories. When those were passed at home they exercised a common power. Whenever any one of them might grant a warrant of con-

stitution, or locate a Provincial Grand Master *abroad*, either of the others might do the same. The Grand Lodges of England and Scotland so understood the subject, and both of them created Provincial Grand Masters in the colony of Massachusetts antecedent to the revolution. The subsequent history of the Masonic bodies established by these Provincial Grand Masters, is full of interest, as bearing upon the question under consideration, and I shall have cause to refer to it in the course of my examination of this subject.

One at least of the Provincial Grand Masters, appointed by the Grand Lodge of England, did not understand that the American revolution severed the *Masonic* connexion between the parent power and the newly created States upon this northern continent. In 1791 the R. W. John Johnson, then the English Provincial Grand Master of Lower Canada, granted a warrant of constitution to his Excellency Thomas Chatterton, then Governor of the State of Vermont, and his associates, for the establishment of a Lodge at Vergennes, by the name of Dorchester Lodge. This Lodge was duly constituted under that warrant, and worked under it until October, 1794, when, in connexion with the other Lodges in the State, which had charters from the Grand Lodges of Massachusetts and New York, it aided in forming the present Grand Lodge of Vermont, and forcibly severing its connexion with Canada, has ever since hailed under the new jurisdiction. The Provincial Grand Master of Canada never complained of this action, or denied the right of Dorchester Lodge of its own motion, to make the severance and aid in establishing a new and independent jurisdiction.

It was assumed by all the State Masonic institutions of this country, which existed before the revolutionary war, that the dissolution of the *political*, necessarily involved a dissolution of the *Masonic*, tie, and they acted accordingly. This, in my judgment, was a farther stretch in the line of masonic *independence* than any thing which has happened since. I am not aware that a Masonic pen was ever raised to sustain this assumption as resting on authority precedent or principle:—and yet three out of four of the Grand Lodges of the United States, who shrink instinctively from the word independence when the stern north-wind bears it to us from Canada, found no difficulty either in using the word, or carrying out the full force of its meaning practically in their own cases.

Ever since the American Revolution the Masonic practice in the United States has been,—that when three or more warranted Lodges are established in any State or Territory where no Grand Lodge exists, they possess the *inherent right* to meet together and form one themselves, and it is not and never was considered necessary to ask the

consent of the Grand Lodge, or Grand Lodges, from which their respective warrants emanated, for this purpose. Most of the Grand Lodges in the United States have been formed in this way, and every Grand Lodge has sanctioned this mode of action, so that the practice and principle are beyond dispute. I need only name Iowa, Texas, California, Minnesota, Oregon, Kansas, Grand Lodges all comparatively of yesterday, and all formed in this, and in no other manner.

With what show of reason, then, can we discard this acknowledged principle and practice? England, Scotland, Ireland, assumed it, and the Grand Lodges of the United States have followed out the assumption. What decent apology can we give for attempting to discard it now, only because our northern brethren have followed in the common path?

Nice distinctions have been drawn, and all kinds of contrasts and comparisons invoked, to show differences between the case of the Independent Grand Lodge of Canada and all antecedent precedents. I have been unable, thus far, so far to stultify my own intellect as to appreciate them as proving distinctions in principle. Two, or a dozen sets of facts, may fall within the fair application of the same principle, though, in many respects, variant from each other. It requires none of the subtle logic of special pleading to make this obvious to every unprejudiced and clear-minded man; but when a set of facts, having no common analogy whatever with another set of facts, are drawn into a controversy, and made the basis of an argument, those who rely upon them ought at least to be able to show their assimilation, as bearing upon the principle they are relied on to sustain.

The Canadian Masonic action of the 10th of October, 1855, has, in some quarters, been treated as analogous to the various Masonic revolutions in the state of New York. To my own conceptions no analogy was ever more absurd. Had England experienced a division of her own Grand Lodge, by revolutionary means, on the soil of England, at home, the cases would have had some resemblance to each other; but they have no more resemblance of revolution now than the formation of the last Grand Lodge of Michigan—by Lodges holding warrants from the Grand Lodge of New York—has of revolutionary action towards that state. Michigan had the right to go alone when she was masonically and constitutionally strong enough, on well recognized principles; as Vermont had, and many other States, and as they did without exception from any quarter.

And precisely with as much propriety might Massachusetts, with her two warranted Lodges in Vermont in 1794; New York with the same number, and England itself with its one, granted through its Provincial Grand Master of Lower Canada, declare the Grand Lodge which those subordinate Lodges formed

to be un-masonic and revolutionary, as they may now make such an assertion as to the Independent Grand Lodge of Canada.

Until it be proved—which it has not been, and cannot be—that the constitutions and charges of Edwin transmitted to us some “ancient land-mark,” recognizing Grand Lodges in their present manner of formation, and recognizing also the powers now claimed by the Grand Lodge of England and its supporters, as well-established portions of legitimate ancient masonic law and right, it is worse than idle to maintain, in the face of the masonic usage and precedent of the last one hundred and forty years, that a competent body of regular lodges existing in a state or territory where there is no Independent Grand Lodge, have not the right to form one. *If they have not, it is more than doubtful whether there is a legitimate Grand Lodge on the continent of North America.*

I have thus far treated this important question as masonic history, principle and usage bear upon it; and I most sincerely regret that it was not placed upon this sole ground from the beginning. Broadly sustainable as it is here, it needed no other argument to contribute any additional support. Still there are other facts connected with the formation of the Independent Grand Lodge of Canada, which cannot be forgotten, and ought not to be forgotten, in considering the subject.

