UNITED AUSTRALIA: PUBLIC OPINION IN ENGLAND AS EXPRESSED IN THE LEADING JOURNALS OF THE UNITED KINGDOM

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9780649727568

United Australia: Public Opinion in England as Expressed in the Leading Journals of the United Kingdom by Charles Potter

Except for use in any review, the reproduction or utilisation of this work in whole or in part in any form by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including xerography, photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, is forbidden without the permission of the publisher, Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd, PO Box 1576 Collingwood, Victoria 3066 Australia.

All rights reserved.

Edited by Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd. Cover @ 2017

This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form or binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

www.triestepublishing.com

CHARLES POTTER

UNITED AUSTRALIA: PUBLIC OPINION IN ENGLAND AS EXPRESSED IN THE LEADING JOURNALS OF THE UNITED KINGDOM



UNITED AUSTRALIA.

PUBLIC OPINION IN ENGLAND

AS EXPRESSED IN THE

LEADING JOURNALS OF THE UNITED KINGDOM.



By Juthority.

SYDNEY: CHARLES POTTER, GOVERNMENT PRINTER.

1890.

JQ4015 1890 Ub.

C.A. Kofoid

viidu Agentailias

CONTENTS.

•	PACE.	1	PAGE.
The Spectator	1	Richmond Herald	69
The St. James' Gazette		The Oyerland Mail	69
Pall Mall Gazette	7	Edinburgh Weekly Scoteman	73
The Morning Post	9	Falmouth and Penryn Times	73
The Globe	1,122 .	· Gloucester Journal	77
Manchester Examiner	12	Hampshire Telegraph	79
The Daily News	13	Lincoln Gazette	80
The Star (London)	16	Newcastle Leader	82
Edinburgh Evening Despatch	18	The Salisbury and Winchester	
The Evening News (Glasgow)	18	Journal	
The Times	20	Exeter Gazette	
The Standard	24	Army and Navy Gazette	88
The Morning Advertiser	27	United Service Gazette	90.00
The Aberdeen Free Press	29	Vanity Fair	
The Aberdeen Journal	32	Weekly Budget	
The Birmingham Post	35	Weekly Times	
The Daily Chronicle (Huddersfield)	36	The West Briton (Truro)	
Hull Eastern Morning News	38	The British Australasian	
East-Anglian Daily Times (Ipswich)	39	Glasgow Mail	
The Leeds Yorkshire Post	40	The Scotsman	
The Liverpool Courier	42	Hull Daily Mail	108
The Manchester Courier	44	The Capitalist	
The Newcastle Journal	48	Altrincham Guardian	
The Plymouth Western Morning News	50	Brighton (Sussex) Daily News Birmingham Post	
Shields Daily News	51	Glasgow Mail	
The British Australasian	53	Leeds Mercury	
Civil Service Gazette	56	Evening News	
Bradford Telegraph	57	Birmingham Gazette	
Dumfries Standard	59	Glasgow Herald	
The Cornish Telegraph	61	The Eastern Morning News	3777720
Bullionist	65	Advertiser	
Statist	66	Aberdeen Free Press	
Ayr Advertiser		1.00 1.00	
11 - 12 - 12 - 12 - 12 - 12 - 12 - 12 -		₩	
	APPI	ENDIX.	
Correspondence		1	38-140
OPINION IN INDIA		arassur annuncionemen aim mini	142

09 %

INTRODUCTORY NOTE.

The Times of November 4th published the despatch of Sir Henry Parkes of October 30th, addressed to Mr. Gillies, and within sixteen days from that publication nearly every influential journal in the United Kingdom joined in the debate on Australian Federation. Among the first, The Times, November 5th, says: - "No better method of testing the strength of the desire for union could be devised than the summoning of such a National Convention as Sir Henry Parkes suggests." And the article concludes:- "Sir Henry Parkes is a capable statesman, and his judgment is entitled to all respect when he pronounces the time to be ripe and the method to be feasible. If that is so, the difficulties will gradually disappear, and the Federation of the Australian Colonies will before long be accomplished." Later in the discussion, November 16th, a leading provincial paper says: -"Criticism is the fire through which all new proposals of importance should pass, and if they cannot pass the ordeal they are better dropped. It must be confessed that the proposals of Sir Henry Parkes have come well out of the criticism that has greeted them."

