

reply, provided that the speakers so replying have not before spoken to the question. Thus, Cushing says: "If a member, therefore, in his reply, goes beyond the proper limits and introduces new matter, other members are at liberty to speak to the question."

There is nothing in these principles of parliamentary law which is opposed to or inconsistent with the landmarks of Freemasonry, or the peculiar organization of the institution: and, hence, this parliamentary law is strictly applicable to the government of a debate in a masonic Lodge. The rule thus obligatory on a masonic Lodge may be enunciated in the language of the sixty-third rule of the American House of representatives, which we adopt as the simplest in its terms, the necessary change being made from leave of the House to leave of the presiding officer:

"No member shall speak more than once to the same question without leave of the chair, unless he be the mover, proposer, or introducer of the matter pending, in which case he shall be permitted to speak in reply, but not until every member choosing to speak shall have spoken."

But if a change is made in the nature of the question by the introduction of a subsidiary motion, then the right to speak again accrues to every member, notwithstanding he may have spoken on the principal motion. Thus, if an amendment is offered, then, as the amendment introduces a new issue, the freedom of debate requires that all the members who desire shall be permitted to discuss its merits. The amendment assumes for the time being the character of a new motion, and the debate on it must be governed by the same principles that are applicable to the original motion. But the inquiry into the nature of amendments will occupy our attention in a succeeding chapter.

CORRESPONDENCE.

MONTREAL, 8th January, 1872.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CRAFTSMAN:

MY DEAR SIR AND BRO.—For your kindness in publishing my letter to the CRAFTSMAN, noticing your October article on "The recent negotiations in Quebec," be pleased to accept my sincere thanks. I desire also to acknowledge the courtesy of your remarks anent my communication.

Differing so widely as we do on the Quebec question and the constitutional principles involved therein, and viewing and construing so diversely the propositions and acts of Quebec and Canada, at the recent conference, I cannot see that any good will be obtained by entering upon a controversey on these subjects. Your persistent accusations against Quebec, and my repeated denials, will not advance the cause of either one iota; on the contrary it may tend to keep alive the excitement and ill will already engendered. Entertaining this view, I think it advisable, so far as I am concerned, to let matters remain as they are for the present, in the hope that time will abate all prejudice and passion from whichever side it proceeds, so that ere long the questions at issue between the Grand Lodges of Quebec and Canada will be approached by both parties in a fraternal spirit and finally settled in such a way that the object for which each of us, according to his own views has been honestly contending, viz: the benefit of masonry in the Dominion, will be attained.

Availing myself of the offer of your pages to give the Quebec brethren the fullest opportunity of stating their views, I venture to ask you to publish the enclosed article from *Pomeroy's Democrat*, which seems to me to reflect the ideas of the Quebec brethren in reference to their masonic position and standing, and I shall be happy to read your remarks in connection therewith.

I am dear Sir and Bro.,

Yours respectfully and fraternally,

VERAX.