The Masons of Canada were, to a large extent, men whose birth-places were abroad. Their Lodges existed by power derived from abroad. The sympathies of their members were largely with their mother country across the ocean, and this natural and honorable feeling was all powerful with them to prevent any rashness or disrespect towards those foreign masonic jurisdictions to which they acknowledged allegiance. Knowing and feeling the inconveniences of their position, the neglect of their wants, and the denial of their just rights, they submitted to years of humble complaint, of brotherly solicitation, of many petitioning and of mild remonstrance—and they submitted in vain. No kind response, no appreciation of self-evident wrongs breathed its gentle breath across the broad Atlantic. They were compelled at last, unwillingly, to realize that all foreign hope was ended, and that the future of their masonic happiness must depend upon themselves. Thus situated, forty-one lodges holding warrants of constitution under the authority of the Grand Lodges of England, Ireland and Scotland, after circulating notice of their intention for several months, assembled at Hamilton, on the 10th day of October, 1855, severed all foreign connection, and constituted themselves a Grand Lodge for Canada.

The wrongs and grievances to which I refer have been sometimes denied, and the representations of these forty-one lodges have been cavilled at by enmity and hawked at

by ignorance; but an earlier justification has already come than the new Grand Lodge could have anticipated, and its own truth is sustained, even from the mouths of its opponents. On the 23rd day of October last, the body of Canadian masons which styles itself “The Provincial Grand Lodge of Free and Accepted Masons of Canada West, under the United Grand Lodge of England”—*which body still acknowledges and adheres to its foreign allegiance*—memorialized the Grand Lodge of England upon its position, and in that memorial has set forth substantially the existence of the same grievances which had been previously set forth, and which, having been treated with scorn and contempt in the quarter to which they were addressed, had forced the forty-one lodges to their independent action of October 10, 1855.

Had the forty-one lodges of Canada postponed their action and continued to bear oppression longer, subsequent events have shown that “scorpions” were doomed to succeed the “whips,” and that while they remained within the portal of foreign jurisdiction, they must leave all hope upon the outside. At the Quarterly Communication of the Grand Lodge of England, on the 4th of June, 1856, when a petition from Canada West was alluded to by a member upon the floor, which petition had been presented to the Grand Master, and notice had been given of a motion by brother Portal, “for granting privileges to the Prov. Grand Lodge of Canada West,” the Grand Master announced, *even before the motion was brought forward*, that he should “refuse putting it from the Chair.” He went on to remark that “the Grand Lodge had nothing to do with the petition,” and added, that he was perfectly justified in ignoring it.” He refused also to read a part of the petition.

Upon this practice the Grand Lodge of England is a myth, having no substantial entity whatever, or, if it has any appreciable existence, it is but as the shadow of the Most Worshipful Earl of Zetland. I know not how these occurrences may strike the minds of the brethren of this Grand Lodge; but I am compelled to admit that no intellectual chemistry can find any thing in my own conceptions which has the least affinity for them. A Grand Master quite as many years as any other living brother on this side of the Atlantic, and—so far as I know—on the other, I have a right to believe that the masonic world will give me credit for having no disposition to restrict the legitimate prerogatives of that exalted station; but when the brother thus situated, and thus responsible to the masonic world at large, assumed an entire personal control over petitions; gratuitously refuses to put motions growing naturally out of them, even before they are offered, and withholds from his Grand Lodge the contents of papers in which that body is interested, I can see

only, in those acts, simple, unmitigated, unalloyed despotism. It is receding to the age of darkness and of iron. Masonry is too intelligent and enlightened to sanction it. If the Grand Lodge of England yields to it, she has arrived at the hour when the rising sun of her East should be transferred to represent the setting sun of her West, and in that changed position it will most appropriately emblematically her declining masonic glory.

I am not ready to say—and I, by no means, intend to say—that neglect and oppression by a Grand Lodge of her subordinates, will in all, or in a majority of cases, justify revolutionary measures. I design always to distinguish between that which is justifiably right, and that which is obviously wrong. And I think that, in most cases which arise, there is usually a well-marked line of distinction, which a well-informed and dispassionate man will experience no great difficulty in finding. I think, for instance, that I can perceive a very plain difference in the relations between a Grand Lodge and its subordinates existing in a single state or territory, and a G. Lodge and its subordinates existing in different countries, thousands of miles apart, and separated by an ocean. I think I can appreciate the existence of a very clear distinction between the difficulties of a few years ago with the Grand Lodge of New York and a portion of her subordinate lodges, and of those existing in 1855 between the Grand Lodge of England and her subordinate lodges in Canada. In the first case the disaffected lodges, in the outset, formed a part of the Grand Lodge of New York. They were represented upon its floor, with as full privileges as to being heard, as their associates; and, if injured, with the undoubted right of renewing the consideration of the subject matters of difference, from time to time, and of laboring to bring the majority to their views, and of convincing them by fact and argument, if they could. Thus situated, they preferred secession, and formed a new Grand Lodge for themselves. This was *revolutionary* beyond doubt, and so has the masonic world at large almost unanimously decided. But there is no fair parallel to this state of things in the case of Canada. The subordinate lodges of Canada had no representation in the Grand Lodge of England. They were in a state of complete and absolute dependence and pupilage. They could only appear at the door of that Grand Lodge as humble suppliants for their rights by written petition, without a single voice of their own upon its tessellated pavement to sustain and enforce their supplications. Their prayers of years were unheeded, their solicitations scorned, their injuries unredressed, and even their money taken from them without acknowledgment or notice. Are these cases analogous? It would be the most palpable and wicked mendacity to say so. Wrongs, such as I have named, could not be borne for ever. They

