

premises, if he would avoid confusion and facilitate the dispatch of business.

Not only, then, is a thorough knowledge of parliamentary law necessary for the presiding officer of a Masonic body, if he would discharge the duties of the chair with credit to himself and comfort to the members, but he must be possessed of the additional information as to what parts of that law are applicable to Masonry, and what parts are not; as to where and when he must refer to it for the decision of a question, and when and where he must lay it aside, and rely for his government upon the organic law and ancient usages of the Institution.

A treatise, then, which should accurately define the parliamentary law in its application to the government of Masonic bodies, showing precisely the points in which it must be pursued and those in which it must be abandoned—which should indicate the alternating prominence of the parliamentary law and the organic law of Masonry, and which should thus present the presiding officer with a chart, pointing out the intricate channels and hidden rocks and under-currents which render every discussion in a deliberative body liable to confusion, which give rise to turbulence, which needlessly protract business, and make doubtful the success of truth—cannot be unacceptable or unprofitable as a contribution to the jurisprudence of the Order.

I propose, then, in several succeeding chapters, to undertake such a task. Defining, accurately, the prerogatives of the chair and the privileges of the members, and the difference between the *business* and the *work* of a Lodge—terms of great significance, and which have an important bearing on the relations of the parliamentary law and the law of Masonry—I shall proceed to lay down the rules and regulations by which the Master of a Lodge may be enabled to conduct the business of the body over which he has been called to preside according to those well-settled principles of government by which alone confusion can be arrested and order preserved.

Although the term Master of a Lodge is used for the sake of brevity of expression, and to avoid a needless augmentation of words, it must be understood that the remarks made in reference to that officer are equally applicable to the presiding officer of higher bodies, such as Chapters, Councils and Commanderies, unless the character of the remark itself, or a specific notice made at the time, should indicate that the principle laid down is to be restricted to symbolic Masonry.

But it must be not be inferred that what is said of the government of subordinate Lodges or Chapters, Councils or Commanderies, is equally applicable to the Grand Bodies in those respective divisions of the Rite. A Grand Lodge, for instance, has a different organization from that of its subordinates. The prerogatives of a Grand Master are more extensive than those of a Master; and the privileges of the representatives who make up the governing body are necessarily superior to those which belong to the members of their subordinate bodies. Hence there is some discrimination to be observed in the application of the parliamentary law to the government of Grand Lodges, Grand Chapters, Grand Councils, and Grand Commanderies. These will therefore be, on appropriate occasions, specially referred to, as well as made in distinct chapters, the special subjects of investigation.

In the next chapter I shall enter, as a preliminary labor, into an inquiry as to what are the prerogatives of the Master of a Lodge, and as to what are the privileges of its members; an inquiry which will necessarily