

the whole matter, and it is just what these officers should pay special attention to if they want to cultivate peace and harmony in the Craft. Any act not having the authority of the Constitution to sustain it is sure to engender discontent among the brethren. It may be suppressed for the time, but when the occasion arises the offender will surely be brought to bay and have to defend his acts. It would be well for the D. D. G. Ms. to remember "They have no inherent powers such as are possessed by the Grand Master, and they can not assume to exercise any prerogatives not laid down in the Constitution." Were this steadily kept in view, we should have fewer exhibitions of "Man, vain man, dressed in a little brief authority," playing such fantastic tricks as now occasionally open our eyes in surprise, and make us wonder what will be the next eccentricity.

It does not seem a logical way of putting it, to say that "D. D. G. Ms. are members of Grand Lodge." Past Masters are members of Grand Lodge, and only Past Masters are eligible for the office, consequently the office is consequent on the membership and not the membership on the office. It won't do to put the cart before the horse in this style. I fully coincide in the opinion that the clothing, &c., enjoined by the Constitution, must be worn either in a Grand or a Chartered Lodge, if the D. D. G. M. desires to have his rank and power recognized.

The Constitution declares that the D. D. G. M. is one of the avenues by which the Grand Master may be applied to officially on any business concerning Masons or Masonry, but the Constitution does not say "he is one of the officers who may communicate with the Grand Master direct." Nothing is proper that the Constitution does not authorize—certain things may be expedient but it is better to make them lawful before attempting to put them into practice.

If the constitution meant to give

the D. D. G. M. "full authority" to preside, it should and would have said so, just as it has done in the case of the G. M. and D. G. M. In the one case it is full, pointed and unmistakable, and in the other it is fairly debatable ground on which an authoritative ruling is wanted, being at most simply permissive. Oliver in the History of Freemasonry says: "The Master in the chair is as despotic in his power as the Colonel of a regiment." The significance of the word "may" is just what we want to get at, and for this we require some Master of pluck to test the question. All are agreed, I believe, that when the D. D. G. M. comes to a Lodge as the bearer of a special communication from G. M. or G. L. he *may* in the sense of *has power* to preside during the delivery of such communication, but we have a recent ruling in Quebec that the D. D. G. M. has no right to interfere with the W. M. of a Lodge in the administration of matters coming within the province of the Master to decide. And I fancy any Past Master may preside, provided the Master of the Lodge permits him to do so, but is not the Master in a sense responsible for all he does? There are certain Masters of Lodges in this city desirous of practically testing the significance of this word "may," if some inflated D. D. G. M. will only afford them the chance.

In certain specially mentioned cases the constitution confers the power to suspend a Lodge or brother, but it must be borne in mind that he possesses no such powers only under these named circumstances, and the D. D. G. M. must be careful to see that he keeps within the law in such cases provided. What may be called contempt of summons is one of the instances where such powers can be exercised. I hardly think a Lodge or brother can be suspended without an opportunity of defence.

The D. D. G. M. may give authority for holding a Lodge of Instruction, but it is only candid to state that any