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Preface and Acknowledgements

This thesis began as a study of anti-Catholicism. It has come a long way since then. Researching and writing it has led me to change almost all the assumptions I began with. Some might say that this ought to be what writing a thesis involves, but I have a strong sympathy for the realists who argue that there is no point in beginning a thesis unless its final conclusions are fairly clear. That way, a lot of work is saved and more attention can be paid to the final form of the thesis. In this thesis a lot of work has, perforce, been discarded or compressed (the first chapter is a compression of four) and, similarly, less attention has been paid to the final shape of the work than I would have desired. In the first case, restrictions on length, and in the second case, restrictions on time, are responsible. But the thesis has the virtue of being original.

In the course of research I came to realise that anti-Catholicism was only one aspect of a larger phenomenon, popularly called sectarianism. That larger phenomenon became the object of my study and via it, in an important way, the whole of colonial society. Comments from a number of people at a work-in-progress seminar towards the end of my first year were very valuable in helping me see this. More important in this regard has been the assistance of Bede Nairn, who, long before me, realised the inadequacies of the orthodox view of the place of Catholics in colonial society, and helped me to see them also. My supervisor, Barry Smith, has been of constant assistance, turning my attention to unasked questions, and trying to improve, as best he could, my prose. Martha Campbell, Nan Phillips, and Jim Gibbney of the Australian Dictionary of Biography staff have also been immensely helpful in providing and pointing out ways of obtaining information. My debt to the files of the A.D.B. will be obvious to anyone reading this thesis: not least I have been able to read copy for Vol. 4 of the A.D.B., and have cited it, although it is as yet unpublished (it probably
will be published before the completion of this thesis). The staffs of the National, the Menzies and, particularly, the Mitchell Libraries have been of every assistance, as have Mons. Duffy of the Sydney Catholic Archdiocesan Archives, Kevin Hilferty of the Catholic Weekly, and the Irish National Association, all of whom have allowed me to consult material in their possession.

As important as all such learned advice and assistance has been the typing skill of Bev Gallina and Jan Hicks, whose efforts in translating my confused manuscript into type, and then corrected typescript into masters fit for printing has been remarkable. Carolyn Pettigrew has also helped immeasurably by checking drafts and proofs with a critical eye. But despite all this assistance, for which I am unutterably grateful, there are, I am afraid, many errors and oddities of interpretation for which only I can be held responsible.
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Introduction

Yet to read the history books all is brightness and light: our enemies have been distance and drought, never ourselves. Nobody has been game to write a history of sectarianism which poisoned Australian life from its foundations and is only now dying.

- Professor Patrick O'Farrell

This thesis is a modest attempt to accept Professor O'Farrell's challenge. Its conclusions may not exactly please him. Like all historians of the Australian Catholic Church before him, Professor O'Farrell assumes that Catholics were very frequently objects of persecution. Sectarianism he more or less equates with anti-Catholicism. He sees Catholics as the innocent victims of anti-Catholic and, up to a point, anti-Irish feeling. This thesis argues that Catholics were very largely responsible for bringing hostility upon themselves. Much of that hostility was a reaction against Catholic sectarianism, rather than the expression of an anti-Catholic predisposition.

The view expressed by Professor O'Farrell was shaped by Cardinal Moran who has been the single most formative influence on Australian Catholic historiography. Moran discerns four stages in the first century of Australian Catholicism: 'open persecution'; 'partial tolerance'; 'nominal


2 The documents which he includes in the section headed 'sectarianism' in his Documents in Australian Catholic History, 2 Vols (Melbourne, 1969), are exclusively attacks on Catholicism on Catholic protests against or reflections on such attacks. O'Farrell is not alone in making this equation. Even Michael Roe (Quest for Authority in Eastern Australia [Melbourne, 1965]), who shows that Catholics were anything but innocent victims in their dealings with other colonists, accepts the equation and includes his section on sectarianism in his chapter on Protestantism (pp.137-9).
religious equality'; and 'comparative calm'. Underlying Moran's divisions, indeed his whole history, is an assumption that the Catholic Church was necessarily in conflict with society. It was persecuted when weak; and as it grew in strength, it forced measures of toleration. Finally, by its strength and its ability to withstand the attacks of its persecutors, the church won for itself a period of comparative calm - the calm that exists between two evenly balanced but opposed forces. For Moran the conflict between Church and society was 'necessary' because of the ingrained anti-Catholic and anti-Irish sentiment of most non-Catholics, and because the Church had to assert her unchanging beliefs and practices in the face of a society that was coming more and more to be influenced by 'irreligion'. This thesis rejects Moran's assumption of a necessary conflict between the Catholic Church and society. It accepts that possibilities of conflict existed in a society where a minority of Irishmen and Catholics were mixed with a British and Protestant majority, but it argues that whatever conflict existed was largely a consequence of the rejection by Catholics of a social milieu that positively sought their assimilation and eschewed the bigotries of the old world.

It has been convincingly argued by one recent historian that little hostility existed against Catholics in New South Wales until the 1830s. Others have suggested that the hostility that appeared in the thirties and forties was not particularly important. It was part of the reaction of

---

1 P.F. Moran, History of the Catholic Church in Australasia (Sydney, probably 1895), pp.24-5.
conservative colonists against changing social conditions, which resulted mainly from the influx of large numbers of free immigrants beginning in the late 1830s. Out of the social and political conflicts of those years there emerged a broad liberal movement with a clear vision of a harmonious colonial society. The movement sought manhood suffrage, universal education, abolition of aid to religion, and the unlocking of the lands. Irish and other Catholics were active in the liberal movement and this encouraged non-Catholics to take for granted their full assimilation into colonial society. Catholic members of the liberal movement naturally shared these hopes. The liberals were optimistic that in colonial society the races and creeds that inhabited the British Isles could mingle without the sectarian rancour that characterised their relations in the old world. By the late 1850s the liberals had come to dominate politics. They were to maintain that dominance for the next twenty or thirty years. The liberal movement had been a popular one and the set of hopes which characterised it, amounting loosely to an ideology, came to exercise an hegemony over society into the eighties. The anti-sectarian strand of the liberal ideology was an important one, amounting to a kind of colonial nativism, but having the opposite aim to American nativism. 1


2 Colonial nativism welcomed migrants but opposed any introductions of the feuds of the countries from which they came. American nativism did not distinguish between the migrant and the beliefs he might bring with him into his new country. Consequently it fiercely opposed migration, especially from Catholic countries. It was the reaction of a middle class well entrenched both economically and politically and hostile to the social disruption which large scale immigration brought. In the colony, liberalism was the ideology of a middle class which had just won full political power and was optimistically seeking to form society according to its own image. It was not defensive ideology. For a full treatment of American nativism see R.A. Billington, The Protestant Crusade 1800–1860: A Study of the Origins of...
The abolition of State aid to religion and the establishment of the Irish national school system were the two means by which the liberals hoped to keep the colony free from religious strife (the positive aspect of their anti-sectarianism). By breaking all ties between the state and the various religious denominations they hoped to establish full religious equality. By removing the denominations from the political arena they hoped to minimise inter-denominational jealousies and keep religious bickerings out of politics. The Irish national system of education, designed to allay sectarian divisiveness in Ireland by educating the children of all creeds in the same school, they saw as particularly appropriate to colonial society. As the Irish schools taught the tenets of Christianity common to the various denominations and made provision for dogmatic religious instruction, the liberals could not see how any objection of substance could be framed against them by those conservative Christians who favoured denominational education. Denominational schools, by separating the children of the different denominations, only encouraged sectarian divisiveness. They were also wasteful of resources, and tended to inhibit the achievement of universal education.

The high immigration of Irish-Catholics from the late 1830s to the early 1860s did not prevent their assimilation into colonial society. The anti-Catholic tradition implicit in British evangelical Protestantism, and popularly manifested in orangeism, was largely quiescent. Its infrequent manifestations were quickly condemned by press and public figures. The real impediment to Catholic assimilation came from the Catholics themselves. Two developments raised serious doubts about Catholic willingness to assimilate into colonial society. The first was the attempt of a few Irishmen to introduce Irish political organisations into the colony.
Motivated partly from nostalgia and partly to gain local political advantage they made their move just as Fenians were becoming active in Ireland. They were not Fenians themselves, but to other colonists they appeared little different. They seemed determined to introduce, for no apparent reason, national divisions which could only destroy the harmony of colonial life. The second development was more serious. When the Irish national system of education had been first mooted in the 1830s, the Catholics, alone of all the denominations, had favoured it. As it grew in public favour, Catholic clerical opinion turned against it. This was partly because of a firming of European Catholic opinion against such liberal compromises, but largely because the Irish hierarchy had come to oppose it. This clerical opposition to public schools, which was supported by a significant, but by no means overwhelming proportion of lay Catholics, caused a major controversy during and after the passage of the 1866 Public Schools Act.

Together, these developments provoked considerable criticism of Catholics. Most criticism was directed against Catholic sectarianism, but the new situation provided opportunity for Protestant sectarians to publicise their more wide-ranging anti-Catholic theories. This tended to harden Catholic opinion, which in turn encouraged feelings of anxiety and aggression in non-Catholics. The Orange Institution began to grow. Politics was becoming polarised as Government members, with some reason, accused Catholics of attempting to dictate to the Government, and Opposition members supported Catholic cries of persecution. The attempted assassination of the Duke of Edinburgh in Sydney in March 1868 by an Irishman calling himself a Fenian, sent a wave of fear and indignation through the colony. The social divisions thus opened up were prevented from healing by the continuation for almost a year of a debate, largely party-political in inspiration, about the origins of the crime and the Government's reactions to it. Politics remained divided along sectarian lines for another eighteen months, during which period a general election was held.
These events seriously weakened the hegemony of the liberal anti-sectarian ideology. Within the Catholic Church the sectarian tendencies in the clerical leadership were confirmed and the anti-sectarian tradition represented by Catholic liberals virtually destroyed. The anti-Catholicism implicit in evangelical Protestantism was inspired, and provided with conditions in which to grow. The liberal, anti-sectarian ideology still exerted a strong influence, and colonial society was itself too complex to be any more than partly polarised along sectarian lines. But, by the end of the seventies, there were two fully formed sectarian subcultures, one Catholic and one Protestant, exerting an influence over Catholics and Protestants outside of them, and tending to divide the whole society.

There was an important difference between the two subcultures. Catholic sectarians saw the church and non-Catholic society in opposition; Protestant sectarians saw themselves as the guardians of the true values of society, and opposed it only because of its failure to remain true to these values. Nonetheless, whenever instances of Catholic sectarianism, such as the bishops' 1879 joint pastoral on education, provoked a hostile reaction, Protestant sectarians were distinguishable from the other critics of Catholicism only by the extravagance of their denunciations.

As social change and the passing of a generation disintegrated the hegemony of the liberal ideology, sectarianism became more pronounced. The Catholic subcommunity, centred on its separate school system came to see itself oppressed, or at least opposed, by the rest of society on most issues. Yet its sectarianism was not all pervasive and it came to champion an Australian nationalism over against the Empire-oriented patriotism of its opponents, and forged an odd and partial alliance with another minority group, the Labor movement. By no means all those who described themselves as Catholics, not even those who were regular churchgoers, were part of the sectarian subcommunity, or ghetto as some have called it, that defined what everybody
understood by Catholicism. Protestant sectarianism remained largely aligned with the conservative forces in society, and with the Liberal and later National Party in politics. Although it contributed its quantity of poison to the social relations between Catholics and Protestants, Protestant sectarianism achieved public significance only in conjunction with wider protests against Catholic sectarianism, in particular during that period of great social stress, World War I.

Most of this thesis is concerned with a detailed examination of the mid-sixties manifestation of Catholic sectarianism; the breakdown of the anti-sectarian hegemony over colonial society; and the growth of Protestant sectarianism. It focuses on a period 1865-1880; and at the centre of the focus are the two years 1868-69. There are advantages and disadvantages in such an approach. It lacks the broad generalisations that a larger survey may have conveyed, and it lacks the perspectives that a comparison of two or more colonies would have provided. On the other hand it enables a fuller picture to be drawn of that much mentioned but little understood phenomenon of sectarianism. And if it is correct that the late sixties did see the entry into colonial life of a serious degree of sectarianism, then the change is worth studying in detail. One advantage of a rather detailed approach is that it helps straighten out the record. Even in simple matters such as chronology this is sufficient to exonerate Henry Parkes from many of the slurs cast upon his character by his detractors, then and now. More importantly, a detailed approach enables penetration below the leading figures of society to men equally important in their own way, but little known. It also enables the discovery of some of the dimensions and variegations of popular feeling, often only tentatively connected to the ideas and actions of their masters. Yet, while this thesis has, to a certain extent, plumbed below the sayings and doings of political and church leaders, there is much about which it can offer only the most
tentative conclusions. The influence of sectarianism in determining voting behaviour is one area that would require detailed research of another kind to allow firmer conclusions to be reached.

This thesis uses words and concepts more frequently employed in sociology and psychology than in history. However, words like 'paranoia', 'ideology', 'denomination' and 'subculture' are also frequently used, with less precision, in everyday speech, and it is thus that they are used in this thesis. My use of the word 'sectarianism', which is central to the whole argument of this thesis, does, however, require further explanation.

In common Australian usage the term 'sectarianism' has a somewhat different meaning to that given it by the social scientists. In Australia, the word refers, very generally, to religious conflict. In less frequent use now that the phenomenon is less prominent, it has in the past had a more particular meaning. In the nineteenth century, it meant stressing the interests of religion, or rather the interests of a special religious collectivity – usually Catholicism or Protestantism – over and against any other interest. For Catholics it has taken on a special meaning: that of anti-Catholicism. Catholic historians, such as Professor O'Farrell, who gave it this meaning are expressing the special experience of a Catholic subculture. For social scientists, especially sociologists, sectarianism refers to the characteristics displayed by sects, those relatively small collections of individuals which have comprised a significant part of Protestantism since the reformation, and which appeared in the guise of heretic movements in European Catholicism before that. That meaning was first used by Weber¹ and was

given its most powerful formulation by his friend Ernst Troeltsch a little later.¹

At first glance there might appear little connection between the Australian and the social scientific use of the word 'sectarianism'. In that case the need to avoid terminological confusion might seem to make it necessary to use an alternative term for the Australian phenomenon. However, further elaboration shows that there are important similarities between the two uses and that each is capable of illuminating the other. The common Australian use of 'sectarianism' is, in an important sense, older than the social scientific use. It was first given a formal elaboration by that much underated nineteenth century historian, W.E.H. Lecky, who devoted his earliest published essay to describing the baneful effects of sectarianism on Ireland.²

For Lecky sectarianism was the especial curse of the Irish. It involved putting the interests of church, Catholic and Protestant, above the interests of nation. Instead of recognising that there was a sphere of life where religious considerations ought to predominate, and one where considerations of citizenship ought to rule, the sectarian subordinated the second to the first. He allowed himself to be ruled in political matters by his religious leaders, who were themselves ruled entirely by the interests of their creed. Lecky's view, with its implicit anti-clericalism, was a classic nineteenth century liberal one. In so far as the sectarian

2 W.E.H. Lecky, Clerical Influences: an essay on Irish sectarianism and English Government (Dublin, 1911). This was a pamphlet edition, edited and introduced by W.E.G. Lloyd and F. Cruise O'Brien. Lecky's essay was originally published in the first (1861) edition of his Leaders of Public Opinion in Ireland. Only 34 copies of that original edition were sold, and the unsold copies were destroyed. On revising his work for a second edition in 1871, Lecky omitted the essay, and it remained omitted in subsequent editions. It is worth noticing that this use of the term is still common in Ireland, as is witnessed by the press reports from Ulster.
placed religious above social or political considerations he
was hostile to, or rejected, the society in which he lived.
For Ernst Troeltsch, sectarianism was the characteristic
behaviour of sects. Sects he placed at one end of a typology
with church at the other end. By means of this typology
Troeltsch attempted to explain the different teachings and
the history of the Christian churches. Put very crudely, he
argued that a church was a large organisation, with a
specialised priesthood, ascribed membership and good
relations with the society around it (or actually encompassing
it, as the theorists of medieval Catholicism would have had it).
A sect was a small, unstructured collectivity with membership
based on a shared (conversion) experience. It rejected
priesthood and sacramental systems, emphasised the literal
interpretation of scripture and awaited the imminent end of
the world. It adopted an attitude of opposition to the
society around it: an opposition which could express itself
in attacks upon society, but more usually in withdrawal
from it.¹

Troeltsch and Weber have led sociologists to give
considerable attention to sects, and those who have tried to
match Troeltsch's broad vision have attempted to give more
subtlety to his typology.² Usually this has been done by
following Neibuhr, who could not find any equivalent of a
church in American society, but found that many of the
religious collectivities, which had originally begun as sects,
were displaying a number of church-like characteristics. He
formulated the concept of 'denomination' to describe these.³

¹Troeltsch, op.cit., Vol.1, pp.331-43. See O.F. Dent,
'Church-Sect Typologies in the Description of Religious
Groups', Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology,
Vol.6, No.1 (April, 1970), pp.22-3, for a tabulated summary
of the characteristics Troeltsch attributes to church and
sect. See also T.F. O'Dea, The Sociology of Religion (New

²For example, B.R. Wilson, Sects and Society (Berkeley, 1961);
B.R. Wilson, ed., Patterns of Sectarianism (London, 1967); M.
Yinger, Religion in the Struggle for Power (Durham, 1946)

³H.R. Neibuhr, The Social Sources of Denominationalism
(New York, 1929).
Generally speaking, a denomination was seen as being somewhere half-way between a sect and a church, both in characteristics, and in historical development.

Following Neibuhr many more sociologists have observed the inadequacies of Troeltsch's typology, particularly its inapplicability in American society. One of their main difficulties has been the existence of sect-like characteristics within churches and church-like characteristics in religious groups more closely resembling sects. More recent attempts to test Troeltsch's typology by using survey techniques and vigorous statistical procedures, have produced similar results. One response to this has been to simplify Troeltsch's construction to make it more generally applicable. Benton Johnson has suggested basing the distinction on the attitude to the world displayed by the collectivity in question: 'A church is a religious group that accepts the social environment in which it exists. A sect is a religious group that rejects the social environment in which it exists.' O'Dea seems to agree with this. As Johnson points out, one of the advantages of his simpler typology is that it indicates the sect-like characteristics which clearly distinguish American Catholicism from its medieval forbear. A second response has been to recognise sectarian or church-like characteristics as a property of individuals or very small

---

2 For example, O.F. Dent, 'The Utility of the Church-Sect Typology' (M.A., A.N.U., 1968), p.193, concludes 'the church-sect typology is inappropriate as a device for describing and classifying religious bodies at the denominational level, because of the marked variations which occur between the groups within the denomination'.
5 Johnson, op.cit., p.546.
groups, rather than large religious collectivities. Thus the terminology becomes psychological rather than sociological. At this level the distinction has some resemblance to Rokeach's open and closed minded typology. The similarities between these uses of 'sectarianism' and the common Australian use is quite clear.

Lately more and more sociologists have come to advocate the abandonment of the church-sect typology altogether. It does seem possible, though, that there is something to be gained by developing the analogy between the behaviour of the medieval and reformation sects described by Troeltsch and the sectarianism displayed by certain groups in nineteenth century Australia, or contemporary Ulster. Indeed the concept would appear to have even wider application. Sectarianism, as Professor O'Farrell has suggestively observed, is a characteristic style of many in the labor movement. His observation could be widened to encompass any radical movement. For the purposes of this thesis, however, 'sectarianism' retains its religious connotations.

---

2 M. Rokeach, The Open and Closed Mind (New York, 1960), Chapter 3.
4 P.J. O'Farrell, 'The History of the New South Wales Labour Movement, 1880-1910. A Religious Interpretation', Journal of Religious History, Vol.II, No.2 (December 1962), pp.133-51. In this article O'Farrell is attempting to apply Troeltsch's typology to the history of the N.S.W. Labor movement. I find the analogy between the dominant reformist wing of the labor movement and the church type less satisfactory, but the overall attempt is an interesting one, and deserves more attention than it has received. It is possible that O'Farrell would want to invoke Troeltsch to defend his identification of sectarianism (in Australia) with anti-Catholicism. Just as the medieval and reformist sects were opposed to the Catholic Church, so too were the nineteenth century Australian sectarians, the argument might run. There is just a germ of truth in such an analogy, but it misunderstands Troeltsch and misreads Australian history.
One final proviso must be mentioned. It concerns the usefulness of religious affiliation as a descriptive tool.

In the course of this thesis frequent reference is made to Catholics, to Protestants and to the various denominations of Protestantism. In some cases the group referred to will be qualified by further description, usually of the form: 'those Catholics who believed so and so....' In other cases the qualification will be implicit, but on many occasions I have fallen into the old mistake of referring to Catholics, or Anglicans or whatever, as if all those who described themselves thus shared similar views and as if all the population could be divided up into religious denominations. Neither of these assumptions is justified.

Only 81 per cent of those included in the 1828 census gave a response as to religious affiliation, and while the response rate was much higher in later censuses, this does not necessarily imply that the 1828 census takers were remiss, and that the outstanding 19 per cent can be divided into the proportional affiliations of the religiously declared 80 per cent. It may be that subsequent censuses are badly biased by a belief that everybody must have some religious affiliation in the same way as they have a sex or a place of birth. Quite clearly a lot of convicts and probably many other early colonists, were completely a-religious (including the Irish). What is interesting is that the more strongly prevailing colonial attitudes, far from being secular, were religious, so that in time and over a generation or two, most colonists felt obliged to have at least a nominal religious affiliation. Even of those who deliberately claimed some religious affiliation, there was no good reason to assume that their views were necessarily those of the clergy of their denomination. This assumption is most commonly made about Catholics: indeed it is one characteristic commonly thought to distinguish Catholics from Protestants. A number of Catholic spokesmen themselves propagated this belief, but in doing so

---

1 Waldersee, op.cit., p.98.
2 Ibid., p.99.
Chapter I

The Growth of Catholic Sectarianism.

New South Wales, unlike England and the United States in the nineteenth century, did not suffer that social disruption caused by large scale Irish-Catholic immigration into an established Anglo-Saxon Protestant society. The reason for this was simple: Irish-Catholics had been part of colonial society from its foundation. Although there were only few Irishmen among the convicts of the first fleet, significant numbers began arriving in 1791, and by 1810 21 percent of the convicts in New South Wales were Irish. By 1825 this had risen to 25 per cent.

Almost 90 percent of these were Catholic, and while there were between five and ten percent of Catholic convicts who were not Irish born, the equation of Irish and Catholic was fixed very early in the colony's history. No figures exist which would indicate the proportion of Irish-Catholics among the much smaller percentage free settlers but, as many of these were soldiers, it was presumably fairly high. Twenty-eight percent of those who supplied the 1828 census-takers with a description of their religious affiliation were Catholics, although nineteen percent of those surveyed declined to register any

---

1 A.G.L. Shaw, Convicts and Colonies (London, 1971), p.363, indicates that none of the ships in the first or second fleet sailed from Ireland. It is likely however that there were some Irish among the first batch of convicts. There was a significant Irish immigration into England in the late eighteenth century and not a few immigrants turned to crime.

2 These percentages are calculated from figures given by Shaw, ibid., pp.363-6.

denominational affiliation at all. The 1828 Returns of the Colony, which ascribed a religion to all colonists, claimed 31 percent as Catholics. Whichever was right, subsequent censuses showed that for the rest of the nineteenth century persons who nominated themselves as Catholic formed between one quarter and one third of the colony's population.

Thus, from its earliest years, Irishmen and Catholics were present in New South Wales in the same proportions as they were in the pre-Irish famine British Isles. There was an important difference, however. In the United Kingdom they were concentrated in Ireland, while in the colony they were evenly distributed throughout the population. Although Ireland was part of His Majesty's realm, and, after 1800, was governed from Westminster, it was still ruled as an alien territory. The mass of its population was distinct in speech, dress, custom and religion, and given over to turbulence and rebelliousness in a way unknown in other parts of the realm. It was the Irishman's apparent lack of respect for social order that caused non-Irish colonists to suspect the Irishmen in their midst. Fear of the Irishman's proven propensity to socially disruptive action conditioned the relations of subsequent generations of colonists to the Irish and their descendants. It pre-disposed colonial opinion to a Tory view of the Act of Union, for they imagined that the separation of Ireland from Great Britain might inspire Irish colonists to imitative action, with far more chaotic consequences.

It was fear of their greater potential for turbulence that formed the colonial administration's attitude to the Irish convicts in the colony prior to 1820. The presence of a leavening of dedicated rebels from the unsuccessful rising of 1798, and the Irish inspiration of the one significant colonial rebellion (at Castle Hill in 1804) only reinforced that fear. At the same time, the various Governors were happy to

1 Ibid., pp.98-9.
call on the Catholic religion to moderate Irish rebelliousness. Once Governor King had had time to modify his original judgment and conclude that at least one of the three priests transported for their part in the '98 rising was a peaceful, orderly man, he happily complied with the colonial office view that the priest might be pardoned and employed to minister to the Catholic convicts. That such permission should have been withdrawn after the Castle Hill rebellion was hardly surprising.¹

Macquarie's suspicions of Fr O'Flinn, arriving in the colony in 1817, without papers, ill-educated and truculent, were equally natural. He recognised that a priest could be a valuable acquisition to the colony, but feared the spirit of insubordination that could be engendered in Catholic convicts by a disorderly priest.² The conflict between Governors Brisbane and Darling and Fr Therry were precisely a product of Therry's turbulent nature; a characteristic which, it might be added, also alienated him from his fellow clergy, and many of his flock.³ That Catholic convicts were forced to attend the divine service of the Established Church in the absence of authorised Catholic clergy was unremarkable; regular attendance at divine service was thought to have an edifying effect on convicts, and Protestant Nonconformists were also compelled to attend. Those historians⁴ who have

⁴ Many but by no means all of these historians were Catholic (e.g. Moran, Eris O'Brien, J.G. Murtagh). Of these, O'Brien (Life and Letters of Archpriest J.J. Therry [Sydney, 1922]; The Dawn of Catholicism in Australia [Sydney, 1928]) has been the most influential. Manning Clark is one recent historian, not a Catholic, who has, if anything, painted an even darker picture than O'Brien. This view has been widely disseminated and has become the generally accepted view of contemporary Australian liberal opinion.
found in the period up to the arrival of Governor Bourke evidence of what they call the persecution of Catholics, ignore the fact that the colony was primarily a penal settlement and that most Catholics, and indeed most colonists, were convicts.

As the colony became more firmly established, and lost its purely penal character, its inhabitants began to dispute its shape and purpose. A number of the more conservative were committed to view the Church of England as the established, or at least, the pre-eminent church in the colony. They opposed the liberalism that inspired Catholic emancipation and were disturbed by evidence that the liberal spirit was even more active in the colony than at Home. In England the struggle for Catholic emancipation had given evangelists (Anglicans and dissenters) and staunch churchmen opportunity to combine in avowing their common opposition to Rome. In the colony a Catholic request, in 1832, for further Protestant assistance towards the erection of St Mary's evoked from some Protestants, evangelicals and conservatives, an assertion of the vast gulf between scriptural Protestantism and idolatrous Catholicism. They were a distinct minority, and by their action alienated rather than gathered support,¹ for a much larger number of non-Catholics abhorred the conservatives' pretensions far more than they disliked Rome.

This was largely the pattern of the 1830s and 1840s. Conservative churchmen, led by the Anglican Archdeacon, Broughton, attacked attempts by liberal Governors, especially Bourke and Gipps, to reduce the Church of England to equality

¹G.P. Shaw, 'William Grant Broughton and His Early Years in New South Wales' (Ph.D., A.N.U., 1970), pp.221-8. One of the disputants was the Anglican Archdeacon, Broughton. His protest was against religious liberalism rather than Catholicism (ibid., p.226) although he was fearful of the Irish potential for insurrection (ibid., p.219). The pamphlets issued during the controversy (1832-3) by Broughton, Rev. Henry Fulton (3), Roger Therry and Fr Ullathorne are bound under the general title of Tracts on Popery in N.S.W. in the A.N.L. The separate titles given in the bibliography at the end of this thesis.
with other churches. In so doing they hit out at Catholicism, the favouring of which they reckoned the most pernicious manifestation of liberal perversity.¹ For Broughton the presence and episcopal pretensions of the Catholic Bishop Polding were particularly galling.² Evangelicals, equally agitated by Catholic episcopal presence, joined in such attacks,³ which were applauded by others of Tory disposition, especially the 'exclusivists'. There were no immediate reasons for the 'exclusivists' to oppose Catholicism. However, they strongly opposed the Governors' liberalism which gave them only equal status with the ex-convict emancipists and they were prompted to accept that there was a connection between that liberalism and Catholicism by the presence of the Irish-Catholic liberals, Plunkett and Therry, as two of the

¹For example, W.G. Broughton, Speech Delivered to the Committee of Protestants (Sydney, 1836); Speech...Upon the Resolution for Establishing a System of General Education (Sydney, n.d. [1839]).
²In 1839 Broughton denounced Polding's wearing of a pectoral cross and ring to the Governor's levee celebrating the Queen's birthday. (H.N. Birt, Benedictine Pioneers in Australia (London, 1911), Vol.II, p.13). In 1843, when Polding returned from Europe as 'Archbishop of Sydney', Broughton protested even more loudly at his adoption of that title, and considerable public debate ensued. See ibid., pp.94-5. The dispute produced the following pamphlets: Rev. R. Allwood, Lectures on the Papal Claim of Jurisdiction (Sydney, 1843); W.A. Duncan, A Letter to the Lord Bishop of Australia (Sydney, 1843); A Second Letter to the Lord Bishop of Australia in Reply to a Lecture of Rev. Robert Allwood (Sydney, 1843); A Third Letter ...in reply to Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Lectures of Rev. R. Allwood (Sydney, 1843); A Layman, An Answer to the latter addressed to the Lord Bishop of Australia in Defense of the Most Rev Dr Polding's Assumption of the Title and Dignity of Archbishop of Sydney and Metropolitan of New Holland (Sydney, 1843).
³Rev. W. McIntyre, Is the Service of the Mass Idolatrous? (Sydney, 1838); Rev. W. Stack, Lecture on the Man of Sin (Sydney, 1839). For confident rebuttals by prominent liberal Catholic laymen see E.H. Hawkesley, The Worship of the Catholic Church not Idolatrous: A reply to the Rev. William McIntyre's candid enquiry into the doctrine maintained by the Rev Mr Stack, Protestant Minister and W.A. Duncan... (Sydney, 1839); A Reply to the Rev. W. Stack's attempted defence of his lecture and the Man of Sin from remarks of W.A. Duncan (Sydney, 1839).
Governors' chief advisers. 1

Catholics met these attacks with confidence, knowing that their claims for equality were supported by a majority of colonists, including the Governor, emancipists, and other men of liberal disposition. 2 The alliance between Catholics and liberals in opposition to Anglicans and conservatives was not as strange in the 1830s and 1840s as it would have been forty years later. Rome had not by then anathemised liberalism and narrowly defined the limit of Catholic thought. Even a Catholic clergyman like Therry could claim that he was prepared to sacrifice 'all but strict integrity of faith and essential purity of morals' in the pursuit of Christian unity, and another Catholic spokesman could declare the possibility of the Church committing errors in civil policy, and the fallibility of the Pope. 3 There was, nonetheless, a danger that Catholics would become over confident. Nothing in the previous experience of the Catholic clergy could have prepared them for a situation where they were neither oppressed nor all powerful, and they were sometimes too eager to discover discrimination, and overstrident in their demands for equality. 4 As Michael Roe has suggested, confident Catholicism could easily become aggressive Catholicism. 5 However, despite occasional Catholic excesses the alliance forged in the thirties between Catholic and liberal colonists remained firm during the disputatious, formative decade of the forties.

In 1837 large scale government assisted immigration into

---

2 o'Farrell, Catholic Church in Australia, p.46; Roe, Quest for Authority, pp.117-24.
3 Ibid., p.112.
4 See Moloney, op.cit., pp.138-9 for an account of a lecture given by Polding in England in 1841, in which he made absurd claims that Catholics were heavily persecuted in the colony. Reports of his lecture naturally engendered hostile comment when they were received back in the colony.
New South Wales was begun. By 1843, 60,000 assisted immigrants had arrived in New South Wales and Victoria, which were not then separated.¹ Despite the depression of the early 1840s immigrants continued to arrive in large numbers until 1845. Immigration was resumed again in 1848. Between 1837 and 1850, 58,000 persons were assisted by the colonial government to immigrate to New South Wales (excluding Victoria).² Between 1837 and 1842 the population of New South Wales almost doubled. It increased by another two-thirds in the next eight years.³ In 1837 the convict portion of the population was 38 percent. In 1840 transportation ceased, and by 1842 convicts comprised only 12.6 percent of the population.⁴ Until 1840 most immigrants were recruited in Britain by agents of the Imperial Government and given full passage to the colony by the colonial government. In 1840 this practice was discontinued and government support given exclusively to the bounty system, which placed the responsibility of recruiting and arranging the passage of immigrants into private hands. The government paid over a certain sum on the successful landing of the immigrants. The system provided for nomination of prospective migrants by relatives or friends in the colony, and for colonial manufacturers and pastoralists to contract for the passage of immigrants with required skills. Theoretically, it allowed colonists more control over the type of immigrant they were assisting.⁵

¹Australian, 19 May 1842.
⁴Ibid., p.406.
⁵Shultz, op.cit., Chapter 1.
The impact on colonial society of such massive immigration has not been effectively studied, but its disruptive and formative effects are obvious. A large number of immigrants were Irish-Catholics, and the late 1830s and 1840s saw an increase in the level of colonial anti-Catholicism. This came from three sources: from conservatives; from evangelicals among the liberals; and from evangelicals among the new immigrants.

The 'exclusivists' were opposed to large scale immigration. They desired cheaper labour than they could obtain from British immigrants and claimed to prefer coolies or convicts. They realised that large scale free immigration meant the end of their vision of society. During the late 1830s numerous derogatory remarks were made about the Irish immigrants who were being brought into the colony in large numbers. Their popery was feared and they were disparagingly compared with coolies. This was condemned in many quarters and seen for what it was: 'exclusivist' spite. Slowly a change took place in the conservative- 'exclusivists' arguments. During 1839 and 1840 conservatives like Broughton, Macarthur and the Sydney Herald frequently criticised the increasing number of Catholic immigrants. Their criticisms were milder and directed against the excessive numbers of Catholic immigrants rather than against Catholics as such. They argued that it was neither fair nor sensible to introduce Catholics into the colony in greater proportions than existed already. In 1840 the Immigration Committee of the Legislative Council, chaired by Broughton, expressed this criticism in its annual report. Catholics immediately organised an impressive protest meeting. It was chaired by the emancipist Dr Bland,

1 Sydney Herald, 9 March 1837.
2 Sydney Times, 1 July 1837; Sydney Monitor, 30 June, 25 August 1837.
3 Sydney Herald, 31 August, 14, 18, 23, 25 September, 6 October 1840.
4 Australasian Chronicle, 24 August 1841; Sydney Herald, 26 August 1841.
who deplored attempts to introduce into the colony factious and party feeling, and won warm applause by saying that he looked upon Ireland, England and Scotland as one nation. The Catholic liberal, W.A. Duncan, affirmed that the Catholic Church would never again be a political church.¹

By the 1840s criticism of Irish-Catholic immigration was beginning to come from less conservative quarters. Thirty-seven percent of adult migrants receiving direct government assistance (arriving 1837-40) were Irish, and about 30 percent were Catholics.² The proportion was even higher for the bounty migrants. In 1841 almost 70 percent of immigrants were Irish,³ a fact which was strongly criticised by the Immigration Committee.⁴ Their criticism was echoed by the radical Presbyterian minister J.D. Lang, who had just returned from America where evidence of organised Irish-Catholic politics had triggered earlier memories of the demoralising effect of large scale Irish immigration into Glasgow.⁵ In a pamphlet entitled The Question of Questions: or is the Colony to be Transformed into a Province of Popedom Lang expressed his fears in lucid form. Such fears were shared by many of the immigrants for whom a dread of popery had been formed by evangelical Protestantism. For 28 percent of adult Protestant migrants abhorrence of popery had been sharpened by an Irish upbringing.⁶ For such men, an Irish or Catholic majority meant religious persecution. The fate

¹Australasian Chronicle, 16 September 1841.
³Australian, 19 May 1842.
⁴Australasian Chronicle, 10 September 1842. I am grateful to John Ohlsson of the University of New South Wales for drawing my attention to most of the references in the above three paragraphs.
⁵See article on J.D. Lang in A.D.B., Vol.2, pp.76-83.
⁶Shultz, 'The Free Settlers of New South Wales', Appendix D, Table XVII p.314; Appendix E, Table XXIV, p.374.
of Protestants in Catholic countries attested to that. Few possessed enough demographic sophistication to realise that it would require many years of almost exclusively Irish immigration to give the colony a Catholic majority. In fact the Irish proportion of the immigrants declined later in the forties. Nevertheless, 49 percent of assisted immigrants arriving in the colony between 1837 and 1850 were Irish.¹

There was a tendency among these Irish immigrants to recreate the sectarianism that had disfigured Catholic-Protestant relations at Home. A branch of O'Connell's Repeal Association was started in Sydney in 1842. Even Archbishop Polding, normally suspicious of manifestations of Irish nationalism, felt obliged to praise O'Connell and Repeal on the occasion of O'Connell's release from prison in 1844.² Such Irish separatist movements did not have in the late 1840s the implications they were to take on in later decades. O'Connell only wanted self-government for Ireland under the Crown and self government was precisely what the colony's liberals wanted themselves.