left the Canadian Lodges but a single alternative, either to give up masonry wholly and entirely, or to raise an independent masonic standard. The impassible point had been reached; the last drop of the cup of forbearance had been drained; and—unwilling to be *forced* from the privileges and enjoyments of the order—they made the selection of honorable independence, and appealed to the justice of a world-wide masonry for sanction and brotherhood. This, in my judgment, was *not* revolution, but the exercise of a proper, necessary and just right; and the masonic world will so decide, unless it is prepared to hold, that there is not, *in any case whatever*, a remedy for masonic oppression.

Upon both grounds then, my brethren, as I view this subject; of the *inherent* right of every state, territory, or country, to establish a Grand Lodge of its own, and the right of a country holding its masonry from a foreign source, to make a severance for unmitigated oppression, I maintain, that the independent Grand Lodge of Canada, established at Hamilton on the 10th day of October, 1855, is legitimately and masonically established, and is entitled *justly and of right* to the sanction, countenance, and support of all the Grand Lodges in the world.

Within a few days after the masonic action of the forty-one lodges at Hamilton, the then Grand Master of the Grand Lodge of New York seems, evidently, to have become alarmed. Before the infant Grand Lodge of Canada was fairly invested with its swaddling-clothes, he appears perfectly prepared to strangle it in its cradle. Seven days only were suffered to pass before he stigmatized many as good men and worthy masons as the world can elsewhere boast of, as being guilty of masonic "rebellion," and then sounded the old atabal alarm of "rebellion" at home. Without taking the trouble to distinguish between Canadian and New York "rebellion," he seized upon the matter a *petitio principii*, assimilated the two unlike cases by a single dash of the pen, raised from their quiet graves the long laid skeletons of "heresy and schism," looked anxiously across the Atlantic to the long-withheld patronizing smile which had a few years past almost emblazoned the waves of old ocean in its passage from London to New York, and concluded that it would be the "height of ingratitude" to England to do any thing less than proscribe the new and independent Grand Lodge of Canada. The same panic alarm seized upon his Committee of Foreign Correspondence in June following. Leo the Tenth and the Cardinals of the Vatican could hardly have been more alarmed at the appearance of the new dogmas of Luther. The shadows of "heresy and schism" triumphed, and glorious New York, at the hands of her strong and great men, chose to confine her masonic sympathies to her own side of the St. Lawrence.

Not thus did the masonry of the empire state reason when she formed her own independent Grand Lodge. She did not rely upon the "implied or express consent of England," nor seek the sanction of any Provincial Grand Lodge which had chartered local lodges in her territory; nor did she then understand that *rebellion* and *independence* were synonymous terms. She then felt the ability to stand up and walk in her own legitimate inherent strength; she threw the crutches of English dependence in England's face, and marched on triumphantly to her own high and glorious masonic destiny. When I assert this I do it upon the authority contended for by the legitimate Grand Lodge of New York, which has always claimed that "in 1785 it adopted a new constitution, and thereby *threw off all allegiance* to the parent body." Unless this be true, I see no escape from the position contended for by the revolutionary Grand Lodge of that state, which I understand to hold, "that, down to 1849, the Grand Lodge of New York continued to be *Provincial* to the Grand Lodge of England."

Before the declared independence of the Grand Lodge of New York, by the alleged action of 1785, that grand body had, for several years, been independent *de facto*. Her Provincial Charter required her to make returns of her proceedings to the Grand Lodge of England, and allow appeals to be taken thereto. But from and after September 1777, she made no returns, and suffered no appeals to be taken; styled herself the Grand Lodge of New York, and not the Provincial Grand Lodge, and claimed the independent title of *Most Worshipful* instead of *Right Worshipful*, the latter being the title of all Provincial Grand Lodges. For the term of about eight years, then, she acted independently, without declaring herself so, and her action, during that interregnum between dependence and undeclared independence, she has always claimed to have been correct and legitimate, and the masonic world has not denied it. Upon principle, however, it would be difficult to find anything as irregular as all this in any of the acts and doings of the forty-one lodges of Canada.

Missouri, in refusing to acknowledge the independent Grand Lodge of Canada, offers no argument but the first impressions of her Grand Master, acquiesced in, apparently *pro forma*, by a Committee. The decision of Virginia, I only know by a statement in the *Freemason's Magazine* of Boston. I have not yet seen her proceedings; but if the Grand Lodge of that venerable old state is perfectly satisfied with the facts and arguments on which her own independence was established, it is not easy to understand her want of appreciation of those which exist as to the independent Grand Lodge of Canada.

I have read the Report of the Committee on this subject, adopted by the Grand Lodge of

Massachusetts; and considering the names it bears, and the history of the formation of the Grand Lodge of that ancient Commonwealth, I have been more than surprised at some of its positions.

The Report begins with the expression of a great deal of sympathy, and expresses the opinion that an independent organization is essential to the effective and proper working of the order, in the opinion of the entire craft in Canada; but professes to find "well-true principles" in the way of recognition, and then states the question at issue to be, "whether it is consistent, with the recognized laws or customs of freemasonry, for any lodges under a particular jurisdiction, to secede from the parent body without its consent, and to form, of their own authority, a new body, having an independent existence and independent powers."

