

Grand Lodge, compiled by R. W. Bro. Otto Klotz, and issued in book form last year, we observe on page 43 that

"Grand Master J. A. Henderson ruled, that where brethren desire to attend the funeral of a brother who desired to be buried according to the Ritual of a non-Masonic Society to which he belonged, that the brethren should not appear as a lodge, or clothed as Masons on funeral occasions, unless the burial rites were performed under the exclusive control of the lodge, and according to the procedure laid down in the Book of Constitution, which only allows the addition of the funeral service of the church to which deceased belonged." (See G. L. Proc. 1880, p 55).

These rulings are in most instances totally ignored, and the brethren not only turn out as lodges in regalia, but permit the services of other societies at the grave in addition to the Masonic ceremony and that of the church, as in the above instance. We have no objection to this; but a ruling which is inoperative should be cancelled, and then all the lodges would be placed on the same footing. Some lodges observe these rulings, and, as we have before said, ill-feeling results from a strict compliance with the law. We remember an instance which occurred in Port Hope some three or four years ago. The W. M. of one of the lodges died, and an informal meeting of the members was called to consider the question of attending his funeral as Masons, but as the W. Bro. had been one of the most prominent members of the I. O. O. F., which body also desired to pay the last token of respect to their departed brother, it was decided that no Masonic recognition of the deceased brother, who had always been active in advancing the interests of the craft, should take place, and the comments on the "liberality" of the

Masons were neither few nor complimentary. The ill-feeling engendered on that occasion has not yet passed away, and we feel convinced Masonry in the town has suffered in consequence of it. Undoubtedly, no disrespect was intended to the memory of the deceased brother, but the edicts were read, and as they are presumed to have the effect of law, (an opinion with which we do not agree unless they are embodied in the Constitution,) it was deemed that the lodges would have been guilty of a Masonic offence if they participated in the funeral as Masons. This is an instance in which the law was faithfully adhered to, but such instances are rare, for a week rarely passes that we do not read in our exchanges of a Masonic funeral taking place which was participated in by other societies, so that the brethren of Toronto are no more to blame than those of Hamilton, London, and other places. What we contend is, that these rulings should either be embodied in the Constitution or withdrawn, leaving it a matter for the lodges to decide themselves whether they will join with other societies in the funeral service of a deceased brother. The ruling of our late lamented Grand Master Wilson may have been very well in its day, but the time for such exclusiveness has passed. A very large number of Masons are Odd-fellows, A. O. U. W., or members of other Secret Societies, and as these societies cannot be considered competitors with Masonry, we see no reason why so large a number of craftsmen should be deprived of Masonic burial because they have exercised the right which no one will deny they