More serious manifestations of Irish Catholic sectarianism were occasionally given at election time. The first colonial elections, for the Sydney Municipal Council in 1842 and then for the Legislative Council early in 1843, were rowdy, riotous affairs. This was particularly true of the Legislative Council election in Melbourne, where the population was almost entirely composed of recent immigrants. The rowdiness was largely a consequence of the novelty of the event, and the fluid state of society, but in it was mixed an element of sectarianism. In Sydney this was largely set off by Irish-Catholic attempts to rally support for Roger Therry. Therry denied seeking Catholic support but stood for a heavily Catholic electorate, and that support was noisily

¹Shultz, 'Immigration', pp.279-80.
²Roe, op.cit., p.104.
given – mostly by immigrants fresh from Ireland, where Catholic electoral strength was still an exciting discovery. Therry was opposed by Charles Cowper, who was supported by the main stream of the liberal movement. By 1843 the more intelligent of the 'exclusivists' had dropped their intransigent stand and were seeking alliances with the more conservative liberals. Therry was one such liberal, and was working in alliance with the ex-'exclusivist' James Macarthur. For this reason and because he held office as acting Attorney-General he was opposed by most liberals, who naturally wished to take advantage of the election to return new men of impeccably liberal sentiment to the Legislative Council.¹ Since Catholics were being urged to return Therry because he was a Catholic, it was only natural that his liberal opponents should attack this as an attempt to place religion before political considerations, and say rude things about political Catholicism. It was a pattern that was to be frequently repeated: sectarian Catholicism engendered a sectarian response. Therry won narrowly.² Not all Catholics supported Therry however. One of his critics was W.A. Duncan who attacked his alliance with Macarthur in the *Australasian Chronicle* which he edited.³ Similar reactions were engendered in later campaigns, such as Longmore's in 1851 and Plunkett's in 1856, when once again attempts were made to rally Catholic support for a candidate on the ground that he was Catholic (or Irish), and that Catholics, as such, ought to be represented in the legislature. In such cases the Catholic candidate was invariably the most conservative of those standing. The opposition in such cases was rarely to the candidate's religion, but rather to his invoking religion to

¹See editorial comments in *Colonial Observer* (edited by Lang), 7,11 January 1843.
³Payten, 'W.A. Duncan', pp.180-1. By his action Duncan precipitated his dismissal as editor by his more conservative emancipist proprietors.
win support he might not otherwise receive.\(^1\)

Such instances of Irish-Catholic sectarianism were an inspiration to Irish Protestants. After a tentative beginning the first colonial orange lodge held its inaugural meeting in April 1845. It quickly gathered support and by 1848 there were between 500 and 700 orangers organised in nine orange lodges. The growth of orangerism was assisted by the \textit{Sentinal} newspaper (1842-48) which was devoted almost exclusively to anti-Catholic themes. It was also assisted by Irish-Catholic threats to break up a proposed twelfth of July procession in 1846. Heavy rain and the persuasions of Dean McEncroe prevented trouble but Irish-Catholic truculence helped persuade Irish and other evangelical Protestants of the need for orange type societies.\(^2\) The twelfth of July in Melbourne that year did provoke a serious riot, which, in turn, persuaded Plunkett, the Attorney-General, to introduce legislation to prohibit party processions and other meetings celebrating or commemorating any...anniversary...connected with any religious or political differences...between classes of Her Majesty's subjects...which...shall have among them firearms...or publicly exhibited any banner, emblem flag or symbol...calculated to provoke animosity between her Majesty's subjects of different religious persuasion.\(^3\)

---

\(^1\) See Moloney, \textit{op.cit.}, pp.234-5 for Longmore's 1851 campaign pp.263-78 for Plunkett's 1856 campaign. For the latter see also Turner, \textit{op.cit.}, pp.412-4. In each case a number of prominent Catholics supported other candidates. In Plunkett's case even Archdeacon McEncroe opposed him.

\(^2\) See AppendixIIa for a fuller, documented account of the beginnings of orangerism in Australia, and the 1846 disturbances.

\(^3\) From preamble to 10 Vic No.17, entitled 'An Act to Prevent for a Certain Time Party Processions and Certain Other Public Exhibitions in the Colony of N.S.W.' Based on the Irish Act of 1832, it was originally passed for a three year period, but was renewed again in 1849. It lapsed in 1852 but was renewed and made perpetual by 20 Vic. No.6, in 1857. It was consolidated by Act No.10, 1901, and is presumably still in force to-day. There is no record of any charge being laid under the Act until 1868, but Plunkett once warned Archdeacon McEncroe that the St Patrick's Total Abstinence Society had infringed the Act. See Roe, \textit{op.cit.}, p.122.
The Party Processions Act indicated the liberals' determination to keep the colony free of the sectarian squabbles which had so disfigured social life in the 'old country', especially Ireland.

Mostly however, the traditional sectarian inclination of immigrants were curbed by colonial conditions which encouraged men to put aside their old differences in the more congenial pursuit of material improvement. Sectarian inclinations were also curbed by the natural alliance between new immigrants and emancipists. Each had reason to oppose the pretensions of the old 'exclusivist'-conservative classes and in protests against the attempts to renew transportation, and in agitation for self-government, a strong liberal movement was developed. In this movement Irish-Catholics like Edward McEncroe co-operated with orangemen like Richard Driver, thus strengthening the anti-sectarian strand of the liberal ideology.

The great influx of free immigrants in the 1840s gave the liberals the numerical strength to guarantee their victory over the conservatives. By the fifties the old 'exclusivist'-conservatives had been vanquished and the liberals set about giving a positive shape to society. Self-government became the immediate goal. Once achieved other reforms would follow. It was at this point that divisions opened within the liberals' ranks over the extent and speed of the reforms required. The exact demarcation of these divisions varied from issue to issue and split the liberals into factions; all moving in the same direction, but some faster and wanting to go further than others. The more tentative liberals eventually became known as conservatives, but on some tenets of the old liberal creed, such as opposition to sectarianism, all were agreed. In the end the more radical liberals were victorious on most issues, and all men were given a vote, the lands were unlocked, state aid to religion abolished, and national education fully established. The achievement of some of these goals, however, was more difficult and took longer than others. By the late 1850s in New South Wales,
everyone was a 'liberal', though some were more 'liberal' than others.

The split between an older generation of more conservative liberals and their younger, more radical, heirs was clearly demonstrated by the controversy surrounding the abolition of state aid to religion. This move was proposed by the younger liberals who viewed it as both guaranteeing the equality of all religions and removing a source of sectarian discontent from the body politic. It was opposed by older liberals like J.H. Plunkett, who thought the 1836 Act, granting aid to several churches, sufficient guarantee of religious equality, and who were chary of the social consequences of depriving the churches of all assistance from the state. It was naturally opposed by what remained of the old conservatives and by most Anglican clergy. It was also strongly opposed by most Catholic clergy and their lay spokesmen. This was a clear indication that the Catholic clergy had sided with the more conservative liberals and would oppose any further attempts to reduce the area of the Church's influence. A number of leading Catholics, however, favoured the abolition of state aid and the clergy's opposition did not at the time raise the spectre of Catholicism organised in the pursuit of political goals.

Despite occasional sectarian incidents, the early years of the 1860s seemed to indicate that the sectarian turbulence of the forties had been successfully subdued. The liberals'

---

1 Turner, op.cit., passim, examines the differences within the liberal movement over this issue.
2 Ibid., especially Chapter 4, 11 and 12.
3 A small riot occurred in Maitland early in 1860 when a crowd of Irish Catholics successfully prevented the Rev. William McIntyre from delivering an advertised lecture entitled 'The Heathenism of Popery'. Colonial opinion condemned Catholics and McIntyre alike as equally guilty. See Colonial Secretary, Correspondence Received, 660/2159, Box 4/3423 in N.S.W. State Archives; Turner, op.cit., p.551; J. Campbell Robinson, The Free Presbyterian Church of Australia (Melbourne, 1947), pp.89-93.
hopes that colonial society might prove by its harmony its superiority to the old world seemed to be fulfilled. Irish Catholics appeared to be as committed to that hope as colonists of other creeds. Some non-Catholics remained apprehensive about the degree of assimilation of the poorer Irish Catholics, but all admitted that leading Catholics, especially the Englishman Archbishop Polding, were fully committed to preserving social harmony.

For colonial liberals, religion, or, more precisely, the Christian religion, was an essential part of society. They acknowledged that Christianity was divided into different denominations, and that each person was convinced that his own denomination contained a purer version of divine truth than any other. On the other hand, they believed that there was a large body of doctrine common to each denomination, and they condemned the intrusion of religious differences into social life, where they would only inhibit social relationships and exercise a divisive influence. The pervasiveness of this view and its positive influence in securing religious toleration and social harmony was illustrated in the public response to the fire that destroyed St Mary's Cathedral on 29 June 1865. That response also indicated the extent of Irish-Catholic assimilation and conveyed intimations of the relief felt by some non-Catholics that such assimilation had proved possible.

The fire was not noticed until it had obtained a good hold, and it quickly consumed the whole building. The crowds who flocked to the scene were treated to 'spectacle of fearful grandeur...of magnificent desolation'. Catholics were grief stricken and the non-Catholic population deeply

1 S.M.H., 30 June 1865. See Birt, Benedictine Pioneers, Vol.II, pp.288-95, for a fuller description of the fire incorporating newspaper reports and other eyewitness accounts. No-one at the time thought that the fire was anything but accidental, although an unsuccessful attempt had been made to burn the Cathedral three years earlier (F.J., 28 May 1862).
moved. Public response was immediate and overwhelming. 'Without yielded any of our predilections for the Protestant religion we recognise in this misfortune a case for unusual sympathy and friendly aid', wrote the Rev. John West, Congregational minister and editor of the Sydney Morning Herald.¹

We should expect from our R.C. fellow citizens a similar sentiment and an equal generosity. It is not in such cases the aid of any particular form of faith that neighbourly help would propose, but to testify to the common obligations of all around us in the day of adversity.

West concluded with praise of Archbishop Polding whose residence in the colony has been thirty years, and whose relations with the public at large have been to win for him a profound respect... When we see what power belongs to his office - what pernicious influence it would be possible to exercise if its foundations were guided by a furious bitter spirit, we may deem the colony fortunate that so large a proportion of the people they had, had before them in the power they were most disposed to reverence an example of so much charity and moderation.

Similar sentiments were frequently spoken during the week following the fire.

Catholics immediately organised an appeal for funds to build a new Cathedral.² A large meeting of prominent non-Catholic citizens resolved to assist their appeal,³ which was formally launched at an impressive public meeting a week after the disaster. The meeting launching the appeal was chaired by Polding and attended by the Governor, Sir John Young; the

¹S.M.H., 1 July 1865. For details on West see John Fairfax and Sons Ltd., A Century of Journalism, The Sydney Morning Herald and its Record of Australian life (Sydney, 1931), pp. 168-73. West was also an historian of some skill and author of A History of Tasmania, 2 Vols. (Launceston, 1852). See G. Nadel, Australia's Colonial Culture (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1957), p.254, for West's 1852 opinion that the general spirit of religious tolerance and refusal to exacerbate denominational differences was precisely due to those differences being merely memories of the old country.
²S.M.H., 1 July 1865.
³S.M.H., 6 July 1865.
Premier, Charles Cowper; the Mayor; and most of the colony's leading citizens.

The main speaker at the meeting was the Governor. In a speech which was to be loudly praised by other speakers at the meeting and which was to win the everlasting gratitude of Catholics and the enmity of a few Protestants, he took up the religious question at the very beginning. After indicating that he attended the meeting in his official capacity as Governor, he observed that doubts had been expressed as to the propriety of his course, and that opinions had been given that more stress should be laid on differences of religion. He went on:

I do not entertain these doubts, nor should I give way to them if the occasion were one of less special emergency than the present. And I am happy to think that the testimony of my conscience in this particular is borne out by the long array of names of Protestant gentlemen, the foremost in position and intelligence of N.S.W., who signified their intention of being present at this meeting and of furthering its objects by their influence and assistance....Speaking generally and without any wish to trench upon religious topics, I hold that this meeting is one not merely of Roman Catholics, but that it may be considered as consisting of representatives of the whole community, who came forward to offer sympathy to fellow citizens, from whom they differ on some points, but with whom they unite in this - that they worship the same merciful Creator on earth, and humbly hope, when time shall be no more and differences done away with, in God's good time to enjoy together the tranquility and happiness of heaven.

The last half of that passage contained a view of religion widely accepted in the colony. Rigorous dogmatists were of course appalled by it; but most intelligent believers recognised it as the only possible premises on which to base their public actions, even if they did not adopt it as fully sufficient.

The Governor continued with a more specific account of his reasons for attending. First of all he attended to show his respect for Polding personally: 'for the blameless yet energetic manner in which Your Grace has discharged the
functions appertaining to your office for a long series of years'. Next, he attended because he wished to show sympathy towards the Catholics of the colony, 'whom I believe to be as faithful, as intelligent, and as industrious a class of the community as any that exists'. He went on to observe that charity required more than the mere sympathy of empty phrases and that it must be backed up with alms. He then turned to his final reason for attending:

...because I desire to indicate through my adhesion to that milder policy of complete toleration which has obtained in the councils of the British Empire during the last thirty-five years, and at the same time to express my earnest hope that no misguided zeal on either side will import into these new countries their furious factions and blind animosities which surviving the causes in which they took rise, and interests they were first intended to serve, still continue to distract and disgrace parts of Ireland. When Governor Macquarie laid the first foundation-stone of the first Cathedral in 1821, he established a happy precedent, inviting to peace and union, which I am well pleased to follow in spirit and intention.

He went on to regret that the Empire could not have pursued this policy of toleration two hundred years earlier, but remarked that the history of those two hundred years presented a lesson to the present day and generation. He concluded with another clear statement of the liberals' hopes:

The present is our inheritance. Let us take care we use it wisely and carefully, and that if our fathers sowed the wind and reaped the whirlwind, we do not leave the sad legacy to our descendants. Let us shun the false lights that led them astray, the false lights of intolerance and persecution. In this country all churches are equal and all men are free.

Other speakers echoed Young's sentiments. Only James Martin, the leader of the Opposition injected a note slightly offensive to Catholics.

For himself he believed that members of the Roman Catholic persuasion should be controlled and guided by their religious teachers. They composed the poor portion of the population and had not the same chance of becoming orderly and good citizens as many others had, and therefore may need directors more than others.
These remarks gave extra point to his praise of Polding:

...it was within his [Martin's] knowledge that he [Polding] had restrained what would have become the intemperate zeal of those over whom he presided. Had it not been for him, political distinctions would on many occasions have changed into religious differences. It was to the venerable gentleman who now presided...that they were indebted for the general peace and tranquility which for the last thirty years had characterized the proceedings of the colony.

Martin was himself the son of Irish-Catholic immigrants (he had been a year old when they emigrated in 1821), and his remarks were perhaps more revealing of his own motives for disengaging himself from Catholicism as he achieved public prominence, than for their content of social truth. Nevertheless such sentiments were shared by a significant proportion of the non-Catholic population.¹

Yet the old tradition of denominational hostility, particularly between Protestants and Catholics, died hard, and Protestant generosity was not without its Protestant critics. Such criticism came from two sources: from Protestants who sympathised with the Catholics' distress but nevertheless thought it wrong to aid a rival denomination, and from fundamentalist, or evangelical Protestants, who believed that the essential evil and perfidy of Catholicism made such toleration not only wrong but a danger to the body politic. Anglican criticism was mainly of the first kind, although continuing resentment of its unprivileged situation added an element of bitter intransigence.

It was an unfortunate coincidence but during the week before the St Mary's fire, the Anglicans announced their intention of launching an appeal for funds to complete their Cathedral, St Andrew's, which had already been 45 years under construction. At the meeting to launch that appeal, held a few days after the St Mary's fire, Bishop Barker, who had

¹S.M.H., 7 July 1865. Fuller accounts of the meeting than presented here can be found in Birt, op.cit., Vol.II, pp.296–309 and Moran, The Catholic Church in Australasia, pp.467–74.
succeeded Broughton to the task of defending what remained of Anglican privilege and influence in the colony, declared that

he could not regard it as consistent with the principles of a reformed church that any members of the Church of England should contribute towards the erection or the re-edification of a place of worship belonging to the Church of Rome - He had no wish to evoke any manifestation of feeling, but he felt it was due to himself and for the edification of his conscience that he should make this statement.¹

The Methodist paper, the Christian Advocate and Wesleyan Record echoed his sentiments.²

John West, the editor of the Herald understood the dilemma of rigorous Protestants and tried to explain it to those who would accuse them of uncharitableness. In an editorial published a week after the fire he wrote:

There are on both sides of the line by which the great section of the Christian professions are divided, persons who could not under any circumstances give money which might directly or indirectly be made subservient to a religion not their own. Logic is with them, but the instincts of the heart against them.

Earlier in the editorial he had attempted to indicate to Protestants how their distrust of Popery was not the most appropriate principle for action, and without contradicting the reasons for this distrust argued that:

The fullness of religious toleration demand that we not only suffer those who recognise our share in the liberties they claim but that we extend the principle without exacting anything but a practical and external respect for the common right of mankind. To hold old opinions or to put an extreme construction upon ancient formulas, in a country where they have no possible force, and where probably, to nine-tenths they are unknown, is but to imitate what we condemn.³

¹ S.M.H., 5 July 1865.
² C.A.W.R., 10 August 1865.
³ S.M.H., 8 July 1865.
The editorial had some effect, for at least one prominent citizen, Thomas Holt, a Congregationalist, later gave 50 to the fund, explaining that a reading of that leading article had 'led him to feel that he could gratify his own feelings without offending his conviction of right'.

Some Protestants remained unimpressed. In a long letter, inserted in the Herald as an advertisement, the Rev. John McGibbon, a Presbyterian minister, invoked the theory of the Protestant Constitution to criticise Governor Young for attending the Catholics' meeting and for attempting to belittle the differences between Protestants and Catholics:

The Queen is a Protestant sovereign. Her throne is built on protest against the religion of Rome. Her right to sit on the throne depends on her maintaining that protest against Rome....It is needless, therefore, to speak about 'old formulas' and 'sectarian prejudices' as objectionable things; for those old formulas and sectarian prejudices are just the basis on which our throne rests, our Queen reigns, our Governor rules, and our people are secure in our Protestant liberty....every privilege which we enjoy, every right that we value, every institution that we venerate depends upon the existence and maintenance of 'religious differences'.

He returned to these differences in a more detailed fashion a little later, and was especially critical of the Governor's claim that the differences between Catholics and Protestants were of 'small moment':

I am sure that no Catholic at the meeting, nor one intelligent Protestant in the country will assent to this...they are differences of truth and error, they cannot be reconciled, they must contend until one or the other is destroyed. The Catholic church unchurches every other church. This is a principle with her that never sleeps. There is no salvation out of her pale. All unless Catholics are in mortal sin, damnable error...all these are principles at present in force, as really and truly as in the days of old; only at present it is impossible to give them force and development as in the days of old.

\(^1\)Holt's letter accompanying his donation, together with a similar one from T.S. Mort, was published in the Freeman's Journal, 2 September 1865.
And on the other hand, Protestants (except the formal and the lukewarm) regard the Catholic church as so corrupt and degenerate as to long since ceased to be a church of Christ. They consider Catholic worship to be idolatrous worship; they consider the doctrine which the priest teaches to be another gospel but the gospel of Christ; and they consider the people to be deluded and deceived and walking in the ways which lead down to death.¹

Thus for Protestant sectarians like McGibbon the most fundamental fact about society was that it was divided between Catholics and Protestants.

McGibbon's letter attracted little immediate attention, but several Presbyterians opened a shilling subscription list to reimburse his publishing costs. They collected £12.³ During the following weeks an attempt was made to rally the Protestant clergy to McGibbon's cause. A month after the publication of his letter 54 clergymen requested that he republish it to further extend its beneficial influence. This was less than one-fifth of the 306 Protestant clergymen in the colony and indicated the limited extent of support for such sectarian arguments.⁴ In the Herald, John West assailed

¹ S.M.H., 11 July 1865. Inserting letters or paid advertisements was often used by disputatious churchmen and minor politicians to ensure publication of their views whenever they felt that the newspaper concerned could not be trusted to insert the communication as a letter.
² See S.M.H., 13 July 1865, for a rebuttal by a prominent Catholic, Charles St Julian, chief law reporter for the Herald and Mayor of Marrickville; S.M.H., 19 July 1865 for a rebuttal of St Julian by an Anglican clergyman, the Rev. Sowerby of Goulburn.
³ F.J., 22 July 1865.
⁴ McGibbon republished his letter, together with the requisition and other associated correspondence in the Herald of 21 August 1865. The date was deliberately chosen for that was the edition prepared for the monthly mail to England. A breakdown into denominations of McGibbon's supporters is interesting. Five were Church of England (out of 134 in the colony); five were Wesleyan (64); seven were Primitive Methodist (11); seven were Congregationalist (18); four were Baptist (16); and 26 were Presbyterian (63). Of the latter, four (out of seven) were Free Presbyterian and 15 (out of 21) were from the General Synod (formed a year previously from...
McGibbon and his supporters, accusing them of 'insane bigotry' and warning that their actions could easily provoke Irish retribution.¹ A more positive indication of the limited appeal of such arguments as McGibbon's was given by the £20,000 that was contributed towards the new Cathedral within five months of the fire.²

A few months after the St Mary's fire Polding departed for Rome and England. When he returned almost two years later he found a considerable change had occurred in the relations between Catholics and the rest of the community. The spirit of toleration that had been so successfully demonstrated following the St Mary's fire seemed to have disappeared. 'You cannot imagine how changed the country is', he wrote to his friend and confident, Abbott Gregory in Rome, 'all spirit seems gone, all depressed under tyranny and despotism'.³ The 'tyranny and despotism' was the government of Martin and Parkes; in particular the education act

Footnote continued from previous page:

the majority of the Free Presbyterians and Lang's small Synod of N.S.W.). These were voluntaryist and generally the most sectarian section of the Presbyterian Church. Only eight of the 28 members of the Synod of Australia (of which he was a member) supported McGibbon. The numbers in brackets are the number of ministers of that particular denomination in the colony according to the Statistical Register of N.S.W. for 1865 (p.119). It is possible that some ministers of the C. of E. and Wesleyan denominations agreed with McGibbon but were loath to participate in such displays of inter-denominational solidarity. A large number of those signing the letter were from country districts, suggesting that all but perhaps the most remotely situated clergymen had had time to be contacted and to reply.

¹S.M.H., 28 August 1865.
²F.J., 18 November 1865.
³Polding to Gregory, 23 October 1867, quoted by Birt, Benedictine Pioneers, p.332.
introduced by Parkes in September 1866. Polding blamed Parkes, whom he accused of using anti-Catholicism to obtain the passage of the education act. He also blamed some of the Irish, including certain of the clergy, for providing Parkes with such an opportunity. 1 Polding was only half right in his attribution of blame, but he was correct in his overall outline. There had been a serious deterioration in the relationship between Catholics and the rest of the community. That deterioration was partly the consequence of colonial Irish assertiveness coinciding with a renewed outbreak of revolutionary plotting and violence in Ireland. It was also the consequence, not of Parkes's anti-Catholicism, but of misguided and extravagant Catholic criticism of the 1866 Public Schools Act.

* * * * *

The growth of sectarianism in New South Wales was largely a by-product of Irish history. Assertive Irish nationalism, spread by O'Connell among the Irish middle class was carried by them to the colonies, where its presence raised the spectre of an Irish threat to the good order of society. Ultramontanism, that peculiar combination of dogmatism and paranoia was a European phenomenon, but it flourished uniquely in Ireland, where it combined with a low-key clerical Irish nationalism. It was conveyed to Australia by Irish prelates and via Irish example, and added to non-Catholic fears of Irish-Catholics divisiveness, especially by its claims for clerical control over the education of Catholic children.

1Ibid., pp.330-2.
The single most important influence on early nineteenth century Ireland was Daniel O'Connell. By his campaign for Catholic emancipation O'Connell gave to the middle class townsmen (the lawyers, the clerks, the shopkeepers and tradesmen) and better off farmers, a sense of national identity and an experience of political power. ¹ His political style, which mixed vulgarity and crude anti-Englishness with invocations of a glorious Irish past appealed to their frustrations and laid the foundations for the more literary and coherent nationalism of Young Ireland/the Gaelic revival. ²

The Catholic emancipation campaign also brought the clergy into Irish politics in a decisive fashion, and linked the church with nationalism, though in a complex manner. The clergy gave to O'Connell's movements, first for emancipation and later for repeal, a revivalist dimension, that more than matched the Presbyterian revival in Ulster. ³ It increased the influence of the Catholic hierarchy in Irish politics and

---

¹ Contrary to the widespread view, O'Connell had little appeal to the peasantry of Ireland, who were only slowly to be incorporated into a national political community. See Thomas N. Brown, 'Nationalism and the Irish Peasant, 1800-1848', Review of Politics, Vol.15, No.4 (October 1953), pp.403-45, especially p.435. There has been no adequate study of O'Connell and his impact on early nineteenth century Ireland. Most studies, such as James A. Reynolds, The Catholic Emancipation Crisis in Ireland, 1823-1829 (New Haven, Connecticut, 1954), are too romantic about the peasantry and exaggerate O'Connell's impact.

² See Sean O'Faolain, King of the Beggars (New York, 1958), for a somewhat censorious but perceptive account of O'Connell's vulgarity.

³ The major revival in Ulster was in 1859, but the rise to prominence in the 1820s of the evangelical Henry Cooke was accompanied by a considerable revival that destroyed that spirit of toleration that had led large numbers of Ulster Presbyterians to support the United Irishmen. See Andrew Boyd, Holy War in Belfast (Tralee, Co. Kerry, 1969), pp.5-8; Donald H. Akenson, The Irish Education Experiment (London, 1970), pp.161-4. See also J. Edwin Orr, The Light of the Nations (Exeter, 1965), pp.126-7.
intensified the authority of the individual clergyman over his parishioners.¹

Although the Catholic clergy in nineteenth century Ireland were rarely united, by the 1860s they did agree on one thing: that the Church, meaning the clergy, must have sole control over education. This meant the virtual death of the Irish national school system as it was originally conceived. Begun in 1832 by a reforming Whig administration the Irish national school system embodied the views of a large body of educated opinion. It was hoped that national schools would spread education to the mass of Irish children, and, by educating children of every faith in the same school in what was common to their different faiths, lessen the inter-denominational bitterness that was the bane of Irish life. In its early years the national system was supported wholeheartedly by the majority of the Catholic hierarchy and by a few liberals among the Presbyterians and Anglicans. It largely achieved its first aim, but Presbyterian intransigence and growing opposition from the Catholic hierarchy dashed whatever hopes it might have had of achieving the second. Clerical pressure and the geographical separation of denominations meant that by the end of the 1860s national schools were, in effect, denominational schools.²

The changed opinion of the Catholic hierarchy was a result of the deaths of the supporters of national schools, such as Murray of Dublin and 'J.K.L.' Doyle, and their

¹ W.E.H. Lecky, Leaders of Public Opinion in Ireland (London [2 Vols, 2nd revised edition], 1912), Vol.II, is very perceptive about O'Connell, and the importance of his role in introducing the clergy into nationalist politics. Together they began to transform the whole social structure of Ireland. He also indicates the revivalist dimensions of some of the great meetings associated with the Repeal campaign: people marching for days to the chosen spot led by their priest; the huge crowd gathered on the morning of the meeting with priests scattered throughout it saying mass; O'Connell on the platform, surrounded by priests and henchmen, with the former predominating (pp.237-8).

² Akenson, op.cit., passim, gives the only non-partisan account of the Irish national school system.
replacement by firm opponents. All the younger bishops and most of the clergy firmly opposed the original conception of national education. Their opposition had two sources. Some opposition, like that of Archbishop McHale of Tuam, was largely nationalist in inspiration (as were O'Connell's objections). Anything foisted on Ireland by an English administration was, ipso facto, bad. Other opposition, like that of Cardinal Cullen, was inspired by a belief that the Church's mission required clerical control of the education of Catholic children. Such a view was European or Roman, rather than Irish in origin, but was readily adapted to Irish conditions. Irish clergymen and bishops, in the middle and late nineteenth century were both consciously Irish and consciously Roman Catholics. The proportions varied from individual to individual and led to frequent conflict, but such conflict was largely circumstantial and did not destroy the essential unity between the dual identities. Education was one issue over which there was no conflict.

Other aspects of mid-late-nineteenth century European Catholicism mixed congenially with Irish Catholicism post-O'Connell. Its authoritarian, rigidly hierarchical ecclesiology, centring the church on the Pope and placing the clergy far above the laity was particularly agreeable to the Irish clergy, as were some, but by no means all, of its denunciations of nineteenth century liberalism. Irish and European Catholic leaders had this in common: they saw themselves leading an embattled, persecuted institution. Many Irish and colonial bishops were partly educated in Rome, which strengthened that aspect of their dual identity. ¹

European Catholicism had been deeply affected by the French Revolution. It was heavily involved in attempts to restore pre-revolutionary Europe. This involved the restoration of the close relationship between church and

state in Catholic countries like France, and the return to the Pope of his Italian states. It was accompanied by a revival of interest in religion and an idealisation of medieval Catholicism. It generated some far fetched conspiracy theories, blaming the French Revolution on certain secret societies, such as the masons. A small liberal group of Catholics, mainly in France, opposed the restoration, especially its gallicanism. They proclaimed that there was much of value in the liberal sentiments which had inspired the French Revolution, and recommended that the church free itself from the fetters of the state, embrace these principles, and provide Europe with the moral leadership that could not come from the reactionary restoration governments. They emphasised the unity of the Church and as a unifying principle stressed the spiritual authority of the Papacy. One consequence of their commitment to the separation of church and state was a belief that the church should control popular education.¹

They were repudiated by church authorities, but their concept of the Church independent of the state and centred on the Papacy was taken up by others of less liberal bent who marred it with the conspiracy theorising, middle ages idealising views of restoration Catholicism. They forged a powerful new ideology albeit with an old name: ultramontanism. Ultramontanism received its fullest formulation in the journals L'Universe (edited by Louis Veuillot in France) and Civiltà Cattolica (edited by Jesuits in Rome), but it exercised a powerful influence on papal thinking and inspired such documents as the Syllabus of Errors issued in 1864.

Like liberal Catholicism, ultramontanism proposed the necessity of Church control over education. It, however, viewed the alternatives as inspired by the same satanic liberalism that produced the French Revolution. Ultramontanism was utterly and at times absurdly, opposed to

¹This was not a simple restatement of traditional practice, for the concept of popular education was a recent one, and had in fact been taken as the state's responsibility by its originators.
European liberalism. Under its influence Catholicism became more authoritarian and obscurantist. Ultramontanism enabled the papacy to survive the destruction of its temporal power, but liberals, and that loose term could be taken to include most educated Englishmen, were disturbed by the change in Catholicism. In the colonies, non-Catholic liberals were similarly surprised at changes in Catholic views.

In 1833, following the final dissolution of the short lived Church and Schools Corporation, Governor Bourke had proposed to the Colonial Office that government aid should be given to 'the three grand divisions of Christians, indifferently...and (to) schools...regulated after the manner of the Irish schools'. His first proposal became the 'Aid

1 Significantly ultramontanism appealed strongly in those areas where the Church had no connection with the state: America, Great Britain and her colonies.

2 The writing of even a reasonably adequate history of nineteenth century Catholicism has yet to be done. Most of what has been written is from a papal centred point of view and accepts the claims of papal apologists that the only changes in nineteenth century Europe took place outside the Church or, at least, outside the Papacy. Some works, such as A.R. Vidler, A Variety of Catholic Modernists (Cambridge, 1967) and L.C. Bouyer, or, The Decomposition of Catholicism (Chicago, 1969) acknowledge the change, and the increased authoritarianism of Catholicism in the nineteenth century, but only skirt around the edges. Austin Gough, 'The French Catholic Hierarchy and Temporal Power', Historical Studies, Vol.II, No.42 (April, 1964), pp.178-91, and his review article of Henry Mayer, ed., 'Catholics and Free Society' in Historical Studies, Vol.10, No.39 (March 1961), pp.370-8, are also very useful from this point of view, as is his debate with some twentieth century Australian liberal Catholics in their journal Prospect, Vol.6, Nos.1, 2 and 4, 1963. In more detail, Vidler's study of Lammenais, Prophecy and Papacy (London, 1954) is useful on liberal Catholicism and restoration Catholicism. P.N. Stearns, 'The Nature of the Avenir Movement', American Historical Review, Vol.LXV, No.4 (July 1960), pp.837-47, is useful as a corrective of some of Vidler's emphases. On ultramontanism see Gough, 'French Catholic Hierarchy', op.cit., and Prospect, Vol.6, No.2. Also W. Gurian, 'Louis Veuillot', Catholic Historical Review, Vol.XXXVI, No.4 (June 1951), pp.385-414.

to Public Worship Act' of 1836, but the second proposal was shelved in the face of strong opposition from Anglicans and non-conformists. The colony's Catholic clergymen, including Bishop Polding, who arrived in 1835, were among its strongest supporters. Their support was undoubtedly influenced by the Irish hierarchy's approval of the scheme.

As the liberal influence in the colony grew so did support for the Irish national scheme. The existing system of education, whereby the government assisted schools by an amount equal to that collected in fees was notoriously inefficient. Successive governors sought to reduce the inefficiency by introducing some order and centralisation into educational organisation. Observing that the ostensible objection of the Protestant denominations to the Irish national system was that it aided popery, Governor Gipps attempted in 1839 to introduce the British and foreign school system, but was thwarted by continuing Anglican opposition. He had intended giving Catholics a separate grant for their schools. In 1843 Governor Fitzroy brought a semblance of order to the educational provisions by establishing two boards: a Denominational Board which would administer the previously existing church schools, and a National Board, which was to establish and administer a system of schools based on the Irish example. Fitzroy's plan was at best a compromise, but indicated the growing support for national schools.

Strongest opposition to national schools still came from the Anglican Church, but by 1848, Catholic clergy had come to oppose them, and demand, like the Anglicans, a purely denominational system. Some Catholics had opposed Gipps'

---

1839 scheme because they feared that if a purely Protestant system of common schools worked successfully, separate grants for Catholic schools might be seen as a luxury and withdrawn. More fundamental opposition to the idea of common schools was offered by Archbishop Polding before a select committee on education initiated by Robert Lowe in 1844. As Lowe had intended, the committee found existing educational provisions abysmal and recommended the immediate establishment of the Irish system of education. In his evidence Polding claimed that the Irish system, although possibly suited to Ireland, was inadequate for the colony where the schoolmaster, in the absence of other influences, had an important role to play in the moral education of the child. He went on to argue that from the Catholic point of view the only suitable system of education was a denominational one. Adopting a point of view that was to be frequently advocated, he argued that religious instruction and practices must be closely interwoven with ordinary instruction: 'In our schools, every hour, when the

---

1 John Barrett, That Better Country (Melbourne, 1966), pp.103-4. This episode provides an interesting example of how Catholic apologists had been able successfully to distort history to present themselves as a persecuted minority. In his Autobiography (London, 1891), p.167, W.B. Ullathorne, the Catholic Vicar-General at the time, described how he and Bishop Polding protested against Gipps' proposals, which he described as forcing Catholics to participate in the British and foreign system. It is clear from Gipps' despatch to Normanby that this was not the case. Ullathorne describes Gipps as listening to their objections and replying that he must adhere to the strongest party, which they were not. Ullathorne recounts that they determined to show their strength in a public demonstration. This they did by staging a huge procession at the opening of St Patrick's Church. What Ullathorne does not indicate was that this took place a year after Gipps had revealed his education plans. Most historians have happily followed Ullathorne's erroneous account. See Austin, op.cit., pp.77; O'Farrell, The Catholic Church in Australia, pp.50-1; T.L. Sutter, Hierarchy and Democracy in Australia: 1788-1810 (Melbourne, 1965), p.39.

2 For details of Lowe's role in this committee, see Ruth Knight, Illiberal Liberal (Melbourne, 1966), pp.87-92.
clock strikes, the children cease from their work and raise their minds to Almighty God.  

Polding's strong commitment to denominational schools seems to date from his 1841-43 visit to Rome, England and Ireland. In Ireland he could not have avoided encountering the growing episcopal opposition to the national schools.  

At the same time the positive ideas of Catholic educational reformers like Edmund Rice, the founder of the Christian Brothers, must have impressed him. Rice firmly opposed national schools, and Polding's words to the 1844 committee echo Rice's when, in 1836, he withdrew his schools from the national system.  

When Polding returned three Christian

1 A.G. Austin, ed., Select Documents in Australian Education (Melbourne, 1963), pp.82-3, has a much edited version of Polding's evidence.

2 This had been the subject of an ambiguous papal rescript in 1841. The rescript appeared uncommitted on the matter, leaving the question of whether or not the national system should be co-operated with up to the judgment of each bishop, but in its summary of the arguments and in the guidelines it laid down it made it clear that any approval of the system was purely on the grounds of expediency, and that it would only be happy with greater episcopal control over books, teachers and where possible, school houses (to be vested in the bishop and the parish priest). It marked a clear shift away from Murray's earlier wholehearted participation in the system. See Akenson, op.cit., p.206-14, for an account of the controversy. Austin, op.cit., pp.80-1, has an edited copy of the rescript.

3 J.D. Fitzpatrick, Edmund Rice (Dublin, 1945), pp.250-1; Akenson, op.cit., p.204. Rice had been persuaded by Archbishop Murray to include some of his schools in the national system, but after two years he withdrew them, arguing that the separation of specifically denominational religious practices, and the exclusion of religious paraphernalia (pious paintings, statues, etc.) from the schoolroom was not compatible with Christian education. This view of education was a product of the romanticism associated with Restoration Catholicism. It wished to see the rituals of the Church in intimate connection with the everyday pattern of life (e.g., the peasants in the field looking up from their work with a prayer on their lips as the church bells ring out the hour). Proponents of this view, such as Rice, sought after the celibate communal life of monks. It was hardly surprising that such a view of education should appeal to Polding, full of dreams of the glories of the Benedictine past.
brothers accompanied him.\textsuperscript{1} Indication of the element of obscurantism that had entered Polding's views were given by his comments on the composition of the select committee. Writing to his friend Fr Hestonstall in Rome he remarked that not one member understood what education really was. Two prominent lay Catholics, Therry and Plunkett, each with wide experience of education matters in Ireland, were members of the committee.\textsuperscript{2}

It was not until the sixties however that Catholic opposition to national schools attracted serious attention. During the 1840s and 1850s it was Anglican objections that drew the ire of educational reformers. The movement for educational reform continued to gather strength during those years. Early in its life the National Board recruited some very able civil servants, such as William Wilkins and G.W. Rusden, and their reports, particularly that drawn up to assist the 1854 select committee on education systematically criticised the existing denominational schools.\textsuperscript{3} Their reports provided ammunition for less constrained publicists like Henry Parkes in his Empire and the Catholic W.A. Duncan. It was clear that the dual system which had existed since 1848 was extremely inefficient, particularly the Denominational Board, which was subsidising several schools in districts where one would have done just as well. That one school would have to be suited to all denominations: thus the Irish system.

