

tion any special appropriation, then we answer this question in the negative. As long as that by-law remains in force, a notice of motion cannot nullify it. Nor does the fact that the majority of those present at the meeting agree as to the appropriation make any difference as to the right or legality of the action. A majority can set aside a by-law only in the regular way provided in the by-laws.

Q. The W. M. is absent from the R. C. of his lodge, but the I. P. M. is present and presides. A candidate is balloted for and rejected. The J. W. rises and eulogizes the candidate, speaking very strongly in his favor, and finally moves that the ballot be again passed, which is done with the same result. Another brother then rises and speaks favorably of the candidate, expressing surprise at the ballot being unfavorable. Another, and another, does the same, until all but one brother has expressed his regret at the rejection of the candidate. The remaining brother was called upon for his opinion, and of course had to admit it was he who had cast the black ball, giving at the same time very good reasons for so doing? Was not this a gross violation of the constitution?

A. Yes. The secrecy of the ballot is one of the most important safeguards of our institution, and the laws for its preservation should be strictly enforced. The responsibility, which mainly rests upon the Masters of lodges in this matter is very great, and they should be exceedingly careful to allow nothing to infringe upon the sacredness by which the ballot has been surrounded. After a ballot has been taken, no discussion is allowable, and the presiding officer should permit no remarks whatever in relation to the candidate. If the proceedings indicated in the above question ever really took place, we think that the presiding officer and all concerned are "liable to severe Masonic censure, and for a second offence to expulsion."

Q. The W. M. of a lodge is absent from home at the time of the R. C. of his lodge occurring. He telegraphs a P. M. of an adjoining town to attend and do his work for him. The P. M. attends as requested, but the I. P. M. is present at the meeting, takes the chair, and conducts the business. Being

unable to do the work himself, he announces, notwithstanding that he is shown the telegram from the W. M. to the P. M., that the candidate for advancement will have to wait until the next R. C. for his degree. Had the I. P. M. the authority to do this? Was his conduct not high-handed towards the lodge, unjust to the candidate, and discourteous to the P. M., who had put himself to a great deal of inconvenience to oblige the W. M. and the lodge.

A. According to the constitution, in the absence of the Master, the immediate Past Master "shall take the chair;" so that it appears in this case the I. P. M. was acting entirely within the scope of his authority. If, however, we had been in his place, and unable to do the work, we would have asked the visiting P. M. to perform the ceremony.

Masonic Correspondence.

We do not hold ourselves responsible for the opinions of our Correspondents.

To the Editor of THE CRAFTSMAN.

DEAR SIR AND BROTHER,—In the issue of the 6th inst., of the London, England, *Freemason* (a paper so generally read by the Masonic world in Canada) a statement is made by that very accurate Masonic authority, Bro. Hughan, of Truro, under the head "Multum in Parvo," alluding to my address before the Great Priory of Canada on the 7th of August last. He says:—"It is not correct, the Earl of Eglington granted a warrant to work the Knight Templar degree in Ireland by authority of the 'Mother Kilwinning Lodge, Scotland,' and that R. W. Bro. James H. Neilson had fully exploded such a notion in the columns of the *Freemason* (having discovered the records of the body in question), and proved to the satisfaction of all concerned that the warrant was only granted for the Craft degrees, though the members did work without authority some of the 'Hauts Grades,' &c., &c. Being unwilling it should be supposed I make any statements in my addresses to the Great Priory of Canada, without due consideration and authority, I would say that my authority in this case of the Templar degree being introduced from Scotland