

I shall not feel that I have altogether failed in my attempt to meet the wishes of those brethren at whose request I stand here.

Amongst resolutions passed and which are in the nature of additions to the rules, there is one on candidates rejected by other Lodges, and one on candidates rejected by Lodge No. 10: March 7th, 1796. "That any person offering as a candidate to this Lodge who had offered as a candidate to any other Lodge and was refused admittance, their petition ought to be taken no notice of in this Lodge." At the same meeting the Secretary was instructed to "report to the neighbouring Lodges the names of candidates that shall be denied admittance in this Lodge."

I find only one reference to the jewels: May 2nd 1796. "Proposed by Brother Beasley that, as the Lodge has been disappointed in not getting the jewels from Newark, he would procure jewels from Kingston, as soon as possible. Resolved that Brother Beasley procure the jewels as soon as he possibly can." When next the jewels are met with in our records, it is long after the period with which we are at present concerned. On August 22nd 1836, the record of their return to the Lodge by Bro. E. Land is made, and an inventory of them is placed on the minutes. The brethren are well aware that sometime after the Lodge ceased working in 1810, Bro. E. Land took charge of the jewels and faithfully preserved them for many years, and finally delivered them to the Lodge when it resumed work in 1836.

Attempts were made to reduce fees, and at last successfully, as the minutes of January 1st, 1798, inform us that the fees were reduced to 1s 3d.

A regular attendance was strictly insisted upon. June 24th, 1796, a resolution was passed to increase the fine to absentees without cause to \$2, and such absentees, absent from two regular meetings, were to "be suspended and dealt with as the Constitution directs." February 5th, 1797, it was resolved: "That the Secretary shall keep a book in which the names of the members present and the members absent shall be registered; and that such registry shall be called over every regular Lodge night, and that such members as are at any time absent, shall give reasons why they were absent, and that such reasons shall be laid before the members present to consider whether such absence was necessary or not, before the member may be fined." As our early brethren had a habit of doing what they said, it is probable that this accusing record was kept. But if it were kept, it has not descended to us. It is permitted me to state to you, my brethren, as Masons, and as a great Masonic secret, which is now communicated to you for the first time, that no such record as this is kept in our day. I am not permitted to state whether it be quite as necessary in our day as it was seventy-two years ago; but we have all equal light on that point, and you are permitted to decide it individually for yourselves. October 3rd, 1798, it was decided: "That Brother Williams be summoned to attend next Lodge night;" and on Nov. 3rd, 1798: "That Brother Samuel Williams be summoned a second time to perform the duties of his Lodge;" and on November 19th, 1798: "That provided Brother Williams does not attend the duties of his Lodge after the second summons, he shall be proceeded

with in a summary manner, provided he has received his summons." In this last motion, there was a narrow escape from a pun; but the Lodge was in no punning humor. It was in grim earnest. There was to be no trifling, and wilful and repeated neglect of duties was to be visited with the terrors of Masonic law. Finally it was found that distance was an element which was entitled to some consideration in a roadless land; and on September 11th, 1801, it was agreed "That Brother John Young, Brother Wm. Nellis, Brother Henry Skinner, be considered ordinary members on the following conditions: to pay up their dues, and to attend the Lodge at the two festivals; their distance from the Lodge is the motive for this indulgence." The last words sound as if the brethren felt it necessary to explain and apologize for having yielded a particle of a principle to the importunities of those who weakly recognized distance as a difficulty, and who had apprehensions of anything over a four mile trip in the days when roads were an innovation, steamboats a daring heresy, fast horses an impossibility or a classic fiction, and velocipedes a crazy dream. At the last meeting, February 9th, 1810, the subject comes up again: "On motion of Brother Beasley, seconded by Brother Birney, that every member of the Lodge that lives within the limits of four miles of the Lodge-room, shall attend the duties of his Lodge every regular Lodge-night, sickness or absent from home on his necessary business excepted."

The brethren did not content themselves with passing resolutions. They had no idea of a law being allowed to become a dead letter. April 6, 1799. "As Brother Samuel Williams has neglected and refused to attend the duties of this Lodge, after having been repeatedly summoned thereon, that he be excluded therefrom. The question respecting which being taken, it was voted that he be accordingly excluded. November 9th, 1804. "As Brother Warner Nellis has not attended his Masonical duties for more than four years past, that he has frequently been summoned by writing, also by a brother at different times, and has not attended the summons, nor the duties of his Lodge, when so often and so regular thereunto summoned, he treating the Lodge with such gross contempt, and by his conduct violating his obligation as a Mason, that he be excluded from Lodge No. 10, and that the Secretary be directed to inform the Grand Lodge of his unmasonic behaviour, and also our Sister Lodge at the Township of Grimsby, and all Lodges acknowledging the jurisdiction of the Grand Lodge at York. That the Worshipful Master direct the Secretary to inform Warner Nellis, that he is excluded from Lodge No. 10, consequently from the benefits of Freemasonry." Brother Warner Nellis thus awakened to the evil of his ways, writes and explains, and is permitted to appear in person in Lodge, and again explains, and after making due atonement, is mercifully received into the fold once more. The brethren were not impracticable, nor implacable, and they knew how to blend mercy with justice.

A proper desire for instruction prevailed. On Nov. 7th 1796, just before proceeding to the election of officers, Bro. Thomas carried a motion: "That, as the members of this Lodge were in general unexperienced Masons, and none of the members