

to bring up an appeal against the Grand Master's decision, whether a suspension or otherwise, and that, thereby, the privilege of such an appeal, even if it did exist, would be rendered nugatory.

4. That as the King is supposed never to do wrong, so is the Grand Master considered never to do wrong.

5. That if appeals to Grand Lodge against the Grand Master's decision were allowed, endless confusion would be the consequence.

6. That the Grand Master is the Grand Lodge during the time it is not in session.

7. And finally, that the only remedy which parties have that feel themselves aggrieved by the decision of the Grand Master, is—not to re-elect him.

Those brethren who hold that an appeal to Grand Lodge against the decision of the Grand Master can be lawfully made, and that, if made in proper form, the Grand Lodge should entertain it, and decide thereon, take the following as their argument:

1. The Constitution itself, wherein is laid down, in plain and unmistakeable language, that the Grand Lodge possesses *supreme* superintending authority; that it has the power of *finally* deciding on *every* case which concerns the interest of the Craft; that a suspension is a matter pending, awaiting a *final* decision, which may be either a removal of that suspension, or fixing definitely its duration, or converting it into erasure or expulsion. That a suspension concerns the interest of the Craft; that, in regard to the power of suspending, the Grand Master has barely more than concurrent jurisdiction with District Deputy Grand Masters. Either may suspend a Lodge or a brother; neither can erase or expel; and each is "another masonic authority" than the Grand Lodge.

2. Again, the Constitution plainly authorizes *any* Lodge or brother who may feel aggrieved by the decision of *any other masonic authority* or jurisdiction, to appeal to Grand Lodge.

3. That Freemasonry, as now practiced, is purely an Institution of British origin, and, therefore, should not contain in its Constitution any thing which is diametrically opposed to the grand principle on which British law was founded: by considering every person innocent until he has been duly proved to be guilty, and by affording every accused party a speedy opportunity for a fair and impartial trial, of which the habeas corpus Act is the best evidence.

4. That to refuse any person, who stands accused of a breach of the law, any opportunity of defending himself, is un-British and un-Christian; and, if done by Masons towards Masons, is un-masonic, and contrary to every principle which we, as Masons, advocate or profess.

5. That before a Lodge can be erased, or a brother be expelled, either must have a fair and an impartial hearing in Grand Lodge: hence the cause of the suspension will be fully discussed in Grand Lodge (or Board of General Purposes, which is the Executive Committee of Grand Lodge), and if such Lodge or brother has been suspended by the Grand Master, it necessarily follows that the Lodge or brother who show cause why they should not respectively be erased or expelled, do thereby *virtually* appeal to Grand Lodge against the decision of the Grand Master. And since this is an indisputable fact, there appears to