Numerous attempts were made during the first ten years of self government to reform education, but bad drafting and

\begin{footnotes}
\item[3] Denominational schools, this report claimed, were denominational in name only: large numbers of children from other denominations attended them; general educational standards were appalling; and religious instruction, when it was given, was very poor in quality. See A. Barcan, 'Opinion Policy and Practice in N.S.W. Education, 1833-1880' (Ph.D., A.N.U., 1962), p.221; Austin, Australian Education, pp.47-56; C. Turney, 'William Wilkins, Australia's Ray Shuttleworth', Turney, ed., op.cit., pp.193-235.
\end{footnotes}
the confused state of politics guaranteed the failure of most. The most significant attempt was made by Charles Cowper in 1863. In 1862 he had introduced a 'Bill to Promote Elementary Education' that was largely based on an act passed in Victoria earlier that year. It established a single Board of Commissioners to administer education, and provided for both national and denominational schools to be transferred to the Board. Denominational schools were to be assisted only if they had an average attendance of 40 or more pupils and, if within two miles of a national school, the combined attendance of the two had to exceed 140. All schools were to be called public schools and no mention was made of specific periods for religious instruction. Because of problems associated with the survival of the Government the Bill did not receive a second reading. Cowper introduced a very similar bill a year later. It passed a second reading by a

1 To mention only those attempts made in 1856-59. Two plans for educational reform were considered by the first ministry under responsible government, that of S.A. Donaldson, which lasted three months. Charles Cowper's succeeding ministry lasted only one month; not sufficient time for him to bring in a bill he was considering. Later in 1856 Thomas Holt introduced several resolutions, which attempted to impart greater unity to the system by establishing a common inspectorate for denominational and national schools, and assisting schools according to their results, as assessed by the inspectors. In 1857 the Colonial Secretary, Henry Parker, prepared a bill substituting a single board for the existing two, but his government fell before its introduction. In 1858, a private member bill to establish a single education board, presided over by a minister was defeated. In 1859 Charles Cowper introduced a bill to establish what was known as the Privy Council system of education. This was based on the English system, and Cowper envisaged the Executive Council, or a committee of it, overseeing education as the Privy Council did in England. Many suspected this as a plot to revert to solely denominational education (which Cowper, the son and brother of Anglican clergymen was suspected of favouring), and it was defeated. See Barcan, op.cit., pp.230-3; K.J. Cable, 'The Church of England in New South Wales and its Policy towards education prior to 1880' (M.A., Sydney University), p.51.

2 U. Corrigan, Catholic Education in New South Wales (Sydney, 1930), p.58; Empire, 29 March 1862.
large majority and was debated in committee, but the Government fell before it received a third reading. In the course of the debate a number of ideas, later to be adopted, but too radical then, were put forward: in particular, an education ministry and free and compulsory education. It was not a well drafted bill, but, despite considerable denominational opposition outside the House, its passage through the Assembly would have been certain. Two other private members' bills to reform education were introduced during the next two years, but without success.

In September 1866 Henry Parkes introduced his Public Schools Bill. This differed from earlier legislative attempts to reform education in that it was carefully drafted. Like Cowper's bill it sought to establish a single educational authority, to be called the Council of Education, and placed restrictions on the further growth of denominational schools. They were, however, to retain their title, while the national schools were to be called public schools. The Bill was less radical than Cowper's. It specifically guaranteed the continued existence of denominational schools and set aside up to one hour a day in public schools to be used for dogmatic religious instruction. Like the Irish national schools, whose text books they were to use, public schools were to teach the common tenets of Christianity in the course of ordinary instruction. Parkes recognised that there were still many colonists who favoured denominational schools, although he hoped that in time that favour would diminish, and they could be cut free from the state. What his bill did was to recognise denominational schools as a luxury; to be assisted by the state, but only after adequate secular education had been provided for all children. Secular in this case did not

---

1 Empire, 2, 25 July, 13, 17 August 1863; V & P (LA NSW), 1863-4 (1) 257, 265.
mean 'anti-' or 'non-religious', but merely 'non-denominational' or 'non-sectarian'.

In speaking to his bill Parkes adduced two main arguments in its favour. He pointed to the many large numbers of children not receiving education — far greater than in some European countries — and listed 26 places in the colony where there were two or more schools serving less than 100 pupils, with a consequent waste of resources, which he estimated at £7,000 per annum. He described the opposition to his bill as coming exclusively from the clergy of the Anglican and Catholic churches: the high proportion of Anglican and Catholic children in already existing national schools showed that most of the laity did not share their clergy's objections.

Parkes's identification of the sources of opposition to the Public Schools Bill was largely correct. Apart from the Anglicans, other Protestant denominations supported the Bill. Although approximately 10,000 Anglicans signed petitions opposing the Bill, but once Parkes made it clear that denominational schools would still be supported, and that religion was not to be excluded from public schools, much of

---

1 He claimed that there were nearly twice as many children under 14 not receiving education as were. This was something of an exaggeration, as he included in his calculations all children under 14, including infants. However, the figures for children of school age not receiving education were quite impressive.

2 Empire, 13 September 1866. Griffiths, op.cit., pp.115-20 has most of the speech. He also has the text of the Act, pp.120-4.


4 Cable, op.cit., p.85, says only 4,000 Anglicans signed petitions. This seems to be the number of signatures on petitions specifically described as Anglican. However, many more petitions, similarly worded, but not as described, were clearly Anglican. See V & P (LA NSW), 1866 (2) 715-45 and Journal (LC NSW), 1866 (2) various pages.
that opposition disappeared.¹ What remained was largely protest at the further reduction of the Church of England's influence in the colony. This left the Catholic clergy and their lay spokesmen as the main opponents of the Bill.

Official Catholic opposition to anything but a purely denominational system of education had been hardening since Polding's first enunciation of it in 1844. Opposition was offered to Cowper's 1859 adaptation of the Privy Council system on the grounds that the Executive Council, which changed according to the government of the day, could not be guaranteed to represent Catholic interests.² At the same time a petition from the clergy spelt out the conditions under which they would accept a unified system of education. For its financial assistance they were prepared to allow the government the right to examine teachers and schools, but they wished to obtain for themselves the right to hire and fire teachers and inspectors and determine the curricula.³ In a pastoral letter Polding explained the reasons for these demands, which he admitted seemed 'illiberal...and exhorbitant'. He explained that from the Catholic point of view education included the 'full development of religious training' and that this could only be achieved by incorporating pious practices into the hour by hour life of the school. He attacked what he called the 'mechanistic assumptions' of the national system, which allowed only one set hour a day for dogmatic religious instruction (the only true religious instruction as far as he was concerned). Such arguments could only have appeared high flowing and theoretical in the colonial context, where the problem was one of providing any education at all. Most colonists saw education as serving psychological and sociological ends; as

¹ Davis, op.cit., pp.144, 146.
² S.M.H., 18 October 1859; Corrigan, op.cit., p.49. Catholics were to speak in high praise of the Privy Council system in the late 1860s, and must have regretted their earlier opposition.
³ Ibid., p.50.
developing a child's abilities and contributing to social harmony. Polding saw it as serving the Church's purpose in a struggle between good and evil. Invading all his arguments was the assumption that the nineteenth century world was hostile to religion, particularly to Catholicism. The assumption central to the national system - that there was a set of beliefs common to all Christian denominations - Polding saw as one of the characteristic evils of the age: 'an attempt to substitute a scheme of benevolence for the Gospel of Christ'.

One of the tasks facing Polding was to persuade the laity to adopt their clergy's position. Leading laity like Duncan, Edward Butler and W.B. Dalley prominently supported national schools, and the debate on Cowper's 1863 Bill demonstrated that other Catholic political figures such as Joseph Leary and Joseph Harpur did also. Support seemed strongest among the native born Catholics. The better-off of more recent Irish immigrants tended to remember the admonitions of O'Connell and other popular bishops like McHale against national schools and supported the clergy.

The Irish bishops' denunciations of national schools were invariably couched in language far more extravagant than Polding's. In Melbourne Bishop Goold captured this spirit of righteousness and paranoia in denouncing the attempt by the Heales government to introduce a national education system:

The present attempt to meddle with these most sacred concerns of our church have been as usual [my emphasis] unprovoked and uncalled for, and what aggravates the insult it brings with it is that it originated with persons strangers to us in all matters of religious faith, and consequently totally unqualified to prepare a system of education that could be acceptable to us.

He concluded by imputing anti-Catholic and anti-religious

---

1O'Farrell, Documents in Australian Catholic History, Vol.1, pp.205-11, has a slightly edited text of this pastoral.
motives to the supporters of national education. ¹

This more aggressive Irishness became more evident in colonial Catholic denunciations of national education during the 1860s. The 1862 pastoral issued by the Australian bishops who had been meeting in Melbourne mixed talk of 'attempts... to wrest from us our liberty of conscience' and of 'persecuting sectarian' with Polding's milder criticism of the 'mechanistic' assumptions of the national system. ² Significantly, it concluded with a copy of the resolutions from the 1859 pastoral of the Irish bishops, which had 'set the blueprint for a decade of agitation' against the national system. ³ In Sydney

¹ O'Farrell, op.cit., pp.211-5 has the text of this pastoral. G.M. Dow, George Higinbotham: Church and State (Melbourne, 1964), pp.62-4, criticises Goold's similarly intransigent position in 1866, with regard to Higinbotham's request for a Catholic representative to sit on the Royal Commission on education which he was establishing. Goold refused to co-operate or compromise with others over education. Dow agrees with Higinbotham's description of the Church's attitude to an issue which concerned all citizens as 'anti-social', and comments: 'In defending its principles the church correctly enough sought the fair minded sympathy of others, but it self righteously failed to accord to those others the same insight into their different principles.'

² F.J., 3 December 1862. It was republished on 20 December. The full text is in Moran, op.cit., pp.770-3, while O'Farrell, op.cit., pp.215-6, has the text of the section dealing with education.

³ In the words of E.R. Norman, The Catholic Church and Ireland in the Age of Revolution 1859-1873 (London, 1965), p.63. Norman, pp.60-6 and Akenson, op.cit., pp.301-4, have accounts of the background and effect of the Irish pastoral. Corrigan, op.cit., p.59, has argued that the Australian bishops moulded their policy around these Irish resolutions. This is not true. There was very little in the Irish resolutions that the bishops had not already demanded. The resolutions were simply appended to give their own views extra authority. It was clear, however, that it was the growing Irish opposition to national education during the fifties, and not Roman attitudes, that was the formative influence on the Australian bishops. Bishop Goold had been in Ireland in 1850 (Birt, op.cit., Vol.II, pp.249-50) and Bishop Quinn of Brisbane had only left Ireland in 1860. Prior to his departure he had been rector of the University School in Dublin (Moran, op.cit., pp.600-6). It is interesting, in the light of recent controversy over the Roman or Irish mould of the Australian
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it was the *Freeman's Journal*, the lay-edited unofficial, organ of the archdiocese, which, in the late fifties and early sixties, put the more extreme Catholic view, and roundly abused Catholics who did not share it. By 1863, in its fulminations against Cowper's education bill it was, in Irish fashion, exhorting Catholics to use the ballot box to further their interest.1

It was known for several months before its introduction that Parkes was preparing a new education bill.2 On 16 July 1866 the Catholic clergy met and decided to send a deputation to Parkes with a list of resolutions which did little more than spell out previously stated demands. They would accept a single system of education if there were Catholics on its administrative body, and episcopal control of inspectorial and teaching staff, and school books.3 Their very least demand was that wherever there were Catholic children they should be assisted to establish a Catholic school. Parkes could not possibly have complied with their requests which would have changed the educational system hardly at all, and would certainly not have made it more economic or efficient.

Having failed to persuade Parkes by reason, the

---

Footnote continued from previous page:

Catholic Church, to note that no mention was made of papal condemnations of mixed education, which had been made since the 1850s. Even after the 1864 *Syllabus of Errors* definitive anathamising of the assumptions that underlay the Irish national system, the Australian bishops continued to quote purely Irish authorities for their objections until Christmas 1867, when Bishop Murray quoted the three clauses of the *Syllabus* (XLV, XLVII, XLVIII) against Catholics who continued to use public schools.

1 *F.J.*, 10 October 1873. Oddly enough the *Freeman's* during this time was edited by a Scots convert, J.K. Heydon, and then by an English born Catholic, William Dolman. For other examples of its style see *F.J.*, 12 October 1859, 12 November 1862. On Heydon, see A.D.B., Vol. I, pp.534-6; for Dolman see Appendix 1c.

2 See for example, *F.J.*, 4 July 1866.

3 *Empire*, 24 July 1866; R. Fogarty, Catholic Education in Australia 1806-1950, 2 Vols (Melbourne, 1959), p.492, has the text of those resolutions.
the Catholic authorities, together with some Anglicans, attempted to overawe Parliament by creating the impression that there was considerable public opposition to the Bill. Petitions poured into the House, and Parkes, the Bill and its supporters were extravagantly denounced at public meetings: 'The perpetrators of the Bill are...typical of the enemies of the Church in this day and age: a fraudulent insolvent, a hoary old libeller and a drunken brawler' declared Fr Keating at one public meeting, while at another Fr Woolfrey declared it 'repulsive, abhorrent and so anti-Christian that it appalled him'. The cry that the Bill was godless and anti-Christian was repeated time and again by Catholics and some Anglicans, both inside and outside the House.

Such vicious misrepresentation provoked an angry reaction. Parkes was annoyed that his bill, which was far kinder to denominational schools than Cowper's had been, should be so much more strongly attacked. He denounced the clergy and reiterated his belief that the laity accepted the Bill. This was something of an exaggeration for all six Catholic members in the Assembly, for example, opposed the Bill. However, there was some point to his claim. Catholic petitions against the Bill contained 8,500 signatures, 11 per cent of the Catholic population over 15. It was 60 per cent of the number of Catholics over 15 attending Church each week, but use of that percentage undermined the clergy's claim that Catholics comprised one third of the colony's population. Although there was little tradition of lay opposition to the clergy within the Catholic Church, some prominent laymen denounced their clergy's position publicly.

1 Presumably Parkes, Land and Buchanan, F.J., 6 October 1866; Empire, 8 October 1866.
2 F.J., 3 November 1866.
3 Egan, Hart, Hurley (Narellan), Cummings, Dignam and Donnelly.
4 These figures are taken, or calculated with appropriate adjustments, from the 1861 Census and the Statistical Register for 1866.
5 For example, Michael Fitzpatrick, the Senior Undersecretary, at Balmain (S.M.H., 27 November 1866) and Charles St Julian, Mayor of Marrickville, at Cook's River (S.M.H., 7 August 1868).
and others were noticeably absent from the protest meetings.

Parkes was not alone in criticising the Catholic clergy. By October both daily papers were expressing exasperation at the clergy's misrepresentation of the Bill's supporters as 'godless' and against religion. By the end of the month they were becoming a little exaggerated themselves. The Empire characterised the controversy over the Bill as

...a struggle between light and darkness... between the elected representatives of the people striving to sow the elements of education all over the land and...those who want to sow ignorance and superstition...the clergy of the Church of England and Roman Catholic church, the episcopal churches.¹

As the debate on the Bill continued, public excitement increased. In late October, while the Bill was being debated in Committee, the Herald claimed that it was exciting 'more public discussion than anything since the land laws were debated'.² A little later a Legislative Councillor expressed the hope that the Council would not force an election on the Bill, because he feared that such a course 'would be attended by bloodshed and perhaps loss of life'.³ He undoubtedly exaggerated, but it was clear that by the extravagance of their opposition to Parkes's Bill, the Catholic clergy were attracting a considerable amount of unfavourable attention to themselves and their co-religionists. They were playing politics as if they were in Ireland, forgetting that they did not have the support of the mass of population, as they would have had in Ireland. Other events had occurred during the previous two years which similarly attracted alarmed and hostile attention to the same group of colonists, only this time as Irishmen, rather than as Catholics.

The generally received picture of Australian Catholics:

¹Empire, 4 October 1866.
²S.M.H., 23 October 1866.
³Empire, 2 November 1866.
the descendents of poor Irish peasantry stock, confined by that background and by Protestant prejudice to the lower orders of society, is not so much exaggeration as falsification.¹ Large numbers of Irish immigrants after the famine came from particularly impoverished circumstances and joined pockets of poverty in Sydney and Melbourne, but there were many non-Irish in those circumstances already. During the first formative period of large scale assisted immigration in the thirties and forties, immigrants from Southern Ireland were not noticeably poorer or less educated than English or Scottish immigrants. Indeed, of the immigrants who between 1837-40 received direct government assistance there were less from Southern Ireland who were agricultural labourers than there were from Scotland and England, and more who were professionals, skilled workers, and shopkeepers and tradesmen.² This was not surprising as Ireland's economy limited the opportunities for men with middle class skills. The socio-economic profile of the bounty immigrants was a little closer to the received version.

There were more southern Irish among the unskilled labourers and agricultural workers than any other nationality, but they

1 Wald ersee, 'Catholic Society', Chap.III, has shown how the Catholic occupational profile in 1828 was little different from that of other denominations. This was well before large scale free immigration. W.W. Phillips, 'Christianity and its Defence in New South Wales, circa 1880-1890' (Ph.D., A.N.U., 1969), pp.20-1 and Appendix III, pp.443-4, indicates that by 1901 a higher than average proportion of Catholics were in manual jobs and a noticeably lower than average proportion were in finance and business. But over emphasis on proportional differences can disguise the fact that there were a lot of Catholics who were in high status occupations. Interestingly enough they had little effect on their Church which seemed to rejoice in, even as it complained of, its low status image. (See Phillips, pp.22-3, for some consideration of this.) Perhaps the inferior education given in Catholic schools as well as the belief that the only good Catholic was a poor Catholic contributed to this. Hans Mol, Religion in Australia (Melbourne, 1971), pp.80-1, makes this point in a slightly different fashion and points out that at least since World War II the occupational profiles of the major Australian denominations have been remarkably similar.

² Shultz, 'The Free Settlers of New South Wales', Appendix D, Table XV, p.311.
still predominated among the professional workers and constituted a high proportion of skilled operatives and shopkeepers. The changed proportions were partly due to post-famine immigration and to the bounty system which allowed Irishmen already in the colony to nominate immigrants: many doing so were ex-convicts, many from the poorer peasantry.

Generally, those and subsequent Irish immigrants assimilated fairly easily into society. Largely because of the chain migration which the bounty system facilitated some areas of fairly heavy Irish settlement developed in the fifties, but these were temporary. During the 1860s the proportion of Irish born in the colony was noticeably decreasing and they were becoming more evenly distributed throughout the population. Irishmen and Catholics remained concentrated in slightly more than usual proportions in Sydney and on the southern tablelands and south-west slopes, but in no sense were these concentrations of much social significance.

Despite generally easy assimilation, some of the Irish immigrants of the late thirties and forties, whom I shall call the 'forties generation' of immigrants, remained nostalgic for Ireland and, having recently discovered an identity as Irishmen over and against Englishmen, persisted

---

1 Ibid., Appendix E, Table X, p.348.
2 Unfortunately Shultz treats all bounty immigrants 1837-50 as one group, although he suspects that pre- and post-famine immigration would show marked differences.
3 Waldersee, 'Catholic Society', chap.VI.
4 Some sociologists have argued that there is a connection between inter-racial or communal tension and violence and the development of 'ghettos' of the minority race or group. It is therefore interesting to discover that not only the Irish, who were far more 'visible' than the Catholics, but also Catholics (by and large), were becoming more evenly distributed in the population at a time when inter-racial or inter-religious hostility was actually increasing. Appendix Ia demonstrates this by comparing the proportions of Irish and Catholics in each electorate in 1861 and 1871.
means O'Connell's old goal of repeal. In the Irish context of the day it was a somewhat old fashioned body. Nonetheless it was enthusiastically welcomed by a number of the colony's Irish who immediately began a branch of the League. By early 1865 it had over 2,000 members in several city and country branches.

The rules of the local League forbade the discussion of local political or religious matters. Nevertheless, when John Robertson, a leading politician of Scots descent, became president in September 1864, both he and the League were criticised. The burden of the criticism was that the League's real intention was to attract Irish votes for use in local politics. In replying to this criticism the secretary of the League claimed that a number of its leading members supported James Martin, one of Robertson's opponents in colonial politics.

The criticism had some point, nonetheless. For leading members of the League the field of municipal politics was

---

1 The eighteen-sixties saw the domination of Irish affairs by Cardinal Cullen (see Norman, op.cit., passim). Cullen disapproved of the League which he thought (incorrectly) was connected with the spirit of 1848. He sponsored a National Association a little after the formation of the League, as a 'safe' alternative to it. While the League simply stood for repeal, the Association wanted disestablishment, free denominational education and, interestingly, compensation for tenants for all improvements affected by them for their land. See ibid., pp.235-89 and Patrick J. Corish, ed., *A History of Irish Catholicism*, Vol.5, No.3 (Dublin, 1967), pp.23-30.

2 F.J., 20 April, 7 May 1864. See Appendix 1b for a chart showing the similarity between leading members of the Celtic Association and the Irish National League (and a later organisation, the Irish State Prisoners' Fund). The Appendix also contains biographical details of these members.

3 F.J., 20 May 1865.

4 *Irish National League, Rules and Laws of the N.S.W. Branch of the I.N.L.* (Sydney, 1864). A copy of this in the M.L.

5 For example, see S.M.H., 4 September 1864.

6 S.M.H., 16 September 1864.
more important than colonial politics. Municipal office bestowed a significant amount of status, valuable for those from urban lower-middle class backgrounds who could not immediately aspire to the colonial legislature. It also had at its behest a useful amount of patronage, which a successful ward politician could increase by putting the votes he controlled at the service of one of the colonial political leaders in Assembly elections, thus placing that leader in his debt. Organisations like the Irish National League enabled ward politicians to contact possible supporters and provided strong enough identification to enable those contacts to be utilised. Temperance bodies, church groups, orange lodges, and, up to a point, friendly societies could serve a similar function. But what distinguished the Irish National League from these other bodies was that its appeal rested on

1 Many League members were active in municipal elections and some had or would soon achieve municipal office - for example: Richard Creagh, Owen Caraher, James Butler, Thomas McCaffrey, Denis Kearney, John Hourigan, J.P. Garvan, Joseph Carroll, J.G. O'Connor, P.T. Grogan.
2 East and West Sydney, the premier colonial electorates, returning four members each to the Assembly contained exactly four of the eight municipal wards each.
3 Lack of space prevents me from elaborating further on this important aspect of colonial electoral politics, although reference is made to it several times below. One has only to look at the lists of candidates and their committee men and compare them with lists of members prominent in such organisations to sense a connection between the two. Such connections undoubtedly became more important once the gaining of goals such as manhood suffrage and the land laws removed the polarity between rich and poor, privileged and underprivileged from electoral politics. Other political contacts were also important: publicans, by the nature of their work (if successful) gregarious and in frequent contact with many men were important in ward politics and indications of the sort of support a candidate for the Assembly in one of the city seats was receiving can be gained from an examination of the hotels in which he had committee rooms, or held his meetings. It would not indicate all his support however, because some of that might be coming from temperance circles, and some of the larger hotels might be sought for convenience, rather than because of their proprietors' partisanship.
the stressing of national, and by implication, religious differences, and it was precisely that that colonial opinion feared and condemned.¹

Such fear and condemnation was encouraged by the revival in Ireland of revolutionary nationalism, in the form of Fenianism. Most colonists thought that the troubles Ireland had suffered had been overcome and that the Irish people had come to share the benefits, material and political, of British subjects. They viewed movements which sought to restore self-government to Ireland with wonder and suspicion, and condemned revolutionary movements as madness, and of particular danger to Britain and the Empire.²

The Fenian movement began almost simultaneously in America and Ireland (where it was also known as the Irish Republican Brotherhood). Formed by some of the unsuccessful 'revolutionaries' of 1848 along the lines of a European secret society (its titular founder, James Stephen, resided in Paris during the early fifties), it recruited among discontented Irishmen in Ireland, England and America. Wracked by divisions, and riddled with British government spies the Fenian movement nonetheless commanded useful political influence in America, and a significant following in Ireland and England. Its two-country basis was both a strength and a weakness for the Fenians. The American side of the movement provided funds and recruits with military experience gained in the civil war, but it tended to misread Irish realities and urge precipitate action. The end of the

¹ The League was not so obviously divisive during its early years, but by late 1866, although it was almost in abeyance, some of its politicians, like Hurley and John Hughes, were taking advantage of the sectarianism provoked during the education controversy to make their appeals more explicit: 'Men of Ireland! Vote for Hurley'; 'Fellow Catholics. Vote for John Hughes, One of ourselves' ran some of their slogans (Empire, 18, 30 November 1866).

² They saw Ireland as geographically an essential part of Great Britain and crucial for England's defence. For a clear statement of this position see S.M.H., 4 September 1864.
American civil war meant an increase of membership in the American wing and pressure for more radical action in Ireland. At this point the British authorities acted, and, late in 1865, raided the Dublin office of the Fenian paper, the *Irish People*, and arrested most of its leaders. A year later one of the factions of the American wing of the movement launched an invasion of Canada, hoping to provoke war between England and America which they believed would be to Ireland's benefit. More a charade than an invasion it nevertheless gave English opinion a shock. In March 1867, after earlier sporadic attempts, the long awaited Fenian rising occurred, and was easily put down. Fenians had been active in England before this and they now concentrated their attention in that quarter hoping to gain arms and money by raids on armouries and banks. Such activities both terrorised and angered British opinion.¹

The arrests of the Fenian leaders in late 1865 was the first significant news about Fenians which the colony had received. Following this the press carried more frequent reports, largely of Fenian activities in America including the abortive Canadian raid. Editorial opinion in the daily press universally condemned the Fenian escapades.² Such events reawakened fears about the revolutionary potential of the local Irish: 'That which was done in Canada in the same spirit might be attempted in Australia' warned the Herald. Giving particular point to these fears was the approach taken to Fenianism by the *Freeman's Journal*, the Irish-Catholic journal in the colony.

Founded in 1850, the Freeman's had, several times in its existence, attempted to boost flagging sales by expressing

² For example, *S.M.H.*, 2, 3 February 1866.
rather exaggerated Irish nationalist sentiments. It had been
doing this under the editorship of William Dolman in 1863-4,
but Dolman's style was dull and had little impact. In mid-
1864 and again in mid-1865 the paper underwent some changes
designed to improve its quality and temper its Irish
sectarianism. The initiator of these changes was W.B. Dalley
who became a part-proprietor of the paper for a short period.¹
The change was short lived. Early in 1866 a young Irishman,
Richard O'Sullivan joined the literary staff of the paper.
Although new to the colony he was soon writing leaders and by
December 1866 had become editor. O'Sullivan, still in his
twenties, was the youngest brother of A.M. Sullivan the
editor and proprietor of the Nation, for which paper he had
worked after graduating from the Catholic University in Dublin
'the most distinguished student of his day in English
literature.²

Like many Irishmen of his generation, O'Sullivan
possessed a powerful hatred of England. This he expressed
with a vituperative eloquence, for which he was probably
unsurpassed in the colony. Commenting on the suspension of
habeas corpus in Ireland early in 1866 he wrote:

¹The exact editorial and proprietorial changes in the
Freeman's Journal at this stage are hard to discover. In
July 1864, undoubtedly feeling the pinch of the recently
introduced newspaper tax, Dolman sold part of his ownership
in the paper, but the purchasers were not named. The paper
underwent a few changes but these were not as extensive as
those that took place a year later, when it changed from a
twice-weekly to a weekly, doubled its size and changed its
layout. Its editorial policy became noticeably less partisan,
although it faultlessly reflected clerical policy on the
issues of state aid and education. These changes were the
result of Dalley's connection with the paper, although
Dolman remained as editor until late 1865 when John Hutchison,
a young protegee of Dalley's took over. In December 1866
Dalley and some of the other proprietors (one of whom was
probably James Hart, M.L.A.), sold their shares and Dolman,
Richard O'Sullivan and Richard Blundell, who had been in
charge of the printing of the paper since the 1850s, became
the owners. See F.J., 27, 30 July, 13 August 1864; 20,
24 June, 1 July 1865, 3 November 1888; G. Barton, The
Literature of New South Wales (Sydney, 1866), p.86.
²Express, 21 February 1880.
Once more our countrymen suddenly find themselves deprived of that right - sacred it was often boasted to British soil - the inestimable blessing peculiar, it was said, to British rule - the liberty of the subject. It is a fact that for the next twelve months, and much longer as fear may suggest, and oppression render necessary, liberty of speech, of act, even of thought, will not exist for Irishmen.

O'Sullivan agreed with the Fenian aim of an independent Ireland, but as a Catholic of ultramontanist inclinations, he found their methods unacceptable. Nonetheless, he preferred them to Britain and used every opportunity provided by overseas news of Fenianism to attack England's rule of Ireland, and Englishmen generally. A little before the unsuccessful Fenian rising, he wrote of England's preparedness:

The horrors of war, especially as waged by England can hardly be described...The (English) press is even now declaring how 'Irish rebels' are to be treated - the fiendish litany of shoot, hang, burn and destroy that appalled the world when 'Christian and Bible loving England' was engaged in quelling the revolt of the pagan sepoys is again being chanted through the length and breadth of Great Britain.2

After news reached the colony that the rising had been postponed (as it was for two months) O'Sullivan was relieved, but only because he did not think the time ripe.3

The Herald echoed colonial feeling when it warned that such articles as O'Sullivan's could only excite 'the most bitter animosity in the section they influence, and, by reaction, in the minds of those they insult and denounce'. It pointed out that the majority of colonists were British and naturally objected to being 'continually insulted with threats of war and by the country to which they belong...represented not only as having a history fraught with oppression, but marked out for humiliation....'4

1 F.J., 21 April 1866.
2 F.J., 19 February 1867.
3 F.J., 9 March 1867.
4 S.M.H., 13 March 1867.
O'Sullivan's editorials were not the only factor arousing the fears of non-Irish colonists. The decision of a number of the 'forties generation' Irishmen to establish a collection for the wives and children of the Fenian leaders arrested in late 1865 was taken by many to indicate sympathy with the Fenians, if not Fenianism itself. The inference was a mistake, for their motivation was anti-English rather than pro-Fenian, but the mistake was understandable. Even leaders of the colonial branch of the Irish National League, who had themselves been mistaken as Fenians thought it an ill-judged action. Their refusal to participate was taken by the State Prisoners Fund organisers as cowardice and was the first of many splits among the adherents of Ireland's cause in the colony. ¹

Simultaneous with this mid-sixties development of Irish assertiveness was a minor revival of the old English no-popery tradition which had been rendered quiescent by the liberal anti-sectarian ideology for well over a decade. For a while the revival was the work of one man, the Rev. John McGibbon. ²

¹The founders of the State Prisoners Fund were 'forties generation' Irishmen of lower-middle class background like the Irish National League. Several had been active in the League but not prominently, although some had been prominent in the Celtic Association. The League soon folded up afterwards. See Appendix Ic for names of those prominent in the Fund and their biographies. See F.J., 20 May 1866, for criticism of the Fund. For criticism by Fund members of the League see F.J., 7 April 1866, 23, 30 March, 3 April 1867. About 400 were collected and sent to Dublin. See evidence of J.G. O'Connor, Treasurer of the Fund (q.1782, p.872), 'Report from the Select Committee on alleged Conspiracy for Purposes of Treason and Assassination, together with the Proceedings of the Committee, Minutes of Evidence and Appendix', V & P (LA NSW), 1868-9 (1) 769-957, hereafter referred to as 'Assassination Committee'. Page numbers are to V & P, not 'Report...'.

²McGibbon, a Presbyterian, was born in Glasgow in 1842 and had been recruited by the Rev. J.D. Lang for the Australian ministry while still a theological student. He arrived with Lang and a number of other clergymen and students in 1850 and at the end of the year was licenced by Lang's Synod of New South Wales (which had formed in 1841 when Lang had broken with the Synod of Australia over the refusal of that body to reject state aid and adopt Lang's newly found voluntaryist principles). During Lang's absence overseas, between 1852 and

Footnote continued on following page...
McGibbon had achieved prominence by his attack on Governor Young's speech after the St Mary's fire, but he had been involved in controversy with a Catholic priest a few months before.¹ His attack on Governor Young brought him into a

Footnote continued from previous page:

1854, McGibbon looked after his Scots church congregation. When Lang returned, the committee of management of the church tried to have McGibbon appointed as co-pastor. Lang, his pride hurt, objected strongly and a number of the committee and congregation withdrew and formed a new congregation at Woolloomooloo with McGibbon as their pastor. The congregation then applied successfully for membership to the Synod of Australia and McGibbon was ordained by that Synod as their minister. He was a successful minister, well liked by his congregation, and by 1860 he had built and largely paid off a substantial stone church in Palmer Street, Woolloomooloo. He was active in the Synod of Australia, and in 1865 was clerk of the Synod when it dissolved its connection with the established Church of Scotland and united with the General Synod of New South Wales, formed the previous year from the bulk of the Synod of Eastern Australia (Free Presbyterians) and Lang's Synod of New South Wales. Although active in Church affairs McGibbon continued his education and in 1863 graduated B.A. from the University of Sydney. In 1868 he graduated LLB, and 1870 LLD. In McGibbon's personality a powerful mixture of pride and righteousness was coupled with a vast energy and industry which often resulted in hyperactivity and took its toll on his health. His religion was essentially simple and evangelical, though his considerable intellectual ability equipped him with wide knowledge of scripture and church history and a rigorous logic to use in its defence. He possessed a very public sense of ministry and neither Catholics, nor politicians (nor even Governors) were safe from his admonishments in what he believed were the interests of truth and rectitude. Yet his speeches and his writings, while often couched in extreme language and produced in the interests of exaggerated principle, always possessed an element of control and rationality that distinguished them from the more fervid and factious rantings of other Protestant champions, such as Wazir Beg or Daniel Allen, who were to share with him and the similarly cooler Rev. Zachary Barry the large task of combating popery in New South Wales during the 1870s and 1880s. (J. Cameron, Centenary History of the Presbyterian Church in New South Wales (Sydney, 1905), pp.15-17, 23, 25, 44, 82-3, 347; J.D. Lang, The Case of the Scots Church, Church Hill... (Sydney, 1853) in M.L.: 'Sydney University Report', 1863, V & P (LA NSW), 1864 (1) 301; S.M.H., 18 January 1868; P.S., 28 May 1870.)

¹The priest, Fr Conway, had claimed in a widely publicised lecture that 'the real enemy of the Bible has always been heretics - the Arians, the Pelagians and the Protestants.... Voltaire was merely the logical successor to Luther and
second lengthy and pseudo-learned controversy with Catholic champions. At the same time McGibbon was attacking what he called 'milk-and-water' Protestants in the Christian Pleader the monthly journal of some of the smaller sects, such as the Primitive Methodists and the Congregationalists. During 1866 and 1867 he contributed about half the copy of this journal, on a variety of subjects, but usually with a no-papery point to make.

Anti-Catholicism was given a boost in mid-1866 as a consequence of that year having been calculated the year of the anti-Christ by an itinerant British millenarian with a wide following, Michael Baxter. In this theory the anti-Christ was identified as Louis Napoleon. More traditional
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Protestantism'. McGibbon devoted two long lectures to demolishing and ridiculing the priests arguments and attracted a rebuttal from the Freeman's Journal and from 'a layman' almost certainly Jabez King Heydon. See F.J., 4 March 1865, for Conway's lecture; C.Pl., April, May 1865, for McGibbon's replies; F.J., 22 March 1865 for its editorial reply, and 26 April 1865 for 'a layman's' rebuttal.

This controversy, conducted by means of paid advertisements in the pages of the Empire was, like the first, conducted with J.K. Heydon, this time calling himself 'an English Catholic', and again concerned the respective attitudes of Catholic and Protestants to the Bible (a frequent point of sectarian dispute). This time Heydon was better prepared (and assisted by the more learned W.B. Dalley) and was simply content to attack McGibbon on one small point. McGibbon on the other hand, ranged over a wide area, attacking mariolatory and Catholic persecution of heretics, as well as pursuing the original argument that Catholics were forbidden to read the Bible. Heydon had the better of the argument, which he published; J.K. Heydon, Controversy between an English Catholic and the Rev. John McGibbon on the Bible and the Reformation (Sydney, 1865).

2 Rev. M. Baxter, Louis Napoleon, The Destined Monarch of the World and future personal Anti-Christ, to appear in 1866 and forcibly to persecute Christians during the latter half of the seven years until he finally perishes at the death of Christ at the end of the War of Armageddon, about or soon after 1873. There was a Melbourne edition of this work in 1861 and a Sydney edition 'reproduced from the latest English edition' in 1866. As well as an edited version of this book called The Coming Battle and Appalling National Convulsions expected from Scripture and Prophecy between 1866 and 1875 (Melbourne) appeared in two different colonial editions, no dates. On Baxter see E.R. Sandeen, The Roots of Fundamentalism (Chicago, 1970), p.98.
millenarians, and this included most evangelical clergymen, objected to this view. McGibbon gave a well attended lecture arguing the traditional case: that the anti-Christ was not a man, but the system of Roman Catholicism. When he attempted a repeat performance of this lecture a number of young I.N.L. activists attended and interrupted him with jeers, whistles and bugles. A fight ensued and the rowdies were ejected. 1 Colonial opinion was shocked: 'A more disorderly, disgraceful and outrageous meeting was perhaps never held in Sydney' declared the Empire, 2 which next day blamed McGibbon for provoking 'angry passions and slumbering feelings of antagonism'. 3 McGibbon's conduct was defended by some and denounced by many. 4 The Freeman's Journal sympathised with the Catholic rowdies, whom it thought had been provoked, 5 but a priest at the Cathedral was wiser, and told his congregation next Sunday that McGibbon had a right to say

1 Empire, 24, 27 August 1866; F.J., 25 August 1866. James Garvan later a leading politician and cabinet minister was one of the rowdies as was Joseph Carroll.
2 Empire, 24 August 1866.
3 Empire, 25 August 1866. On 29 August the Empire gave a fuller account of its criticism against attacks on it by McGibbon.

freedom is likely to degenerate into license unless used with proper regard for the conditions of the society in which it is exercised. There are no greater enemies of real practical liberty than men of ill balanced minds who insist upon the exercise of the most extreme privilege under all circumstances and persist in the practice of mere abstract rights however offensive or injurious to others. Wise men submit to small theoretical restraints for the sake of enjoying the greater practical liberty....Can it be contended for a moment that in the ventilation of an absurd and fanciful theory incapable of decision and of no practical importance whatever a minister of the religion of peace and love is justified in saying or doing certain things to arouse the most bitter animosities of race and creed and likely to end in bloodshed?

