

the same being a practical denial of the doctrine of exclusive jurisdiction on which we all stand, we do not deem it advisable that the official relations terminated by the death of our representative, Bro. H. Heuschel, and of the representative of the Grand Lodge of York and Friendship, Bro. Orlin. H. Miner, should be again resumed.

The following from the report of the committee on foreign correspondence was also adopted :—

In view of the fact that the claim has been recently advanced that lodges whose existence within a given territory antedates the formation of a Grand Lodge therein, cannot upon the formation of such Grand Lodge be compelled to transfer their allegiance thereto, we deem it proper to submit the following from the remarks of the Grand Master, and ask your concurrence therein, as expressing the sentiments of the Grand Lodge upon this subject

Exclusive jurisdiction has but one meaning. It does not admit of any qualification, but on the contrary, asserts the right of a Grand Lodge to assume entire control of masonry within its prescribed limits.

This entire control the Grand Lodge of New Mexico has assumed in the case of the only recusant lodge within its territorial limits, Silver City lodge, at Silver City, as we are officially informed through R. W. Henry E. Hamilton, the representative of New Mexico near this Grand Lodge; it having arrested the charter of that lodge for failing to make returns and pay dues to the Grand Lodge of New Mexico, the rightful, supreme, and only legitimate authority in that jurisdiction. If in the defence of its exclusive authority the Grand Lodge of New Mexico should place under disabilities any of the brethren residing in its territory, we recommend that the Grand Master be authorized to take such steps as may be necessary to protect the lodges in Illinois from the intrusion of visitors not in good standing.

SOUTH CAROLINA.—The Grand Master says : “ The Grand Lodge of Missouri refuses to surrender jurisdiction over two lodges originally chartered by it, but now embraced in the territorial limits of the newly constituted Grand Lodge of New Mexico. This action would seem clearly in contravention of the received American doctrine of the exclusive jurisdiction of a Grand Lodge within the territory throughout which its authority extends.”

Again the Grand Master says in reference to Minnesota and Dakota :

“ I regret further to inform you of similar differences between these two Grand Lodges, that of Minnesota refusing to cede to the new Grand Lodge of Dakota jurisdiction of the subordinate lodges situate in the territory of the latter, but organized before its formation by the former. Nay more, for the Grand Lodge of Minnesota sustains and supports these two subordinates in their refusal to recognize the Grand Lodge of their own territory. It is to be regretted that with a principle so clearly established these unseemly differences should so constantly arise. We can only hope that the public opinion of the masonic world, recognizing this principle in the interests of peace and harmony, will be so distinctly expressed, that no further difficulties of this kind may hereafter occur.”