

at all meetings? Why notify the brethren only half-yearly of their indebtedness? Of course, the secretary's duties would be increased, but the extra labor imposed upon him would benefit the individual lodge and the Craft generally.

Closely allied with this subject is the non affiliate question. While we are driving brethren out of our lodges at a rapid rate through pure stupidity and stubbornness, we are doing nothing to gather in the large army of non-affiliates scattered over the province. Our Grand Lodge officers are distributed among committees, who split hairs on benevolent grants, recommend the issuance of warrants, check over the finances and hoard a surplus, and occasionally submit reports entirely at variance with facts. Of course, it is not the specific duty of any of the sub-committees indicated to deal with retaining members or gathering in worthy non-affiliates, but what is the duty of the Committee on the Condition of Masonry? Surely something more than to indulge in a few glittering generalities, suggest the enforcement of the law for non-payment of dues, and urge the brethren to collect material for lodge histories.

There is one point that should be remembered regarding brethren suspended for non-payment of dues and non-affiliates, namely: that they are still Freemasons, and our obligations defining our duty to our brethren are as binding upon us individually to them as if they were in good standing. They have violated no Masonic law, nor even a Masonic principle, but may have contravened some lodge law, and consequently as individual Masons we are morally bound to relieve their necessities if they require it, or acknowledge them as brothers if they are in possession of the signs, secrets and tokens.

THE TEETOTAL WAVE.

The M. W. the Grand Master of the Grand Lodge of Mississippi having arrested the charter of Mississippi Lodge

at Rodney, for violating recent legislation emanating from Grand Lodge, providing for the exclusion of liquor sellers, the officers of the lodge have appealed against his action to Grand Lodge. The appellants give eleven separate and distinct reasons why the lodge should not be suspended, and they make out a fairly good case.

In the first place it is contended that they have not violated any National, State or Masonic law. In support of their adherence to Masonic law it is claimed that an innovation has been made in Masonry, and consequently they were not bound to conform to it. Our Mississippi brethren should recollect that the majority rule, and that a majority can even do wrong. Their second contention is that the constitution has been violated. Judging by precedents established in this jurisdiction, this contention is a weak one, as it has been demonstrated here that the constitution is a football, kicked and tossed about by brethren whose ideas of Masonic law and usage are more than mercurial.

They hold, in the third place, that the objectionable law is a violation of State and national law. The appellants should remember that Masonic law, including even its irregularities, is peculiar to the Institution; but it is difficult to conceive how Masons should be called upon to violate the laws of the State in which they reside.

The fifth, sixth, seventh, eighth, and ninth clauses deal with the incongruities arising from Masonic conflicting with State law, ignorance of the latter rendering an opinion by us as to the soundness of the objections an impossibility.

The tenth objection we give in full: "We hold, the only pre-requisite that can be demanded of an applicant for Masonry, is that he shall be free born, of mature age, and of good report: hale and sound. The Grand Lodge can, with as much authority, enact a law regulating the religious profession and worship, or prohibit the free exercise thereof, as it can the occupation of its applicants for membership." The last sentence in