Although the question might have been stated with greater fairness, I do not object to it, as thus expressed. And I feel no difficulty in saying, that if the consistency of such action is denied, *Massachusetts herself has no legitimate Grand Lodge whatever.* She asked no "consent" to "secede" from the "parent body," by either of her Provincial Grand Lodges. Both on the 2nd day of January, 1783, when the old Massachusetts Grand Lodge assembled, after an entire suspension of eight years; and in August 1837—when her Saint John's Grand Lodge met, after a suspension of more than twelve years—we find no such idea dreamed of, so far as she has seen fit to disclose her history to the masonic world. The Grand Master of one of her Grand Lodges laid in his shroud of glory under the King's Chapel, and the other also had passed away from earth. An assumed "elective supremacy," in the one case, and a silently assumed *right to act*, in the other, were all that were thought necessary in those "good days of old." Nor was more thought needful when the Massachusetts and St. John's Grand Lodges, united in 1792, and formed the present Grand Lodge of Massachusetts.

If all this action was not secession, by what name is it to be described? Who ever heard, among it all, that the "consent" of the "Grand Body" was asked, and who so ignorant as not to know, that upon *self-assumed* authority, Massachusetts inaugurated a "new body, with an independent existence and independent powers." This being true, the committee of Massachusetts must either disavow themselves, or admit that *independent* action is to be enjoyed by them only in common with others.

I quote another paragraph from the report of the Massachusetts Committee.—"Each Grand Lodge in the United States rules and governs without interference from any other, all Lodges within the civil jurisdiction of the State in which she is situated—holding the

territories as common ground, wherein each Grand Lodge is free to charter Lodges at pleasure, until each territory by being regularly admitted to the Union as a State, acquires the right to form a Grand Lodge, for itself. Your Committee are aware that this has sometimes been done before admission as a State; but although it may be alleged in excuse that territories are States in process of formation, we still think the practice illegal, and *not to be justified in any case*, the only safe rule, in our opinion, being that laid down."

The first portion of this opinion admits of no controversy;—no one denies its truth and correctness. The second portion has no truth to sustain it, and, if Massachusetts holds to it, she stands alone. I would be highly thankful to know, *when, where, and by whom* any such rule, as to the Grand Lodges of the territories, was established and *what* Grand Lodge has either assented to or acquiesced in it. For myself, I know of none. If such Grand Lodges are of doubtful validity, I cannot withhold the question, whether my own native and loved State is not now in full masonic communion with Minnesota, Oregon and Kansas?—and if she is *not*, why she does not inform her sister Grand Lodges that her masonic compasses do not embrace them in this circle of masonic brotherhood.

The Committee of the Grand Lodge of Massachusetts find no difficulty in deciding, that all the reasons given by the formers of the Grand Lodge of Canada make out only a case of "simple inconvenience;" hold the action they have taken to be rebellion; assert that "in masonry there can be no long-continued oppression," that "there can be no temptation to tyranny, for nothing is to be gained by it," and that "within certain bounds the will of the majority is absolute." They then most fraternally call the Grand Lodge of England "our venerable mother," protest against the newly formed Grand Lodge of Canada by resolution, and forbid all masonic communication with it or with any Lodge or individual having any connexion therewith.

It is doubtless always "inconvenient" for masonry to be governed by a power three thousand miles off and across an ocean. The Grand Lodge of Massachusetts itself found it so at the close of the revolutionary war, and remedied the "inconvenience" by its own act. Canada, even more inconveniently situated than Massachusetts, has simply done an act of the same kind. Is it possible, in the worlds or in Heaven's high chancery, to hold one to be loyal, and the other treasonable? That "side of the majority" which "within certain bounds is absolute," and which the Massachusetts Committee see so clearly to be a protection against "oppression and tyranny," has been prostrated upon the floor of the Grand Lodge of England by the despotic will of the present Grand Master, and has, at this mo-

ment, as every well-informed mason knows, only a mythical existence, at least within that Grand Lodge of "our venerable mother."

In the full meaning of the second resolution passed by the Grand Lodge of Massachusetts, at the recommendation of its committee, a very large range is taken. Carried out to its results, as it obviously reads, some seven or eight State Grand Lodges, all their subordinates, and all the members of each, are literally excommunicated from association with that Grand body,—inasmuch as that number of Grand Lodges have agreed that they *will* have "connexion" with this same independent Grand Lodge of Canada. If this was actually intended, it seems to me to open a fountain of bitter waters, illy adapted to promote the growth of charity and brotherly love.

I have examined, with some care, the communications of some masonic writers on this highly interesting subject, with a view of learning all that was accessible; and I am obliged to express my surprise at what has appeared in relation to it in some of the leading masonic publications. It has been contended in one quarter that the recognition of the Independent Grand Lodge of Canada by the Grand Lodge of Ireland is of no great importance, *because she had only about fifteen lodges in Canada, and did not burthen them with charges so harshly as the Grand Lodge of England did the lodges holding warrants under her.* This is a singular argument to be urged, and very naturally leads to the inquiry, why, if Ireland's *acknowledgement* is of no importance, Scotland's *refusal* is of even as much weight, when it is known that she had a far less number of lodges in the Province under her care. If in a territory free and open for the admission of warranted lodges by different foreign Grand Lodges, the question of right and wrong is to be settled by the greater or lesser number of lodges introduced by each, then we have introduced a new masonic rule of practice, the existence of which is yet unknown to our constitutions, and equally unknown to the intellectual tribunals of masonic equity and justice.

