

vate Lodges;" also, Robertson's Digest, pages, 58, 59, 60, and 236.]

2. It is not legal to postpone the ballot on candidates from one meeting to another. [See Constitution, clause 2, "of Proposing Members."] Robertson's Digest, page 28, says: "After the committee on character have reported to the lodge in favor of the candidate, he must be balloted for at that meeting. The Master has no power to postpone the ballot from time to time." [See G. L. Proceedings, 1865, page 31.]

3. As to calling the meeting of the lodge at so unseemly an hour as 7.30 a. m., when the regular hour is 7.30 p. m., we think there can be no question of its impropriety. The Constitution does not prescribe any regular hour, but the by-laws of most lodges do. In some instances, we have noticed the hour of meeting is left to the discretion of the W. M. We take it for granted the by-laws of King Solomon Lodge stipulates the hour at which the regular meetings shall take place, but even if they do not the early hour chosen on the occasion referred to, when important business was to be transacted, could not be justified. Our correspondent is right, when he describes the manner of calling the meeting as "extremely shady."

4. While the Constitution is silent as to the form of "calling off," and we know of no ruling on the subject, we think there can be no two opinions as to the custom of "calling off" for a definite time, to a certain time, or for a particular purpose. It would be in the highest degree absurd and improper for the W. M. of a lodge to claim the right to "call off," and resume labor at his own sweet will, as his doing so might place the business in the hands of a clique, if the W. M. would stoop, as in this instance, to take a dishonorable advantage. Some pet scheme might be on the notice, or an objectionable candidate might be balloted for at a favorable opportunity by "calling on" the lodge at an

unlooked for hour, when those opposed were not in attendance. The ceremony of "calling off" is suggestive of a definite time or purpose, and we believe if asked to rule upon the question Grand Lodge would not permit a lodge to be "called off" indefinitely.

The affairs of King Solomon Lodge, we are informed, have not been in a satisfactory state for some time, but they cannot be improved by such questionable means as the W. M. on this occasion resorted to, and we trust that a most thorough investigation has either been begun, or that such action will not be further delayed.—  
ED. CRAFTSMAN.

Since writing the foregoing, we have received a circular, calling a meeting of the lodge for Thursday, the 14th ult., at 7.30 a. m., the W. M. evidently being fully determined to continue the outrages which he has commenced. We are surprised that the D.D.G.M. of the Toronto District does not do his duty. Surely, it cannot be true that he refuses to take any action; if so, the G. M. should deal with the matter promptly.

### THE GRAND LODGE OF QUEBEC vs. THE GRAND LODGE OF ENGLAND.

BY BRO. FRANK W. BAXTER.

The readers of THE CRAFTSMAN who reside within the jurisdictions of the Grand Lodges of Canada and Quebec, are doubtless as well, if not better, informed of the whys and wherefores of the difficulties that unfortunately exist between the Grand Bodies of Quebec and those of England, than myself, and it is not for me, a resident of another jurisdiction, to attempt to enlighten, even did it lie in my power; but at the same time, it may be of interest to your readers, to know the opinions of at least one "Yank" on the question at issue. I am well aware that my opinions will have but little weight with the "powers that