4 For example, see Empire, 1 September 1866.
5 F.J., 25 August 1866.
whatever he pleased, and that Catholics would only draw
trouble on themselves if they attempted to interrupt him. 1

This advice was not heeded by a group of young men who
that same day gathered around the Rev. J.J. Westwood, a
regular Hyde Park Sunday preacher, and began to jeer and
jostle him. Westwood had been one of the Baxter-liners
against whom McGibbon had been arguing, but he shared
McGibbon's abhorrence of popery. He was pushed around the
Park by the young men and a large crowd of spectators, and
struck several times with fruit. He eventually managed to
escape when a policeman, the first to be seen in the Park
that day, came to his assistance. 2

The next Sunday events similar to the previous week were
repeated. This time it was a group of Israelites (or
'beardies') who were jostled from the Park 3 and a well known
temperance lecturer was also roughly handled, having his coat
torn from his back. The crowd, largely of young people, was
estimated to be 2,000 in number and the daily press was
beginning to give the phenomenon worried attention. That
Monday (3 September) the Empire spoke of 'people who have
apparently organised themselves into a body for the sole
purpose of preventing open air discussion on any subject' and
warned that this must be checked, lest it lead to 'much
bitterness of feeling, sectarian animosity and perhaps even
bloodshed'. 4 The authorities were also worried, particularly
as rumours began circulating that the orangemen were going to
join in. On the following Sunday a large force of police were

---

1 Empire, 1 September 1866. This information was contributed
by a Catholic correspondent who wanted it publicised 'as it
is commonly said abroad that the Catholic priests were the
means of stirring those noisy people at McGibbon's lecture'.
2 Empire, 27 August 1866. The colony was experiencing a
depression and unemployed youths were swelling the numbers in
the Park on Sunday, and had already caused trouble on
previous Sundays (Empire, 14 August 1866).
3 These 'beardies' as they were called were almost certainly
followers of John Wroe, a Christian Israelite from Britain
who conducted several lecture tours of the colony and died
4 Empire, 3 September 1866.
sent to the Park, and a reserve of 50 more were concealed behind the Museum. Over a thousand young men, most armed with cudgels, attended the Park, plus a crowd of 3,000 spectators. All milled around for an hour or two, but the presence of the police prevented fighting, and the crowd eventually dispersed.¹

To many, the events indicated that some Catholics were prepared to resort to violence against those who opposed their point of view. Occurring as they did when Irish affairs were becoming more violent they increased colonists apprehensions of the divisive potential of Irish-Catholics. They occurred less than a month before the introduction of the Public Schools Act. For many colonists the Irish sectarianism of the 'forties generation' Irishmen and the Catholic sectarianism displayed by the clergy in rejecting public schools were part of the same syndrome. They were largely correct, for although the clergy disapproved of any Irish nationalism that was more than a nostalgic cultural movement, and the 'forties generation' laity sometimes objected to what they saw as unnecessary clerical interference in political matters, clergy and laity were one over education. The 'forties generation' transferred their Irish contemporaries opposition to national schools to the colony, and provided the clergy's most prominent lay supporters.

The conflict provoked between the authorities of the Catholic church and the Government by the Public Schools Act continued and intensified during 1867. The conflict spread to other areas of government administration that touched on Catholic interests, and was, in an important sense, a classic conflict of interests between church and state. It came about, not as Catholic authorities claimed, because Parkes was trying to persecute them, but because Parkes was a far

¹See file on Hyde Park disturbance in Colonial Secretary Correspondence Received, New South Wales State Archives, file 66/4493, Box 4/3423; Empire, 10 September 1866.
more energetic Colonial Secretary than any previously, and
very conscious of the responsibilities and duties of
government. In the course of his administration Parkes found
Catholic ecclesiastics claiming authority over areas which
properly belonged to the government. He consequently
resisted them and again attracted their ire.

The first such instance occurred in February and
involved a Fr Dillon, the Catholic chaplain to Cockatoo Island
prison. Dillon, a young priest, who had arrived in the
colony from All Hallows six years before, had been chaplain
to the prison since 1864. He was an arrogant young man,
convinced of the superiority of the priestly caste and fully
committed to the paranoid theorising of European Catholicism.

1 This was rather the first such instance which secured
publicity. The Colonial Secretary's files in State Archives
indicate earlier occasions, such as Parkes attempt in late
1866 to discover whether the Catholic authorities had
dismissed a teacher from a Catholic denominational school
because he refused to sign a petition opposing the Public
Schools Act. This was the reason given by the letter of
dismissal the teacher had received from the Catholic
Inspector. In the face of obduracy and deviousness from the
Catholic officials and unsure of his position, particularly
as the Denominational Board ceased to exist after 1866, Parkes
could do nothing. See Colonial Secretary, Correspondence
Received, State Archives of New South Wales, f.67/140,
Box 4/588.

2 In the Seminary Dillon had been known as 'Red' Dillon,
apparently because of his fiery hair, but possibly in
reference to his temper as well. In 1878 after a long stay
at Camden, he was transferred back to the Balmain parish,
succeeding Fr Forrest. When Forrest sent his housekeeper
around to his old presbytery to collect some things he had
left behind, Dillon, in a rage, refused to give them up and
struck her. She took him to court for assault and slander.
The case was dismissed when a number of witnesses, including
priests, contradicted themselves (P.S., 29 June 1878). If any
other evidence is required of Dillon's paranoid, sectarian
personality it is provided in a series of lectures he gave at
Edinburgh in 1882, just after he had left the colony. These
were published as a book, and his dependence on Barruel,
Civiltà Cattolica and all the other paraphernalia of nineteenth
century European Catholic paranoia is evident in the title:
The War of Anti-Christ with Church and Christian Civilisation:
A review of the rise and progress of Atheism: its extension
through Voltaire: its use of Freemasonry and Kindred Secret
Societies for Anti-Christian War: the union and 'illuminism'.

Footnote continued on next page...
He had prominently opposed Parkes, Martin and the Public Schools Act, and seemed to believe that the Catholic prisoners on the Island were simply the innocent victims of Anglo-Saxon Protestant oppression. Dillon had frequently given Gotha K. Mann, the Superintendent of the prison, grounds for complaint. Eventually a letter of Mann's to the Inspector-General of Police, John McLerie, informing him that one of the visitors Dillon had brought onto the Island was a Fenian, came to Parkes's attention. Parkes consulted Mann, heard his other complaints about Dillon and decided to dismiss him. He requested the Catholic Vicar-General to recommend a replacement, but Sheeby refused on the grounds that he had not been informed of the reasons for Dillon's dismissal.

Footnote continued from previous page:

of masonry by Weishaupt: its progress under the leaders of the first French Revolution and under Nubius, Palmerston and Mazzini: the control of its hidden 'inner circle' over all revolutionary organisations: its influence over British Freemasonry: its attempts upon Ireland: oaths, signs and passwords of the three degrees etc. etc.: the Spoilation of the Propaganda. (Dublin, M.H. Gill, London and New York, Burns and Oats, 1885, 240 pages.) There is a copy in the Mitchell Library. Dillon settled in Rome where he died, apparently of 'melancholia' in 1889. Before his death he published another huge tome, displaying, as its title indicated, another facet of the Irish priestly character, mariolatry, in an exaggerated form: The Virgin Mother of Good Counsel: A history of the ancient Sanctuary of Our Lady of Good Counsel in Genazzano, and of the wonderful apparition and miraculous translation of Her Sacred Image from Scutani in Albania to Genazzano in 1467. With an appendix on the Miraculous Crucifix, San Pio, Roman Ecclesiastical Education, etc. (First edition, 655 pages, printed at Propaganda Press, Rome, 1884: slightly abridged popular edition by M.H. Gill, Dublin, 1885.) This later information comes from R. Wynn, 'Dillon of Balmain', Australian Catholic Record, Vol.27, Nos. 3 and 4 (July, October 1950), pp.309-10. Wynn claims that the profits from the sales of both these books was very considerable, and were given over by Dillon for the benefit of the suffering nuns in Italy who had been despoiled of all their property by the Italian Government.

1 Mann to McLerie, 30 January 1867, P.C., A 895, pp.486-8. The basis of this information was a report from a prisoner to one of the warders to this effect, dated 25 January 1867. It is in the Special Bundle of Correspondence, 'Alleged Fenian conspiracy re attempted assassination of Duke of Edinburgh', Colonial Secretary, Correspondence Received, New South Wales State Archives, Box 4/786.1. Hereafter referred to as 'Special Bundle'.
He was told these privately by the Premier, James Martin, but remained adamant that he be told them in writing. Parkes replied that although the church authorities were always asked to 'recommend' men to be appointed to government positions like chaplaincies, they had no control over those appointments, and thus could not expect the government to consult with them on such matters. The Freeman's Journal indicated what Sheehy was about '...the real battle is one that has already been won at home. The clergy there "appoint" never "recommend" and if the appointment doesn't please, the government can refuse it'.

Even before they received this explanation from Parkes the Church officials, or rather some of the I.N.L. politicians acting for them, had released the correspondence to the press. They did so immediately after the calling of writs for an important by-election (for an East Sydney seat), which the Opposition, supported by the I.N.L. activists, was anxious to win. The correspondence gave only a partial picture of the dispute, for it merely contained Parkes's refusal to grant what appeared to be a reasonable request, and gave no indication of his reasons for doing so. It consequently placed the government in an unfavourable light.

During the campaign Catholics and other Opposition speakers

---

1 Or so Martin asserted in the Assembly on 1 August 1866 (Empire, 2 August 1866). This was never contradicted.
2 Halloran to Sheehy, 11 March 1867. V & P (LA NSW), 1867-8 (2) 223. Halloran was the senior undersecretary to the Colonial Secretary. This is contained in 'Correspondence Respecting the Dismissal of Rev. Mr Dillon, Roman Catholic Chaplain, Cockatoo Island', V & P (LA NSW), 1867-8 (2) 217-28.
3 F.J., 16 March 1867.
4 This was how James Martin explained the release of the correspondence to the press (Empire, 2 August 1867). Again, no one contradicted him and the timing and the involvement of the I.N.L. activists in the campaign point to the truth of his remarks. Martin had, up until the previous year always received Irish backing in elections.
5 Empire, 11 March 1867; S.M.H., 12 March 1867 both criticised Parkes.
frequently referred to the case as illustrating the despotic nature of the Government. ¹

Another instance of Catholic authorities claiming control over the appointments of gaol chaplaincies occurred a couple of months later at Berrima. The Church authorities replaced one chaplain by another and simply requested the government to request the Governor to sanction it. Parkes allowed the appointment to stand, but firmly informed Sheehy that gaol chaplaincies were government and not ecclesiastical appointments.²

In the period between these two instances, Parkes and Sheehy had come into conflict over a slightly different matter: the Catholic orphan school at Parramatta. This was financed from government funds and staffed largely by Sisters of Charity. Its board of management, originally appointed to handle the apprenticing of the orphans had, over several decades, taken wider responsibility for the institution. Early in 1867 Parkes decided that the teaching facilities at the Catholic and Protestant orphan schools should be examined, and appointed a school inspector to do so. The board of the Catholic school was informed of his coming, but when he arrived the matron refused him entry. Parkes informed her that she had no such right and on the next occasion the inspector was allowed to inspect the boys' school, but again the matron objected, this time to the inspection of the girls' school, which was staffed by nuns. Parkes agreed to waive that requirement. A little later the real reason for the matron's original refusal was made clear. A letter arrived from Sheehy, on behalf of the board of management of the school, protesting to Parkes that his arbitrary request that they submit their teachers to inspection ignored the responsibility given them for running

¹S.M.H., 12, 15, 21 March 1867. Needless to say my account of this instance differs radically from that of Wynn's (op.cit.), which relies exclusively on Catholic sources.
²See 'Correspondence Respecting to Charge in Office of Roman Catholic Chaplain, Berrima Gaol', V & P (LA NSW), 1867-8 (2) 243-5.
the affairs of the institution. Parkes ignored their letter, but, with an eye for future publication had a cabinet minute prepared, pointing out that the responsibilities of the committee went no further than the apprenticing of the orphans. Since the government was responsible for the financing of the institution, they were responsible to see that it was properly functioning. ¹

Motivating the Catholic authorities in these encounters was resentment at the encroachments made on their authority by the Public Schools Bill. Just how extensive these encroachments were was demonstrated a little later when the Council of Education gazetted a list of books approved for use in public and denominational schools. ² This did not include the only two series of books of which the Catholic authorities approved, and the latter indignantly protested. ³

The books given primary recommendation by the regulations were the Irish National school books, which Catholics claimed had been devised by Archbishop Whately to weaken the faith of

²N.S.W. Government Gazette, 28 May 1867, p.1292, 14 June 1867, p.1834.
³See 'Correspondence on Return Respecting School Books authorised by Council of Education', V & P (LA NSW), 1867-8 (4) 601-8. Parkes explained later that the books the Catholic authorities desired contained large sections of Catholic doctrine and were thus unsuited for use in general instruction periods, even in Catholic denominational schools, any one of which had a few non-Catholic children in attendance. (Empire, 24 July 1867.) The Catholics had perhaps some reason to be indignant as this meant that their denominational schools would be little different from public schools, all because of a few non-Catholic children, who could just as easily attend a public school. The Freeman's Journal raised this argument, but it was not until Polding returned in August that it was taken any further.
the Catholic children of Ireland. In mid-June Bishops Quin and Lanigan and Vicar-General Sheehy waited on Parkes with a long list of complaints, including the book regulations. Parkes pointed out the unreality of their position: they wished the Government, and the Council of Education in its regulations to substantially change an Act which had only recently been passed by the Assembly with a large majority. The ecclesiastical dignitaries did not comprehend this.

At an inconclusive meeting of clergy and laity, called immediately after the gazetting of the regulations, to plan tactics, James Hart, the leading Catholic M.L.A. and a supporter of Opposition leader, James Robertson, suggested that the best tactic was to force the Government out and fight them on the hustings. When Parliament resumed on 2 July, the Opposition, with Hart, Macpherson, Macleay and Robertson to the fore, launched a series of attacks on the Government over Fr Dillon, the Catholic orphan school and the school book regulations. The Government replied vigorously and tempers became strained. The Government, and Parkes in

---

1 For other statements of this claim see Hart's motion on the book regulations in the Assembly (S.M.H., 3 July 1867) and Plunkett's speech in the Legislative Council (Empire, 26 July 1867). The claim was frequently made by the Catholics to explain their objections to the national schools and rested on an alleged 'confession' by Whately, who had had a hand in writing the books, to his friend Nassau Senior. This had been published in a posthumous edition of Whately's letters and papers by his daughter. The claim was substantially a false one. See Appendix VI for an examination of the claim.

2 S.M.H., 22 June 1867.

3 F.J., 29 June 1867. This meeting was enthusiastically welcomed by the Freeman's as evidence that the clergy and laity were absent and the meeting could not agree on a course to pursue.

4 The Opposition was a united body only in their detestation of the Government. On the issue of education two of its leading members, Robertson and Forster, favoured a purely secular system, while Hart and the high Tory Anglicans, Macpherson and Macleay wished to see an exclusively denominational system. The latter two M.P.'s were almost pathological in their hatred of Parkes.
particular, was accused of anti-Catholicism, and of trying to turn the colony against Catholics for their own political advantage. Some Government supporters slipped into no-popery rhetoric, and the high point of the month's fracas came when J.D. Lang crossed from Opposition to Government benches, claiming that Robertson, whom he usually followed, was fighting the priests' battles. ¹ At one stage Parkes, constantly under pressure, but usually in control, became flustered and displayed the normally suppressed and inactive streak of prejudice and paranoia in his make-up. In defending himself against frequent accusations that he was anti-Catholic he invoked a rather old fashioned view of the constitution which admitted Catholics to the benefits of citizenship only on sufferance:

The whole of his life contradicted the change (of hostility towards Catholics)...he would afford them every liberty he gave himself, but when they wanted more he would resist them. As a British subject in a Protestant nation, under a Protestant monarch, he would claim for them all civil privileges. He would extend every power he had to give them equality in all he possessed himself. But if he found they were encroaching on the rights of the people, arrogating themselves power which did not belong to them, then it was time to resist them.²

It was not a view he normally adopted, but it indicated the direction the thinking of a lot of colonists could turn under the constant reiteration of Catholic demands.³

Many in the colony believed that the frequent sectarian debate bred further sectarianism. The evidence justified

¹Empire, 1 August 1867.
²S.M.H., 18 July 1867.
³Unfortunately space does not permit me to give a fuller account of the deterioration of the relationship between Parkes and the Catholic authorities, in which it will be seen that I differ from the usual account and hold the Catholics responsible rather than Parkes. I hope in the near future to publish an article dealing with this and later instances where I believe Parkes has been badly treated by historians too ready to accept the Catholic point of view without checking more of the sources.
their belief. At the twelfth of July dinner in 1867 the orangemen celebrated a threefold increase in lodge membership which had occurred during the previous three years.\(^1\) The reasons for such an increase were not suggested, but the minute book of one of the lodges, the No.2 Loyal Orange Lodge, indicated the cause. It contains a record of those joining the lodge between September 1866 and February 1872. Between September 1866 and March 1868 there were two noticeable peaks in the numbers seeking membership. These coincided with agitation over the Public Schools Bill in 1866 and the sectarian debate in the Assembly in 1867.\(^2\) However, despite increased membership, the Orange Institution remained what it had always been in the colony - a refuge for a few hundred nostalgic, socially frustrated, largely Ulster-born Protestants. Insignificant in its own right it nonetheless served to confirm Irish-Catholics in their mistaken belief in the similarity between colonial and Irish society. As well, its increasingly vocal presence added to the fears of non-Irish colonists that just such a similarity might be emerging.

Indications of increasing sectarianism in colonial society continued to multiply. In July McGibbon was joined by a second prolix Protestant champion, the Anglican clergyman, Zachary Barry,\(^3\) who began a debate with the

\(^1\) *Empire*, 15 July 1867.

\(^2\) No.2 Loyal Orange Lodge ('Shomberg' Lodge), Minute Book (M.L. MSS 749). The monthly figures for initiations were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1866</th>
<th>1867</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 2</td>
<td>May 1867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 4</td>
<td>June 1867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 7</td>
<td>July 1867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 3</td>
<td>August 1867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 1</td>
<td>September 1867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 4</td>
<td>October 1867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 1</td>
<td>November 1867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 0</td>
<td>December 1867</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^3\) Barry was born in Cork, Ireland in 1827 and was educated at Trinity College Dublin where he graduated B.A. in 1849 (and LLD in 1868). After ordination he was appointed to a parish in Liverpool, England, under Frederick Barker who was soon to become Bishop of Sydney. After two years in Liverpool, Footnote continued on following page...
Catholic Duncan as to whether or not Catholic bishops were bound to persecute Protestants. At about the same time he was joined in controversy with those ritualists in the Church of England, who de-emphasised the differences between the Catholic and Protestant churches. In November he began a long controversy in the pages of the Herald with Alexander Gordon, an Anglican solicitor, Chancellor of the archdiocese and the Anglican's staunchest defender of denominational schools. The Council of Education's right to specify the books to be used in denominational schools formed the basis of their controversy, but the debate was widened from time to time, and was entered occasionally by other controversialists. In the course of the debate, Barry and other defenders of the Council of Education produced many of

Footnote continued from previous page:

Barry went to Western Australia, but after ten years returned to Ireland where he became organising secretary for the Irish Church Home Missions until Barker induced him to return to Australia late in 1865. His years in Liverpool and in Ireland with the Home Missions Society, an organisation notorious among the Catholics in the south for its proselytising, firmed him in his evangelical Christianity and strong detestation of popery. He was strongly opposed to Anglican claims of exclusiveness and fought many battles with other Anglicans, including his Bishop, in defence of his practice of preaching and participating in services at other Protestant churches. He was frequently involved in public disputes with fellow Anglicans over tendencies towards ritualism, which he was very prone to suspect, and over the Church's favouring of denominational education. He was also something of a lecturer on popular science, and, in the 1870s a leading opponent of the freethought movement. Despite his disputatious character he was a mild mannered and charitable man in his private life, as even the Bulletin, never a journal to show much sympathy for Protestant clerics and orangemen, was led to admit. (See A.D.B., Vol.3, pp.111-2; A.C., November-December 1871, 27 February 1873, 4 December 1875; S.M.H., 25 November 1865, 7 July, 19 September 1868; P.S., 26 August 1876; Bulletin, 22 October 1898.)

1 [Z. Barry and 'Icolmkill'], Do Catholic Bishops swear to Persecute Protestants. Answered in a series of letters between the Rev. Zachary Barry and 'Icolmkill' (Sydney, 1876). 'Icolmkill' was a penname of Duncan.

2 Z. Barry, 'An Erring Sister's Shame' - The Giauour (Sydney, 1867). This had originally been published as a long letter in the Anglican Australian Churchman.
the usual Protestant objections to Catholic theology and practice: its superstition, its aggressiveness and its proselytising. ¹

Accusations of proselytising and discrimination, those twin indices of worsening relations between Catholics and Protestants, were beginning to be made with greater frequency. The Christian Pleder in February and May 1867 carried denunciations of alleged proselytising by priests and nuns ('female jesuits') at St Vincent's Hospital and the Benevolent Asylum, and in April two young Irish Catholics claimed, with some justification, to have been refused membership of the St Leonard's Volunteer Company on the grounds of their religion. ² Interestingly, the two young men attempted to blame the Sydney Morning Herald for this piece of discrimination. ³ Their accusation was absurd, but it suggests that their exclusion from the Volunteers was only the most noticeable example of a more extensive hostility offered towards them as Irish and Catholic, which they felt required a wider explanation. In choosing the Herald as their scapegoat, they were thinking of the criticism that paper had offered of the Catholic authorities over education, but more importantly, they were seeking an object, which by reason of its assumed influence over so many of the colony's population, could be described as an adequate cause of the wider hostility they were experiencing.

The right of the Council of Education to dictate the books to be used in denominational schools was a topic that bothered Archbishop Polding when he returned to the colony in August 1867. Such was his reputation as a peacemaker that many colonists hoped that his return would see a lessening of Catholic sectarianism. ⁴ Such hopes were unrealistic, for

¹ See, for example, S.M.H., 13, 21 November 1867.
² F.J., 6 April 1867.
³ Ibid.
⁴ That there were some who hoped for this is clear. McGibbon made critical reference to them in a long article in the Christian Pleder in November, as did Fr Dillon at the first annual meeting of the Catholic Association in 1868. (F.J., 19 December 1868.)
Polding had opposed any but denominational education for twenty-five years and had been publicly quoted by McEncroe as condemning Parkes's Act well before his return. ¹ Nevertheless Polding's first actions on returning to the colony were conciliatory, and he attempted to reduce the tension between Church and government which had developed in his absence. On the day of his arrival the Catholic authorities received a reply from the Council of Education concerning their request to be allowed to use their own school books in denominational schools. As a result of Catholic political initiative the matter had been previously debated in the Assembly and the unsuitability of the Catholics' books agreed upon. The Council's letter did no more than point this out. ² Simultaneously, however, the Council agreed that the Irish national scripture lessons need not be used in Catholic schools. Polding received legal advice that the Council did have the power to grant Catholics permission to use the books of their choice in their schools, ³ and Sheehy, on Polding's behalf, wrote again to the council, querying their interpretation of the Public Schools Act and pointing out that if this request was not granted, there was virtually no difference between public and denominational

¹ F.J., 29 June 1867. McEncroe, at a meeting of Catholics, quoted Polding as writing 'God help the future generations if this bill passes'.

² Wilkins (secretary of Council of Education) to Sheehy, 7 August 1867, V & P (LA NSW), 1867-8 (4) 804.

³ Edward Butler and Alexander Gordon. Their opinions were perhaps correct in law, but did not answer Parkes's objection that for the Council to act in that way would contradict the intentions of the legislation as expressed by the legislature. See Polding to Lanigan, 28 August 1867, folder entitled 'Polding to Lanigan', p.10, S.A.A.
schools. At the same time Polding prepared, but did not
issue, a circular directed to the clergy of the archdiocese
urging them to do everything possible to persuade their
parishioners to patronise denominational schools.

The Council of Education rejected Polding's view of the
Act and referred to the Legislature's recent decision as
their authority. Further correspondence failed to gain any
concession, and the clergy determined to establish their own
system of schools, independent of the state, wherein they
could use whatever books they chose. To provide financial
support and organisation they determined to establish a
Catholic Association, which they hoped all Catholics would
join. The Association was launched at a meeting early in
November. It was greeted enthusiastically by the Freeman's

---

1 This was not exactly true. There were still some important
distinctions between denominational and public schools. For
a start only Catholic teachers could be appointed to Catholic
denominational schools and consequently the one hour a day
of specifically religious instruction was always used and
usually taken by the same teacher who taught the 'secular'
subjects. As well, in practice, the letter of the law,
requiring the complete absence of religious insignia, was
never fully enforced and the frequent presence of the parish
priest, as chairman of the school board, and in some cases of
nuns as teachers, meant that the schools had a specifically
denominational character entirely lacking in public schools.

2 This circular, prepared by Sheehy and Polding in August was
not actually circulated, and then under Sheehy's signature,
till November. They had apparently delayed circulating it in
the hope that some concession might be won from their
 correspondence with the Council over the school books issue
and presumably did not wish to provide their critics in the
Government with more ammunition to use against them. It was
eventually read from the pulpit of all churches on 1 December
1867. See F.J., 7 December 1867. In that Freeman's Journal
report the date on the document was given as 17 August.
Fogarty, op.cit., p.210, dates it as 27 August. Fogarty also
imagines that the circular was sent out on that date, but it
is obvious from the Freeman's 7 December report, and from a
later circular of Polding's in November (O'Farrell, op.cit.,
p.361) that this circular was not sent out till November.
O'Farrell, op.cit., pp.357-8, has the full text of the
circular.

3 Wilkins to Sheehy, 6 September 1867, V & P (LA NSW), 1867 (4)
804.

4 Ibid.

5 Corrigan, op.cit., p.77.
and by the large gathering at the inaugural meeting. Yet, of the prominent laity only Plunkett, Heydon, and Dally attended, and Dally's support for the Association was ambiguous. 1 'Forties generation' Irishmen were prominent, and several activists from the old Irish National League filled executive positions in the organisation. 2 But although branches were quickly established in a number of parishes, and a central Council formed, the organisation remained dominated by the clergy. Although lay support was essential, this support whether deliberately, or by default, was not readily forthcoming. 3

As was to be expected, the inaugural meeting of the Catholic Association was marked by some noticeably sectarian Catholic comment. Polding himself set the tone in an opening speech that revealed his exasperation at the gradual removal of education from clerical control. He turned his ire against the Council of Education's inspectors: 'I must go to some Jones or Johnson, some inspector, before I can talk to my children', and 'no one (sic) who knows what education is and reads the reports of these inspectors must perceive that any Tom, Dick and Harry taken off the streets would have been as good inspectors as they'. He also enunciated, for the first time, a dubious argument that was to be increasingly used in the education debate: that since

1 While he claimed that too much attention had been paid to the political aspects of the question, his own speech was as much a political operation for his friend Robertson, as a gesture of respect for his old mentor, Polding. He criticised the 'contempt for religious education' shown by some parliamentarians, but did not explicitly support denominational education. See Empire, 6 November 1867; F.J., 9 November 1867, for accounts of the meeting. O'Farrell, op.cit., p.359 has a copy of the resolutions passed at the meeting, and, p.360-1, a copy of the Constitution adopted.

2 For example, Patrick McMahon was the first lay secretary - and was succeeded by J.G.O'Connor.

3 After a couple of months the Freeman's rarely reported their meetings.
Catholics were one-third of the population, and paid one-third of the taxes they ought to be allowed one-third of the education allocation to use in their own schools. Sheehy also attacked the school inspectors, whom he accused of behaviour 'despotic and ungentlemanly...asking pimping questions of children, and when they saw the opportunities sneaking into school and looking through the teachers' bags for papers during their absence.' Following the meeting Polding issued the circular already referred to and a second, condemning public schools more strongly still, and pointing out to the clergy and laity that it was impossible to remain neutral in the struggle: 'he who is not with us is against us'.

This renewed demonstration of Catholic sectarianism did not pass without critical public comment. The Empire was particularly disappointed with Polding. It praised his many estimable qualities...as a Christian minister, as an accomplished scholar, as a gentleman in the fullest acceptance of the term...(but) with a feeling of reluctance...we call in question the soundness of opinion expressed by the reverend gentleman at the meeting.

In the Christian Pleadere McGibbon indulged in apocalyptic rhetoric:

The late meeting at St Mary's was worthy of the place and worthy of the speakers. The Archbishop came out in his true character...in exact accordance with the prophetic description of the Anti-Christian Beast, his mouth spoke 'great things' (but) he did not fail to show in what he said the rest of the Scriptural description of the Beast 'speaking lies is hypocrisy'.

McGibbon hoped that the meeting had revealed to all Protestants the real aim of the Romanists. In case it had

---

1 Empire, 6 November 1867; F.J., 9 November 1867.
2 o'Farrell, op.cit., pp.361-4 has a text of this circular. See also Lanigan, op.cit., p.81.
3 Empire, 13 November 1867.
not he spelt it out in a fashion calculated to incite:

When the priest O'Farrell spoke of riot and blood the people cheered as if ready then and there to proceed to work, and spread throughout Sydney another Bartholemew and to show that his bloodthirsty spirit was the general spirit, the Archbishop did not rebuke...doubtless if those bloodthirsty priests had their will, they would not take the trouble to hold public meetings... they would take the method which is consecrated in the memory of their church - they would set up their Inquisition and build their dungeons and hire their ruffians for riot and blood! Thank God...sleepy and indifferent and truckling as many Protestants are they have still enough of English liberty to check the blood thirsty aspirations of Rome, and let the priests know that if ever the days of riot and blood come through their vile agitation and spiritual tyranny, a strong army will beat them in the field and make short work of them.

The Wesleyan Christian Advocate and Wesleyan Record, in less extravagant language, also criticised the hypocrisy and truculence of the Catholic clergy.

The Council of Education was similarly disturbed by ecclesiastical criticism of their inspectors, and asked Polding and Sheehy if they would give details of their accusations. loftily, the clergymen replied that they had no confidence that the Council would act on their criticism. The single instance was easily explained by the Council's secretary. Although unable to produce evidence of their complaints the Catholic authorities were determined to demonstrate their truth. During November, whenever the two Council of Education inspectors examined Catholic schools they found Sheehy watching them like a hawk. On one occasion, as they were concluding an inspection of the Catholic school at Surry Hills, Sheehy burst into the school room, and without

---

1 C.P.L., November 1867.
2 C.A.W.R., 19 December 1867.
3 See 'Correspondence Respecting charges made against - and alleged misconduct of Public School Inspectors', V & P (LA NSW), 1867-8 (4) 637-44.
acknowledging the inspectors presence, told the pupils that as it was past four o'clock they had no reason to be in class, and should go home. The next day, they examined the school run by the Sisters of the Good Shepherd in Pitt Street.

Given the paranoia displayed by Catholic clergymen at that time it was hardly surprising that following the first day's inspection, the nun in charge of the school should have dispatched to Sheehy an hysterical note, accusing the inspectors of impertinence and dreading their return the next day. The next morning, as the inspection was in progress, Sheehy, with two members of the school board, entered the room and in front of the children and teachers informed the inspectors that he had had complaints of their behaviour and had decided to end the inspection. The matter was raised in the Assembly and provided Parkes with opportunity to indicate the overbearing approach of his clerical critics. The Catholic authorities refused to allow the inspectors to return to the school. Its certificate was withdrawn and it became dependant on the support of the Catholic Association.

The exaggerated fear and hatred held by the Sydney Catholic authorities for Parkes and the Council of Education was not shared by all Catholics. Even the Freeman's Journal could, a week before the big meeting at St Mary's, publish a report from its Bathurst correspondent that included the assessment that 'Mr Parkes is a sincere patron of education'. This assessment was offered following an inspection by Parkes of the two Catholic denominational schools at Bathurst. Parkes had professed himself very impressed by what he saw. Such a display of impartiality was appropriate, for the colony was preparing for its first royal visit and the last

1 Ibid.; letter of Sheehy in S.M.H., 26 November 1867.
2 Parkes stressed that the teachers whose inspection Sheehy had forbidden were public servants, in receipt of public money. S.M.H., 23, 25 November 1867.
3 F.J., 2 November 1867.
thing most colonists wanted at that time when, as they imagined, the eyes of the world were upon them, was an unseemly display of sectarian animosity.

* * * * *

Hopes that New South Wales would remain free of sectarian display during the Royal visit were not to be realised. But it was Victoria which experienced the first upset co-incident with the visit. This was a fracas outside the Protestant Hall which resulted in the death of one person. The cause of the fracas was a large transparency which decorated the Protestant Hall. Portraying King William III crossing the Boyne, it attracted ribald attention from Irish-Catholics, who threw a few stones at it. One of the trustees of the Hall gathered some relations, friends and firearms and determined to defend the transparency. When, the next evening, a few stones were thrown at the transparency by a crowd of Irishmen, they discharged a volley into the crowd, wounding four. One, a boy of 11, died of his wounds three weeks later. Melbournians were appalled, and the authorities became concerned that the Fenians might attempt reprisals.

Both Sydney papers carried short and exaggerated accounts of 'Orange-Irish riots' in their telegram columns a day later, but no more news subsequently. The Empire devoted a short leader to deploring it as 'a disgrace to the Australian colonies' and hoped it would not be repeated in

1 The above account is constructed from newspaper reports of the incident; from correspondence concerning it which appeared in the press; and from various court proceedings arising from it. See Argus, 28, 29 and 30 November, 6, 13 and 24 December 1867, and 18, 20, 21 March 1868.

Sydney.¹ The Freeman's Journal expressed similar sentiments. It warned the government that the same rioting would occur in Sydney if orangemen were allowed to display offensive emblems and repeated the point a fortnight later.²

Despite press attempts to play down the Melbourne affray, rumours of a similar occurrence when the Prince landed in Sydney were rife, and added to an already tense situation. One such rumour was that the orangemen would arm themselves with revolvers and turn out in full regalia to take part in the procession organised to welcome the Prince. The Freeman's Journal devoted several leaders to urge the authorities to prevent this.

The future welfare of the colonies imperatively demands that religious discord should find no countenance and that each denomination should feel its perfect equality before the law and in society with all others. Hitherto we have been happily free of this dreadful curse [of orange intolerance] and the good effects of the exemption are at once visible to those who have had any experience of the different state of things, so it behoves any man who wishes to see that exemption perpetuated to crush the slightest appearance of the spirit of intolerance.³

Thus even the Freeman's could, when it suited it, invoke the liberal, anti-sectarian ideology.

Rumours of an orange procession were ill founded. The orangemen were particularly defensive in the face of prevailing colonial opinion. The Grand Lodge had met little before the Prince's arrival, and despite a few objections, decided that it would be ill-advised to stage any public demonstration. As well as the legal penalties and public condemnation a demonstration would have earned, they were further discouraged by the fact that they did not possess the paraphernalia of banners, flags and drums that were such

¹Empire, 29 November 1867. See also S.M.H., 29 November 1867.
²F.J., 7, 21 December 1867.
³F.J., 11 January 1867. See also F.J., 4 January 1868.
an important part of their celebrations in the old country. They did however decide to present the Prince with an address.

Three weeks earlier, on the arrival of Governor Belmore, fear of unfavourable attention had diverted them from even that course of action. That was despite rumours, widely circulating among Catholics, that Belmore was an orangeman, or at least an orange sympathiser.

More serious than rumours of orangemen were rumours of Fenians, fed by the news of widespread terrorist activity by Fenians in England. Late in November colonial papers carried news of the rescue of two Fenian leaders, Kelly and Deasy, from a prison van in Manchester and the killing of one of their guards, a police sergeant named Brett.

December mails carried news of the trial of a number of Irishmen for Brett's murder, and of widespread alarm in England at this and other Fenian activity reported from no less than 40 towns. The next English mail early in January carried news of the conviction of a number of Fenians in connection with the Manchester affair and gave clear indication that English alarm at Fenian depredations had by no means abated.

---

1 Evidence of W. Coulter, Grand Master, L.O.I. (qq.2854-5, p.908), 'Assassination Committee'. It was possible for orangemen to march under the banners of the Protestant Friendly Society, the orange benefit society, which was taking part in the procession along with other friendly societies.

2 Evidence of W. Coulter (q.2856, p.908), 'Assassination Committee'.

3 He was not. See Belmore to Duke of Buckingham and Chandos, 18 May 1868, Belmore Correspondence, p.35.

4 For example, F.J., 23 November 1867.

5 S.M.H., 2, 19 December 1867; Empire, 19 December 1867. In both papers of the latter date news of Fenian activities was given prominence over any other overseas news. Places mentioned as having Fenian scares included Newcastle, Liverpool, Hull, Chester, Brighton, Falmouth, Cardiff, Hereford.

6 S.M.H., 3 January 1868; Empire, 3 January 1868.
colony of the execution of three men, Allan, Gould and Larkin, for the murder of Sergeant Brett and later mails carried reports that widespread sympathy for these men was being shown throughout Ireland, in circles not previously thought 'tainted' with Fenianism.

It has been argued that the execution of these three men in Manchester had an impact on Irish public opinion similar to the impact of the executions of Easter 1916. If that were true the blatantly dishonest trial and the refusal of the Tory government to countenance clemency contributed considerably to that effect. But they were in turn products of the remarkable impact on British public opinion of the attack on the prison van in Manchester and the long list of other Fenian escapades. Until then, nineteenth century Englishmen regarded the Irish with a mixture of incomprehension, irritation and amusement. In 1867 a potent element of fear was added as the large and growing Irish ghettos in London and the industrial centres of the north took on an aspect of alien territory, capable of bringing forth destruction and violence of an apparently senseless kind into the very heart of English society. To most Englishmen Fenianism seemed senseless and irrational, and because irrational, unpredictable and capable of making anybody its victim. This combination of idiocy and destructiveness was captured by Tenniel's lead cartoon in Punch late in December. It portrayed a simian featured Irishman surrounded by his attractive wife and children but sitting on a keg of gunpowder to which he had just applied a fuse.

The isolated position of the colonies, combined with the

---

1 For example the huge march of mourners in Dublin led by John Martin and A.M. Sullivan reported in the colonial press in early February. E.g., S.M.H., 3 and 11 February 1868.
3 Punch, 28 December 1867. See L.P. Curtis, Apes and Angels, (London 1971), p.39. Tenniel was the first caricaturist to reduce the rebellious Irishmen to ape status. This began in 1865 with the first news of Fenianism, and culminated in 1867-8, and again during the early years of the Land League, 1881-3.
large number of Irishmen in the population, magnified the impact of the English alarm and produced a new crop of Fenian rumours. There were reports of Fenians meeting in hotels; of Fenians drilling on the outskirts of Sydney; of head centres arriving from America. The use of 'disloyal' and 'Fenian' language was said to be rife and a number of the detectives were employed to test the truth of the rumours.\(^1\)

Such rumours revealed more about the people who believed and circulated them than about the plots they were supposed to indicate. The so called pro-Fenian language was but one expression of a more generalised dissatisfaction which must have been common enough among the lower orders of society. Expressions such as 'Who is the bloody Prince! Nothing but a damned German bastard',\(^2\) was hardly a product of specifically Irish disaffection; and it appears fairly clear that amongst many of the colonial youth and the poorer classes, the epitet of Fenian was used more in jocular than serious fashion.\(^3\)

Similarly, evidence of Fenian plotting was seen in other normal activities. Some of the police even were prone to these suspicions. Three years later one detective was

---

\(^1\)See evidence of detective Broomfield (qq.2346-2357, p.889), detective Powell (qq.2384-2405, p.890) and detective Bowden (q.2551 and qq.2560-2561, p.896), 'Assassination Committee'.