And it has been contended too, strange as it may seem, that since the separation of Canada from France, the three Grand Lodges of Great Britain and Ireland, have "held and improved" that Province, (to use the language of the writer,) as a "coparcenary or a partnership inheritance, with a joint right of succession"—as "one heir holding the premises as an estate in common." With such a view of her position, Canada might well complain that this interesting masonic partnership of the rose, the shamrock and the thistle, did not transact its business under some regular partnership title, and issue its lodge warrants in the name of the firm. It might also have been important to enquire, in what respective individual proportions these joint partners of "Canadian masonic rights

and privileges owned the masonic stock of such a glorious inheritance, and not have left so important a matter wholly to inference. The author of the argument to which I am addressing myself, brings down his statistics no farther than the year 1848, at which time, according to his information, said stock consisted of ninety-seven shares, of which England possessed eighty, Ireland fifteen, and Scotland two.

Upon the loyal theory suggested, the writer might with propriety have insisted that England and Scotland should have enjoyed Ireland from interfering with their partnership rights, by acknowledging Canadian Masonic Independence.

A partnership where each separate partner acts independent of the firm, transacts his part of the business independent of his associates, carries it on in his own name and on his own responsibility, and has a "joint individual interest" and a "right of survivorship" besides, in so large a property as the masonic territory of Canada, *without knowing it or suspecting it himself*, is an invention which leaves steam and telegraphs in the far distance, and will only be equalled by the discovery of a partially successful rudder to the balloon.

It is among my strongest wishes, personally, to see the masonry of this continent firmly established on its own unsculptured Doric column, as strong in its moral as are the Pyramids in their physical strength. Every lawful masonic act which, to a fair and unbiassed judgment, has a tendency in that direction, has always had and always will have my warmest encouragement and firmest support. I sincerely and solemnly believe the movement in Canada to have been one of that kind, and, in common with the members of this Grand Lodge, I have felt bound to give it the best support in my power. I have no doubt of its eventual success, and none that such success is most highly important both to the masonry of Canada and of the United States. To ourselves, my brethren, who are the immediate neighbors of Canada, and who know, personally, many of the officers and members of the Independent Grand Lodge, and of the lodges which recognize its organization, it is wholly idle to talk about masonic "rebellion." We know them to be legitimate and true masons, and worthy of the name; law-abiding men; men whom we esteem for their manliness and their virtues; men with whom it is our pleasure and our pride to exchange the right hand of fellowship, and from an association with whom no bull of excommunication—come it whence it may—will ever be able to separate us. The masonic course of their predecessors, more than forty years ago, and when the unfortunate cloud of war hung over our respective countries, is not unfamiliar to me. Some of its unpublished annals have survived and are in my possession,

preserved and transmitted to me by that most worthy Grand Master who preceded me in the oriental chair. Those annals show the same honourable, exalted and brotherly spirit, which characterizes our Canadian brethren of the present hour. In sustaining such men, and their lawful masonic acts, we sustain the order in its purity, and strengthen the foundation on which rests the Doric column of American Freemasonry.

PHILIP C. TUCKER,
Grand Master of the Grand Lodge
of Vermont.

Burlington, Jan. 14, 1857.

The *Canadian Masonic Pioneer* is published on the first of every month, at Montreal, U. S. Terms. Five Shillings Cy., per annum payable invariably in advance.

All communications must be pre-paid, and addressed to the Editors *Masonic Pioneer* Montreal.



The Canadian Masonic Pioneer.

MONTREAL, MARCH 2, 1857.

We present our readers to-day, with that portion of the Grand Master's address to the Grand Lodge of Vermont, which relates to the Grand Lodge of Canada, and earnestly recommend it to the careful perusal of every mason into whose hands the present number of the *Pioneer* may fall.

M. W. Brother Philip C. Tucker, the Grand Master of Vermont, is well known, all the world over, as being one of the most clear-headed, warm-hearted masonic veterans who ever lived. His knowledge of the history, usages, and principles of freemasonry is unsurpassed, if not unequalled by any living man. His unshrinking devotion to our Order during a long series of years, including that period of anti-masonic excitement and persecution, which in his own state, in particular, severely tried men's sincerity, proves his whole soul to be thoroughly imbued with its genuine spirit. While he is the last man to look to for countenance in an infraction of masonic law, those who read his address will perceive that he is not to be easily driven from the defence of that which is masonically legal and right. He is an old, able, eloquent masonic writer; but had he never before lifted his pen, this masterly vindication of the proceedings of Canadian masons, and of the position and rights of our Grand Lodge, would have rendered his

name immortal, and covered his memory with imperishable honour.

Not Canada alone, but the whole masonic world owes him an everlasting debt of obligation for this sound and lucid exposition of the principles involved in the question of the constitutionality of our Independent Grand Lodge. Facts so unquestionable, reasoning so strictly logical, arguments so perfectly clear and so forcible, as are here presented, cannot fail to satisfy every mind not totally blinded by unmitigated prejudice.

But neither prejudice, want of sympathy, love of oppression, or an aversion to sanction that which was right, has had much to do in causing some of our sister Grand Lodges to withhold from us their fraternal recognition and fellowship. It has been more the fear of doing wrong by countenancing schism and rebellion, and this fear was the creature of ignorance. Our case was, in some respects, anomalous and the principles applicable to it but little understood. New York, identifying it with her own, sounded the alarm, and with some others, shrank from us, as all good and true masons should shrink from schismatics, with instinctive horror.

