

a "mixed funeral" shows respect to the dead, and there can be no reason why a distinguished Mason should not at the same time be an honored member of such excellent associations as the Oddfellows, Knights of Pythias, United Workmen, Orangemen, &c.; and yet, forsooth, according to the ideas of some Masons, such a man is to renounce, as it were, when dying, those who will perchance pay for his burial, have attended him faithfully during his sickness, night after night, and supplied him regularly out of their weekly benefit funds, and at his death will give his widow cheques to the amount, in all probability, of several thousands of dollars. They, these men say, must not be permitted to officially show the respect in which they held their deceased brother, because, forsooth, the Masons, who probably had never visited him while ill, till the last moment, who certainly had never given him any financial aid, unless he asked for it, say "nay." As an old Mason, who years ago attended many "mixed funerals," and came through the trying ordeal without being contaminated, I think such bigoted ideas are unworthy of a really good cause. Yours,

AN OLD MASON.

Kingston, Ont.

### Grand Lodge Meeting.

To the Editor of THE CRAFTSMAN.

DEAR SIR AND R. W. BROTHER,—Before the next meeting of Grand Lodge would it not be well to discuss through the columns of THE CRAFTSMAN the anomalous position of Royal Mother Solomon Lodge, at Jerusalem, which has a roll of over eight thousand honorary members, most of whom never saw the lodge, never will see it, and who are not known to the actual members, if any actual members it has since the learned Rob Morris left the land of the Palm Tree? Joking aside, however, it is perfectly absurd to permit an American brother, or

any other chieftain of any side degree, to make honorary members in a Canadian lodge, without asking the consent of the members, or having them proposed and balloted for as the Constitution of the Grand Lodge of Canada requires. The question requires ventilation. Yours truly,

ENQUIRER.

Toronto, May 1, 1882.

### Jurisprudence Department.

EDITED BY R. W. BRO. HENRY ROBERTSON,  
P. D. D. G. M.

Query—Should the Audit Committee of a Lodge be appointed by the W. M. or elected by the Lodge?

My reason for asking this question at the present time is as follows:—

A by-law of our Lodge provides that on the day of his installation the W. M. shall appoint an audit committee.

A circular notice from the office of the D.D.G.M. of this (Hamilton) district calls the attention of this and other lodges in the district having similar by-laws, that such by-law is not in accordance with the last clause of section 17, under the caption of "Private Lodges," in the Book of Constitutions.

It would appear unseemly for a junior member of the Craft to dispute the rulings of his superior officer, but upon making examination of the constitution of other by-laws, not being those of lodges in this district alone, and finding the same provision therein for the appointment of the auditors by the W.M., I wrote—acting under the instructions of our W.M.—asking for further information, to our District Secretary. I also ventured to suggest that our by-law was framed in accordance with that part of section 2, under the same caption, which provides amongst other matters, that the W.M. shall, on the day of his installation, appoint "also all committees for conducting the business of the lodge;" and that in section 17 the word "appointed" would seem to refer to the previous section, and tend to show that an election by the members of the lodge was not intended. I also noticed the fact that other lodges had evidently taken the same construction of the wording of the Book of Constitutions, by adopting similar by-laws.

I have been of opinion that the words "appointed by the lodge" would simply signify that the lodge accounts, etc., should not be audited by any person or persons outside of the lodge.