

EXCLUSIVE GRAND LODGE JURISDICTION.

There is no subject in which we take a deeper interest than that of our right to exclusive jurisdiction in the province of Quebec.

There is one point upon which all Grand Lodges on this continent seem agreed, viz: that after a Grand Lodge is once formed in a territory no other Grand Lodge has a right to charter lodges in that territory.

But there is a second question that has recently been disputed by a few Grand Lodges and brethren, viz: that all lodges working under foreign jurisdictions, in the territory, when the new Grand Lodge has been formed, must surrender their connection with those jurisdictions and join the new Grand Lodge.

The Grand Lodges of Nebraska, Washington, and Missouri all hold that lodges in existence, in a territory, prior to the formation of a Grand Lodge, cannot be compelled to surrender their connection with the parent Grand Lodge and to join the new one.

Minnesota also held the same opinion, but has since changed, although that Grand Lodge was an interested party, it having had lodges in Dakota at the time.

We give what has been said on both sides of the question, in the proceedings, for the year just past.

NEBRASKA.—The following report of the committee on foreign correspondence was adopted, viz:

One subject is particularly worthy of mention by us, and of serious consideration by you, and it arises out of the dispute between the Grand Lodges of Minnesota and of Dakota, involving the "American doctrine" of exclusive Grand Lodge jurisdiction.

It seems that before the organization of the Grand Lodge of Dakota the Grand Lodge of Minnesota had chartered two lodges in the then unoccupied territory of Dakota, situate in the extreme northern portion thereof. Other lodges were likewise chartered by the Grand Lodge of Iowa, and perhaps some other Grand Lodges, all in regular form. In 1875 a portion of the lodges so chartered, not including those holding charters from the Grand Lodge of Minnesota, met by their representatives, formed a convention, and thereafter organized a Grand Lodge in and for the territory of Dakota. The Minnesota lodges having taken no part therein, and, as is claimed, not having been invited so to do, declined, for reasons satisfactory to themselves, to acknowledge allegiance to the Grand Lodge of Dakota, and insisted that they be permitted to continue under the protection of the Grand Lodge of Minnesota. Upon the expressed wish of said lodges, the Grand Lodge of Minnesota refused to compel her subordinates to acknowledge fealty to the Grand Lodge of Dakota, and continues her protection over the same—or one of them—despite the protest of Dakota. As we understand it, the doctrine of exclusive jurisdiction, as applied in this country is this:

1. That upon the due formation of a Grand Lodge in any State or territory, no Grand Lodge of any State or country can lawfully issue a charter for a subordinate lodge within the geographical limits of such State or country.
2. That any Grand Lodge can lawfully organize lodges in any state or territory in which no Grand Lodge has been organized.