The Grand Master of Vermont has completely dispelled the obscuring mists which hung around the subject, and lighted it up with rays clear as sunshine, culminated from history, precedent, law, usage and principle, and thrown upon it with all the force and power of truth and eloquence. We entertain no doubt that the result will be most salutary. Our brethren *must* either answer these arguments, or yield to their force. To answer them is impossible, and we therefore confidently anticipate an early recognition of our just rights, by all the Grand Lodges upon this continent, and peaceful fraternal fellowship with all true masons throughout the universe.

The following correspondence can be properly understood and appreciated, by those only who are acquainted with the proceedings of some of the officers of the late Provincial Grand Lodge of Montreal and William Henry, since the formation of the Grand Lodge of Canada. We say "late Provincial Grand Lodge," because, although, the Provincial Grand Master, who resides in Quebec, still holds his commission, his Grand Lodge has ceased to exist; the late election of Treasurer and appointment of other officers having taken place in November, 1854, whereas the regulations required that this should be done annually.

The lodges which united in establishing the Independent Grand Lodge of Canada were not only willing, but particularly desirous to conform in all things to masonic law and usage. They were, therefore, perfectly prepared to deliver up their warrants, to those European Grand Lodges from which they had been received. Of this, the Provincial Grand Master was promptly informed. He intimated that those

derived from the United Grand Lodge of England should be returned through him, as the agent of that Grand Lodge. This was consented to, on condition that the said warrants should never be used to revive Lodges in Canada. With this understanding, by unanimous votes of the Lodges, several warrants were immediately surrendered, and they were received, as was supposed in good faith, to be returned to the source whence they originated. Here is a note from the Provincial Grand Secretary acknowledging the receipt of one of these warrants.

Provincial Grand Lodge,
District Montreal and William Henry,
Montreal, 5th November, 1855.

SIR AND BROTHER,—I have to acknowledge receipt of the Warrant of Constitution of the St. George's Lodge of this City, that Lodge having ceased to work under the United Grand Lodge of England.

I have received the half-yearly returns of the said Lodge to 1st instant, with the sum of seven Pounds Eight Shillings, in payment of the dues accrued, and I shall make early application to the Grand Secretary for the certificates which those returns call for.

I am,

Sir, and Brother,
Yours fraternally,

OGILVY MOFFATT.

P. G. Secretary.

Brother John Charles Spence, &c., &c.,
Montreal.

Now the result as to the warrant of St. George's Lodge, will illustrate the game at which our Provincial authorities have been playing, and in which they have been so promptly check-mated by R. W. Brother Brown.

Several months elapsed, during which the most extraordinary efforts were made to arouse to adverse action certain disappointed, dying-out old fogies. At length an old P. M. who, during two years occupancy of the oriental chair, was never able to work his lodge through three degrees, was found ready to receive and unfurl the old parchment. The city was literally scoured to gather under this banner an army of "loyalists" to put down "rebellion." In violation of all masonic law, usage and principle, masons who had been unaffiliated, in some instances, for more than ten years, and men who had been excluded from their lodges were made to fill the several offices, and thus was St. George's Lodge, 643, E. R., made to return to its allegiance. Its books, property, money, members and masonry, however, belong to No. 13, Canada Register. The same course having been pursued in one or two other instances those lodges which had not sent in their warrants decided to retain them, in their own possession, until they should be demanded by the Grand Lodge of England, or disposed of in a manner more in accordance with the principles and interests of masonry.

Prevost Lodge, which has a large and highly respectable membership, was perfectly unanimous in its action in reference to the formation of the Grand Lodge of Canada. Subse-

quently, however, one of its members who happened to have possession of the jewels, &c., and had been informed by the P. G. M. that one dissentient could retain them, took it into his head to be very "loyal" and hold on to them. It was to accommodate him and perhaps one other person, that the warrant was demanded. Once in his possession, the Grand Lodge of England would have been advised that Prevost Lodge had retired to its allegiance, and was working under her jurisdiction. If there are really seven members in Dunham who want a Lodge under the jurisdiction of the Grand Lodge of England, let them apply for a dispensation and organize one, and we promise not only to pay for the Dispensation, but will send each of them—and all the masons they can make—a copy of the *Pioneer* gratis. A course of procedure so utterly unmasonic and so unmanly as that to which I advert can only result in mischief, and must inevitably cover those who are engaged in it with disgrace. We therefore admonish all concerned that the sooner it is discontinued the better.

Provincial Grand Lodge,
District of Montreal and William Henry,
Montreal, 7th January, 1857.

DEAR SIR,—By command of the R. W. the Provincial Grand Master of this district, I am instructed to demand from you the warrant of constitution of Prevost Lodge, No. 776, E. R., held from the Grand Lodge of England, under which yourself, and several members of that Lodge have for some time passed ceased to work, and request that the same may be transmitted to him through me.

I am Dear Sir,
Yours truly,

(Signed)

OGILVY MOFFATT,
P. G. Secretary.

David Brown, Esq.,
Dunham.

Dunham, 23rd January, 1857.