\(^2\)Evidence of detective Bowden (q.2565, p.896), 'Assassination Committee'.

\(^3\)See evidence of detective Bowden, ibid.; and evidence of detective Finigan (q.2699, p.901). See also Appendix D4, p.942; and evidence of Francis Fitzpatrick (p.914) and R.H. Reynolds (pp.914-5), 'Assassination Committee'. Other indications of a certain general disaffection were given in rumours that the large pavillion temporarily erected by the City Council in Hyde Park would be burnt down. These were taken seriously by the City Council which installed an extra five hydrants in the building and stationed a watchman in it the whole time. See evidence of Charles Moore, Mayor, (qq.3257-3283, pp.921-2), 'Assassination Committee'.
still firmly convinced that he had discovered the first meeting held by the Fenians in Sydney, at the end of April 1866. He had been told so by a number of reliable people and considered it undeniable. What he was referring to was the first meeting of Irish State Prisoners Fund Committee, though he was not alone in considering that organisation irrefutable evidence of Fenian activities. Any sort of gathering of Irishmen in hotels, a common enough phenomenon, was viewed by some with suspicion. Henry Wager, the officer in charge of detectives, once instructed a detective to investigate a meeting of priests that had been taking place regularly at a certain public house. The detective did so and discovered that the source of the report were the frequent visits of two or three priests to the sick bed of the hotel's proprietor.

As a consequence of the Fenian Scare the authorities were receiving almost as many reports of possible Fenian disturbances at the time of the Prince's arrival as they were receiving reports of rumoured orange trouble. It was reported that Fenians were preparing to stage a demonstration; that a hurling match was being organised to gather them together to assault the orangemen should they march; and at least one report claimed that any disturbance would be taken as an opportunity to shoot the Prince. This latter report was not taken seriously by the police.

---

1 Evidence of detective Broomfield (qq.2204-2231, p.885), 'Assassination Committee'.
2 For example, evidence of detective Powell (q.2406, p.890), 'Assassination Committee'.
3 Evidence of detective Finigan (q.2658, p.899), 'Assassination Committee'.
4 Evidence of detective Camphin (q.1774, p.872); evidence of ex-detective McGlone (q.2811, pp.905-6); Appendix A7 (p.930), 'Assassination Committee'.

The possibility of major social disorder on the occasion of the royal visit seriously perturbed responsible colonial opinion. When Governor Belmore arrived on 7 January, the Herald, responding to the rumours of his orange sympathy, devoted part of an editorial to inform him that 'the normal condition of the colony' was not one of 'religious conflict or sectarian animosity', and to warn him that 'nothing could be more unfortunate than for a Governor to be found in the narrow arena of pestiferous strife and to feel himself ruler of a sect and not a whole people'. Ten days later the Empire's political columnist 'Le Flaneur' claimed that 'neither political or religious feeling ever ran higher in Florence or Edinburgh than they do just now in Sydney', and suggested that up to 12,000 might turn out to brawl during the welcome to the Prince. That figure was chosen more for effect than accuracy, and was largely incidental to his main argument that widespread feeling of religious bitterness, which might give rise to such brawling, was a consequence of the obsession of politicians with religious questions, and of the constant feuding in the letter columns of the press between the champions of the various denominations.

Despite the inability of the police to uncover reliable evidence of likely disorder, the authorities were disturbed. Parkes several times urged John McLerie, the Inspector General of Police, to try and produce solid evidence of some kind, and willingly acceded to McLerie's request that he be allowed to swear in 500 special constables for services on the day of the procession. The Executive Council considered

1 S.M.H., 8 January 1868.
2 Empire, 18 January 1868.
the matter a little before the landing. By then the absence
of conclusive evidence had predisposed the ministers to play
down the danger and they agreed with Belmore that it would be
best not to provoke fears by publicly reminding the populace
of the provisions of the Party Processions Act. Nevertheless
it was decided to station a detachment of 100 men from the
50th Regiment in the large pavilion temporarily erected in
Hyde Park. McLerie had been making enquiries of his own
and assurances he had received from the Catholic authorities
and the orangemen eased his fears, so that when he found it
difficult to find 500 men to swear in as 'specials', he
decided he could safely abandon that plan. He did, however,
swear in 88 City Council employees for keeping the crowds in
check at certain points of the procession.

1 Belmore to Duke of Buckingham and Chandos, 1 February 1868,
Colonial Office Records, 201/546, f.79.
2 Evidence of McLerie (qq.144-149, p.803), and evidence of
Fosbery (q.258, p.807), 'Assassination Committee'. Belmore
did not mention this in his dispatch referred to above, and it is possible that the two police officers, whose evidence
was given a year later, are mistaking this occasion for a
later one, but T.A. Murray, who was President of the Reception
Committee, in a letter to his sister written a month later
referred to 'military forces available in case of necessity'
in a wider reference to anticipated disorder, so it is more
likely that the men were stationed there, and that the
Governor merely omitted to mention the fact in his report.
See T.A. Murray to Marie Bunn, 20 February 1868, Murray
family papers, Series I, no. 117, MS 565, A.N.L.
3 James Hart, a friend of McEncroe's and the leading Catholic
spokesman in the Legislative Assembly, claimed later that
McLerie had contacted McEncroe to request his assistance in
pacifying his co-religionists (S.M.H., 12 December 1868).
Fosbery, McLerie's assistant, had already been approached by
a worried McEncroe who enquired of police intentions respecting
the proposed orange march (evidence Fosbery [qq.250-252, p.807]
'Assassination Committee'). Hart also claimed that McLerie
had approached orange leaders, but they denied this (evidence
of Coulter [q.2854, p.908] and of G.L. Wilson [qq.2993-2998],
'Assassination Committee'). McLerie, however, would not have
found it all that difficult to discover that the L.O.I. did
not intend to march.
4 See copies of official correspondence on this published in
S.M.H., 15 December 1868. Also see 'Special Bundle'.
McLerie had intended to recruit these men from among the
members of the various friendly societies. Most of their
members, however, intended to march in the procession.
Although the expected sectarian strife did not eventuate, sectarian tension in the colony remained high. This was largely the work of Richard O'Sullivan, who responded to the news of 'the judicial murder' of the 'Manchester martyrs' with some fervently anti-British tirades. On 18 January the Freeman's carried news of the execution of 'the Fenian martyrs' and comment critical of those who sought clemency for them: 'true sympathisers with the prisoners would sooner cut off their right hand than whine as beggars at the feet of their foreign masters'.¹ The following week's issue contained comment from Irish papers fiercely critical of the executions and the British Government. One commentator warned the English newspapers of the dangerous consequences of urging Englishmen to set upon Irishmen in a race war, implying that this was in fact what was happening. Editorially in that issue, O'Sullivan claimed that the divergence of opinion on the hangings illustrated the unbridgeable gap between Protestants and Catholics and went on to argue against the executions, not primarily because the shooting of Brett was accidental, but because the storming of the van was a political action: an act of war against the British government. Following this confusing admission, O'Sullivan argued that they should have been exonerated for they did not intend to kill anyone: had they wished to, not a guard would have remained alive. He then argued that the executions would have had the opposite effect of deterrence:

It is much more likely to prompt the brothers of the strangled men to make reprisals whenever opportunity presents itself. The Fenians can argue this way - Allen was hung, not for shooting Brett, but for being a Fenian. If the British Government shoot us for being Republicans and to deter us from rebelling, we are justified in shooting their adherents for being Royalists and to impress them with the uselessness of resistance.²

¹ F.J., 18 January 1868.
A week later, a long letter from 'our special correspondent' detailed the injustices of the trial and sketched a picture of the cowardly panic gripping British officials at the time. It did not fail to observe that the same journals which screamed about 'anarchy', 'armed rebellion', 'ruffianism', 'priestcraft', and 'low Irish' would have 'lauded the act of the Fenians to the skies, as the purest and most heroic act of patriotism of the present age had it taken place in Florence, for the rescue of Garibaldi'.

The following week's English mail carried news of an explosion outside Clerkenwell Prison in London, presumably intended to secure the release of Fenian prisoners within, which took the lives of six passers-by and injured many others. O'Sullivan saw this as the act of vengange for the Manchester executions which he had predicted. The mail carried news of many other Fenian scares in England; of troops guarding armories and public buildings; of special precautions to protect the Queen; and of the swearing in of 30,000 special constables in London alone. Its reception marked the high point of colonial fears of Fenianism. Over all this, rashly, O'Sullivan exulted:

The descriptions given of the state of the metropolis and the populous manufacturing towns resemble accounts of cities beleaguered by a mighty foe....The great British people, who were so fond of challenging the world look amazingly like a flock of sheep in whose midst a ravenous tiger has leaped. Calmness and confidence have altogether disappeared, leaving in their stead frenzy and universal distrust. Cowards in their panic are always brutal to those whom they have in their power, and whom they expect to be leagued with their enemies, and accordingly, a bloodthirsty appetite has seized upon the great Anglo-Saxons, they cry out for the hangman, and, while their lips quiver in abject fear,

1 F.J., 8 February 1868.
2 F.J., 15 February 1868. A week later O'Sullivan denied that the explosion could have been revenge and condemned the deed as 'murder of a very wicked shape' and went on to deny its connection with Fenianism, echoing the denials of the London Fenian Revolutionary Committee (F.J., 22 February 1868).
threaten terrible things against the disturbers of their peace. Truely this is a pretty spectacle for mighty England to present to the nations of this earth. But she gets no sympathy, for she has no friends. There is not a civilised country on the face of the globe that has not suffered something from her, and that does not owe her a grudge; there is not a nation but would rejoice to see her fields made a Golgotha of, and her cities destroyed, even as Sodom and Gomorrah.

The *Sydney Morning Herald* reacted rather differently to the news of the Clerkenwell explosion. It saw it as revealing 'the dark and desperate character of the Fenian conspiracy', but observed that such acts made Fenianism appear more formidable than it really was, and warned that Britain should still continue to treat it with moderation. Its conclusion betrayed its annoyance at the anti-British capital the *Freeman's* was making of the episode: 'There is not a grievance which Ireland has that has not been suffered in far larger proportions by countries under Catholic governments and by Protestants living within them.'

The seriousness of the English government's concern over Fenianism appeared to be confirmed by the despatch from the secretary of State for Colonies which arrived with the mail that brought the details of the Clerkenwell explosion. It drew to the attention of the various colonies the provisions of the Treason Felony Act, passed by the Commons

---

1 *F.J.*, 15 February 1868. Copies of the editorials and articles referred to above can be found in Appendix (pp.948-54) of *Assassination Committee*. Parkes introduced them as evidence for his belief that Fenianism was being fomented in the colony during the months immediately prior to the attempted assassination of the Duke of Edinburgh.

2 *S.M.H.*, 12 February 1868.

3 It was tabled by Parkes without comment on 25 January. (*S.M.H.*, 26 February 1868). A copy is in *V & P* (LA NSW), 1867-8 (2), 45.
in 1848. This act enabled certain treasonable activities to be treated as felonies rather than as capital offences as under the original High Treason Act, and was passed specifically to deal with the rather harmless but relatively numerous Young Ireland revolutionaries.1 It had been frequently invoked since, particularly against the Fenians, and the Secretary of State's action in recommending it to colonial legislatures was taken as indicating his fear that Fenianism could erupt in the colonies as well. This was the significance given the despatch by the Freeman's Journal and the Empire, and both condemned the presumptions of the Secretary of State, arguing that such a measure was unnecessary in the relatively peaceful and law abiding colony, and hoped that no more would be heard of it.2 The Freeman's later used it as an excuse to launch yet another fierce attack on British misrule in Ireland.3

While the Manchester executions and their aftermath were feeding the sectarian delusions of a number of the colony's Irish, these same delusions received reinforcement by the colonial Government's refusal to declare St Patrick's Day a public holiday, as it had been for the previous few years. Early in February, leading Irishmen, mostly of the 'forties generation', met to organise the 1868 celebration.4 As usual the Governor was approached to act as patron and T.A.

2 Empire, 26 February 1868; F.J., 29 February 1868. The Governor, Lord Belmore noticed the criticism and observed in a despatch to the Parliamentary Undersecretary for Colonies that any attempt to introduce such a measure would be bitterly opposed. He had been told there were 'rumours of a spirit of Fenianism abroad, particularly in the country districts', but thought there was no cause for alarm. Belmore to Adderly, 21 February 1868, Copies of Correspondence of Earl of Belmore, 1868-72, p.15.
3 F.J.,
4 S.M.H., 8 February 1868.
Murray as President. At the next meeting Thomas O'Neil was elected chairman, William Dolman and Joseph Carrol were chosen as secretaries and John Hughes as treasurer. However, when the Government was approached with a request to declare the day a public holiday, James Martin informed them that his colleagues were of the opinion that there were too many holidays, which interfered with business, and that their request could not be granted.

At a meeting of the committee several days later the Government was angrily criticised. Denis Kearney thought more respect should be paid to the colony's Irish population, while James Garvan and John Hughes described the refusal as 'an insult to the Irish'. Garvan hoped that Irishmen 'would show the tyrannical toady now at the head of the government ...(who) if he had his own way would stamp out the feeling of nationality that ennobled the whole human race...that he did not have the power to enforce it (the ban on St Patrick's Day)'. John Hourigan thought such a refusal came in bad grace from the Premier 'who would never have got a seat if it hadn't been for the St Patrick's Day people'. They agreed to hold a regatta nevertheless. This was not the end of their trouble however. The sectarians who comprised the committee were always likely to fight among themselves and when Richard O'Sullivan, who had turned up for the first time to a meeting on 11 March, was appointed to a sub-committee to draw up a list of toasts, John Hughes, who was

---

1 F.J., 8 February 1868.
2 S.M.H., 15 February 1868.
3 Empire, 19 February 1868; F.J., 22 February 1868. The meeting did, however, refuse to consider a suggestion put to them by John Coghlan, suggesting that instead of a regatta a picnic be held to raise funds 'for the benefit of the wives and children of the unfortunate men recently murdered on English soil for endeavouring to procure justice for their native land'.
also on the sub-committee indicated his refusal to serve with him on the grounds that at last St Patrick's Day O'Sullivan had refused to drink Her Majesty's health. In the ensuing uproar O'Sullivan proudly admitted the charge and John Speerin, who had also been appointed to the committee indicated that he, too, was withdrawing his name. In the Herald's report the next day, the day of the Sailors' Home picnic, both O'Sullivan and Speerin were reported as stating that they would not drink a toast to the Queen.

Those who closely read their papers that morning of 12 March would have seen yet another reference to the loyalty or lack of it of the same section of the community from which O'Sullivan came. This was contained in a report of the previous day's debate in the Assembly, when William Cummings, the Catholic M.L.A. from Bathurst, had defended the Catholic clergy against criticism made by Parkes two nights before. On that occasion, Parkes, exasperated by the filibustering of the Opposition, had been stung by Thomas Garrett's criticism that he was deliberately trying to create a spirit of dissension in the country. He had hotly denied the charge, and went on angrily to accuse the Catholic clergy of gross and unmitigated falsehoods in their assaults on the education act. Such attacks were not 'assaults against him, but against the constituted authority of the country'. Cummings affirmed the loyalty of the Catholic clergy and renewed the criticism that Parkes was 'deliberately trying to divide our people into nationalities'. Such a division was certainly taking place,

---

1 See letter of J. Speerin, S.M.H., 21 March 1868, and evidence of John Hughes (qq.2815-2842, pp.506-7), 'Assassination Committee'. See also letter from John Hourigan, another member of the Committee. Hourigan insisted that a large part of the report of the meeting was incorrect and hinted that this might have been deliberate. (S.M.H., 17 March 1868.)
2 S.M.H., 12 March 1868.
3 S.M.H., 10 March 1868.
4 S.M.H., 12 March 1868.
although Parkes was no more responsible for it than anyone else. An event which took place later that day was considerably to accelerate the process of division.
Chapter II

A Peaceful Town Turned Upside Down

Prince Alfred Ernest Albert, Duke of Edinburgh, Queen Victoria's fourth child and second son arrived in Sydney on 21 January 1868.¹ Fears of Fenians and sectarian disturbances were submerged by the rejoicing that swept the city and the colony during the first days of the visit. Thousands braved heavy showers and lined South Head and other harbour side vantage points to observe the arrival of the 'Galatea', the naval frigate captained by the Prince on his tour of the colonies.² The following day many thousands more packed the area around Circular Quay and lined the streets to cheer the Prince when he landed and passed in procession. In the evenings the streets were thronged by crowds excitedly viewing the hundreds of transparencies and other illuminations which graced the fronts of buildings, and elaborate arches erected

---

¹ The Prince had been touring the Australian colonies since October 1867 and had previously visited South Australia, Victoria and Tasmania. Prior to that he had spent some weeks in the Cape Colony. The best account of the tour is J. Milner and O. Brierly, The Cruise of the Galatea (London, 1869). The Rev. John Milner was naval chaplain on board the 'Galatea' and the book is largely composed of his journals written during the tour. Oswald Brierly, a painter who was a member of the Prince's personal suite did a number of sketches during the tour which were reproduced as illustrations in the volume. A more recent work by Brian McKinley, The First Royal Tour (Melbourne, 1970), is rendered almost useless by a plethora of mistakes. Philip Cowburn, 'The Attempted Assassination of the Duke of Edinburgh, 1868', J.R.A.H.S., Vol.55, Pt.1 (March 1969), pp.19-42, has a very useful account of the Prince's arrival in Sydney and of the colony's welcome for him.
over the route of the procession.1

I strolled at daybreak through our streets,
and everywhere I went,
A peaceful town turned upside down - a waste
of glass and wood.2

There were some who deprecated the lavish displays, the
enthusiasm and enjoyment, but they were very few and were
roundly abused by the papers for their philistinism.3 The
Freeman's Journal had previously adopted a position of
studious detachment,4 but by the time of his arrival, had
unbent and wished the Duke 'a pleasant stay and a safe
voyage home'.5 It saved whatever criticism it had for
displays of colonial pomposity,6 but it shared that sentiment
with, among others, a large section of the crowd awaiting the
landing of the Prince at Circular Quay, who good naturedly
jeered members of the ministry when they arrived, resplendent

---

1 S.M.H., 23 January 1868; Empire, 23 January 1868.
T.A. Murray, who was President of the Reception Committee,
claimed that there were 200,000 people packed into the city
during the first week of the visit, nearly twice its usual
population of 110,000 and almost half the colony's population
of 431,000. (T.A. Murray to Anna Bunn (his sister),
20 February 1868, Murray Family papers, Series II, No.117,
MS.565, A.N.L.) Other sources commented on the large number
of country people in the city for the visit (e.g. S.M.H.,
21 January 1868).
2 S.M.H., 21 January 1868.
3 Ibid.; Empire, 3 February 1867.
4 F.J., 12 October 1867. It had written of the Prince: 'He
is the second son of the Queen of England, and accordingly
the many here who rejoice in calling themselves the subjects
of that lady are preparing to give him a reception....'
6 F.J., 18 January 1868.
in blue and gold court dress. Most colonists were genuinely eager to express their loyalty and those few who turned out merely to see the display could hardly have remained unaffected.

This was the first tour of the colonies by a member of the Royal Family and many colonists saw it as Imperial recognition of their achievement. Consequently there was a large element of self congratulation in their welcome. Equally important was the opportunity the visit provided for celebrating their British character and for momentarily bridging the thousands of miles between themselves and 'Home'. In England this was the beginning of that trend towards adulation of the monarchy, a trend that was if anything reinforced by the upsurge in republicanism in 1871. Much of this adulation flowed from personal admiration for Queen Victoria, so perfect an embodiment of homeliness, motherhood and respectability. The colonial middle class enthusiastically shared those values and the presence of royalty enabled the more socially aspiring to recreate in balls and receptions some of the high life enjoyed by those who, in England, would have been their social superiors.

While the reasons for the welcome's remarkable enthusiasm are many and varied, it is difficult to escape the conclusion that this first royal visit coincided with an identity crisis in the Australian colonies. The Prince arrived in the antipodes just as the leading men of the different colonies were showing their confidence in the colonies' future by beginning seriously to discuss federation. It was even suggested in several places that the Prince might become the

---

1 S.M.H., 23 January 1868. Parkes wore a coat over his uniform until the Prince was about to step ashore and James Byrnes wore ordinary dress. In England David Buchanan was appalled to read of the colonial 'toadying' to the Prince and wrote an angry letter to Parkes telling him so (Buchanan to Parkes, 19 February 1868, P.C., A874, pp.178-81).

2 For example, Empire, 20 July 1867.
King of a federated Australia. Such optimism was tempered by an awareness that a large section of British opinion had concluded that 'responsible government... had ignominiously failed in the colonies' and that 'colonists were impatient of wholesome control and desirous of occasionally departing from British forms of Government'. An awareness of this criticism added some anxious self-consciousness to the colonies' welcome and a determination on the part of those leading men who most closely identified their own success with that of the colonies to clearly establish the nature of their achievement. In Sydney the leading men, particularly those in politics, had been associated with the colony since the 1840s or earlier and had taken part in the movements which had given the colony its current political and social institutions. Significantly the most lavish illuminations in Sydney appeared on the government buildings. These pictures symbolised and

---

1 For example: A Colonist, A Proposal for the Confederation of the Australian Colonies with Prince Alfred, Duke of Edinburgh, as King of Australia (Sydney, 1867) and Australasian, 11 January 1868.


3 In the words of an editorial in an edition of the London Standard which reached the colony at the same time as the Prince. See Empire, 23 January 1868.

4 The Herald (24 January 1868) described the illuminations as 'turning the city into a university for the people' because they expressed 'the ruling ideas as well as the achievements of our mixed population'. For example, gracing the Council of Education Building was a large picture of the chariot of education drawn by four flying horses and driving before it the dark bird of ignorance. In the chariot were Minerva, goddess of wisdom and another figure holding aloft a standard inscribed 'knowledge is power'. Above the picture was the number '700 schools' and above that an open bible. Hanging between the two Houses of Parliament was a large transparency showing the parting of two galleys. In the largest of these, 'The British Constitution', stood Britannica handing over a rudder, the emblem of self government to the young woman in the other, representing Australia. See Empire, 23 January 1868, for fuller descriptions of these and many other transparencies. Cowburn, op.cit., pp.26-7, devotes some attention to this interesting portrayal of the colonists' self image.
celebrated the colony's progress: not just its material advancement, gained from sheep, gold and trade; but its achievements in education, in civilising the aborigines, in moving to political responsibility and in maintaining social unity.

The press and public speakers, then and later, concentrated upon establishing an independent Australian identity that was fundamentally British in its essential attributes. Much of this, appropriately, was expressed in the course of arguments specifically devoted to loyalty. Loyalty, these arguments ran, was the most important attribute the colonists could display during the Prince's visit, but it was not to be a blind loyalty given to the Prince simply because of his rank and title. That would be more appropriate to the subjects of despots than independent minded men of British stock. It was given partly because 'he was his mother's son': but Victoria was no despot, rather the very model of a constitutional monarch. More powerfully, it was an appropriate and grateful response to Britain for learning the lessons of the American Revolution, and granting the colonies self government when they desired it. They were proud and pleased that they had not been forced to emulate the Americans, whose society and political institutions they considered lacking in that balance between individual freedom and respect for authority that characterised the British genius. For while the Empire could reflect that in the fulness of time Australia would probably be a republic it denied any present desire for that form of government and endorsed the sentiments of the politician who proclaimed his loyalty 'to the real ties, moral and mental ties, that bind us to England', and concluded that in her defence 'we are as willing to spend the last penny of our money and last dregs of our blood as are our brothers who remain upon her soil'.¹

¹These two quotations from the Empire, 23 January 1868. The observation of the Empire is from 3 February 1868. Other expressions of the argument about loyalty may be found in S.M.H., 21, 23, 27 January, 4 March 1868; Empire, 20, 23 January, 3 February 1868; Australasian, 11 January 1868. See also A. Mitchie, Loyalty Royalty and the Prince's Visit (Melbourne, 1869), for a fairly comprehensive summary of the arguments first appearing in the press a year earlier.
Apart from short visits to Queensland and the Hunter Valley, it was intended that the Prince would spend two months in Sydney before departing for New Zealand. After the first fortnight city life returned almost to normal, although a fairly hectic social calendar centred on the royal person continued, and events such as the German torchlight procession, held on 9 March after several postponements due to rain, could still attract huge crowds into the streets. Another event previously postponed because of rain was the Sailors' Home picnic. This was held on 12 March at Clontarf, an extensive foreshore and beach and a popular picnic spot on Middle Harbour, about eight miles from Sydney.

The Sailors' Home committee under the chairmanship of Sir William Manning had determined early in January to hold a huge picnic to raise funds for the Home, which was still incomplete. It was originally planned for 15 February, but that was a Saturday and objections from Jewish citizens led to its postponement until 17 February when heavy rain led to its further postponement. It finally came off on 12 March and a government half-holiday and one of the first fine days of the visit helped guarantee a large attendance. Steamers had been ferrying people from Circular Quay since early morning and when the Prince arrived at 2 p.m. a crowd of about 3,000 people were restlessly waiting for the luncheon to commence. It was not a very palatable affair. The joints of meat had been kept by a special freezing process since the previous postponement and were placed before guests in 30lb lumps. A fine grey sand had been kicked up by the crowds in the luncheon tent and covered everything; but large quantities of alcohol, including champagne, and the pleasant weather kept the crowd happy. A little after 3 p.m. the

---

1 S.M.H., 4 January 1868.
2 S.M.H., 5, 7 and 18 February 1868.
3 S.M.H., 18 February 1868.
Prince rose from the luncheon and strolled with Sir William Manning in the direction of the small cove where 100 aboriginals, who were to perform for the Prince, had been gathered out of the sight of the more sensitive picniers. The Prince had just handed Manning a cheque for the Sailors' Home when a man detached himself from the crowd, rapidly approached him and fired a revolver at his back from almost point-blank range. The Prince fell forward, crying 'Good God, my back is broken' and as Manning turned and stumbled the man attempted to fire a second shot. The cartridge misfired and as the man was cocking the weapon for a third shot he was grabbed from behind. This deflected his aim and the bullet struck a bystander in the foot.¹

Immediately the peaceful scene became one of vast confusion. Those who had seen the crime were quickest to the spot and many of them proceeded to attack the assailant. Immediately a cry was set up to hang him and men who could not get close enough to physically assault him cut tent ropes, noosed them, and ran them over branches to provide the means for his execution. Some men broke down and wept while others ran around wild with grief and rage. Women fainted while others had hysterics and those with stronger stomachs screeched to be allowed at him, brandishing their scissors. The assailant was quickly battered senseless by the mob and would certainly have been killed if men of steadier spirit had not interposed and at considerable risk to their own safety, conducted him to the relative security of a steamer. Some police had been in attendance at the ground and had quickly

¹The bystander was George Thorne, a retired merchant. For description of the attempted assassination, and its effect on the picniers, see reports in S.M.H., 13 March 1868; Empire, 13 March 1868. See also evidence given at the preliminary hearing of the charge of attempted murder, against the prisoner, O'Farrell, in Empire, 17 March 1868. Further descriptions are offered by T.A. Murray, in Legislative Council (S.M.H., 19 March 1868); by James Ivory, in his diary (M.L., MSS.101, p.213); in the two Stephens's comments, already noticed; and in Edward Stephen to Emilie Stephen, 27 March 1868, in Bedford, op.cit., pp.207-8.
taken possession of the prisoner. As they did so they heard him cry 'I'm a Fenian. May God save Ireland'. In their efforts to protect him they were assisted by members of the Prince's suite, some bandsmen from the 'Galatea' and a few other gentlemen, all of whom were severely battered by the mob and accused of being Fenians. Sir Alfred Stephen was active in restraining those of murderous intent, whose numbers included Alexander Stuart, a future Premier, who was running about with a carving knife to stab the assailant:

Sir Alfred Stephen: No! No! Stuart - let the law take its course.

Stuart: Damn you and the law, let me rip the - scoundrel up.

Others, on seeing the Prince fall, had run to his assistance and carried him into one of the tents where he was examined by two naval surgeons. On removing his clothing they discovered that the bullet had penetrated his back a little to the right of the spine. Its force had been considerably reduced by the seam of his coat and the cross-over of his thick rubber braces, and it had been deflected by the ribs, passing around them, to lodge a few inches below his right nipple. The wound was painful, but quite superficial, a result which some found easy to call miraculous.

It had taken the police and their assistants ten minutes to convey the prisoner to the steamer 'Patterson'. Once on board they had to dissuade the sailors from trying to hang him themselves. Meanwhile the angry mob, deprived of their victim, vented their feelings in an indignation meeting, the first of many to be held in the colony over the next few weeks. The

---

1 Evidence of S. Sgt Rawlinson at preliminary hearing, Empire, 17 March 1868.
2 Empire, 16 March 1868.
3 This encounter was described by Edward Stephen to his wife Emilie in Bedford, op.cit., p.208.
4 For example, S.M.H., 13 March 1868. See also sermons preached on a day of thanksgiving for the Prince's recovery, S.M.H., 29 April 1868.
meeting quickly resolved that the assailant must be dispatched there and then, and a number rushed to the steamer to demand his return. The crew were ready to comply with this, but those on board with the prisoner ordered the vessel to proceed to Sydney and, after a little time, prevailed.

The crowd then hung about in small groups, voicing anger and frustration, with which was mixed a certain apprehension that the assassin might have accomplices. An hour later the Prince was carried to another steamer to convey him to Government House. The crowd then embarked and returned to a city already seething with rumour and excitement.¹

The steamer carrying the prisoner reached Sydney at about 4.30. During the journey he seemed to recover somewhat and, as he landed, he thanked one of the policemen accompanying him who had wiped the blood from his face. He said that he did not care about death but that he was sorry he had missed his aim: 'I made a bloody mess of it'. He was taken by cab to Darlinghurst gaol.²

At Clontarf Lord Belmore had taken charge of the Prince's welfare. He directed his wife and aide-de-camp to return to Sydney to prepare Government House to receive the victim and to take precautions for his safety. Belmore had already formed the opinion 'that it was a Fenian business', and sent instructions for a troop of mounted police to go to Circular Quay to give the impression that the Prince would be landed there, 'for fear of another attempt being made on him in the confusion of the landing'.³ The Prince was landed at the small jetty below Government House. Despite Belmore's attempted ruse a large crowd had gathered there, but police and soldiers kept them well away from the landing place and the path to the house. As the Prince was carried up the path

¹Ibid.; also see Report of Supt Fosbery, Enclosure No.1 in Document No.6, 'Attempted Assassination, Correspondence'. p.741.
²Evidence of S. Sgt Rawlinson, Empire, 17 March 1868.
³Belmore to Buckingham and Chandos, 25 March 1868, in Belmore Correspondence, p.21 in M.L.
a strong detachment of marines surrounded his stretcher.  

The Legislative Assembly was sitting at the time. Thomas Garrett was speaking for the Opposition, stalling for time until Saul Samuel arrived to propose a resolution attacking the Government over Supply. A little after 4.30, William Macleay entered the Chamber and dramatically announced that the Prince had been shot. Most members remembered that recently a member had been told his house was on fire as a ruse to get him out of the Chamber, and Garrett continued speaking. At this point Martin, the Premier, was called out of the Chamber. A little later another member rushed in with confirmation of the news, to be immediately followed by Martin, who announced that the Prince had been shot, supposedly by a Dublin man, but that it was not serious. The House immediately adjourned.  

In the city the stories of the attempted assassination were at first disbelieved, and those who had seen the battered prisoner landed and placed in a cab by police had assumed he was the victim of some drunken brawl. However the sight of mounted police clattering towards the Quay gave weight to the rumours and a large crowd quickly gathered there. When it was known that the Prince had been landed and was lying in Government House a large crowd formed outside its gates, anxiously awaiting news of his condition. A large number of people remained all night.  

A reporter from the Sydney Morning Herald had been at the picnic and made his way back to the city as soon as he could. A special news-sheet conveying the details of the outrage was quickly run off and distributed through the city.  

---

1 Belmore to Buckingham and Chandos, 27 March 1868, C.O., 201/546, ff.197-8.  
2 Empire, 13 March 1868.  
3 S.M.H., 13 March 1868.  
4 Ibid. A copy of one of these is in the Ferguson collection in the A.N.L. (F.C. No.5825). It is not a full broadsheet, but a column of print 18" x 3" on galley paper. Its first article is datelined 7 p.m., but there are later additions, giving details of the Prince's health, which suggests several 'editions' may have been run off during the evening.
the outrage was quickly telegraphed to other centres where it was greeted by grief and anger. In Goulburn the church bells were rung and the Anglican Bishop held a special service for the Prince's recovery, which was attended by members of all denominations.\(^1\) In Maitland a downcast audience tried to distract themselves at an entertainment provided by a Miss Aitkin and a Mr. Rainford. During the performance a telegram was handed to Rainford, conveying the news that the Prince was definitely out of danger. He announced this from the stage and as one the audience rose and cheered and cheered. Even after several renditions of the 'National Anthem' it was some time before they quietened down.\(^2\)

In Sydney excitement continued to grow as the broad-sheet accounts of the event were distributed and as those who had been present retailed their stories. The military guard at Government House was doubled and a strong detachment of sailors was set to patrol its domain.\(^3\) Most entertainments were cancelled and the inhabitants of the city gathered in small groups, voicing their indignation and formulating their suspicions. Not much was known of the would-be assassin except that he was an Irishman, and on that basis it was widely believed that he was a Fenian. As people talked, apparently harmless activities of Irishmen and Catholics were recollected and re-examined by minds sharpened by suspicion.

The committee of the Catholic Association met that evening, but suspended all business to support a motion of Fr Luckie abhorring the crime and sympathising with the Prince. Speakers pointed out, presumably to members of the press, that though they had originally assembled to peacefully agitate on an important matter affecting their civil and religious liberties, this did not mean they were any the less loyal to Queen and constitution. Others emphatically

\(^{1}\)Empire, 16 March 1868; Milner and Brierly, op.cit., p.412. Milner had been in Goulburn at the time of the attempted assassination.

\(^{2}\)Ibid.

\(^{3}\)Belmore to Buckingham and Chandos, 26 March 1868, Belmore Correspondence, p.21 Australasian, 14 March 1868.
condemned Fenianism and all its work. The No. 2 Orange Lodge also met that evening. They too suspended normal business and passed a motion expressing their 'horror and indignation at the diabolical outrage'. The motion concluded with the hope that 'the knowledge of the vile horde from which the blow emanated may make him (the Prince) more firm to support and maintain the Protestant faith'.

Not everyone was convinced that the assassin was a Fenian. Richard O'Sullivan, writing that night a leader for the next issue of the Freeman's observed that many were saying that the criminal was insane. He deplored the deed 'which will cast a darkened stain upon the annals of N.S.W. as long as time will endure' and sympathised with the widowed Queen. Even if the assassin was insane, the fact that he was an Irishman made O'Sullivan fearful of the outcome. There could be no doubting the truth of his assertion that 'the prayer...of thousands of our countrymen on learning of the sad affair was "Pray God that he be not an Irishman!"'.

Meanwhile, largely due to the efforts of Parkes, more details of the assailant were becoming known. After the adjournment of Parliament, Parkes and Martin took a cab to Government House. Martin decided to wait there until the Prince was brought in, but Parkes, who had discovered from a police officer that the assailant had been lodged in Darlinghurst gaol, decided to proceed to the gaol and discover what he could. There, he and James Byrnes, the Minister for Works, who had accompanied him, found that the assailant had just been placed in a cell and they were able to question him, discovering amongst other things, that his name was Henry James O'Farrell and that he had, the previous night, lodged at the Clarendon Hotel at the corner of Hunter and George Streets in the city. Observing that the police were still in such a state of confusion that they had not even obtained that

---

1 S.M.H., 13 March 1868.
2 No. 2 Loyal Orange Lodge ('Shomberg'), Minute Book, M.L., MSS. 749.
3 F.J., 14 March 1868.
basic information from the prisoner, Parkes decided, as ministerial head of the police force, to pursue the enquiries himself. He and Byrnes went first to the Police Office and collected Henry Wager, the head of the detective force and Sergeant Baikie, the only two men present, and together they proceeded to the Clarendon Hotel. There a surprised owner showed them O'Farrell's room where they found a trunk, some loose clothing, percussion caps, cartridges and wadding for a revolver, a Douay bible, a Catholic prayer book and rosary and some French newspapers. On a table was a small book, with lined pages, ruled up as an account book.¹ Nine pages had been torn out of this and were found in the pocket of a waistcoat. They were written on both sides in pencil, and although illegible in parts, contained what appeared to be almost conclusive proof of the existence of a Fenian conspiracy.²

These pages contained a rambling collection of thoughts, little better than a stream of consciousness in the way they slipped from one association to another. It was later referred to as 'leaves from a diary', and a highly personal

¹Evidence of Parkes (q.1073, p.841); evidence of Wager (q.1997, p.878 and qq.2012-7, p.879); evidence of Read, (q.574, p.820), 'Assassination Committee'; see also statutory declarations of Wager and A. Baikie, p.728, 'O'Farrell papers', S.M.H., 13 March 1868.

²The original pages are in the 'Special Bundle'. Two printed versions of it exist. The first seems to have been made by the police before they handed the pages to Parkes on 10 August 1868 ('Attempted Assassination Correspondence', p.756). Parkes tabled the second copy, together with affidavits sworn on 18 September by Wager and Baikie attesting to its authenticity, on 15 December 1868 ('O'Farrell papers', p.727). Parkes returned the original to McLerie on 19 August 1868. There is little difference between the wording of the two versions, although the second has deciphered a few more words from the original. However, several long passages appear in different places in the two versions. This was because the pages were loose and a couple of pages had changed position between one transcription and the next. It says something about the jerky nature of the text that this should not be noticed. The original leaves in the 'Special Bundle' are in the same order as transcribed in what I have identified as the first version.
and a slightly incoherent diary entry would be its closest analogy, but there was no evidence that the memorandum book was used as a diary for there were no other entries and nor were these pages dated. If it had not been found among the possessions of a man who had just attempted assassination it would probably have been dismissed as the inconsequential meanderings of a madman. Such doubts were not likely to occur to men who had, from the first news of the crime, understandably suspected Fenians.

