

dealt with as the offence may warrant, or otherwise hold his peace. We regard it as dangerous to the best interests of the fraternity, and subversive of the good order of the lodge, to permit a member of a lodge to override the impartial judgment of the master.

MASONIC TRIALS.

NEBRASKA.—The Grand Master decided that it is one of the duties of the junior warden's office to prefer charges upon receiving the necessary information. This he does officially and not personally. As a member of his lodge he has a right to be present at, and to participate in, any action of his lodge where his personal interests are not involved; his personal rights cannot be abridged by his official acts.

SOUTH CAROLINA.—The Grand Master decided that in a trial in a lodge, either side may be represented by counsel, who must be a Mason. Each party, or their respective counsel, examines and cross-examines the witnesses. To provide for an appeal it is well that the secretary should make a full abstract of the testimony as offered. If the accused introduce no evidence he has the closing argument; otherwise it belongs to the prosecution. After the parties have retired and the lodge are deliberating, any member has a right to discuss the matter. It is advisable, if the accused be not present or represented, for the lodge to appoint some brother to represent him, unless, being notified, he positively refuses to attend.

MAINE.—Charges of a serious character, signed by a Master Mason in good standing, were preferred against an officer of the Grand Lodge. The counsel for the accuser was not a Mason. It was decided that no person but a Mason in good standing be allowed as attorney for either parties.

TENNESSEE.—The Grand Master ruled that an indefinitely suspended or expelled Mason may testify on a masonic trial in the same manner as a profane. That the testimony of children old enough to comprehend the solemnity of an obligation would ordinarily be received upon a masonic trial; yet it is not advisable to introduce the testimony of minor children upon the trial of their father.

THRONE.

MISSOURI.—In the report on foreign correspondence we find the following:

“Quebec, 1879—The tenth annual communication met in the city of Montreal, September 24th, 1879, M. W. Bro. Melbourne M. Tait, G. M. on the Throne. Throne is good—it is new—wonder if Solomon, our first Most Excellent Grand Master, had his throne in the holy place, where he presided in that lodge at Jerusalem.”

Your committee would beg to state that the term “throne,” as applied to the masonic chair of King Solomon, is not new. If our Missouri brother will refer to Mackey's Jurisprudence, Landmark fifth, he will find “that the Grand Master assumes the chair, or as it is called in England the *throne*.”

Or if he refers to D. Murray Lyon's history of Freemasonry in Scotland, he will find, referring to Wm. St. Clair Rosselin, page 181, “Although he only filled the *Grand Throne* during the first year of Grand Lodge's existence, he continued to take an active interest in its affairs; and through his influence with the