DEAR SIR,—In answer to your demand upon me, by the hands of Mr. Kemp, for the English Warrant of Constitution of Prevost Lodge, I have to say, that for the present at least, I must most respectfully decline complying with that demand, for several reasons, among which are the following:—

That the existence of the Grand Lodge of Canada, whose jurisdiction I acknowledge, precludes, in my opinion, the possibility of any other body in the same territory, having sufficient power to take the Warrant of Constitution from a subordinate Lodge, more particularly when such warrant was not granted by the body so demanding it.

That the said Warrant of Constitution emanated from the Grand Lodge of England, that therefore, even though a Provincial Grand Lodge did exist, I could not recognize its right to demand from me that which it never had power to grant.

That my own convictions are, that a compliance with this requisition would not in any degree tend to the benefit of the Institution of Freemasonry in Canada, as has already been proved, by the compliance of others with like demands.

That whenever a demand for the said War-

rant shall be made, by the Grand Lodge of England, sanctioned by the Grand Lodge of Canada, I shall feel bound to give it my best consideration.

With great respect,

I am, dear Sir,

Very truly yours,

DAVID BROWN.

Ogilvy Moffatt, Esq.,
Montreal.

CANADIAN MASONIC PIONEER.—The *Pioneer* boldly asserts he was not lost in the woods. That's only hearsay. Not a word about the snow. Now we of the *Messenger* proclaim this publicly that the *Pioneer* on his travel to New York has either lost his way or been seduced from his duty. Any person knowing of his whereabouts, or will undertake to deliver him at the *Masonic Messenger* office, shall be handsomely rewarded. *Vivat Victoria*; a special edict. Fear and obey.—*Masonic Messenger*.

Snow? Got none.

Lost his way on travel to New York? New York's *hard road* to travel.

Seduced? Like to see the fellow could do it.

Whereabouts? Always on the "look-out."

Handsomely rewarded? *Shell out*.

We have a letter from that world-renowned and universally admired Brother, *Rob Morris*, of old Kentucky, Editor of the *American Freemason*, in which he says, "I will certainly be with you at your July meeting." "So mote it be." Exact day; 'second Wednesday in July.' Place, Montreal. Many latch-strings will be found out—pull the one at 128 *Craig Street*.

By invitation several of the Canadian Brethren visited Champlain Lodge at its last monthly communication, and were most courteously received. At the desire of the W. M., and the expressed wish of the members of Champlain Lodge, R. W. Brother J. H. Isaacson, of Montreal, the Grand Senior Warden of the Grand Lodge of Canada, for a time ruled the Lodge, and during his occupancy of the chair, assisted by the Canadian brethren, initiated a candidate into the mysteries of freemasonry, the ceremony being performed in accordance with the English ritual.

PALESTINE, TEXAS, Jany. 21, 1857.

In the Grand Lodge of Texas.

Resolution 9th from the Report on Foreign Correspondence was adopted, as follows:—

"Resolved that the Grand Lodge of Texas has witnessed the formation of an Independent Grand Lodge in Canada, with pleasure, as a movement calculated to conduce to the best interests of Freemasonry; and that we extend the right hand of fellowship and ask an interchange of masonic intelligence.

A new lodge at Quebec, C. E., under the Grand Lodge of Canada, is shortly to be established under the most favourable auspices, to be known as "La Logo Champlain."

We have much pleasure in announcing to our readers that on the 9th of last month a new Masonic Lodge was opened in the village of Maitland, C. W., to be known as Maitland Lodge.

Brother W. B. Simpson, of Brockville, D. D. G. Master of the Grand Lodge of Canada, installed the following brethren as officers of said Lodge, viz:—

W. Bro. G. C. Longley.....	W. Master.
“ W. Garvey,	S. W.
“ J. Marcy,	J. W.
“ D. Maxwell,	Secy.
“ J. Howard,	Treas.
“ E. L. Morris,	S. D.
“ Thos. Camm,	J. D.
“ T. D. Despat,	I. G.
“ D. Byers,	Tyler.

DIED.

At La Colle, on the 13th ult., W. Brother Lieut.-Col. Robert Hoyle, of disease of the heart, aged 75 years, deeply and deservedly regretted by all. During his illness he was surrounded by kind and sympathetic friends; and every resource which art, and the heartfelt affection of a truly sympathising family could summon, was brought to his aid. But it was not within the scope of human skill to prolong his existence. At length nature paid her last debt, and he departed this life firm in the faith of a redeeming Saviour. He was a kind and affectionate husband and father; kind and liberal to the poor; to lessen human misery and increase human happiness was the law of his heart, and the language of his lips. The highest tribute that can be paid to man, can in all truthfulness be paid to him. Those who enjoyed his confidence and knew him best, honoured and respected him most.

Though deeply mourned and missed, the excellent qualities of his kind and affectionate heart render consolation to his domestic circle, where his memory will ever be cherished as one deservedly dear. He was ever foremost in the promotion of public welfare, and a liberal subscriber to charitable and other institutions.

Col. Hoyle was one of the first English settlers on the Seignior of La Colle, and the only M.P.P. born in England, when his famous 92 Resolutions were passed. He was firm but liberal in his political principles; frank in the expression of his opinions; and fearless in the advocacy of them; ever unimpeachable in the performance of his public duties, which were many and various, having filled all the public offices in the gift of the country.

And is he gone! and shall we never behold
The noble casket that contained his soul?

At his particular request Bro. Hoyle was interred with masonic honours.

THOS. RAWLINGS,

Accountant, Conveyancer and Custom
House Broker,
BRANTFORD, C. W.