In almost the opening phrases the 'diary' expressed what amounted to despair at 'being left behind and for such a purpose!' and went on to ask 'Was Washington a criminal, for hanging Major Andre? was he, since he did in retaliation?' The answer appeared to be no, for 'he did it for his country and it checked the cruelty of the English'. It went on 'If I should fail...I should never forgive myself. Fail! but I cannot'. The author then went on to anticipate his own death:

I am to die in a few days, let me see, two weeks from this....It will be a fine soul race to somewhere, or, more probably to nowhere, or nihil. What nonsense it is to write like this, and yet I find grim satisfaction in thinking of the vengeance. How the nobility of the three countries will curse me, and the toady and lickspittle press hunt the dictionaries for terms of abhorrence! But vengeance for Ireland is sweet.

Several references were made to 'the nine' or 'the dear nine'. One such reference was ominous: 'There was a Judas in the twelve...in our band there was a No 3 as bad; but his horrible death, will, I trust, be a warning to traitors.' It went on to reflect that 'I must play the fool like Brutus, the simpleton, the ready laugh...show yourself incapable of entertaining serious ideas' - this as a way of escaping detection. It was sprinkled with criticisms of the local Irish, at whose expense appeared the only flash of wit in the document: 'these in esse or in posse convict people. For swearing and cursing and the use of the word bloody commend me to this colony.' It ended with expressions of distrust, a growing incoherence and imprecations against the colonial government and England.
The French newspapers found in his room were issues of L'Univers, the rabidly ultramontanist paper edited by Louis Veuillot. It is unlikely that any of the search party could read French, but each paper contained articles mentioning 'fénians', and must have further confirmed their suspicions of a foreign based conspiracy. It is doubtful if they were looked at again. Had they been they would have caused some confusion. The articles, naturally, were written from a pro-Vatican viewpoint and firmly condemned Fenianism. All the author of these articles (A. Lacordaire) wished for Ireland was religious freedom similar to Scotland.

By now firmly convinced that they were dealing with a serious conspiracy, Parkes took possession of the clothing and documents and proceeded to the Currency Lass Hotel where, he had been informed, O'Farrell, had stayed before moving to the Clarendon around Christmas time. This was owned by Dan Tierney, a man sometimes active in Irish affairs in the city and, presumably, the Tierney referred to in O'Farrell's 'diary' as a man who could not be trusted. There the party found a small trunk containing further possessions of O'Farrell, including some letters from Ballarat about business affairs and a letter from Bishop Sheil of Adelaide, written from Wexford in Ireland at the end of July 1867, urging O'Farrell to go at once to Adelaide and present himself to the Vicar General: 'Your best place will be with the Jesuits who will treat you with every kindness and attention suitable to your position. In his 'diary' O'Farrell had mentioned 'going in for the Church' as something he had once seriously considered, and Sheil's letter was a reply to a letter of O'Farrell's written 26 April 1867, obviously enquiring to this end. Such considerations, O'Farrell had recorded, 'plunged me into a fever - the having to decide on loyalty to church or country'.

1 Copies of these articles are in 'Attempted Assassination Correspondence', pp. 765-7.
2 A copy of this letter is printed in 'Attempted Assassination Correspondence', pp. 762-3; see also S.M.H., 15 April 1868. O'Farrell's original letter to Sheil, dated 16 April 1867, was published in S.M.H., 5 May 1868.
The papers next morning carried full reports of the attempted assassination and of the Prince's satisfactory condition. Each had a different version of the prisoner's name, H.F. O'Farrell in the Herald and H.F. Farrell in the Empire, but they gave accurate details of his appearance (5'11", fair complexion) and reported that he had told Parkes he had not intended to kill the Prince, only to give him a fright. Each paper claimed he was perfectly self possessed, and the Herald reported that when Parkes asked him how he had come to commit such an outrage, he had replied, 'come, come, it is not fair to ask such a question as that - the Prince will live, it's only a side wound - I shall be hanged but the Prince will live.' Both described him as a native of Dublin who had been in many countries, while the Empire added that he spoke with the accent of a Liverpool Irishman and had said that he had lived there most of his life. It also reported that when apprehended by the police he had cried 'God Save Ireland'. It was understood that he had come from England only three months ago. Each paper reported that Parkes and two policemen had gone to the Clarendon and Currency Lass Hotels where the prisoner had lodged and had found a Catholic prayer book and bible and papers showing that he was from Melbourne. Neither mentioned the 'diary' pages. It was also reported by other lodgers at the Clarendon Hotel that O'Farrell would become very bad tempered whenever the Prince was mentioned. The Empire went further in this direction and noted that people who knew him at both hotels considered that he was insane. It quoted Dan Tierney as saying that he had requested O'Farrell to leave his hotel some eight weeks before. Previous to that O'Farrell had been a model guest, but he had then become intemperate and irregular in his habits and constantly annoyed his fellow lodgers with interminable stories of his mining speculation.

1 S.M.H., 13 April 1868.
2 Empire, 13 March 1868.
3 S.M.H., 13 March 1868.
4 Ibid.
and terrible losses therein.\(^1\)

Although these reports made no mention of Fenianism and tended to treat the crime as an isolated event, this in no way inhibited the rumours which were widely circulating. 'Friday was a worse day than even Thursday, for the stories about Fenianism and the precautions necessary were quite alarming' wrote young Florence Smith, fiancee of one of Sir Alfred Stephen's sons, to her sisters in Melbourne.\(^2\) Not every rumour concerned Fenians and the more romantic (or salacious) speculated that O'Farrell had been avenging a wrong done to a wife or sister by the Prince, who was reported to be skilled in that regard.\(^3\) Nevertheless, there was anger in the air and police were forced to mount guard on the two hotels where O'Farrell had stayed to prevent them from being pulled down by irate crowds.\(^4\)

A long discussion in the Assembly demonstrated the way in which discussion in the community was focusing around two related questions: whether the crime was planned by Fenians and whether Catholics and Irish sympathised with the crime and shared the guilt. Martin moved for an address of sympathy to be sent to the Prince, and gained loud applause when he expressed his indignation at the assassination attempt. He said that the Government had had no reason to expect that such an attempt would be made, and concluded by saying that if Fenianism did exist stronger steps would be taken to put it down than in England. From the opposition benches Samuel (in the absence of Robertson, who was in the country) and Macleay both promised to sink all differences of a party

---

\(^1\)Empire, 13 March 1868.

\(^2\)Florence Smith to Emilie Stephen, 23 March 1868, Bedford, op.cit., p.207.

\(^3\)See Report of Detective Bowden, 13 March 1868, 'Special Bundle' and 'A conversation between the Principal Warder at Darlinghurst Gaol and...Henry James O'Farrell, 20 March 1868...', 'O'Farrell Papers', p.720.

\(^4\)M. Consett Stephen to Emilie Stephen, 27 March 1868, Bedford, op.cit., p.207.
nature to strengthen the government, and vowed that Fenians, if they existed, must be exterminated. Most speakers were similarly uncertain about the existence of Fenians in the colony. A few, however, had made up their minds. The Rev. J.D. Lang had been at Clontarf the day before and claimed that he had urged the mob to spare the prisoner, least they remove 'the only chance of searching out the vile conspiracy of which he was only a member'. John Stewart, on the other hand, 'did not believe there was a single Fenian in the colony (Oh! Oh!)' and explained that by a Fenian he meant an actual member of that secret society. He admitted, though, that there might well be people who sympathised with them and shared their feelings of antipathy for England. He, and a number of other speakers, denied any connection between the crime and 'members of a certain race and religion'. So sensitive were they on this topic that neither the race nor the religion in question was actually named, and when, early in the debate, Alan Macpherson first mentioned the possibility of a connection in order to deny it, a number of members greeted his words with cries of 'nobody said so!' Clearly many were saying so outside.

That the criminal was not a resident of the colony was for several speakers sufficient grounds to exonerate the inhabitants of the colony from blame. This argument was particularly appealing to the native born, who seemed to find in the occasion an obligation to stress that aspect of their identity, as if such an assertion cleared them still further from complicity in the crime. Two speakers drew attention to the Freeman's Journal, claiming that it was a major source of sedition within the colony, although one of them (Tighe) carefully cleared it of connection with the crime by observing that as the criminal was an outsider he could not have been influenced by it. The address was finally passed unanimously and the Assembly proceeded to Government House to present it to Belmore.¹

¹S.M.H., 14 March 1868.
The same issues that preoccupied members of the Assembly had also troubled John West and Samuel Bennett several hours earlier as they penned their leaders for the two morning papers. In the *Empire* Bennett worried about the crime, and had not clarified his thoughts before the paper went to press. While arguing that no political or religious end could have been served by the attempted assassination, he still thought it might have been 'the result of a deeply laid plan with a specific object'. If it was not that, then it was the act of a madman. He thought it a disgrace to the country, but warned against the harbouring of feelings other than humility and sorrow, and stressed that the crime must not be seen as necessitating a departure from the principles of British justice.¹

It was just this tendency, which had been shown by even 'grave and grey headed men' at Clontarf a few hours before which disturbed John West at the *Herald*. He found it 'impossible to use words to describe the blackness of the crime...or to utter fully the impression it has produced', but it was the consequences it could have on society that he feared most:

> Let us not under zeal righteousness commit the wrong of casting undeserved suspicion upon any person or persons - of confounding the innocent with the guilty, of assuming that the crime of a man is the crime of a party, and implicating in the guilt, or sympathy with the guilty, those who recoil from it as strongly as we do ourselves. We must strive to preserve a moderation and calmness that will keep us from excesses.²

The *Herald*’s warning was a pertinent one. The growth of sectarian tensions within colonial society over the previous two years had weakened the hegemony of the nativist anti-sectarian strand of the dominant liberal ideology which played an important role in maintaining social cohesion in the rapidly growing and rapidly changing colonial society.

¹ *Empire*, 13 March 1868.
² *S.M.H.*., 13 March 1868.
The sudden impact of the attempted assassination was likely to rapidly accelerate that process of deterioration, especially if even 'those grave and grey headed men...in whom subjection to public order had become a habit'\textsuperscript{1} should depart from socially sanctioned procedures for dealing with such an event, as they had almost done at Clontarf. The danger was that pent up feelings of anger and frustration might find relief in the identification and branding of scapegoats and by so doing weaken much further the anti-sectarian ideology and thus the cohesion and stability of the society. It was important for those strongly committed to the values and institutions of the society to find some way of allowing public expression of these potentially disruptive feelings which was not socially divisive. Such a way was at hand in the indignation meeting. An impromptu indignation meeting had been held at Clontarf soon after the shooting, but the immediate impact of the event was still too strong and the meeting had quickly deteriorated into the lynch mob from which it had formed.

By the next morning tempers had cooled somewhat and 50-60 leading citizens met at the Town Hall in Wynyard Square to plan and indignation meeting for the afternoon in the pavilion in Hyde Park. A sub-committee was formed to draw up a list of resolutions and speakers. Shops and offices had closed early to allow their employees to attend and a crowd of between 17,000 and 25,000, silent, with pale faces and stern looks, packed into the building and overflowed outside. The platform was crowded with men prominent in financial, commercial and political affairs. Many clergymen of all denominations were gathered amongst them. Loud applause greeted many as they took their place on the platform but the loudest of all was for four men: Sir William Manning and John Hay who had been actively involved in the capture of the would be assassin; Dr Bland, one of the oldest and most revered of the early colonists; and W.B. Dalley, the young hope of the colony. Charles Moore, the mayor, took the chair

\textsuperscript{1}Ibid.
and announced that resolutions would simply be put without comment. This would, he hoped, have more impact than thousands of finely turned phrases. His announcement was greeted with cheers.

Dr Badham, the Vice Chancellor of the University, moved the first resolution, expressing sympathy with the Prince. It was seconded by S.D. Gordon. The second resolution, proposed by John Hay and Dr Bland, expressed devotion to the Queen in both her person and position. Sir William Manning put the third resolution, seconded by E.S. Hill, expressing the meeting's 'abhorrence at the cowardice of the deed through which the life of a guest of the people had been attempted'. William Windeyer and W.B. Dalley moved the fourth resolution desiring the Mayor and themselves to convey the previous resolutions to the Governor to transmit to the Prince and the Queen, and each departed from instructions to give a short speech expressing their burning indignation. Dalley also expressed his gratitude that the assassin was not of the colony and that consequently he could not be identified with any person in the colony. Charles Cowper and Edward Flood moved a vote of thanks in the Mayor and the meeting broke up with loud cheers for the Mayor, the Governor, the Prince and the Queen.¹

Two slight disruptions had occurred during the meeting. At one point the Rev. Thomas Smith, Anglican rector of St Barnabas's, attempted to address the meeting but was ruled out of order by the chairman. Earlier, before the meeting began, the Anglican Bishop Barker, and the Dean of Sydney William Cowper, had strode angrily from the platform when they were informed that no clergyman would be allowed to speak at the meeting. This decision had been made by the organising committee at the same time as they decided to exclude addresses by those who were to propose the resolutions. Both

¹This account of the meeting is taken from S.M.H., 14 March 1868.
decisions were products of a desire to avoid, as far as possible, situations that could encourage sectarian feelings. ¹

At an other point in the meeting, Alfred Shifton, who was rather drunk, loudly declared that he 'did not believe in the British throne'. He was apprehended by George Hixson, a young volunteer, who had attended the meeting in full uniform. As Hixson attempted to convey Shifton through the crowds to the police office to have him charged, he himself was attacked by another man, Leopold Morgan, who had been told by some wit beside him that the man pushing past them in a green uniform was a Fenian. For his trouble, Morgan too was dragged off to the watchhouse. The next morning he was charged with assault and Shifton with drunkenness. A large crowd attended the court to see 'the Fenians'.²

Meanwhile, at Darlinghurst gaol, the prisoner, O'Farrell, had been speaking freely and telling a story which served to confirm the haphazard remarks of his diary. During the evenings of 12 and 13 March he conversed with one of the warders guarding him. These conversations the warder reported to the gaoler who sent his report on to Parkes the following day. In these conversations O'Farrell claimed that there were Fenians all over the colonies and that there had been ten Fenians in Sydney. Nine of them had gone to England, where they would soon cause trouble. He was the tenth. He said he had done away with the Prince because he had received word from London, where it was believed that the Prince of Wales was drinking himself to death. This meant that the Duke of Edinburgh would be the next king. He wondered if his clothing would be searched for papers, and hoped that no one else had been arrested. He also provided

¹Their letters protesting against this treatment are in S.M.H., 14 March 1868. Both papers thought that the committee had overacted, arguing that 'the clergy have not displayed such despotic tendencies to deserve to be treated thus', Empire, 16 March 1868. See also editorial in S.M.H., 14 March 1868.

²S.M.H., 14 March, 16 March 1868; Empire, 16 March 1868.
some biographical information. He had been born in Aaron's Quay, Dublin, but had left when six months old. He had come to Melbourne with his parents in 1841 and he had a sister living in Melbourne still.¹

F.R. Bernard, the chief warder visited O'Farrell on the morning of 13 March. O'Farrell recognised him, having known him in Victoria, and informed him that immediately following the arrival of the news of the Manchester executions, a Fenian body was organised in Melbourne, consisting of some Ballarat men, under the leadership of someone who had come out from England. They had come to Sydney and recruited more men, 24 in all, but then reduced their ranks to ten, who drew lots to see who would assassinate the Prince and Governor Belmore. Immediately after this Belmore became patron of a society favourable to them and they decided to exempt him and drew lots again to determine who would shoot the Prince alone. This fell to O'Farrell. This had all taken place two months before, after which nearly all the band left for England. Bernard immediately reported this conversation to the Colonial Secretary.²

Parkes spent most of Saturday 14 March in his office, interviewing large numbers of people who had come to him with views and information on the attempted assassination. At the end of the day he wrote to Belmore, informing him that the police had ascertained from Archdeacon McEncroe that O'Farrell had been a candidate for the Catholic priesthood. He continued:

I regret to say that there really is reason to believe that a number of disaffected people are scattered through our country. I do not think any grounds exist for the apprehension of violence from numbers, but I do think there is a treacherous spirit of disloyalty instigating small knots of men to displays of criminal intention.

¹Memo of J.C. Read, principal gaoler, to Henry Parkes, 14 March 1868, Appendix D5, p.942, 'Assassination Committee'.
²H.J. O'Farrell, statement made by the chief warder, Darlington Gaol, 13 March 1868', V & P (LA NSW) 1868-9(1) 733.
He concluded by noting that two detectives had been dismissed that morning for avowing Fenian sympathies.\(^1\)

The two detectives, Lyons and Apjohn, had in fact been dismissed for fighting and Lyons was later re-employed,\(^2\) but the panic which Parkes had noticed in the police force two days before still existed and Parkes had probably been told they were Fenians: Lyons was at least Irish. The two senior officers, Fosbery and Wager (McLerie was sick) were convinced Fenians abounded,\(^3\) and their frustration at not being able to produce evidence made them very irritable. Fosbery at one point declared of the Irish Catholics that he 'would like to bring the guns of the "Galatea" to blow down some of the wretches' houses',\(^4\) and Wager vowed that he would have all the priests boiled down and thrown into Woolloomooloo Bay.\(^5\) All the detectives were assigned to find out what they could about O'Farrell's movements and possible accomplices, and while none turned up clear evidence of accomplices they received numerous reports of 'treasonable' language and suspicious Irishmen. These reports were being passed straight on to Parkes.\(^6\)

For the three days immediately after the assassination the press had discounted the possibility of a Fenian plot. It is doubtful if this had any inhibiting effect on the rumours which were being fed by those who were connected with

---

\(^1\) Parkes to Belmore, 14 March 1868, Letters to the Earl of Belmore, 1868-72, Vol.2, pp.531-5.

\(^2\) Evidence of Lyons (q.2145-7, p.883; q.2196, p.885), 'Assassination Committee'.

\(^3\) See their evidence in 'Assassination Committee'.

\(^4\) According to detective Daniel McGlone, evidence (q.2747, p.902), 'Assassination Committee'.

\(^5\) Evidence of detective Finigan (q.2669, p.900), 'Assassination Committee'.

\(^6\) The 'Special Bundle' contains several reports from the first two days after the assassination attempt. Most however are from the next two weeks. Two from the early period detail the suspicions of Powell, the proprietor of the Clarendon Hotel, who appeared eager to demonstrate his loyalty by accusing a number of other people of Fenianism. Amongst the accused were two police officers, one of whom Powell claimed had suggested that he (Powell) might give evidence that would prove O'Farrell insane.
Then, the morning of Monday, 16 March, the Empire reported that 'the Government has abundant evidence that the crime was the result of deliberate political organisation and appointment originating in Ireland'. The Herald carried the news that 'from information elicited since Thursday evening there is little doubt that O'Farrell contemplated taking the life of the Prince some time before he made the attempt', and mentioned that he had taken a room overlooking Circular Quay on the day the Prince landed. It also noted that 'some idle rumours are circulating about the apprehensions of Fenian sympathisers, but the absurdity of most carries their own refutation'.

The following morning the papers carried the transcript of O'Farrell's preliminary hearing which included the police evidence that he said he was a Fenian and his own statement that 'the task of executing the Prince was allocated to me and I have failed, and I am not very sorry that I have failed'. They also carried the news that the Government had gazetted a reward of 1,000 for information leading to the arrest of any of O'Farrell's accomplices. The Empire reported (falsely) that a number of police had been dismissed for Fenian sympathies and also carried what purported to be a biography of O'Farrell, based on the recollections of

---

1 He had told Fr Dwyer, the Catholic chaplain, and Dr Aaron, the visiting surgeon, that he was a Fenian. [For Dwyer's visit see O'Farrell's conversation with Parkes, 24 March, p.715, 'O'Farrell papers'; for Aaron's visits, see statement of warder Carroll, Appendix D3, p.933, 'Assassination Committee'.] Not all those who visited O'Farrell remained convinced of his sanity. Detective McGlone had a peek at him on 14 March and said that he seemed to be shaking his head and rolling his eyes like a madman. [Evidence of McGlone (q.2801, p.905), 'Assassination Committee'.] Later that day Parkes forbade O'Farrell visitors unless he, Parkes, had first approved them.

2 Empire, 16 March 1868.

3 S.M.H., 16 March 1868.

4 S.M.H., 17 March 1868. The reward was gazetted on 13 March but did not appear until Monday 16th. (Government Gazette, extraordinary, 13 March 1868, p.739.)
people who held conversations with him over the previous two months. The biography was incoherent and had O'Farrell at different times being educated in Paris, serving in the Austrian Army, and keeping a saloon in San Francisco. The Empire warned that 'little reliance could be placed on anything he asserted'. Nevertheless it concluded that 'the facts show that his crime was long contemplated and deliberately carried out'.¹ The same paper carried a piece from the Yass Courier full of even wilder fantasies, which among other things confused O'Farrell with his brother, P.A.C. O'Farrell, a solicitor who had absconded from Melbourne four years previously to escape his creditors. This much had been worked out in Sydney a few days earlier, and confirmed by the evidence of John Carfrae, a Victorian squatter who had met the assailant at the home of P.A.C. O'Farrell some fourteen years before. Nevertheless, it was not until after Thursday, 19 March, when the mail arrived with copies of the Melbourne papers, that fuller and more accurate details of his past were published. These included information gathered from people who had known him at Ballarat and included tales of heavy drinking bouts ending in delirium tremens; of assaults on his friends and relatives; and the opinion of some of his friends that 'he was not of sound mind', and that 'aberration of the intellect was the source of his attack on the Prince'.² While such opinions may have reinforced those who wanted to believe in his madness, and may even, because of their reasonableness, have convinced a few, they came too late to have much impact. The announcement on the Monday that the government had proof of the Fenian conspiracy, and the passage of the Treason Felony Bill on Wednesday had a powerful effect in convincing the community that a conspiracy actually existed and that O'Farrell was part of it.

¹Empire, 17 March 1868.
²Empire, 20 March 1868 (from Australasian of 14 March), 23 March and 26 March 1868 (from Ballarat Courier). See Appendix V, for biography of O'Farrell.
The Treason Felony Bill, introduced by Martin on the evening of Wednesday, 19 March, was a product of the Government's conviction that a Fenian conspiracy existed. It was circularised to members only moments before Martin rose to move the suspension of standing orders to enable it to be passed that evening. In his opening speech Martin spoke of 'the great quantity of information which has been placed before the Government, tending to show that there were living in the colony persons who were engaged in conspiracy against the British crown'. John Robertson, who seconded his motion, admitted that he had revised his original opinion that the assassination attempt had been the act of a madman.  

The first seven clauses of the Bill Martin introduced were identical to the Treason Felony Act passed by the Commons in 1848, concerning which the Secretary of State for Colonies had circularised all colonial governments three months before. Martin explained that they made all treasonable offences, except attacks on the sovereign, felonies, and thus more easily dealt with than under the High Treason Act. To these he had added three clauses of his own invention. The first of these, clause 8 of the Bill, allowed a Justice of the Peace to issue a search warrant if it was believed that treasonable purposes were entertained and papers or weapons concealed on any premises. The warrant had to be countersigned by three members of the Executive. Martin explained that it was necessary if the Government was to be able to test the numerous statements made to them concerning treasonable activities. The next clause, clause 9 of the Bill, was the most remarkable of all. It proposed that any person who 'used language disrespectful of the sovereign, or avowed a factious refusal to join in a loyal toast, or expressed approval of persons suspected of being engaged in treasonable practices' would be liable to two years imprisonment. Clause 10 made it an offence to publish

1Empire, 19 March 1868. The following account of the debate, unless stated otherwise is from the same source.
language of the same kind with a penalty of three years. Each had obviously been framed with Richard O'Sullivan and the Freeman's Journal in mind. Martin explained that it was not proposed to force people to drink the loyal toast, but to make it an offence to openly refuse to:

He attached great importance to this clause because it seemed to him that if those who were indisposed towards the monarchy or towards the sovereign of the British Isles were permitted to use language disrespectful to the sovereign with impunity, they would become habituated to this kind of thing, and would proceed from language to something else. They would be ready to be led to overt acts of sedition.

The Bill quickly passed through all stages, with only William Forster and John Stewart opposing its passage. They argued that a Bill which placed such limits on freedom of speech ought not to be passed in such a rush. Forster warned the House against being carried away by the excitement in the country at large, which it should be seeking to counteract, not encourage, and voiced a suspicion that the Government might try to turn the Act to party advantage. The only widespread discussion concerned its duration, and Martin got around this by introducing an eleventh clause which made the previous three clauses operative for only two years. The Bill had an even quicker passage through the Upper House, where only John Hay objected to it as a possible instrument of oppression. He disagreed with Sir William Manning's view that as the Government thought it was necessary it must therefore be necessary. It was quickly passed and returned to the Assembly without amendment that same evening. It became law the next day.

Neither of the newspapers was enthusiastic. The Empire deplored that such a law should be thought necessary

---

1 Confirmatory evidence of this opinion can be found in the 'Minute of the Executive Council, 11 August 1868', issued after the Colonial Office had declined to submit the Act for royal assent. A copy is enclosed in Belmore to Buckingham and Chandos, 12 August 1868, C.O., 201/547, f.270.
and warned that its vague phrasing probably outlawed even condemnatory discussion of Fenianism. The Herald was less critical and shared with Martin the hope that it would 'check the mental perversions of the multitudes who have yielded their sympathy to the projects of Fenians. The law will lead them to reflect and adopt different standards of justice.' Nevertheless, they were unhappy at the ambiguity of certain provisions. The Freeman's Journal thought it was unnecessary but nevertheless had to be obeyed and warned its readers to be careful 'for the least remark may be construed into disloyalty and punishable under the Act'. The Freeman's was not alone in warning people of the provisions of the Act. Two days later, Monday 23 March, a number of placards bearing the Colonial Secretary's signature and warning people of the provisions of clause 9 of the Act were posted in prominent parts of the city.

Apart from the Government's assertion that such an Act was necessary there was little evidence available to the public that unequivocally pointed to the truth of such claims. The same issue of the Sydney Morning Herald that carried a report of the debate on the Bill also carried an account of a long interview between O'Farrell and Parkes where O'Farrell gave more information about the way he came to be appointed to kill the Prince and about the Fenian organisation generally. He mentioned four previous occasions when he had intended to shoot the Prince but had been prevented by one thing or another. The Herald reflected on these remarks and grudgingly admitted that he was probably a Fenian, although it would like to have more proof than 'O'Farrell's own words'.

1 Empire, 19, 20 March 1868.  
2 S.M.H., 20 March 1868.  
3 F.J., 21 March 1868.  
4 S.M.H., 24 March 1868. These were off prints of a one page supplement to the Government Gazette of 20 March 1868 (p.797).
The next day it reflected that 'the disclosures awaken some degree of incredulity'. Nor was news from overseas any more enlightening. On 14 March the paper carried cable news from England which announced the decline of Fenianism. But then, the next day, it was reported from Hokitika, a gold field on the West Coast of the south island of New Zealand that there had been a large procession there, in memory of 'the Manchester Martyrs'. It had been led by two Catholic priests who had attempted to stage a mock burial in the local graveyard. If Fenianism was dying in England it seemed to have taken fresh root in the colonies. The Herald commented that in the face of that sort of behaviour from Catholic priests, more was required from local Catholics than general affirmation that good Catholicism equalled loyalty. This was a somewhat more impatient remark than its fulsome praise for the loyalty of Polding 'the peacemaker' immediately following the assassination attempt.

The debate on the Treason Felony Act had done little to clarify the confusion about Fenians. The views of most of those who spoke, and the Act itself, with its ominous yet ambiguous clauses, only added to the anxiety felt by the community at large. Fear and suspicion mingled in the breasts of many colonists and quite a few were encouraged to inform the authorities of them. Parkes and the police officers were deluged with warnings of further crimes, and reports of the suspicious doings, and 'Fenian proclivities' of various colonists. Some were clearly from frightened and

1S.M.H., 19 March 1868.
2S.M.H., 18 March 1868.
4S.M.H., 20 March 1868.
5S.M.H., 14 March 1868.
6Evidence of Parkes (q.1299, p.853), 'Assassination Committee'. Some of these threats and reports were produced during the Committee's hearing and were published in an Appendix. A number of other reports and records of police investigation are in the 'Special Bundle'.
well meaning men, but the almost pathological state of the whole society was having its own effects on the minds of the less well adjusted and producing a spate of threatening letters and 'reports' of quite far fetched plots. It was also providing inspiration and opportunity for rogues.

By and large it was the men prominent in Irish affairs who were viewed with the most suspicion. Those named or investigated included Richard O'Sullivan, Patrick M'Donagh, John Speerin, Patrick Freehill, Thomas McCaffrey, Daniel Robinson, James Butler and James Garvan. A number of other Irish names were also mentioned, but in no case did investigation by the detectives provide anything more than new suspicions. Several examples will provide illustration.

On Monday, 16 March, the detective office received an anonymous communication to the effect that a carpet bag had been left at Mr Speerin's, the pawnbroker, by two men, who resembled Patrick Freehill and Richard O'Sullivan. The correspondent thought this was significant as Speerin had refused to drink the loyal toast. That same day, detective Joseph Camphin reported to the I.G.P. that he had been informed by a certain Alexander Cooper that a little time ago Speerin had come to his office with a quantity of india-rubber balls. He had wanted glass tubing made to fit the balls. Cooper thought they were 'combustable (sic) balls'. Two days later another anonymous report was received concerning Speerin. It was also reported that some firearms Speerin had had in his windows had disappeared. Lyons added that he had heard from a publican that some of the seamen from the 'Galatea' and 'Challenger' (another warship) were planning to make things hot for Speerin and his friends. Nothing further seems to have happened. 8

A week later the Governor, Belmore, received an anonymous, badly spelt and ill-composed letter, apparently written by a woman and dated 25 March. It informed him that lots had been drawn to take his life and that the task had fallen to a man who practised shooting pigeons with an air-gun

1 The papers connected with this are in the 'Special Bundle'.

on Victoria Wharf, Erskine Street. She also told him that the conspirators met every Wednesday night in a pub in Argyle Street.\(^1\) Investigations by the police discovered that a man had been shooting pigeons with an air gun, but there was nothing else against him. A watch on the public house in Argyle Street did not reveal anything.\(^2\) Numerous reports were received concerning this or that hotel which was thought to be the meeting place of Fenians. On one occasion a detective managed to obtain entry to one of these meetings and found that it was the branch of a benefit society.\(^3\)

In these cases, as in many others, ordinary occurrences had been exaggerated by suspicious and, in the second case, probably deranged minds into a definite pattern indicating subversive intent. Sometimes jocular remarks, or a failure to display appropriate sentiments regarding the Prince, the assassination attempt, or the assassin led to a person being reported. On 17 March, Robert Henry Reynolds, a barber and a Crimean veteran, reported to the police that Francis Fitzpatrick of the Survey Department (the son of Michael Fitzpatrick, the senior under-secretary) had said to him before the Prince arrived that he would be shot. Later he said that he would not take his hat off to any King or Queen, for they were only human beings like himself. On the evening of the day of the assassination Fitzpatrick had said he had known O'Farrell and actually had on one of O'Farrell's shirts and he had later said that he did not consider O'Farrell's act a cowardly one, as he had shot the Prince in full view of everyone.\(^4\) Ten months later Henry Parks mentioned

\(^1\)Published in Appendix (A10, p.932), 'Assassination Committee'.
\(^2\)Evidence of McLerie (qq.94-8, p.801); evidence of detective Camphin (qq.1762-7, pp.871-2); 'Assassination Committee'.
\(^3\)Evidence of detective Raven (qq.2103-6, p.882), 'Assassination Committee'.
\(^4\)Appendix (D4, p.942), 'Assassination Committee'. 
this case before the 'Select Committee investigating the alleged Conspiracy for the Purposes of treason and assassination', and both Fitzpatrick and Reynolds were called before the committee. Fitzpatrick denied making the first and fourth remark, but agreed he might have made the second and commented that he had had a shirt belonging to O'Farrell in his possession: he had purchased a pawn ticket from a man who had been living with O'Farrell and had found a shirt of O'Farrell's among the goods redeemed. When Reynolds was questioned by the Committee he acknowledged that Fitzpatrick might have been jesting. Fitzpatrick often jested, Reynolds admitted, even about the Roman Catholics, although he was one. Even if Fitzpatrick had made the first and fourth remarks, but felt it politic to deny them, that was hardly exceptionable. Rumours were circulating before the royal arrival that the Prince might be shot, and expressions of a certain sympathy with O'Farrell were part of a democratic or republican syndrome and were not uncommon. For example, another would-be police spy informed the Inspector General that he had heard a constable in uniform avow that O'Farrell had been wrongly hanged, for he had not killed a man. Such a view was understandable among those who by virtue of youth, nationality or occupation did not fully share the views of the easily shocked middle classes.

Parkes, Belmore and Martin each received a large number of threats. Their wording suggested that they were sourced in deranged personalities:

---

1Evidence of Parkes (q.1046, p.839), 'Assassination Committee'.

2Evidence of Fitzpatrick (p.914), 'Assassination Committee'.

3Evidence of R.H. Reynolds (qq.3103-7, pp.914-5), 'Assassination Committee'.

4W.M.C. Campbell to I.G.P., 17 April 1868, 'Special Bundle'.

Orange Belmore: By the blessed + of Christ and his immaculate mother, the Blessed Virgin, your days are numbered, together with your ministry, the dogs. We are everywhere in the colony. You little know our strength, it is legion. So prepare your coffins.¹

Martin and Parkes, your days are Numbered, the first available opportunity. A finean and 3,000 more at one moment's notice....I tell you that the number of fenians here are legion and could put you and your forces down at any time. No more at present, but in a short time you will be on the look out for me, and I shall dare you to tutch me (sic).²

Parkes claimed to have received at least 20 such threats, all of which he ignored.³ Martin and the Governor also ignored them, although Martin at one time had two police guarding his house at Potts Point.⁴ The wording of most of those threats suggests Irish and Catholic sources, and they were very similar in style to the threatening letters which always accompanied rural disorder in Ireland.⁵ There they were directed against landlords and sometimes Protestant clergymen or tenantry. In Ireland there was cause to take them seriously, for they were often acted upon, but there had been no history of such things in the colonies although a little later one orangeman who received several threatening letters was subsequently shot at.⁶ Not all threats were from apparently Irish Catholic sources. Archbishop Polding received several threatening letters, as did Fr Dwyer, the Chaplain at Darlinghurst prison.⁷ The author of one letter was tracked down by the police. This was a J.S.K., who, in April, following the execution of O'Farrell, had written to Belmore indicating that Belmore would have to pay for

¹Appendix (D10, p.944), 'Assassination Committee'.
²Appendix (D11, p.944), 'Assassination Committee'.
³Evidence of McLerie (q.80, p.801), 'Assassination Committee'.
⁴Evidence of McLerie (qq.189-91, p.804), ibid.
⁷F.J., 28 March 1868. See 'Special Bundle' for one such letter to Polding, apparently handed on to the police.
O'Farrell's death with his own. The letter was postmarked Beechworth and the Victorian police were able to trace the author. He was a drunken old Irishman who had just been gaol for indecent assault. 

Despite a reward of £250 for information on seditious persons which might lead to prosecution under the Treason Felony Act, only one warrant was issued under clause 8 of the Act. This was to enable the police to search the baggage of a James Reardon, who was already on board the steamer 'Rakaia', on the point of departure for the United States. It was issued 31 March. Information had been given to the police by a person called Gale who claimed to have met Reardon in Melbourne. Reardon had boasted he was a Fenian and had distributed Fenian documents, Gale reported. The police searched for Reardon in Sydney and found him at a boarding house in Woolloomooloo. Reardon was an Irish-American and had been in the colonies, mainly South Australia, for some time. He had come to Sydney with his wife and daughter en-route for America. While in Adelaide he had run a drapery business and had collected money from Irishmen, mainly around Kapunda, for the wives and children of the Irish State Prisoners. For this he had been presented with a medal. When the police searched his belongings on the ship the medal was one of the things they were looking for, for they had been informed from various sources that it was a Fenian warrant, or a medal sent out to him from Manchester. Instead they found several letters relating to his collecting for the State Prisoners fund, which they confiscated and let him go. The police who had done the searching, led by Fosbery and Wager, remained convinced that he was a Fenian, but had not enough information to warrant his arrest. They later claimed that he said he was a Fenian, but given that

---

1 A copy of this is in Appendix (A8, p.931), 'Assassination Committee'.
2 Appendix (A8, p.931), 'Assassination Committee'; see also Belmore to Sir George Bowen, 1 July 1868, Belmore Correspondence, p.58.
3 This was gazetted 9 April 1868. See Empire, 14 April 1868.
they thought the letters indicative of Fenian activities, which they were not, their testimony on this could hardly be relied upon.\footnote{Report of Fosbery to I.G.P., 1 April 1868, 'Special Bundle'. Evidence of Fosbery (qq.261-71, pp.807-8; qq.383-92, p.812) evidence of detective Broomfield (qq.2248-73, pp.885-6); evidence of Henry Wager (qq.1907-32, 1950-7, pp.876-7); evidence of detective Powell (qq.2455-80, p.892); evidence of detective Chudleigh (qq.2628, p.899); evidence of Oliver Rea (p.923-4) in 'Assassination Committee'. The originals of the correspondence confiscated from Reardon are in the 'Special Bundle'. Copies are attached to I.G.P. to Colonial Secretary, 2 April 1868, pp.742-4, 'Attempted Assassination Correspondence'.} After he had left they received word from the Victorian police that Reardon was 'a low schemer', who might well have hit upon the idea of collecting money for the Fenian cause. They doubted, however, if any of it would leave his own pockets.\footnote{See Appendix (A2, p.929), 'Assassination Committee'.}

The police were not the only people interested in Reardon. A certain Philip Baker, who was at that time lodging in the same boarding house as Reardon noticed that not only was Reardon buying large numbers of American gold coins but he had once spoken slightingly of the Prince. Baker decided that he could probably produce enough 'evidence' to prove Reardon an accomplice of O'Farrell and approached the landlady with a proposition, offering to split the 1,000 reward money with her if she would testify to certain things. She refused, and a little later asked him to leave her house. Baker had a friend, a coloured man, a bugler in the Volunteers, named Brady with whom he spent a lot of time drinking. Whether he was convinced or not himself he had certainly convinced Brady that Reardon was a Fenian, for early on the morning of Reardon's departure, Brady, who had been drinking most or all of the night, donned his Volunteer uniform and proceeded to assault Reardon just as he was entering the house after a morning stroll. A milkman who intervened to assist Reardon was badly hurt by Brady, who had
gone beserk, screaming that the whole house was a nest of Fenians, and abusing the landlady and her daughters in a most ungentlemanly fashion. A constable who was approached and requested to take action refused. This was observed by a resident of the house, D'arcy Wentworth Lathrop Murray, an ex-M.P. from Tasmania, who had lately lost his fortune and had come to Sydney to request the Duke of Edinburgh's assistance. His father had been a military officer and a close friend of the Duke of Kent. The Prince had recommended him to Parkes, who had not been able to find him a position. He had, since his arrival in Sydney, worked on the Empire and had become friendly with its proprietor, Samuel Bennett. He had been sick in bed the day Baker solicited assistance from the landlady and overheard the conversation. On observing the assault he urged the landlady to summon the police. 'It is no use summoning the police', she replied, 'we are Irishmen, and the volunteers and the police are paid to insult Irishmen'. Murray told Bennett of the occurrence. After verifying it Bennett published the next morning a letter from Murray describing the events and a leader warning colonists not to allow their justifiable feelings of indignation to carry over into unjustifiable violence.¹

The person most disadvantaged by the Reardon case was an Oliver Rea. Rea had been a mounted trooper but had recently lost his leg in an accident. Reardon was his cousin and had sought him out when he came to Sydney where they had spent some time together. In Reardon's luggage Fosbery found a photograph of Rea, who Reardon said was his friend. Fosbery later angrily chastised Rea, an ex-policeman, for being friendly with a Fenian. Rea's pension was at this time still being decided and Rea believed that Fosbery had made sure that

¹See evidence of D'Arcy Murray (pp.860-2); evidence of Patrick Nailon (p.922-3); evidence of Mary Bergin (p.898); 'Assassination Committee'. Also see Empire, 2 April 1868. Baker, in his evidence before the committee denied the evidence of the others, but not very convincingly. See pp.924-5 of 'Assassination Committee'.
it would be as low as possible.  

