

MASONIC JURISPRUDENCE.

QUESTION.—If one Lodge initiates a person from the jurisdiction of another lodge, and after the mistake has been discovered and he is returned to his own jurisdiction, is it necessary to ballot for him a second time?

ANSWER.—A person initiated into a lodge becomes a member of it, and can only join any other through the medium of the ballot. The case put by our correspondent does not alter this position in any way. We scarcely understand what is meant by the member being "returned to his own jurisdiction." The lodge initiating him while he lived in a different jurisdiction, without permission first obtained, was guilty of a masonic offence; but having admitted him, it has no power to dispossess him of his membership, or return him to his proper jurisdiction, merely on the ground of the error.

QUESTION.—A man, whose ordinary residence has been in Quebec, is engaged by a person, as a permanent employee, whose residence is in Ontario. His duties however, require him to spend a portion of the year near his former residence. Can a lodge in Ontario, in whose jurisdiction his employer resides, initiate him into Freemasonry without the consent of the Quebec Lodge having jurisdiction where he formerly lived, and still is engaged for a portion of the year?

ANSWER.—If he is a married man and his family continue to reside in Quebec, that must be regarded as his place of residence, and the consent of the lodge there would, we think, be necessary to his initiation in Ontario. But if a single man, then the place where his employer lives, and where, therefore, his employment rests, would be his residence, and the lodge would be quite right in so regarding it. His presence in Quebec during part of the year is a mere incident of his Ontario engagement, and does not affect the question of residence.

QUESTION.—At the installation of the W. M. of a Lodge, can the election be reviewed on the confirmation of the minutes, and must the brother objecting to the election, state the ground of his objection?

ANSWER.—The election of the W. M. cannot be reviewed on the confirmation of minutes. Grand Lodge has distinctly declared that the only point which can arise on the question "shall the minutes be confirmed?" is whether they are a correct record of what took place at the meeting to which they relate. In the case of the election of a W. M., however, there is the confirmation of the election as well as the confirmation of the minutes. The Constitution, under the head, "Of Masters and Wardens of Lodges," referring to this subject says: "It is necessary, previous to the installation of the Master, that the election be confirmed," and it is important to bear in mind that this is entirely different and apart from the confirmation of minutes. It arises, as our readers who are familiar with the ritual are aware, when the installing officer enquires whether the brethren are satisfied with their choice? Should a majority not be satisfied, they can so declare without giving any reasons, and a new election must be ordered, to take place at the following regular meeting of the lodge.

QUESTION.—A Lodge applies to another Lodge for permission to initiate a candidate who resides within the jurisdiction of the latter, and the permission is refused. Can the Lodge go on notwithstanding and ballot for and accept such candidate?

ANSWER.—Yes, the lodge may ballot for and accept the candidate, but it cannot initiate him so long as the lodge to whose jurisdiction he belongs, withholds its consent. The lodge which, having asked per-