In the following pages the principal articles of the English press are reproduced, with the name of the journal and date of publication. It will be seen that not only the London daily papers, but the great provincial journals, from Southampton to Aberdeen, and most of the economic and official publications, discussed the great Australian question.

For convenience of reference the despatch of Sir Henry Parkes of October 30th is here reprinted:—

Colonial Secretary's Office,

Sir.

Sydney, 30 October, 1889.

Your telegram, explanatory of your views in favour of bringing the machinery of the Federal Council into operation in giving effect to the recommendations of General Edwards for the federalization of Australian troops, reached me last week in Brisbane. Being extremely anxious to meet your wishes, I lost no time in re-examining the provisions of the Federal Council Act; and I regret that I cannot concur in your view, that the Council possesses the requisite power to constitute, direct, and control an united Australian army. The subsection of clause 15, to which you specially referred me, appears to supply evidence to the contrary. The two words "general defences" are included in a long list of secondary matters, such as "uniformity of weights and measures" and the "status of corporations and joint stock companies," and it would be a very strained interpretation that could give to those two words so used a definition of legal authority to deal with a matter second to none other in the exercise of National power. It is not for me to say what is the precise meaning of the words on which you rely; but it is contended that they cannot be construed to mean the creation, direction, mobilisation, and executive control of a great army for the defence of the whole of Australia.

For more than twenty years I have had the question of Australian federation almost constantly before me; and I cannot be accused of indifference to it at any time, merely because I had become convinced from earlier examination, while others were adopting the scheme of the present Federal Council at a later period, that no such body would ever answer the great objects of Federal Government. Leaving the provisions of the Act as to the legislative capacity of the Council, we are at once precipitated upon an impassable barrier, in the fact that there does not exist in it or behind it any form of executive power. Supposing, for example, that the Federal Council's recommendations or enactments, for the movement of Australian soldiers could be accepted, there could not be found anywhere a corresponding executive authority to give effect to them.

The vitally important recommendation made by General Edwards is one, in any light from which it can be viewed, of national magnitude and significance. The vast sums annually expended by the Continental Colonies for defence works and services would be of greatly enhanced value in time

of public danger, if the scattered and unconnected forces locally maintained could be brought under one command, and, whenever advisable, directed to one field of operations. I am satisfied that this cannot be done by any existing machinery. The Executive Governments of the several Colonies could not act in combination for any such purpose, nor could they so act independently of each other. The Federal Council has no executive power to act at all. The Imperial Parliament, on the application of the Colonies, could, no doubt, pass an Act to constitute the Federal Army under one command, and to authorize its operations in any part of Australia; but the Colonies could never consent to the Imperial Executive interfering in the direction of its movements. Hence, then, this first great Federal question, when looked at fairly, brings us, in spite of preferences or prejudices, face to face with the imperative necessity for a Federal Government. And why should we turn aside from what is inevitable in the nature of our onward progress? It must come, a year or two later possibly, but in any case soon.

I hope I need not assure you that this Government is anxious to work in harmony with the Governments of the sister Colonies in the matter under consideration, and is desirous of avoiding subordinate questions coloured by party feeling or collateral issues. It is a question to be put to the mind and heart of Australia, in view of the destiny of Australia, and on which it is hoped all sections of the collective population will unite without regard to narrower considerations. Believing that the time is ripe for consolidating the Australias into one, this Government respectfully invites you to join in taking the first great step, namely, to appoint representatives of Victoria to a National Convention for the purpose of devising and reporting upon an adequate scheme of Federal Government. With much deference to the views of the other Colonies, it is suggested that, in order to avoid any sense of inequality in debate or any party complexion, the number from each Colony should be the same, and should be equally chosen from both sides in political life; and that, in the case of each Colony, the representatives should be elected by Parliament and receive commissions from the Governor in Council. It is further suggested that six members from each Colony would be a convenient number, both in regard to combining a fair representation of the two Houses, and at the same time not making the Convention too unwieldy. In each case four members might be taken from the Assembly, two from each side; and two members from the Council, one from each side. In the case of Western Australia, where only one House exists, possibly only four members might be elected. If New Zealand joined, the Convention would as a result consist of forty members.