November 1, 1856.

F. J. RASTRICK,

Architect and Civil Engineer,
Hamilton, C. W.

ALFRED BARTON,

Commission Merchant & General Agent,
BOWMANVILLE, C. W.

June, 1856.

T. IRELAND, CARD AND SEAL ENGRAVER,

26 Great St. James Street.

MONTREAL.

November 1, 1856.

ALEXANDER MCGIBBON,

WHOLESALE & RETAIL

Grocer, Wine, Ale & Spirit Merchant

No. 154 Notre Dame Street,
MONTREAL.

PAUL MONDOU,

Passenger Agent, Vermont Central R.R.,

No. 65, Commissioners Street,
MONTREAL, C.E.

June, 1856.

ON DRAUGHT,

SALT & Co.'s EAST INDIA PALE ALE,

From Burton on Trent. Also, Guinness & Sons
DOUBLE EXTRA STOUT.

SHAKSPEARE INN

St. Francis Xavier Street,

GEORGE LULLIAM.

June, 1856.

THE OTTAWA HOTEL,

GREAT ST. JAMES STREET,
MONTREAL.

CONDUCTED IN THE AMERICAN STYLE.

THE OTTAWA HOTEL stands in the very heart of the business part of the City, being in the same street and within two minutes walk of the Post Office and Banks.

The PARLORS and BEDROOMS are light, airy and well ventilated; the TABLES always supplied with the best to be found in the Markets; and the WINES, LIQUORS and CIGARS are invariably of the choicest brands.

CARRIAGES will be in attendance at the Railroad and Steamboat Depots, on the arrival of Cais and Boats.

A. HOFFNUNG,

170 NOTRE DAME STREET, 170
MONTREAL,

Facing St. Lawrence Man Street.

Importer of Geneva Watches, Fine Gold Jewellery of every description, Electro Silver spoons, Forks, Cruets, Cake Baskets, &c., Papier Maché Ware, Clocks, Musical Instruments and Fancy Goods, the whole of which will be offered at prices that defy competition.

MASONIC JEWELLERY manufactured to order.
June, 1856.

STERNBERG & HIMES,

MERCHANT TAILORS,

144 Notre Dame Street, Montreal,

Wholesale and Retail Clothiers, and Manufacturers of Hats, Caps and Furs. Masonic Clothing, Jewels, Working Tools, &c., &c.

June, 1856.

C. BRYSON,

ACCOUNT BOOK Manufacturer, General Bookbinder, Paper Ruler and Stationer. Wholesale and Retail, No. 39 St. Francis Xavier Street, Montreal.

Sells for cash only at unusually low rates, and makes no Second Price.

FRANCHERE, TOURVILLE & Co., COMMISSION MERCHANTS

AND
FLOUR, GRAIN AND PORK DEALERS,

No. 8, Common St., Gillespie's Buildings.
All orders and consignments made to them will meet prompt attention and quick returns.
June, 1856.

COLEMAN'S

MONTREAL HOUSE,

CUSTOM-HOUSE SQUARE,

MONTREAL,
J. W. COLEMAN.

June, 1856.

British Commercial Life Assurance Co. OF LONDON,

(Established 1820, empowered by Act of Parliament)

CAPITAL AND ASSETS £1,000,000 STG.

Prospectuses and all information can be had at the Offices of the Company, No. 12 Great St. James Street, Montreal.

PHILLIPS, GRAVELEY, DUFRESNE & Co.,
Agents.

British American Friendly Society OF CANADA,

(Incorporated by Special Act of Parliament.)
Established in 1853 for the Assurance of Life and Health.
CAPITAL, £100,000.

Head Office, 12 Great St. James Street, Montreal
With other Branch Offices through British North America.

Prospectuses, Reports, Forms of Application, and all information will be furnished at the Head Office or at any of the Branch Offices.

JAS. H. PHILLIPS, President.
DAVID HUNTER, Secy.
July 1, 1856.

PHILLIPS, GRAVELEY, DUFRESNE & Co.,
Life, Fire, and Marine Insurance Agents and Brokers,

OFFICES:—No. 12 Great St. James Street, Montreal; No. 16 St. Louis Street, U. T., Quebec.
July 1, 1856.

THOMAS BRODIE, EASTERN HOUSE, BOWMANVILLE.

July 1, 1856.

A. WILSON,

CONFECTIONER,

Corner of Notre Dame and St. Peter Streets.
MONTREAL.

July 1, 1856.

AGENTS FOR THE PIONEER.

Thos. Camm,.....Brockville, C.W.
W. C. Morrison,.....Toronto, C.W.
H. Grist,.....Hamilton, C.W.
Alex. S. Abbot,.....London, C.W.
A. Barton,.....Bowmanville, C.W.
Geo. Duncan,.....Windsor, C.W.
Ths. Rawlings,.....Brantford, C.W.
G. H. Napier,.....Melbourne, C.E.
W. A. Osgood,.....St. John's, C.E.
E. Gusten,.....Stanstead, C.E.
R. Douglass,.....Lacolle, C.E.
G. W. Johnston,.....Clarenceville, C.E.
J. Douglass Wells,.....Vankleek Hill, C.W.
W. A. Higgs,.....Stratford, C.W.
Powell,.....Simcoe
Alex. Simpson,.....Quebec.

MONTREAL:

Printed for the Proprietors by Brothers OWLER & STEVENSON and Published at their Office, No. 42 St. Francis Xavier Street.