

is transacted correctly. All of the Lodges are properly supplied with the lights, jewels, working tools and other requisites for a proper rendering of our ceremonies. I pointed out to each Lodge, either in the work or in the mode of transacting business any mistake or discrepancy that I thought should be rectified, and the suggestions made, and even the rebukes administered, though these were happily few, were received in the best possible spirit.

Among the variety of questions propounded officially for my consideration there were few of general interest. To an enquiry whether a resident of a neighboring Province could be accepted in a Lodge in this Jurisdiction, the Lodge nearest his residence in the other Province consenting, I directed the Grand Secretary to reply that I thought the consent of the Grand Master of that Jurisdiction must be obtained by the applicant, to enable him to petition away from the Jurisdiction in which he lived. I can understand a Lodge waiving its rights over a candidate to another Lodge on the same registry; but it appears to me to give permission to go outside of the limits of the Grand Lodge in which a man lives is a Sovereign act, and cannot be exercised by a subordinate. I decided, on an application to that effect, that the law and practice in this Province did not allow of the installation in public of the officers of a Lodge, and I knew of no power possessed by the Grand Master to enable him to issue a dispensation to legalize such a public installation. I also decided that the refusal of a Lodge to receive the petition of an applicant for initiation is equivalent to a rejection, and that a candidate whose petition has not been received cannot again petition within six months. I decided, also, that a ballot taken upon an application for admission is irregular and illegal, when the Grand Lodge laws respecting the sending of the name, age, residence and occupation of the petitioner, to every member of the Lodge, have not been obeyed.

Among the dispensations issued during the year was one to enable Keith Lodge, No. 23, Moncton, to hold a meeting for the election of its Office-bearers, the Lodge having failed to hold a meeting on the day fixed by law for the election. I also issued a dispensation to enable the Worshipful Master of Salisbury Lodge to serve a third term, as there was no Past Master in the Lodge and none of the Wardens was willing to accept the Chair. Few dispensations have been issued to enable Lodges to pass or raise Brethren within the constitutional period. Several applications for dispensations have been refused, and in the cases granted, the emergency seemed to justify the exercise of the power vested in the Grand Master by the Constitution. When dispensations have been applied for to enable Lodges to wear Masonic clothing at public balls or parties of a mixed character, attended by other persons than Masons or members of their own households, I have reluctantly granted the dispensations, because it appears to have been the custom to permit the display of Masonic clothing at such parties. But the Grand Secretary has endeavored to impress upon Lodges that the custom would be more honored in the breach than in the observance; and that it was not desirable to give entertainments of this kind, throwing them open by public advertisement to all kinds of persons. I have found that, occasionally, Lodges desiring dispensations have issued summonses, invited other Lodges to participate in their arrangements, and proceeded entirely as though the granting of a dispensation was a mere matter of form, to be had simply for the asking. In one or two cases I have felt it my duty to refuse applications for dispensations, after Lodges had made their arrangements, and my only regret was that some innocent brethren were put to much inconvenience by the neglect or indifference of the Master and Wardens to take the right steps at the proper time.

The By-Laws of Several Lodges have been submitted for approval during the term. Where Lodges have adopted as a part of their By-laws the provisions of the Constitution, I have, as far as possible, erased them, thinking it quite unnecessary (and likely to lead to errors, for a Lodge to adopt as a local regulation one that is already binding as a general regulation.

On examining the By-laws it appears that much confusion exists in the minds of many of the compilers as to the terms "exclusion" and "suspension." These terms are not synonymous. If a brother is "excluded" his connection with his Lodge ceases and he becomes an involuntary unaffiliate. He can only renew his membership in that or any other Lodge by following the usual forms for the admission of adjoining members and by undergoing a ballot. "Suspension" does not erase a brother's name from the roll, or absolutely terminate his membership; and, in case where he is suspended for non payment of dues, his membership may be resumed without any vote of the Lodge. I refer to this because Lodges are constantly dealing with excluded brethren as if they were suspended; and occasionally with suspended brethren as if they were excluded. A reference to the Constitution, page 46, Sec. 28, and to page 47, Sec. 28 and 29, will show at once that these terms are not convertible.