

didate, and is electioneering, and sternly forbidden by the law. Of course, here I have stated a strong instance, and no one would take issue with me as to its reprehensibility. But I am of the opinion that there are milder forms of the evil, working greater prejudice to the craft. Among them, self-imposed candidates, seekers after office through the ordinary channel of electioneering.

"In my judgment, there is not now, nor has there been in the past, an office in the gift of this Grand Body worth possessing at the price of so great a departure from the ancient teachings, if not landmarks, of the fraternity. In plain unmistakable terms, the soliciting of votes for a particular candidate, or the securing of promises to work in the interest of a candidate, is what is forbidden. I may say of a brother, there is good material for Grand Master, or Grand Secretary, or any other office, and truthfully recommend him, but I have no right to solicit votes or promises in his behalf. On the other hand, I may say of a particular brother, he is not good material for this or that office, and may truthfully speak of his demerits or criticise his conduct, but I may not secure promises to vote or work against him. I may give my brother light to aid his judgment, but I may not by promise or solicitation compromise his perfect freedom of action.

"So sensitive is Masonry, and even this Grand Lodge, on this subject, that nominations—naming of persons for office—is forbidden. This, as well as the prohibition upon electioneering, I understand to be a part of the unwritten law of the craft. I have been advised in friendly counsel upon this question, that while this law may serve some good purpose in theory, it is hardly available for practice. Then I suggest a plain duty—repeal it. As Masons we cannot afford, by our actions, to brand our profession as false—to make the law and openly violate it."

GRAND CHAPTER RIGHTS.

To the Editor of the CRAFTSMAN.

DEAR SIR,—In looking over the Proceedings of the Grand Chapter of Quebec, I notice that an application was received from Victoria for a Warrant to open a chapter of Royal Arch Masons there, which the Grand Z., on consideration, declined to issue, for reasons that do not appear to be sufficient; and it is a matter of deep regret that this want of action was confirmed by Grand Chapter. To my thinking, there is only one reason that should have prevented this request being complied with, and that reason is, that some Grand Chapter possessed exclusive Masonic jurisdiction there,—the fact that more than one Grand Chapter exercised *concurrent jurisdiction*, should be a strong reason for granting the application. In church matters, it is found that nothing so tends to build up a church *at home* as having missions *abroad*, and I can not but see that a grand blunder has been consummated. For the present we will assume that the Grand Chapters of England, Ireland and Scotland would have had no hesitation in issuing the Warrant, and none would have questioned their right to do so had the application been made to either of them. If we are a Grand Chapter, which we claim to be, as well as to be the peers of either of these Grand Chapters, why should we hesitate to exercise powers that they would only be too glad to be invited to do? We certainly should be the last to have any doubts of the extent of our authority, and this refusal may, and likely will be, the means of precluding our receiving any such request in future, unless our action in this regard is reconsidered. To claim to be a Grand Chapter, and in words seek for a recognition of full rights as such, and then, on the first opportunity, to refuse to perform our duties or shirk the responsibilities of the privileges that have been accorded to us, seems