

didate. The W.M. on finding the result of the ballot, before formally declaring the result to the lodge, asked the brethren, to satisfy themselves that no error had been made in depositing the balls in the ballot box; to which he received no reply, clearly demonstrating that the brethren were quite satisfied that they had acted correctly. The W.M. then said: "Brethren under the circumstances I have no alternative but to declare the candidate rejected." Immediately after the result of the ballot had been announced, the proposer of the rejected candidate rose and said that he wished to raise an objection, as the balloting was irregular, and that he would bring the matter before Grand Lodge. After some discussion the W.M. ruled that the ballot taken was illegal, and subsequently permitted the proposer to withdraw the candidate. Taking the foregoing particulars into consideration, the ballot was unconstitutional, but the question arises, was he rejected on that account alone, or was there any other objection to the candidate. Of course, the right of objection is an undenied privilege to every brother, and the one making the objection need not give his reasons. Therefore, it is presumed that no brother would urge an objection to the admission of a candidate unless he had good and sufficient reasons for so doing. Mere personal spite, either against the candidate, the proposer, or the W.M., is not supposed to actuate the motives of any Mason, and unless the irregularity of the ballot was the sole objection, the proposer and seconder must submit to the decision of the lodge. At the same time, the W.M. and the members must judge from the feeling displayed whether the objections are sufficient to bar the candidate for re-election. The objector can then again exercise his right in the secrecy of the ballot, and no one has any authority to question who did it, or why it was done, the case cited is a peculiar one, as the question arises if the ballot as here stated was illegal. The candidate had not been balloted for at all, consequently

he cannot have been rejected. The case can only be considered properly after understanding all the circumstances. Had the four brethren who voted verbally retired during the ballot, a different complexion might have been placed on the matter. But the spirit of brotherly love should prevail, and anything of a spiteful or ungenerous nature should not be permitted to enter a Lodge of Free and Accepted Masons. — *Freemason's Chronicle, Sydney.*

### UNDER THE FOCUS OF A SCOTTISH EYE.

The *Scottish Freemason* pokes a little fun at the multiplicity of degrees in America:

Of the number of Degrees termed Masonic by our American brothers, and receiving more or less patronage, there is no end. What is termed the American Rite, that is the Degrees most universally recognized as Masonic, are E. A., F.C., M.M., given under Lodge Warrant; Mark Master, Past Master, Most Excellent Master and Royal Arch, given under Chapter Warrant; Red Cross Knights, Knights Templar and Knights of Malta, given under Encampment Warrant, and Royal and Select Masters, which are sometimes given in Chapter and sometimes under separate Warrant. Besides these there are Rites of thirty-three Degrees, of ninety and ninety-six Degrees, of Christian Masonry and Mohammedan Masonry: and curious to relate, the candidate for Mohammedan Masonry—that is, the Ancient Arabic Order of Nobles of the Mystic Shrine—must be a Christian Mason, that is a Knight Templar. Then there is Lady Freemasonry, the principal representative of which—"The Star of the East"—has lately developed a higher Degree called the "White Shrine." This amplification of degrees does not seem to increase the general harmony much to judge by the way such epithets as "liar," "Masonic fraud," "degree peddler," etc., etc., are being bandied about. That