Rea was not the only person to have been roughly treated by the senior police authorities during the first panicky month after the assassination attempt. Another was detective Daniel McGlone, whose case illustrates how the widespread suspicion of Irishmen was shared by police authorities about Irishmen in their own force. McGlone was an Irishman who had served in the British Army for 15 years and had seen action in the Crimea. He had been a member of the Victorian police force and had transferred to the N.S.W. force in the early 1860s. He had been active as a detective on the diggings and in the pursuit of bushrangers. He had been selected to arrest the famous Frank Gardiner in Queensland and accompanied him to Sydney to stand trial. A bachelor, McGlone had been staying at Michael Shalvey's comfortable new Hyde Park Hotel since it opened in 1867. A visitor there on Saturday, 14 March, a Mr Powell of Berrima overheard someone say to the barman 'what a fuss about the Prince, if it were a poor man with four or five children there would not be so much fuss about it'. Powell looked up and saw that McGlone was sitting reading a paper within hearing of the remark and yet had not apprehended the speaker. Later that day, as he was on his way to catch a train to return to Berrima, he mentioned this to J.B. Wilson, the Minister for Lands, who in turn mentioned it to Fosbery. Fosbery called McGlone into his office and asked him why he had not left Shalvey's, as he had instructed him to before. McGlone denied receiving any such instructions. Fosbery told him the instructions had been implied, and that Shalvey's was nothing but a nest of Fenians where Fenianism was spoken all the time. He told McGlone Powell's story, as retailed to

1 Evidence of Fosbery (q.386, p.812) and evidence of Rea (p.923) 'Assassination Committee'. Rea's pension was set by the Police Superannuation Board at 2s. per day, which was lower than the usual rate of 4s. per day (see Blue Book for 1868). He may have been correct in his suspicions. The third member of the Board with Fosbery and McLerie was Captain Scott, a notoriously feble-minded police magistrate, who was something of an anti-Catholic.
him by Wilson. Somewhere in the process of retelling the
words had been changed to an expression of satisfaction that
the Prince had been shot. McGlone disclaimed any knowledge
of such a conversation and disputed Fosbery's contention that
the assassination was a Fenian plot. Fosbery loftily informed
him that the government had all the evidence it required
and ordered him to leave Shalvey's. Fosbery contacted Powell
in Berrima and discovered that the words used were not as
reported to him, and that Powell was not now entirely sure it
was McGlone he had seen in the room. However, some other vague
charges of disloyalty had been made against McGlone and on
16 March Fosbery told him of these. McGlone wrote his denial
and then, later in the day, and in 'a state of great excitement',
wrote to the Inspector General submitting his resignation.
The next day he reconsidered and attempted to withdraw.
McLerie, however, refused 'as he considered that an officer who
would desire to leave when there was so much pressing duty...
was better out of the force than in it'. ¹ McGlone had the
matter raised in Parliament but to no avail. ²

¹ Evidence of McGlone (pp.902-6), 'Assassination Committee',
S.M.H., 22 April 1868, 'Papers relating to the resignation of
Detective McGlone', laid on table of Legislative Assembly 24
April 1868, and published in S.M.H., 27 April 1868. For
biographical details of McGlone see F.J., 25 July 1863,
11 February 1865; Empire, 18 July 1866 and McGlone to Colonial
Secretary, 24 February 1870 in Colonial Secretary, Correspondence
Received, (70/1781, Box 4/689) N.S.W. State Archives.

² S.M.H., 27 April 1868. It can be seen from this case and
from that of Apjohn and Lyons (see evidence of Lyons [q.2196,
p.885], 'Assassination Committee') that no detective was
actually dismissed from the force for Fenianism. A fourth
detective, L. Finigan, later claimed that he was demoted
because he was an Irishman and a Catholic (evidence of Finigan
[pp.889-900] in 'Assassination Committee'), but in the
'Special Bundle' is information from another source that
suggests Finigan might have tipped off some of his underworld
contacts that they were in danger of arrest, and it was for
that that he was demoted. However, it is also clear Fosbery
and Wager were both deeply suspicious of and prejudiced against
the Irish detectives in their employ.
The ninth clause of the Treason Felony Act, intended to stop disloyal speech, was more frequently invoked than the eighth. Supporters of the Act later claimed that this clause had forced the disaffected to keep silent and had lessened the possibility of conflict between Irishmen and Orangemen. It could be, though, that they exaggerated the extent and misjudged the character of the 'disloyal' talk. It has been suggested above that this was so, and the charges that were actually laid certainly bear the suggestion out. Fifty or more men were charged under this clause of the Treason Felony Act in its first year of operation. In every case those who were charged were drunk at the time, and the arrests were the result of overzealousness on the part of the constabulary or members of the public.

Some examples will illustrate the way the Act was used. One of the first charges laid was against a Patrick Burns, who, at Armidale on 23 March was heard to say several times, in a loud voice, on the verandah of the New England Hotel, that he was a Fenian and would give the toast: 'Here's to the green bird, white feather and Irish King'. He was arrested, and later remanded for trial at the Quarter Sessions.

In Goulburn, the day after, a Bartholomew Toomey was committed for saying 'it serves the Prince right. He had no business in the country.' He was later discharged, the crown declining to prosecute.

James Johnson, a 65 year old man was arrested on 23 March at Yass for being drunk. When arrested he said he was a Fenian. He was discharged the next day, after being fined five shillings for being drunk. The constable who originally charged him did not realise that

---

1 For example, see evidence of McLerie (q.182, p.804) and of Bowden (q.256, p.896) in 'Assassination Committee'. Also S.M.H., 14 August 1868.
2 See p.78.
3 S.M.H., 1 April 1868.
4 S.M.H., 25 March 1868.
5 S.M.H., 1 April 1868.
Johnson's words were an offence against the Treason Felony Act until told so by the magistrate. He then rearrested Johnson and charged him under clause 9. Johnson explained that it was the drink that had made him speak thus, but the magistrate gaol ed him till the Quarter Sessions. On 26 March John Sinnett, a native of Dublin and an elderly man, was arrested at the Gundagai racecourse for uttering treasonable language. The arresting sergeant deposed that he had heard Sinnett say, 'up with the green, the Prince will play hell with us'. A friend of Sinnett's argued in his defence that while Sinnett had used such words they had been in reference to the colours of the rider who won the last race. Sinnett had been 'pretty well lushy' at the time, as well. The magistrate discharged Sinnett but lectured him on the trouble the use of 'party cries and national distinctions' would cause in 'this land where all had equal rights and perfect freedom'.

Sometimes there was evidence that this clause of the Act could be used vindictively. Ambrose Kelly and Richard Noonan were arrested at Tyagong for having said, the day before, in a public house in Cowra, that 'there was no more harm in shooting the bloody Prince than a black fellow'. After their arrest they were exhibited to the citizens of the two towns, who flocked to see the real live Fenians, but, at their trial, various witnesses contradicted themselves and the two men were discharged. Later, Kelly wrote an angry letter to the Burrowa Express, claiming that a man named Bryant had deliberately given wrong information against them.

The largest number of arrests were made in the first two months after the passage of the Act. In August, a district Judge, Meymott, at Grafton, opined that the law had been passed at a time of great excitement, and expressed the hope that no other arrests would be made under the Act, 'for

---

1 Empire, 31 March 1868.
2 S.M.H., 31 March 1868.
3 S.M.H., 31 March 1868; F.J., 11 April 1868. Kelly's letter was reprinted in F.J., 18 April 1868.
in his opinion there was no such thing as Fenianism in the country, not even a feeling of disloyalty.¹ In February 1869, in Bathurst, Judge Carey, in commenting on the case of a man brought before him charged with offences under the Act and pleading drunkenness as an excuse, commented that he would treat this case as he did all others under the Act: in every case the prisoners pleaded drunkenness and he granted their discharge upon their recognizances to appear when called upon.²

Most arrests were made in country districts, and as well as being drunk, the men arrested were mostly itinerants. By no means all of them were Irishmen. It would seem that warmed by drink they had the courage to express their estrangement from society by identifying with that group so obviously feared and hated by the settled and successful classes. A good example of this outsider syndrome occurred at the Marengo races on St. Patrick's Day. There, a rowdy crowd of diggers spent all day drinking, brawling and cursing and generally terrifying the well-to-do, including the town's two policemen. Towards the end of the day a large group on their way home danced on the road, screaming out 'We're bloody Fenians! Come on! We'd soon as kill a man as look at him!'³

As well as itinerants two groups of men in the colony were, by the nature and the traditions of their occupation, outsiders. They were the navvies and the diggers. It is not surprising that the only reports of mass sympathy for O'Farrell and Fenians should come from the Western and Northern rail heads and one of the gold fields. On St Patrick's Day, at Hartley near Lithgow, the Irish navvies celebrated in typical navvy fashion by getting drunk, and dancing and brawling. Some had intended to hold a march to celebrate the day, and in some of the reports reaching the authorities this was

¹ S.M.H., 8 August 1868.
² Empire, 26 February 1869.
³ S.M.H., 28 March 1868.
described as being held in sympathy with the 'Manchester martyrs'. Consequently a large squad of police were sent to the place, but largely through the influence of the local priest, no march took place. Nevertheless, the next day, rumours were rife in Sydney to the effect that a large group of Fenians had marched down the railway line, with flags and banners, and some reports even suggested they intended to march to Sydney. The press lent support to the milder versions of these rumours, which were later contradicted by local residents and the police reports. Other reports of intended demonstrations were received from Singleton, but police action prevented any such eventuality. At the end of April it was reported by the police magistrate at Grenfell that an effigy of Prince Alfred had been hung in the township in the Tyagong gold fields near Grenfell. That part of the gold field was much inhabited by Irish shopkeepers and diggers. Attempts were made to arrest those responsible, but apparently without success. The police magistrate at Grenfell had previously reported the arrival of suspicious Irishmen in the area, and later made his own gesture in the direction of suppressing disloyalty by confiscating copies of the Sydney Freeman's Journal and other Irish newspapers.

It was possible in such times for men without a treasonable thought in their heads to come under the attention of the authorities, although in such cases commonsense more easily prevailed. One such case concerned an Alfred Boggis, a sub-editor on the Newcastle Chronicle and a Primitive Methodist.

---

1 Rumours appeared in S.M.H., 18 March 1868, Empire, 18, 28 March 1868. For corrections see Report of Inspector Lydiard, 18 March 1868, in 'Special Bundle', and read by Parkes in Legislative Assembly; S.M.H., 28 March 1868; letter from local Protestant residents in S.M.H., 9 April 1868.

2 Empire, 20 March 1868; Evidence of McLerie (q.80, pp.800-1) in 'Assassination Committee'.

3 See Appendix D2 (p.942) and evidence of Parkes (qq.1042-4, p.838) in 'Assassination Committee'.

4 F. Dalton to Col. Sec., 23 March 1868, in 'Special Bundle'; F.J., 23 May 1868.
On 25 May, the day after the Queen's birthday, the Primitive Methodists in the Newcastle district held a camp meeting at Waratah. It concluded with a tea feast and speeches. One of the speakers was Alfred Boggis who roundly criticised the Queen and the Royal Family. He did not consider the Queen a converted person, he said, for she had lately come to countenance by her presence amusements such as theatre and horse racing. Her son, Prince Albert (sic) was worse: 'a sabbath breaker, a gambler and...a drunkard', and he concluded with an earnest prayer that such as he might never occupy England's throne. This speech created a minor scandal in the area, and was reported to the authorities by the national school teacher. The local police sub-inspector sent a report to his supervisor, who passed it on to the I.G.P. who in turn passed it on to the Colonial Secretary and suggested the Attorney-General's opinion be sought. McLerie did however venture the opinion that 'such improper remarks may be attributed to religious fanaticism than treasonable intent'. That, presumably, was the Government's opinion as well. ¹

Overall, in the first months following the attempted assassination, the government and its officials acted with a certain control. Some of the police were a little panicky and they and Parkes were perhaps over-ready to listen indiscriminately to any source of information, but, as no evidence was forthcoming, no arrests were made. This was a commendable contrast to, say, the reaction of the authorities in Manchester following the rescue of Kelly and Deasy and the accidental killing of Brett. ² Among the general population, although rumours were widespread and tempers sometimes frayed, no recourse was had to violence, and, generally, the steadying influence of the non-sectarian ideology prevailed. The

¹Sub-Inspector Harmon to E.C. Morisset, 8 June 1868 in 'Special Bundle'.
²When large numbers of Irish were rounded up on the merest suspicion. See Rose, op.cit., p.42.
opportunity for the lawful expression of the strong feelings induced by the assassination attempt which was provided by the indignation meetings probably played an important role in this. Certainly these meetings occupied a very prominent place in colonial life for the two weeks after 12 March.

The idea for such meetings seems to have been almost spontaneous, for not only did the leading citizens of Sydney decide on that means of expressing their feelings on the day after the attempted assassination, but the inhabitants of other centres seemed to discover, or adopt, the idea almost simultaneously. A meeting was held in Newcastle on the evening of 13 March, and at Windsor, Mudgee, Yass, West Maitland, Albury, Tamworth and a number of other towns the next day. Other places quickly followed suit, as did the various Sydney municipalities, and then clubs, societies and almost every other conceivable social group. These meetings almost invariably took the form of the original Sydney meeting, although the bans on speeches, and on clergymen addressing meetings were both lifted. Motions of sympathy with the Prince, of loyalty and devotion to the Queen, and of indignation at and execration of the crime were the usual procedures and most meetings resolved to embody their resolutions in an address which was sent to the Prince. An extraordinary edition of the Government Gazette was issued on 20 March containing the details of 45 such addresses and a reply from the Prince, assuring his well wishers that 'the cowardly act of one individual has not to one degree checked my confidence in the loyalty to the throne and person of their majesty, or affection to myself'. Another, containing 50 addresses, was issued on 26 March, and others followed. In country centres the meetings were described as the largest ever gathered and those presiding or moving motions were the leading citizens of the town. Only once, at Bathurst, was

---

1 S.M.H., 14 March 1868.
2 Government Gazette, 10 March 1868, pp.819-33.
attendance at the meeting, or rather the signing of a petition circulated there and later, made into some sort of test of loyalty, and this was quickly repudiated by the other citizens. At no time was there any discrimination against Irishmen or Catholics, although occasionally a speaker was carried away by his indignation and became injudicious in his remarks, and sometimes the question of collective Irish and Catholic guilt was raised.

At the Redfern indignation meeting several speakers strayed onto the question of Fenians and the Rev William Slayter (Congregationalist) said he did not think Fenians existed in the colony. Thomas Buckland, a staunchly evangelical Anglican, tended to disagree and stated that he associated Fenianism with Speerin and O'Sullivan, but he was quick to point out that most of the Irish, like Alderman Caraher, were exceptionally loyal. At an indignation meeting of civil servants William Arnold, the speaker of the Legislative Assembly, did not draw such a distinction, and 'without wishing to identify Irishmen and Catholics with Fenianism', he thought there was a special reason for them 'to come forward and deny anything approaching sympathy with the act or with the feelings of disloyalty which the assassination attempt was only an open and insolent manifestation'. Arnold was immediately repudiated by three senior civil servants who were Catholics: W.A. Duncan, Michael Fitzpatrick and Richard O'Connor, the Clerk of the Parliaments, all of whom denied any connection between disloyalty and the Catholic religion. Duncan admitted that a few hot-headed young men connected with a certain newspaper might have expressed disloyalty, but they would not have wished things to have been carried so far. He pointed out that Fenianism was

---

1 S.M.H., 14, 20 March 1868.
2 Empire, 19 March 1868. Buckland was a wealthy merchant and a director of the Bank of N.S.W. (A.D.B., Vol.2, pp.288-9); see also P.S., 2 October 1869.
started by non-Irishmen and non-Catholics, and argued that its members were men of no religion at all. At an indignation meeting the Fellows of St John's College two days later, Edward Butler, the Irish Catholic Crown Prosecutor, indignantly denied Arnold's suggestions. It was, he said, comparable to an English Catholic asking English Protestants to apologise 'if an attack was made on the Queen by an English Protestant Chartist....'

Given the propensity for crude sentiment and insulting language displayed by most city councillors, it was not surprising that some socially disruptive statements should have been made when the aldermen of the Sydney Corporation met to adopt an address of sympathy for the Prince. Although most speakers confined their rhetoric to bathetic descriptions of their sorrow and deprecations of the crime and the criminal, John McIntosh ranged a little more widely. He thought that seditious language had too long been tolerated in the colony and hinted darkly about a certain Irish League. William Pritchard, a man of orange sympathies, if not membership, hoped that from this day forth we should hear no more of the wrongs of Ireland. When such wrongs were spoken of he hoped and trusted they would be put down in a most unmistakable manner. He would see the Roman Catholics prepared to join in this. If after this Irishmen should persist in any agitation as regarded the wrongs of Ireland...he should be the first to advocate putting a poll tax on them, like the Chinese.

Pritchard was an Englishman, and he was hotly rebuked by

---

1 S.M.H., 16 March 1868.
2 S.M.H., 18 March 1868.
3 Pritchard was born in Gloucestershire in 1830 and emigrated to N.S.W. with his parents in 1840. He began working a year later and by the 1860s was a successful miller and produce merchant. He later launched into the land sale business and pioneered the movement to sub-divide a number of the large estates around Sydney. (Bulletin, 18 March 1882.) Late in 1868 two political Catholics, Creagh and Hurley argued in the Freeman's as to whether he was an orangeman (F.J., 21, 28 November 1868). He probably was not, but he did advertise in the Australian Protestant Banner, the orange paper.
another orange-sympathising alderman, Michael Chapman, a native of Cork. The Irish were as loyal as the English, Chapman proclaimed, and had proved it by fighting battles for the English which Pritchard knew nothing about. At the next meeting of the Council Pritchard attempted to back down. He had not uttered a word against the Irish as regards their creed and country, he said. His remarks had only been directed at Irishmen involved in seditious societies, such as the Irish National League. He had been misreported, he lamely cried. Other aldermen were not prepared to let him get off the hook so easily, and claimed that he had been correctly reported and successfully moved his explanation out of order. Three days later Pritchard's supporters succeeded in having a special meeting called to hear his explanation. In the absence of the Mayor, Alderman Murphy, a Pritchard supporter, took the chair and ruled that Pritchard could be the only speaker. This incensed the other aldermen and a verbal brawl began which was still continuing when the meeting was closed to the press half-an-hour later. It was not surprising that when someone accidentally discharged a firearm in the vicinity of Pritchard's premises, a rumour should quickly sweep the city that he had been shot.

Several attempts were made early in April to organise a meeting of the working classes to present an address to the Prince. A meeting of 100 gathered in Hyde Park on 3 April, voted John Davies to the chair, and heard a Mr Holland explain why he had called the meeting. On a motion of Frank Dixon it was postponed until the next day. This time the crowd

---

1 If Chapman was not then an orangeman, he certainly was three years later: P.J., 16 December 1871; P.S., 7 December 1872; T. & C.J., 16 July 1877.
2 S.M.H., 20 March 1868.
3 S.M.H., 24 March 1868.
4 S.M.H., 27 March 1868.
5 Empire, 25 March 1868.
6 Empire, 4 April 1868.
was smaller, but, with Davies again in the chair, Dixon began an agitated address. After touching on several topics, 'speaking as an Englishman and a Protestant' he proceeded to attack the Catholics for 'trying to get the upper hand'. A soldier in uniform stepped up to the platform and ominously asked what he meant, and Davies, to avoid trouble, moved Dixon's remarks out of order. Holland then repudiated the attempt to bring religion into the movement and the meeting adjourned.  

Instances of sectarian feeling such as described above were rare, although they testify to pressures pushing people in such a direction. The circumstances of the royal tour, and particularly its conjunction with the blossoming pride in colonial achievement and groping towards a national self identity made the impact of the attempted assassination all the more rendering and helps to explain the remarkable response to the event, both at Clontarf and afterwards. Fortunately those whose pride was most offended were those whose identification with the colony was strongest and who were the most committed to maintaining the stability and affirming the non-sectarian character of the society. It was not surprising that most of the speakers at the indignation meetings mentioned the disgrace and humiliation that had befallen the colony. Some mentioned it in order, optimistically, to point to the assassin's foreign origins and deny any disgrace; most, pessimistically, to describe the colony as disgraced forever. Only a few of the latter went on to identify the Irish-Catholics as a scapegoat, as more guilty than the rest; a fact which demonstrates the strength of the anti-sectarian ideology amongst the prominent classes in the society, and to the degree of Irish-Catholic assimilation generally.

It was the native born who identified most closely with the colony and who consequently felt the humiliation more

---

1 *Empire*, 6 April 1868. Dixon was probably the Frank Dixon who was one of the chief organisers of the early N.S.W. labor movement. See *A.D.B.*, Vol.4, forthcoming.
keenly than the rest. On 17 March a group of such men met at Tolano's Australian Hotel in George Street in response to an advertisement inserted in that morning's paper by William Day and Samuel Bayliss. According to the advertisement the purpose of the meeting was to 'arrange a general meeting of Australians to express indignation at the late attempt to assassinate the Duke of Edinburgh'. The meeting was attended by a large number of prominent colonists including Geoffrey Eagar, W.B. Dalley, W.C. Windeyer, Daniel Egan, George Thornton, Richard Driver and William Tunks, who took the chair. A committee was appointed to plan a public meeting. That meeting was held in the Victoria Theatre on 24 March. The Theatre was packed and the audience included many who had travelled from the country districts to attend. The pillars of the boxes were decorated with national emblems - cornstalks, and the gentlemen of the committee were distinguished by blue badges.

The Hon. John Campbell, M.L.C., took the chair and in his opening remarks affirmed, in the face of previously professed doubts, that 'it was fitting for the sons of the soil to meet and separately address the Prince, whose life had been so basely attacked in their native land'. Other speakers included Eager, Thornton, Egan, J.A. Cunneen, Michael Fitzpatrick, G.R. Dibbs and G.B. Barton. Their resolutions were approximately the same as those of other meetings, except for one, the second, which explicitly stated the anti-sectarian ideology, which the native born obviously felt to be especially their own. It read 'that this meeting, cherishing as it does the connection with the mother country desires to protest against the introduction of political animosities foreign to this country'. This was supported by George Thornton and two native born Catholics of Irish parentage, J.A. Cunneen and Michael Fitzpatrick. Each affirmed the sentiments of the motion, and while

---

1 S.M.H., 17 March 1868.
2 S.M.H., 18 March 1868.
Thornton concluded with the hope that O'Farrell's body might be buried in the sea, so as not to pollute their native land. Fitzpatrick ended by observing that 'it was the first time the native born had met together face to face (cheers and confused dispute)'. This point George Barton took up, regretting that it was the first time that native Australians had raised their voice. He went on to suggest that natives were discriminated against in employment and in other ways. This speech was in full blown rhetorical style and gave offence to at least one other native who wrote to the press critical of 'Barton's anti-English sentiments'. Barton replied in several long letters denying the charge and effusing about an Australian identity. Although Fitzpatrick and Barton celebrated the event as the first meeting exclusively of the native born, sentiments similar to those expressed by Barton had been voiced previously. On 3 March the Herald had editorialised critically about 'the cry of "Australia for the Australians" and "a Native Ministry" which one party in the community have been putting forward for some time now'. The following day it warned against 'the cockiness and arrogance and blindness involved in self proving statements to the effect that things Australian are best'.

Although the Herald would not accept the extremes of the nativists' position it had no disagreement with them over their disparagement of sectarianism. It saw the assassination attempt as clearly demonstrating the danger of introducing into the colony the animosities of the old

1 Thornton was speaking before O'Farrell's trial, but he, like most colonists, assumed O'Farrell would be found guilty and executed.
2 S.M.H., 25 March 1868.
3 S.M.H., 1 April 1868.
4 For example, Empire, 4 April 1868.
5 S.M.H., 3 March 1868.
6 S.M.H., 4 March 1868.
world. At one point it remarked that the evil act might possibly bring forth good, for the almost unanimous protest and the affirmations of loyalty and union which the act inspired could only encourage the greater growth and more confident display of such sentiments. It saw the act and the reaction to it as having lessons of particular importance to Catholics and Irishmen. It particularly hoped that Irishmen would come to see that the intrusion of Irish grievances into Australian politics could only have unfortunate results:

They subject themselves to a great deal of unnecessary hostility, provoke against themselves a great deal of unnecessary prejudice by making their career in Australia subordinate to their past history and sympathies as Irishmen. No class has so much to lose by the fanatical preservation of hereditary hatred. It is to their own interest and to the interest of Australians generally, that Irish questions should be expurgated from our local politics.

Naturally, a large part of its censure fell on the Freeman's Journal. On St Patrick's Day it published several extracts from the previous two months of that journal, and pointed out that 'such quotations must have exasperated the anti-Catholic population'. It asked Catholics to consider such quotations from the standpoint of Englishmen, and wonder not at the bitterness they caused. Its argument was a simple one: Catholics wonder and protest at being charged with responsibility for the outrages - the reason is simple - while Catholics continue to support or, at least, fail to thoroughly repudiate a journal such as that, it is only natural that the Church and Irishmen generally should be associated with the disloyal, even treasonable sentiments expressed in its pages.

---

1 S.M.H., 16 March 1868.
2 S.M.H., 21 March 1868.
3 S.M.H., 10 March 1868.
4 Mostly as referred to above, pp.82-4.
5 S.M.H., 17 March 1868.
The Herald also drew from the events of mid-March a message for Catholics on the education issue. It drew attention to the energy which Catholic spokesmen devoted to clearing their countrymen and co-religionists from the charge of sympathy with the assassin. It noticed how passionately they implored colonists not to misunderstand them, and to allow them credit for as much virtue as prevailed in other communities, and observed that:

This (misunderstanding) is not due to any constitutionally imposed religious or political disability....If there exists any such isolation, any such separateness of sect and race as make a barrier on the ordinary intercourse of life, and establishes mutual ignorance of each others religious and political principles, it must be self imposed by those who complain of it....If there had been a mixed system of education from the beginning would there have been the possibility of mutual misunderstanding now complained of.

It concluded with an appropriate invocation of the nativist ideology:

We do not look for the disappearance of sects or for any approach to uniformity of opinion. The spread of education, far from making people think alike, will multiply differences of opinion...but a healthy conflict of opinion may exist in politics or theology without there being such sectarian isolation from cradle to the grave as shall make large sections of the community look askance at each other with mysterious suspicion as with that mutual fear that easily graduates into mutual hate.1

The Empire's views were hardly different. On 7 April, as the Prince departed the colony for England, the Empire argued that it was high time 'to extinguish the smouldering fire of religious or national tolerance which remain amongst us'. It admitted that when it was learnt that the perpetrator of the attempt on the life of the Prince was an Irishman and a Catholic 'there were Englishmen and Protestants justified in

1S.M.H., 30 March 1868.
momentarily entertaining a feeling of burning indignation towards Irishmen and Catholics'. However, when Irishmen and Catholics were found everywhere to spontaneously assemble and denounce the would be assassin 'then there no longer existed the shadow of an excuse for violent and vindictive clamour against Catholics, which, we are sorry to say, too many men of a different creed freely indulged in'. The editorial devoted a lot of attention to sketching out an optimistic future for the colony, when a native born generation would rule its destinies: a generation free of sympathy for any of the factions of the old country. But this future could only eventuate with the active assistance of the present generation:

We have a glorious work before us here: and now, if we will only unite heartily in the undertaking, we may lay broad and deep the foundations on which, in time to come, the noble fabric of an Australian nation may be reared. But ere we can fitly enter on such an undertaking we must cast to the winds all prejudices, national and social, which are the bane of European communities...The watchwords and party cries which led men in other climes to seek each other's life should have no significance in a land like this, where every sane man, unconvicted of crime has a voice in making the laws.\textsuperscript{1}

Most colonists would have agreed. One way they signified their agreement was by building a monument to the Prince that symbolised the sympathy they felt for him, and their gratitude for his recovery. They decided to build a hospital. A Congregationalist minister, Rev. John Graham, had first suggested the idea in a letter to the Herald of 16 March, waspishly pointing out that he had intended mentioning it at the 13 March indignation meeting, but had been prevented by the ban on clergymen.\textsuperscript{2} It was originally planned to erect

\textsuperscript{1}Empire, 7 April 1868. See also Newcastle Chronicle, 21 March, 4 April 1868, for similar nativist sentiments.

\textsuperscript{2}S.M.H., 16 March 1868.
a new building on the then Sydney Hospital site and a large meeting of citizens was held to launch an appeal on 20 March. The meeting was interrupted quite early in its proceedings by T.S. Mort and T.A. Murray, who felt that the money raised should go to complete the Sailors' Home, but the great majority of those present preferred a hospital, which the Rev. Graham had predicted would be 'a vast memorial to unsectarian charity'. Appropriately, one of the main speakers was a Catholic priest - the Rev. G.F. Dillon, who stood in for Sheehy, the Vicar General, who could not attend. Dillon repudiated the charge that Catholics favoured sedition and congratulated the press, in the person of John Fairfax, who had spoken immediately before him, for the calm manner with which they had dealt with events of the previous weeks. One Protestant, signing himself Ernest, later disagreed with Graham's non-sectarian conception and argued that as St Vincent's was a Catholic hospital, so the new hospital should be wholly Protestant, enabling Protestant ministers 'to take around the word of God without giving offence'. He was attacked for this view by, among others, 'a Jew', and 'a member of the Church of England', who asked rhetorically 'is this Protestant charity, the charity of our Divine Master?' For two months after this meeting the Prince Alfred Hospital collection became a topic of great interest. Money was solicited door to door; employers wrote praising the generosity of their employees; and full lists of donations were published in the press.  

Dillon had good cause to praise the daily press for the role they had played in defusing the effects of the attempted assassination. They had refrained from publishing anything about Fenianism until the Government's reward notice made it futile to ignore that previously rumoured connection, and they

1 S.M.H., 23 March 1868.
2 S.M.H., 24 March 1868.
3 For example, S.M.H., 7 April 1868.
gave no publicity to other rumours which could only have inflamed feeling further had they been given the semi-official stamp of newspaper recognition. They also ignored completely the opinions of the Protestant clergymen, and in so doing removed from their pages what must, in some cases at least, have been a powerful fuel for sectarian fires. Even when two such clergymen, Zachary Barry and S.C. Kent, published their sermons on the matter, they were given a most perfunctory notice by the press.¹

Barry delivered his sermon in his parish church, St Jude's, Randwick. Taking as his text Matthew XIV, 17, 'Be of good cheer; it is I; be not afraid', Barry reminded his congregation that all suffering and trouble was sent by the Lord to test their faith. However, while they should recognise that intention of the Lord in the terrible occurrence at Clontarf, they should also take confidence that the assassin was not successful, for it showed that the British nation was still under 'the special protection of her Lord', a protection which she had gained by her 'guardianship of the faith purified from the additions and abuses of ages'. This brought him to more practical considerations. The British nation had always been threatened by those within the realm who gave allegiance to 'the Foreigner', an allegiance which absolved them from loyalty to their rightful sovereign. Fenianism was but the latest in a long line of such threats, and while he did not think the Catholic prelates in Australia were responsible for the deed at Clontarf, they nevertheless allowed disloyal doctrines to circulate in schools,² and refrained from repudiating as their own that journal which widely circulated Fenian doctrine in this country. However, more than Catholics were to blame for that journal's continued existence. It would long ago have been suppressed, Barry

¹Empire, 4 April 1868.
²For example, in a Christian Brothers reading book, 'the great agitator' was referred to as 'the Liberator'!
argued, if people had not been too afraid of being labelled intolerant. In a sermon two and a half weeks later, Barry expressed the hope that the calamity would unite more strongly the Protestant churches of the country.

The Rev. S.C. Kent was less severe. His was a thanksgiving sermon, and he called on his congregation to praise and bless the Lord for miraculously protecting the Prince. He asked them to reflect on 'the sorrow our Gracious Queen has been spared' and 'the loss which the British Empire had been spared'. Kent had been deeply moved by the assassination attempt and had been the first to suggest that the colony's name be changed, because of the disgrace which had fallen upon her present name. He suggested 'Alfredland'. The next day someone else suggested 'Alfredea', which they claimed not only sounded more pleasant but contained the initial letters of the rest of the Prince's name (Alfred Edward Albert). An old colonist, Joseph Docker M.L.C., suggested 'Australia', but after several days correspondence the issue faded.

Other official Protestant reaction was mixed. The Christian Advocate and Wesleyan Record agreed with Barry that when Fenianism was better known 'it will be seen how much unchangeable and infallible Popery had to do with it'. It also had little time for those who preached tolerance, although it admitted itself that 'perhaps a little forebearance was wise at present'. Nevertheless, in due time 'the old animosities will return...and the great battle between right and wrong will be fought'. The Church of England included a special prayer for the recovery of the Prince in its liturgy, and the Australian Churchman, its semi-official paper, in its

---

1 Z. Barry, The Danger Controlled: a sermon for the Sunday after the Attempted Murder of Prince Alfred (Sydney, 1868).
2 S.M.H., 3 April 1868.
3 S.C. Kent, Brief Notes of a Thanksgiving Sermon commemorating the preservation of the life of H.R.H. Prince Alfred (Sydney, 1868). A copy is in the State Library of Victoria.
4 For example, S.M.H., 20 March 1868; Empire, 23 March 1868.
5 C.A.W.R., 2 April 1868.
first comment on the affair, said that O'Farrell was probably insane and expressed its conviction that Fenianism did not exist in Australia.\footnote{A.C., 21 March 1868.} After considering the news of the 'Fenian demonstration' led by Catholic priests at Hokatika it was less certain of this, but continued to stress that 'Fenianism is only fully developed lawlessness' and argued that the lesson to be learnt from it was 'that we must foster among all classes, especially the young, a feeling of loyalty and reverence for all lawful authority'. It, too, called upon Catholic colonists to demonstrate their loyalty by demanding that the \textit{Freeman's Journal} change its tone or cease to exist.\footnote{A.C., 18 March 1868.}

At the more popular level a number of Protestants seemed to be demonstrating more fear than defiance. The specification 'Protestant' began to appear in a number of advertisements for jobs, but mostly in the employment wanted columns, from servants seeking work with Protestant families.\footnote{For example, S.M.H., 1 April 1867.} Patrick McCarroll, a well established Catholic master butcher, was forced to advertise in the press to deny rumours that he had discharged all Protestant members of his staff: he still employed 21.\footnote{S.M.H., 20, 21 March 1868.} On 31 March a meeting was held at Jacob Blakes' Robin Hood Hotel (a meeting place of orangemen in the Cowper-Robertson faction) to form an Australasian British Association. The object of the Association was to protect the political and social interests of loyal British subjects in the colonies. A number of speakers spoke darkly of the way previous ministries had cultivated the votes of the Irish section of the community by appointing only Irishmen to the civil service.\footnote{F.J., 4 April 1868.}
The loyal orangemen did however gain enough confidence from the events of 12 March to address the Prince and the Governor, an action they had refrained from when they arrived 'for fear of hurting the feelings of fellow colonists'. Their indignation meeting in the Lyceum schoolroom was attended by 900 men; considerably more than their existing membership of 600 and four times the number that attended the last twelfth of July celebration. It was a fair indication of the almost instantaneous growth of interest in the Institution. At the meeting a number of speakers, including John Davies, spoke about Protestant loyalty and popish perfidy, and the prospectus for a new orange weekly journal was distributed. This was to be called the Australian Protestant Banner and was to be published by G.R. Addison, the publisher of the dying Christian Pleader. The title change, at least, indicated a more aggressive Protestant approach. Addison hoped to get 1,500 subscribers before he launched the journal. It did not begin till June and even then was under-subscribed. If Addison did not gain much comfort from public interest in his new publishing venture, nor did the orangemen from their approach to Belmore. The Governor, acting on behalf of the Prince, agreed to accept an address from them, but refused to receive anything on his own part, an action which, he later assumed, the orangemen had taken as a snub.

