

pretation of the generally accepted law of 'exclusive jurisdiction.' The question has been argued pro and con, with considerable warmth and much subtlety of reasoning. If our sister Grand Lodge of Missouri would look at the question from this standpoint, it would not seem difficult to persuade her that, while it is no great advantage to her to exercise jurisdiction over a lodge in New Mexico, it may be of serious disadvantage to the Grand Lodge of New Mexico to have the jurisdiction over its territory so divided.

"Insistence upon technical right without substantial advantage should never be the rule, when substantial disadvantage may result to others.

"This whole question should be acted upon by the various Grand Lodges,—in the West more especially,—and it would seem that, however plausible may be the reasoning by which the Grand Lodge of one State or Territory sustains its supervision over lodges in the territorial jurisdiction of another Grand Lodge, the general advantage of the whole fraternity may be best promoted by awarding to the Grand Lodge of any State or Territory exclusive jurisdiction over all lodges within its boundaries."

NEW SOUTH WALES.

RHODE ISLAND, 1881.—Report of Committee on Foreign Correspondence adopted says: "This Body claims to be legally organized and to be justly entitled to the government of the craft in that country. Inasmuch, however, as only a minority of the lodges in New South Wales have consented to, or taken part in, the formation of the newly created body, which has failed as yet to receive the approval of the Grand Lodges already in possession, your committee do not recommend that any present action be taken on the request for recognition."

OHIO, 1881.—Recognized New South Wales.

UTAH, 1882.—Grand Master Emerson says: "I am informed that the Grand Lodge of New South Wales, established in 1877, has repeatedly requested recognition from this Grand Lodge. For some reason the request has been delayed and no action taken thereon, and I have no doubt the reason for this non-action was based on good and sufficient grounds. A few of the American Grand Lodges have granted this claimant admittance into the Sisterhood of Grand Lodges. I am of the opinion that in this instance the old adage "make haste slowly," is very applicable. It appears that not one-tenth of the lodges in the colony of New South Wales have united in the formation of this Grand Lodge, those refusing to do so remaining obedient to the Mother Grand Lodges in England, Scotland and Ireland. For myself, I am not in favor of recognizing any new Grand Lodge unless, at least, a majority of the lodges in the Territory have united in its organization. That other Grand Lodges have recognized the new Grand Lodge in Australia, is no good reason why we should. Utah in such matters is its own master, and perfectly independent. I recommend that the request of the Grand Lodge of New South Wales for recognition be referred to the Chairman of the Committee on Correspondence, who I am satisfied will give the matter due consideration, to report thereon at our next or some future communication.

NEVADA, 1881.—The following preamble and resolution was adopted:

"Whereas, the Grand Lodge of New South Wales seems to have been regularly formed in accordance with ancient usage; therefore,