

lation of the "ancient landmarks" of the Order to require it. Because the Grand Encampment, by an interpolation in the old form of application, requires a profession of a *belief* in, instead of a promise to give a *preference*, in case of a religious war, for the Christian religion, is no reason that a Templar is required to profess a belief in the dogma of the Trinity. Very many Christians do not believe it. We think the original requirement is all that is essential; for, if some sectarian fraters continue their aggressive work, it might end in the requirement that each candidate shall belong to some evangelical church, and perhaps finally to the Holy Roman Catholic Church. Masonic Bodies should not grow narrow in their creeds and requirements. It is contrary to the spirit of the age, and Masonry as well as Templary is a progressive science.—*Trestle Board*.

FREEMASONS IN THE JURY BOX.

It is not often that Freemasonry is alluded to in a Court of Law, but such was the case last week in the Dartford County Court. It appears that one of the parties to a dispute was a member of the Craft, while several of the gentlemen who were summoned on the jury also belonged to the Order. The opposing counsel objected to them, and Judge Emden held that this course was reasonable under the circumstances, and discharged the Freemason Jurors from attendance.

This was probably a novel experience so far as this country is concerned, although we have seen a record of similar action in the United States—we certainly hope it will not be made a practice of, else the good name and reputation of Freemasonry will be brought into disrepute. Of course it is but fair that anything like partiality should be avoided in the composition of a jury set to try a case, but we can hardly believe a Masonic litigant would stand any better chance of securing a verdict if he were tried by a body of Brother Masons than he would if his

case went forward in the ordinary course. We should certainly hope that the Masonic tie between the parties would not be disgraced by any undue preference, and believe that the opinion of the general body of members of the Craft will be that partiality would not be shown.

Some of our contemporaries, commenting on the case, observe that should this sort of objection become common, it may lead to awkward results, for if litigants who are not Freemasons are to insist on having none of the Order on the jury, those who belong to it might as reasonably object to submit the fate of their actions to the arbitrament of men who are outside the Mystic Tie, all of which and very much more might reasonably be urged in connection with the occurrence, but happily, as our contemporaries put it, Freemasonry does not meddle with law or civil rights, and that being so we can but hope it may remain as much unknown in Courts of Law in the future as it has been in the past.—*Freemason's Chronicle*.

AGED AFFILIATED MASONS.

An esteemed and active brother in *good standing*, of over three-score years of age, at St. John, Cal., writes us in a private letter, asking, "is there not some way in which the old non-affiliates could be brought back to the fold?" He adds, "I think the next Grand Lodge could pass some law giving some Master Mason in good standing the right to examine a poor old brother and know why he was suspended, and if he had committed no crime against State or Lodge, and only unable to pay his dues by misfortune, he should be restored by paying, say ten dollars, to the nearest Lodge to which he lives; and if a cripple, take him back anyway, if found good and true." It would seem that our kind-hearted brother—as we know him to be—has in mind some particular case within his own knowledge. It is a fact that there are a large number of such cases. We know