

The ball given by Kerr Lodge, No. 236, G. R. O., at Barrie, on the 18th ult., was one of the most pleasing and satisfactory events that has ever taken place in the town. The arrangements were perfect, and reflected the greatest credit on the members of the committee. Among those present, were M. W. Bro. D. Spry, Past Grand Master, and R. W. Bro. Henry Robertson, Deputy Grand Master. We take pleasure in congratulating Kerr Lodge on having made so great a success of their entertainment.

It is our sad duty to chronicle the death of R. W. Bro. M. H. Spencer, at his residence at Barrie, on the 10th ult. Bro. Spencer had been failing for some time, but on the morning of the tenth was found dead in his bed, a fit of apoplexy being supposed to be the immediate cause. Bro. Spencer was a P. M. of Corinthian Lodge, No. 106, G. R. O., P. D. D. G. M. Toronto District, Past H. of Signet Chapter, No. 34; Preceptor of Mount Calvary Encampment; a Royal and Select Master, and an 18° of the A. & A. Rite. Bro. Spencer was formerly an active member of the County Council of Simcoe, and Captain in Simcoe Foresters. His funeral was conducted with military and masonic honors on the 13th inst.

THE POPE AND FREEMASONS.—The Pope, in his reply to the address of the Sacred College, at Rome, on December 24, is reported as having said

“The experience of no distant times has been so bitter and sad, as to force the authors of divorce laws to re-establish, by their codes, the indissolubility of marriage. Yet, if the desire of sects, and the vote of Freemasons, should prevail, one would see promulgated from Rome—from which only the parent light of revealed truth, and the splendor of Catholic life, ought to start—a law utterly opposed to Catholic principles.”

Alas! the poor Freemasons are ter-

ribly bad fellows in the eyes of His Holiness, and all because they have freed themselves from “the narrow limits of particular institutions, whether civil or religious, and view in every son of Adam a brother of the dust.”

THE *Dispatch* questions the propriety of allowing nominations to be made at the election of officers by a subordinate Lodge, but favors such a practice in the Grand Lodge and other governing bodies. We approve the view taken by our esteemed contemporary as regards the rule that should be followed in subordinate Lodges. It is neither dignified nor profitable to have several brethren formally named for some office, when perhaps their respective proposers are the only persons who will cast votes in their favor. It is still more unseemly when the Brother who names a candidate for office offers a fulsome eulogy of the one so named. It is far better that the old method should be adhered to, allowing each member to write his own ballot, and to express his choice in an orderly and quiet manner. In the Grand Lodge there is, of course, no such acquaintance among members as is the case in subordinate Lodges, and there can be no such general knowledge of the talent available for office as in the home body; the *Dispatch*, therefore, favors the nomination of candidates for office in the Grand bodies, believing that it is well that names should thus be proposed, and the merits of candidates stated. While there is force in the argument it is not convincing. Possibly in some very large jurisdiction there may be need of nominations, but in the governing body that does not include more than four or five hundred members we think that brethren may act intelligently in electing their officers, without being aided, or biased, by nominations and preliminary addresses.—*Freemasons' Repository.*