his first duty is to his own lodge, and that he should be courteous to his own lodge, even at the risk of appearing discourteous to another.

Q. A brother takes his dimit from a lodge —subsequently applies again to be admitted, but is rejected two or three times. He then removes for three months to another place, and applies there for membership. Would the lodge be justified in admitting him without applying for information from the lodge in the place where he formerly resided, and to which he returned at the expiration of the period named?

A. This question appears to be based upon a mistaken conception of the constitutional provisions regarding proposing members. It must be borne in mind that there is a wide difference between candidates for initiation and members applying for affiliation; and the same strictness is by no means required for the admission of the latter that is necessary in the case of the former. Prior to 1871, the consent of the lodge within whose jurisdiction a candidate for initiation resided, was required to be had before he could be initiated in any other lodge. But this provision did not apply to members asking affiliation, and it has since been amended by substituting for such consent a dispensation from the Grand Master. The only other cause apparently justifying this question is the one providing for the case of a candidate who has not resided twelve months in the jurisdiction of the lodge to which he applies, in which case a certificate of character must be produced from the lodge nearest to his former residence. But this clause also applies only to candidates for initiation, and not to members applying for affiliation. One who is already a Mason may apply to join any lodge in this jurisdiction, regardless of residence or any former rejection; and the lodge to which he applies is not bound to apply for information unless it chooses to do so. Of course, three months is not sufficient time to acquire a knowledge of the applicant's character, and a lodge having due regard to its own reputation would naturally make enquiries where he previously resided before admitting one who, although a member of the Craft, might not be altogether what he should be, or one likely to make trouble where none should exist.

Q. At the regular meeting of a Lodge a motion was made instructing the J. W. to provide, in addition to tea and coffee already provided for the members, ale and beer; an amendment was proposed referring the whole subject of refreshments to a committee; later an amendment was offered to the amendment to strike "ale and beer" out of the original motion, which was carried. After the amendment was declared carried, would it not have been the proper course for the W. M. to put the question "shall the motion, as amended, be adopted?"

A. Yes. We presume that Parliamentary usage is the only guide we have in matters of this kind, and we believe that the procedure in Parliament is as stated. When an amendment to an amendment is moved, the question is put "shall the amendment as amended carry?" If carried, and there is no further amendment proposed, the question is then put, "shall the original motion, as amended, carry?" Sometimes, however, this rule is not strictly adhered to. On the second or third reading of a bill, a motion might be carried declaring some principle adverse to the principle of a bill, and asserting the expediency of not proceeding with it any further. Upon such an amendment being carried, the House would simply proceed to the next order of business. But even in such a case as this, it would be proper for the Speaker of the House, upon his own authority, to put the question, "shall the original motion, as amended, carry?" As to this particular amendment to the amendment, we are inclined to think that it could have been ruled out of order, as, in general, a motion to refer has precedence over a motion to amend. It is also objectionable as being a direct negative to the original motion. If tea and coffee were already provided, the ob-