Archbishop Polding was touring the southern districts of the colony when the attempted assassination occurred. He returned to Sydney ten days later. He was ill when he returned,
but when he recovered he accepted an invitation from the Prince to visit him at Government House.\(^1\) He found him in good health and the following Sunday arranged for a solemn Te Deum to be sung in the Cathedral to celebrate the Prince's recovery. A pastoral letter was read in all the churches that same day.\(^2\) This pastoral had a two-fold purpose. Folding wished, firstly, to comfort his flock at a time when they were being accused of sympathy with O'Farrell. He denied that this could be true, for the Church had always condemned secret societies and assassination. He further denied that it was in any way incumbent upon them, as Catholics, to separately protest against the crime. He went on to exhort them to avoid 'any habits, or societies or modes of speech that might excite or maintain unfriendly classes or faction'.\(^3\)

Governor Belmore was one non-Catholic impressed by the pastoral and sent a copy to the Secretary of State for Colonies, who, he thought, might want it published in England.\(^4\) The question of whether Catholics and Irishmen needed separately to protest was raised on other occasions when Catholics as members of some Catholic institution such as St John's College, or the Holy Catholic Guild, met to express their indignation. The need for a separate protest was denied by all speakers, although at the Guild meeting some in the audience expressed their belief that denial was necessary.\(^5\)

Some Irishmen had obviously thought so, for, on 16 March an advertisement appeared in the morning papers calling Irishmen to an indignation meeting in Hyde Park that evening. The advertisement went on to add that the meeting would also

---

2 S.M.H., 28 March 1868.
3 An edited version of this pastoral is in O'Farrell, Documents in Australian Catholic History, Vol.1, pp.426-8.
4 Belmore to Buckingham and Chandos, 1 April 1868, Belmore Correspondence, p.28.
5 S.M.H., 24 March 1868.
protest against 'the base and unfounded imputations cast upon Irishmen by certain members of Parliament on Friday evening last'. It was this latter intention that worried the cabinet who requested Belmore to authorise troops to be placed at the disposal of the authorities. Belmore agreed, and 100 men were secretly stationed in the pavilion in Hyde Park. They were not required, for that afternoon, the Evening News carried a notice postponing the meeting and only about 200 men turned up, milled around aimlessly and then went home.

The impact of the assassination on those who identified themselves as Irishmen was more traumatic. It drove the older and better established members of Irish associations to sever that identification, at least temporarily, while it elicited a response of careful defiance from some of the others. The St Patrick's Day regatta committee met the day after the attempt. They had before them a letter from Belmore, withdrawing his patronage because of the avowed refusal by two men at the Wednesday night meeting to drink to the Queen. They also had a letter from T.A. Murray declining to preside at the celebration owing to the assassination attempt, and suggesting that no colonist would want to indulge in festivities anyway. They also had letters from several gentlemen withdrawing their yachts from the regatta, and from two members of the committee, declining to attend future meetings. One of these letters was from Alderman Caraher, who had previously been prominent in colonial Irish affairs. He later confessed that the news of the attempted

1 S.M.H., 16 March 1868.
2 Parkes did not think such precautions were necessary, but the rest of the Cabinet did. See Parkes to Belmore, 16 March 1868, and Col. Waddy to Belmore, 16 March 1868, Letters received by the Earl of Belmore, Vol.II, pp.537 and 897.
3 S.M.H., 17 March 1868, Belmore to Buckingham and Chandos, 27 March 1868 (confidential), f.230.
assassination had so shocked him that he was unable to work for several days, and he did not participate in Irish affairs again. During the meeting John Hughes asked to be allowed to retire from the position of Treasurer. James Garvan attacked him and the others who were resigning from the committee for making it appear as if those not resigning were Fenians, and for failing to stay true to the Irish nation. When the chairman, Thomas O'Neil, refused to rule Garvan out of order, Hughes walked out. The meeting was forced to adjourn as the proprietor of the hotel they were meeting in, Mr Punch, asked them to leave. An indication of the way the regatta committee was viewed by many as an epitome of Fenianism was given by a John Malone, who felt it necessary to place an advertisement in the press denying any connection with it.

The committee met again three weeks later at Kearney's Collonade Hotel, and decided to postpone the regatta one year and return any subscriptions already collected. A strong feeling existed against those men who had resigned from the committee and a resolution, proposed by John Hourigan and Thomas McCaffrey, was passed, denying that the committee members were disloyal, and condemning those members who had resigned for encouraging this impression by their action. Denis Kearney and several others also criticised the Rev. G.F. Dillon for 'telling lies' about the Irish National League.

Since the assassination, Dillon had been, in his inimitable style, denying any connection between Catholicism
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1 S.M.H., 20, 24 March 1868.
2 See Appendix Ic for biography of Caraher.
3 S.M.H., 14 March 1868.
4 S.M.H., 21 March 1868.
5 S.M.H., 4 April 1868.
6 Empire, 4 April 1868; S.M.H., 4 April 1868.
The *Freeman's* ran a little scared for two weeks following the assassination attempt, and displayed a conciliatory tone. It regretted that the authorities should have, after the event, talked about a Fenian conspiracy, for everyone of any sense had been up until then convinced that O'Farrell was alone. That had been a mistake and could still be rectified: 'let us hear no more of treason or conspiracy; let the criminal be punished according to his deserts and let all classes of colonists keep together in mutual tolerance and good will'.

A week later they were getting tougher, and defending their right to remind colonists that Ireland had for centuries been misgoverned. They also published a speech given by Parkes in 1855 at a dinner to welcome Charles Gavan Duffy to Sydney. There Parkes had said that if he had been in Ireland at the same time as Duffy he, too, would have been a rebel like Duffy.

The next week it attacked orangemen, 'who seemed to be flourishing in Sydney', and a week later attacked the hypocrisy of the *Herald* for daring to criticise the *Freeman's* for publishing articles offensive to Englishmen, when its own columns, particularly those devoted to European news, were full of news which could only give the greatest offence to Catholics. In the same issue it published an extract from an Irish paper praising sectarianism in so far as it meant 'people holding definite and distinct opinions on

---

1 *F.J.*, 21 March 1868.
2 *F.J.*, 28 March 1868. Dolman, who had taken over from Hughes as treasurer of the regatta committee and had been secretary before that, was responsible for this. In a report to the I.G.P. in the 'Special Bundle' (22 March 1868) Patrick Lyons, the recently dismissed detective, who was still reporting suspicious goings-on in an attempt to get back into the force, reported that Dolman had told him that he was trying to find the speech which Parkes had given at the welcome to Gavan Duffy. Dolman had also complained that the post office were holding back a parcel of papers sent to him from Ireland, and admitted that the *Freeman's* had lost 25 subscribers since the assassination attempt.
3 *F.J.*, 6 April 1868. It specially referred to a column by 'Stella' which gave a fairly straightforward, if somewhat Anglo-Saxon centred, account of clerical politics at Rome.
politics, morals and religion'. The article went on to attack the 'so called leading Catholic laymen', who were but nominally Catholic, for while they went to mass on Sunday, they 'would not attend a Catholic meeting to advance Catholic interests because it is considered illiberal, or ultramontane or sectarian'.

On 25 April the Freeman's published a long editorial 'concerning ourselves', which demonstrated how unrepentantly sectarian it remained. It described itself as 'an Irish Catholic Nationalist organ', and said it was not surprising that it should be the butt of much hostility from those who imagined that the colony was English, and that only English sympathies, English opinions and English modes of thought should be allowed. It went on to spell out its different views more fully, and to declare its determination to uphold those differences: it gave news of Ireland and tried to do justice to the motives of those who laboured on her behalf, without necessarily identifying with their projects or measures; it endeavoured 'to portray the infidel revolution sapping the foundation of all legitimate authority in Europe'; it opposed the glorification of England with facts of her moral and physical destitution; and it opposed 'the grand scheme for moulding all colonists into an homogenous mass of Deists, or uncivilised Pagans'. Its essential sectarianism was revealed when it characterised the rest of the world as holding views which were those of only a few Protestant sectarians like Barry: that, for example, and in the Freeman's own version, England's glory 'could be attributed to her abandonment of Catholicity'. It proudly pictured itself as 'a solitary dissentient', and implicitly attacked its own clergy by regretting that 'some people, who ought to know better, thought that the best way to clear their own loyalty...was to join with the general howl of the anti-Catholics against the Freeman's'.

---

1Ibid.
It also developed the conspiracy thesis which, when elaborated and polished, was to become the version of events generally accepted among later generations of Catholics; and which was popularised by the Bulletin 15 years later. This version was as follows: the attempted assassination came as a windfall to those like Parkes who supported non-sectarian education; they saw instantly how it could be turned to their purpose; they reported that O'Farrell was a Fenian, and that Fenianism existed in the colony; they declared that all Irishmen in the colony were Fenians and sympathised with the abettors of assassination and murder. They thus concluded that the Freeman's was a disloyal print and ought to be put down. The Freeman's could proudly announce that this object of the conspirators had not yet been achieved, for, although all government advertisements had been withdrawn from it, new subscriptions quite made up for the lack of revenue.¹

The Freeman's was hardly fair to Parkes in imagining that he had described O'Farrell as a Fenian simply for political advantage. Parkes's conviction that O'Farrell was a Fenian had been formed when he read O'Farrell's 'diary' on the evening of 12 March. A number of conversations he had had with O'Farrell subsequently only firmed him in his belief.² Two of these conversations were recorded by Samuel Cook, the parliamentary reporter for the Sydney Morning Herald.³ He had been concealed outside O'Farrell's cell by Parkes who wished to have a record of O'Farrell's revelations to assist

¹F.J., 25 April 1868. This last point might well have been bravado, as Dolman had confessed a month earlier to ex-detective Lyons that 25 subscriptions had been withdrawn since the assassination attempt.
²Conversations on 12, 17, 18, 24 and 30 March, 3, 11, 17 and 20 April, 1864.
³These conversations took place on 18 and 24 March. Cook also recorded a conversation between F.R. Bernard, the Chief Warder and O'Farrell on 20 March. Edited copies of the transcripts are published on pp.716-25 of 'O'Farrell papers'. The report in the Sydney Morning Herald on 19 March, referred to above, was based on Cook's transcript of the first of these conversations. See also evidence of Cook (pp.863-6) in 'Assassination Committee'.
him in his investigations. O'Farrell was talkative and continued to give details about the Fenian organisation generally, and the circumstances surrounding his selection as the assassin. At no time however did he mention other names, and he remained vague about subsequent movements planned by his fellow plotters, except to say that they had all left the colony. As recorded by Cook, O'Farrell's remarks were both tantalising and confounding. Parkes was tantalised. The results of investigations by the detectives had a similar effect. They failed to produce conclusive evidence of Fenians, but neither did they produce evidence to the contrary, and his senior police officers shared his belief in the society's colonial existence. As far as Parkes was concerned their failure to produce any real Fenians was due to the difficulty of this kind of police work. As he remarked several times later, even in Ireland, with an immensely bigger force of police, gaining enough evidence to sustain a conviction was very difficult. 1

Governor Belmore was beginning to have doubts. At Clontarf his first reaction had been to suspect a Fenian plot. By 25 March, in a letter to the Secretary of State for Colonies, he was affirming his belief in O'Farrell's sanity, but admitting that, except for his own statements, 'we have very real evidence to connect him with Fenianism'. Concerning the 'diary' he wrote '(it) might in clever hands be made to tell as much for insanity as Fenianism. I doubt there being any actual accomplices here.' 2 Earlier in the same letter he had pointed out a contradiction in O'Farrell's account. According to Bernard, the chief warder, O'Farrell had said that he and his accomplices had originally intended to include Belmore's death in their plans, but changed their minds when he became patron to some society favourable to them.

---

1 For example, evidence of Parkes (q.1117, p.843), 'Assassination Committee'.
2 Belmore to Buckingham and Chandos, 25 March 1868, Belmore Correspondence, p.19.
All this, O'Farrell indicated had taken place two months previously, about mid January. Belmore pointed out that the reference could only be to his patronage of the St Patrick's Day regatta committee and this was not until late February. However he agreed with Parkes that the warder must have misunderstood O'Farrell's meaning. There were further contradictions in his evidence on this point. Again, according to his conversation with Bernard, the band of Fenians formed in Melbourne when they heard of the Manchester executions. They then came to Sydney where apparently they recruited him and others, and where they drew lots. They had departed by mid January. Yet it was not until 13 January that news of the Manchester executions reached Australia.

Other ambiguities, if not contradictions, existed. To Bernard, O'Farrell implied clearly that the Fenian band which had first met in Melbourne under someone sent from England, had themselves decided to execute the Prince. To warder Chapman and later to Parkes he spoke of instructions, or a warrant, being sent out from England. He also spoke in a contradictory fashion about the number in the Fenian band. In his 'diary' he mentioned the 'nine' that were left, apart from him, and after one man had been murdered as a traitor. To Parkes he spoke of eleven men and vaguely mentioned one who had been seen in the company of detectives. But to warder Chapman he spoke of ten Fenians, as he did on an
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1 Ibid., p.17.
2 'H.J. O'Farrell', statement made by, to Chief Warder, Darlinghurst gaol, 13 March 1868, V & P (LA NSW), 1868-9 (1), 733.
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4 To warder Chapman on 12 March, see Appendix D5 (p.942), 'Assassination Committee'. To Parkes, 24 March, see 'O'Farrell papers', p.723.
5 To Parkes, 24 March 1868, see 'O'Farrell papers', p.723.
6 To warder Chapman, 13 March 1868, see Appendix D5 (p.942), 'Assassination Committee'.

earlier occasion to Parkes. To Chapman he also mentioned the nine who were returning to England to cause trouble. Yet, to Bernard he said 'some' had gone to England and later to Parkes he said one had remained behind in the south seas. Other minor contradictions occur in his various interviews. They could, of course, indicate bad memory, or a desire to dissimulate, as much as inconsistent inventiveness.

It was not surprising that there remained people who believed O'Farrell insane. This was the plea on which his defence was based. The defence was organised in Melbourne by his sister, a Mrs Caroline Allen, who retained a solicitor, Pavey, and Butler Cole Aspinall, one of Melbourne's leading barristers, for the defence. A little later W.B. Dalley was added as junior counsel. O'Farrell's trial was set for 26 March, only ten days after the preliminary hearing, which gave those organising the defence little time to act. At the opening day of the trial before Justice Cheeke at the heavily guarded Central Criminal Court, Aspinall, who had just arrived from Melbourne, was able to secure an adjournment of four days to enable defence witnesses to arrive, and to give him time to find other witnesses in Sydney. The defence was to be that the prisoner was insane. The trial properly began on 30 March, with the prosecution successfully challenging four jurors, because, the Freeman's asserted, they had Irish names. The Premier and Attorney General, James Martin, led the prosecution and in an opening address indicated that all he intended to show was that O'Farrell was the man who had shot the Prince and that he had done so with the intention of killing him. He made it quite clear that the jury should consider the victim of the crime as just another British subject and indicated that he would make no allusions to the

1 To Parkes, 18 March 1868, see 'O'Farrell, Papers', p.716.
2 To Parkes, 24 March 1868, see 'O'Farrell, Papers', p.723.
3 The revelation that O'Farrell's sister's name was Allen led the Hobart Mercury to report that O'Farrell was an uncle of the man Allen, one of the 'Manchester Martyrs'. Empire, 13 April 1868.
broader circumstances of the crime. In conclusion he expressed the hope that by the trial they might let the whole world know that we did not deal summarily with his assailant under any feeling of excitement, but had examined his case calmly and impartially and fairly so that the British Empire and the world might have an example not of our vengeance but of our justice.¹

To establish his case Martin simply called several witnesses of the shooting and one of the surgeons who had examined the Prince immediately afterwards, who stated that the wound could easily have been fatal.

The key witness for the defence was Mrs Allen, the prisoner's sister, and wife of a Victorian civil servant. She gave some biographical detail of O'Farrell's early life, mentioning his training for the priesthood in Melbourne and Europe. The main burden of her evidence related to O'Farrell's health early in 1867. As a result of information she had received then, she and an elder sister visited O'Farrell in Ballarat, where he had owned a hay and corn store since 1854. She found him very sick, almost incoherent and talking of plots to poison him. He had been in such a state for several weeks. She and her sister stayed with him for a fortnight. During that time he had two bad epileptic fits and was given the last rites of the Church. He also talked of killing himself. When coherent he talked mainly of the losses he had sustained speculating in mining stocks. Eventually he recovered enough to return to Melbourne with her and undertook negotiations to buy a house. He returned to Ballarat for a short while, where he collapsed again, and spent two days in Ballarat hospital. He completely lost his memory of the events of the previous two months. He then stayed some time in Melbourne and about September left for Queensland and Sydney. In Melbourne he was calmer, but talked interminably of the losses he had sustained by the actions of his brother (the absconding solicitor, P.A.C. O'Farrell) and he surrounded himself with

¹S.M.H., 31 March 1868.
pistols, swords and daggers. The defence called several other witnesses who had known him in Ballarat or Sydney and who testified to certain indications of madness in him. In cross-examination however, Martin was able to get admissions that O'Farrell drank heavily and might only have been suffering from delirium tremens. The last defence witness was the solicitor Pavey who testified that at such short notice he had not been able to persuade any of the doctors who had attended O'Farrell in Ballarat to come to Sydney. Had they done so they would have testified to his insanity.

Martin then re-opened the prosecutions case, calling a number of witnesses who testified that they had known O'Farrell in Sydney and had found him quite normal, although a little inclined to excitement whenever Fenianism was mentioned.

In his address to the jury Aspinall devoted attention to O'Farrell's indeterminate state within the church: neither ordained priest, nor layman, and suggested that that was a cause of his insanity. As further evidence of his insanity he pointed to his coolness immediately prior to the assassination attempt. He reminded the jury that the first reaction of most colonists when they heard the news was that it could only be the mark of a madman, so senseless, so purposeless did it appear. Rather riskily he tried to turn the talk of Fenians to his own advantage and pointed out that if they were to find the prisoner guilty they would be branding us all with the embarrassing taint of Fenianism and conveying the embarrassing intelligence of the British government that no matter where the Prince or powers of the British government might go there would be a secret assassin in a conclave of assassins waiting to strike his blow.

He spoke at length on the case of the youth, Oxford, who, back in 1840 had fired two shots at the Queen and Prince Albert as they drove up Constitution Hill in London. Oxford had claimed to be a member of a secret society, which was later found to be of his own invention. He was judged
insane.¹

Martin, in his summary, pointed out that the issue of Fenianism was not at stake. All the jury were required to do was to judge whether O'Farrell had fired the shot which had wounded the Prince and if he had intended that shot to be fatal. If the jury thought him insane at the time of the shooting they must acquit him, but the defence had only shown that he was suffering from delirium tremens early in 1867. Even the defence witnesses had had to admit that he had later conducted himself in a perfectly sane manner. His action at Clontarf, Martin argued, spoke more of cool deliberation than insanity and he concluded by pointing out that if it were not perfectly clear from the evidence that O'Farrell was insane at the time, then they had to find him guilty. In his address to the jury Justice Cheeke reviewed the evidence and favoured Martin's view on the issue of insanity. The jury retired for an hour and returned with a verdict of guilty. Reading from a prepared script, which showed he had held little doubt of the verdict, Cheeke sentenced O'Farrell to death, and, somewhat improperly, told him to hold no hope of remission of that sentence.²

With the exception of the Freeman's Journal the press greeted the decision as a just one,³ and Belmore praised Martin's discretion for divesting the trial as far as possible of political significance.⁴ The Freeman's later argued that

¹See Justin McCarthy, A History of Our Times, (London 1899) Vol.1, p.157, for an account of Oxford's attempted assassination. Two other attempts were made on the Queen's life in 1842, the first from the same spot as Oxford's. Like Oxford both these would-be assassins were young men of artisan stock, one a hunchback, and both clearly mad. Nevertheless each was given a prison sentence. The same was true of another man who shot at her in 1849 from about the same spot as Oxford. (p.159).

²S.M.H., 1 April 1868.

³For example S.M.H., 1 and 2 April 1868; Empire, 1 April 1868.

⁴Belmore to Buckingham and Chandos, 22 April 1868, Belmore Correspondence, p.30.
that the trial had been rushed and that the circumstances made it impossible for a jury to reach an unbiased opinion about O'Farrell's sanity. 1 It could also be argued that had the Government placed before the court all the evidence in its possession, particularly O'Farrell's 'diary', it may have been easier to argue the case for insanity. Even so it is doubtful if, under the McNaghten rules, any such argument could have been successful. Clearly, what was uppermost in the Government's mind was the need for a quick but proper trial, in order to calm the community. Writing on 27 March, Mr. Consett Stephen recorded of a friend that

Norton says that if the jury find O'Farrell insane neither they nor Aspinall nor the prisoner will live through the day - and from the way he speaks I have no doubt he would lend most willingly a helping hand to murder the lot - and what is more, I have not yet spoken to anyone whom I believe would not do the same.2

O'Farrell had to be sacrificed to calm the emotions aroused by his deed.

It was for this reason that the Government refused to countenance any plea for clemency. Immediately after the court's decision was known, Mrs Allen, O'Farrell's sister, petitioned the Prince and Belmore asking for clemency. She claimed that O'Farrell was insane (and thus that the court had erred) and used the same arguments as Aspinall, viz that his coolness on the occasion could only be that of a madman. To this petition she attached a letter from one of the doctors who had attended O'Farrell at Ballarat, but who had been unable to come to Sydney for the trial. In this letter the doctor, Whitticombe, said he could prove O'Farrell insane at a time when he was not suffering from the D.T.'s. 3 The Prince,

1 F.J., 25 April 1868.
3 An account of the contents of the petition and of Whitticombe's letter is in Empire, 7 April 1868. The petition was obviously sent before that date as Parkes mentions it in a letter to Belmore 2 April 1868 [Letters to Earl of Belmore 1868-73, Vol.II, p.545[. Parkes found it 'offensive, injudicious and scarcely justifiable'. Belmore mentions Whitticombe's letter in a despatch to Buckingham and Chandos, 28 April 1868, C.0.201/548, f307.
who had almost fully recovered from his wound left the colony for England on 6 April. Before departing he expressed to the Governor, in writing, his earnest hope that O'Farrell's sentence might not be carried out until the British Government had been consulted. The Executive Council met later in the day of the Prince's departure and considered the two communications. Justice Cheeke was present at the meeting, and informed Belmore, who had specifically sought his opinion, that Dr Whitticombe's evidence could not have made any difference to the outcome of the trial. The Executive decided to allow the law to take its course and set 21 April as the date for O'Farrell's execution.¹

After O'Farrell had been sentenced the restrictions on visitors were lifted and he received several visits from his sister, and, as the execution date drew nearer, from Fr Dwyer, the gaol chaplain, some sisters of Charity, and from Archbishop Polding himself. The ruling that a warder had to be present during a visit was waived for these visitors. On 15 April, six days before his execution a change seemed to come over O'Farrell. To Fr Dwyer, the prison chaplain, with whom he had argued a month earlier, he confessed that 'he had been long enough playing the fool' and admitted that the Fenian story had been a concoction, that he had left some papers in his room for the express purpose of their falling into the hands of the police, and that he had been 'stringing Parkes along'.² The next day, noting that

¹ Belmore to Buckingham and Chandos, 28 April 1868, C.O.201/548, f307. Parkes to Sherriff, 7 April, 'Attempted Assassination, Correspondence', p.744. S.M.H., 7, 8 April. Parkes, in a letter to his sister, said that the Cabinet did not think that the Prince should 'interfere in the administration of our laws - on a question purely local' (Parkes to Miss Parkes, 9 July 1868, P.C., A1044, n.p.). Belmore asked the judge's opinion on the bearing O'Farrell's 'diary' would have had on the trial, had it been produced. Cheeke replied that as it was circumstantial evidence it could not have had much effect. See Belmore to Buckingham and Chandos, 28 December 1868, C.O. 201/548 f380.

² Evidence of Dwyer (q.1649-55, pp.867-8) 'Assassination Committee'. Archbishop Polding also mentions this change in Footnote continued following page...
O'Farrell's penitent demeanour was unchanged, Dwyer suggested that he make a statement of all this, and place it in the hands of 'someone outside the sphere of politics'. On the day before his execution O'Farrell wrote a draft of such a statement in Dwyer's presence, on paper Dwyer had provided. Dwyer suggested one minor change, and O'Farrell returned to his cell where he made two neat copies, one of which he handed to Dwyer later that evening. The other neat copy he attempted to present to Parkes, who was attending the gaol on another matter. Parkes however declined to take it and said it should be attested and sealed before a magistrate. This was done, and it was placed in Parkes's hands the next morning.

That was the morning of O'Farrell's execution. Accompanied by Fr Dwyer he left his cell at nine o'clock and strode briskly to the gallows erected the gaol yard. A large number of visitors, by invitation of the Executive, had gathered to watch him drop, and he disappointed them by refraining from making a final statement. Death was almost instantaneous, and after he had hung a while, he was cut down and a plaster-caste made of his face by the sculptor Walter McGill. As his relatives had not claimed his body it was taken under police escort by way of back streets to Newtown station, where it was transferred to a train for the journey to Haslem Creek cemetery.

footnote cont'd from previous page

O'Farrell's demeanour in a letter to Gregory written a day after the execution, Polding to Gregory, 22 April 1868 in Birt, op.cit., p.337.

1 Ibid., (q.1659, p.868).


3 Evidence of Read (qq.628-36, p.822) 'Assassination Committee'.

4 21 signatures appear as witnesses of his execution, including those of Walter Montgomery, the actor, and E.H. Hargreaves, the 'discoveror' of gold. See appendix (B13, p.936) Assassination Committee'.

5 See appendix (B26, p.937) in 'Assassination Committee'.

6 H. McLean to Col.Sec., 23 July 1868, Colonial Secretary, Correspondence Received, f68/3936, Box 4/630, N.S.W. State Archives.
A big crowd gathered outside the gaol which was guarded by a strong detachment of police. As well, a squad of men from the 50th Regiment were stationed in the court house in case of trouble.\footnote{Parkes to Belmore, 20 April 1868, Col. Waddy to Belmore, 20 April 1868 in Letter to Earl of Belmore, Vol.II, p.544, p.899.} The \textit{Sydney Morning Herald} produced a special midday supplement describing the event in heavily moral terms.\footnote{'Execution of O'Farrell, Sydney Morning Herald Office, Tuesday 21 March, Noon,...' Broadside, 16 3/4" x 4 1/2" in Ferguson Collection, No.5837.} A certain bizarre interest in O'Farrell continued even after death. During the two weeks before his execution he had been visited at different times by Mr Kelly and Dr Carr, two phrenologists lecturing in the city. On the evening following O'Farrell's execution Carr, in a lecture chaired by Allan Macpherson, gave a long account of the findings of his phrenological examination of O'Farrell: 'the size of the brain was above average...(which is) usually associated with an extremely sensitive organisation... large veneration and caution inspired a high conception of spiritual responsibility....'\footnote{Empire, 22 April 1868.} During March the photographer, Montague Scott, was given permission to take a photograph of O'Farrell because the Prince wished to have one as a momento.\footnote{Appendix (Bl7, p.936) 'Assassination Committee'.} Numerous copies were soon on sale in the shops.\footnote{S.M.H., 27 March 1868.} Similarly, reproductions of O'Farrell's death mask were quickly put on sale, presumably giving rise to the grisly rumour that O'Farrell's grave had been opened and his head removed. These rumours were strong enough for the police to investigate the grave, but they found the body untouched. Nevertheless, a guard was mounted over it for a week.\footnote{Parkes, replying to a question from Driver in Legislative Assembly, S.M.H., 28 April 1868. Evidence of Parkes (q.1267, p.851) 'Assassination Committee'.}
The controversy caused by O'Farrell continued after his death. His final statement, denying the veracity of his previous stories about his membership of a Fenian conspiracy renewed the old controversy about his motivation and mental state, which had become closely tied to the wider question of Catholic and Irish implication in his crime. When Parkes read the statement he realised its importance. He did not believe it, sharing with the police authorities the view that it was a typically unreliable product of a man about to face death, but he knew that in the hands of the Government's opponents it would be a powerful weapon. He decided to redouble his efforts to unearth some of O'Farrell's accomplices, who, he firmly believed, were still present in the colonies. Only thus could the falsity of that final statement be demonstrated.

Parkes, in his self appointed role as chief detective, had previously accepted the services of private individuals who came to him offering to apprehend Fenians they claimed to know. Some had been sworn in as special constables to enable them to make arrests, but had not been successful. Others had been asked to continue reporting to the police.

---

1 J. McLerie to Colonial Secretary, 10 August 1868, 'O'Farrell, Papers', p.729.
2 See file 'Special Constables' in 'Special Bundle' and pp. 738-40 and p.745 in 'Attempted Assassination, Correspondence'.
3 One of these was William Montague Clarence Campbell, who claimed to be the illegitimate son of King William IV, and to have been brought up by Major General Sir Archibald Campbell, at one time Lt. Governor of New Brunswick. Campbell had previously been Superintendent of the City Soup Kitchen, which he had tried to have brought under Government control and himself paid a government salary (W.M.C. Campbell to J.D. Lang, 2 September 1867, Lang Papers, Vol.II, pp.603-5). While holding that position he had felt threatened by Fenians and had asked the police to supply him with a gun. He was unemployed at the time of the assassination attempt, and was soon offering his services and some far fetched information about Fenians to the government. On his first letter (13 April) Parkes had scrawled 'I think the man is mad' but advised the I.G.P. to receive his reports, as they might contain some information of value. This the I.G.P. did,

Footnote continued on following page..
while most had been discouraged as probable frauds. One such informant was a Victorian detective, Harry Benedict. He had seen Parkes late in March offering to catch some Fenians if he was given employment, but his information was vague and Parkes had not been interested. In April, Benedict, who, as a result of material published in the press, then knew more details of the supposed conspiracy, wrote to Parkes offering to point out two accomplices of O'Farrell, whom, he claimed, were now in the city. This letter reached Parkes on 20 April. The next morning, after the execution, Parkes sent for Benedict, who showed him numerous testimonials referring to his service in the Victorian police, and gave even more elaborate assurances, but little hard information, that he could lay his hands on a number of Fenians in Melbourne. He would, however, need some financial assistance to pursue them, and asked for a written guarantee that he would get the full reward of £1,000 for every Fenian he caught. He was also quizzed by Martin, but such was the eagerness of the two politicians to obtain evidence supporting their view that they accepted Benedict's deal and sent him off to Victoria with a £30 loan. Unknown to them, Benedict had previously offered his services to O'Farrell's defence lawyers and had told some friends in the Sydney detective force that he thought there was something to be made out of all the fuss. He even offered to cut detective McGlone in on the deal. In Victoria he sent back a number of letters claiming that he had discovered several Fenians and was in pursuit of more, but required more money. These letters were all written from

Footnote continued from previous page:

but Campbell reported nothing but trivia, given portentous implication by his great fear of Irishmen and Catholics. Campbell later contributed bad verse to the Protestant Banner. He kept pestering the Government for an appointment as a detective, and then as Inspector of Charities. Eventually he became a teacher in a small country school. See 'Special Bundle'; A.P.B., 1 August 1868; W.M.C. Campbell to Parkes, 8 August 1872, P.C., A878, pp.300-2.
Ballarat where he apparently had settled. Parkes eventually realised he had been duped and the correspondence ceased.\(^1\) He had previously been quite enthusiastic about Benedict's chances of success and had communicated his confidence to Belmore and the Colonial Office.\(^2\) But Parkes at this time was desperately trying to convince others of his original interpretation of the crime.

Benedict was not the only one to have duped the over-anxious Parkes. Another was Charles Miller, alias Meyers, a prisoner in Darlinghurst prison, who, during April, saw Parkes several times and spun him a vague yarn about belonging to the Fenian organisation. He claimed that William Cummings the member for East Macquarie, was a Fenian head-centre, and named several other prominent Irishmen as Fenians. He further claimed to have been entrusted by the Fenians with the task of executing the Prince at Newcastle. It was there that he had been arrested for larceny. On 20 April Meyers presented Parkes with a long written statement detailing his knowledge of Fenian activity in N.S.W., and offering to assist the police in bringing them to justice.\(^3\)

\(^1\)Evidence of Benedict's motivation and details of his original approach to Parkes is in the evidence of McGlone (qq.2749-58, pp.902-3); of detective Raven (qq.2117-21, p.882); of detective Bowen (qq.2558-61, p.896), 'Assassination Committee'. Benedict's correspondence with Parkes is in 'Attempted Assassination, Correspondence', p.747-51. Benedict's testimonials are published in Appendix D5, pp.939-41 in 'Assassination Committee'.

\(^2\)Parkes to Belmore, 21 April 1868, Letters to Earl of Belmore, 1868-71, Vol.II, p.538. That letter is dated 21 March, but it is clear from internal and other evidence that it should be 21 April. The mistake may have been Parkes's or Belmore's daughter, who copied out the correspondence now in the possession of the Mitchell Library from the originals in her father's possession. See also Buckingham and Chandos to Belmore, 1 July 1868, and Parkes to Belmore, 1 August 1868, in Belmore Correspondence, pp.33 and 59.

\(^3\)It is published as Appendix D6, p.943 in 'Assassination Committee'.
Martin, on looking at Meyers charge sheet, declared that a prosecution should not have been initiated on such flimsy evidence and Meyers was given some money and taken to Parramatta where he was unconditionally pardoned and released on the understanding that he would proceed to Bathurst by an indirect route so as not to arouse suspicion, and apprehend the Fenians he claimed resided there. Meyers determined to go via Yass, Young, Grenfell and Orange. He proceeded slowly and sent back frequent requests for more money, some of which were answered. Eventually the police realised they had been hoaxed and ceased replying to his correspondence. Meyers happily settled in Orange. ¹

Parkes was correct in supposing that the Opposition was waiting for any opportunity to attack the Government, and him in particular, over their handling of the O'Farrell business. He had already been attacked for 'starting' rumours that the Catholic Bishop of Adelaide was in league with O'Farrell and the Fenians. The basis of these rumours had been a letter from the Bishop to O'Farrell, which had been amongst the correspondence found at Tierney's hotel. It simply advised O'Farrell to enter the Jesuits, and its tabling by Parkes put an end to the rumours.² When the House met on the afternoon following O'Farrell's execution, Macleay asked Parkes if the Government had received the dying declaration made by O'Farrell, and whether it denied that he had been connected with anyone else. Parkes simply replied in the

¹ See evidence of Parkes (qq.1195-1252, pp.846-50) in 'Assassination Committee'. There Parkes claimed that he never thought Meyers reliable but that in order to discover the operation of such a crime as Fenianism it was unlikely that much assistance would be had from reputable men. See also evidence of Fosberry (qq.286-306, pp.808-9), and evidence of Read (p.819) in 'Assassination Committee'. Meyers Correspondence with the Sydney police is published in pp. 757-61 of 'Attempted Assassination, Correspondence'. The originals are in the 'Special Bundle'.

² S.M.H., 15 April 1868.
affirmative and Forster launched what was to be the main attack, centred on the visit to O'Farrell by Dr Carr the phrenologist. During that visit Carr had attempted to ascertain O'Farrell's views on the immortality of the soul, but had been interrupted by a warder, who thought this was a line of questioning inappropriate in the case of a man about to be hung.¹ The Opposition also held this view and Forster moved adjournment to enable a full scale attack to be made on the Government. The basis of the attack was to be the irregularities, such as the Carr interview, in the Government's treatment of O'Farrell, but early in the debate Macleay returned to the O'Farrell statement, which he argued should be made available immediately, suggesting that Parkes was trying to use the statement as he had used the Bishop of Adelaide's letter, 'to excite a great deal of disagreeable feeling among the people generally'. This Parkes indignantly denied and, in looking around for a way of justifying his refusal to produce the statement, claimed it had to be considered by the Executive Council, and that, at the same time as it had been received, the Government 'had received another statement of very highest importance...which could not be considered apart from the other'. His indignation led him to speak more unwisely still, and, waving a sheaf of papers in his hand, he went on:

He had never heard that it was proper to ask for statements of this kind when the Government had to grapple, as it believed, with a new kind of crime, of which there was evidence...that it was deep seated in the colony and...in the highest degree difficult to deal with.

This was no more than a statement of Parkes's, and of the whole ministry's, belief, but the Opposition found in it more useful ammunition.² Talk about a 'new crime' seemed

¹For an account of their conversation see evidence of Warder J. Carroll (qq. 2904-15, p.909) and Appendix B12, p.935, in 'Assassination Committee'.

²In July Belmore wrote that he believed O'Farrell's dying statement to be true, but observed that this view was not shared by his ministers. Belmore to George Bowen, 19 July 1868, Belmore Correspondence, p.58.
far fetched, and Robertson and Driver both argued forcefully that not only were such statements fabrications, for any Fenian in the colony must surely have been ferreted out by the Treason Felon Act, but that their only consequence was to further encourage the division in the colony which Parkes's earlier statements had so powerfully engendered. There was considerable truth in such a view, although by choosing to make the Government's handling of the O'Farrell business a political issue the Opposition was also helping to sustain the divisions produced by O'Farrell's actions: divisions which would have occurred quite irrespective of any course adopted by the Government. Some members of the Opposition: Macleay, Macpherson and most of the Catholic members, were, by now, victims of their own propaganda and were firmly convinced that Parkes and the other ministers were concerned solely with retaining power by stirring up anti-Catholic feeling.

Such an assault on the Government was a final fling at the end of a long and acrimonious session. It was the last of many such attacks on the Government, and on Parkes in particular. These attacks always claimed that the Government was anti-Catholic and attempting to divide society along religious lines. The justification for these attacks was slight, but they were about the only issue that the various factions comprising the Opposition agreed upon, and they held out hopes of considerable Catholic support in the next election. On the other hand the Government, and Parkes in particular, were becoming vulnerable on this point. The paranoia in Parkes make-up had been first provoked by the attacks on him over the education act and was now further roused by criticism of his handling of the O'Farrell case. In this it had become entangled with his considerable vanity. Parkes was not accepted in high society, such as it was, in Sydney, and although this did not much worry him he could hardly have been unconscious of the jokes circulating in that

---

1 S.M.H., 22 April 1868.
society about his early years in the colony as a labourer and a toy-shop owner. This awareness added extra determination to his attempts to justify his actions in the O'Farrell affair, and led him to act at times with considerable indiscretion. His speech in the House on 21 April was one such occasion.

The existence of a duplicate of O'Farrell's statement was unknown to Parkes and the Government, who probably assumed Macleay's information came from the same sources in the gaol responsible for providing the details of Dr Carr's visit. O'Farrell had asked Dwyer that a copy of his statement be placed in the safe keeping of W.B. Dalley, one of his defence counsels. Fr Dwyer had informed Dalley of this on the morning of the execution, and, after Macleay's questioning had failed to persuade Parkes to table his copy, Dwyer allowed Dalley to transcribe his own copy of the statement. In the Assembly the next night, 22 April, Macleay asked that the statement be tabled, and, on the refusal of this request, moved adjournment and proceeded to read the statement to an astonished Assembly. The Government was stunned, although Martin recovered quickly enough to point out that the Government 'had reasons for delaying publication of the document which Macleay could not know' and hoped that no harm could come from his actions. John Stewart put the view which had obviously formed in Parkes's mind. He doubted if the letter read by Macleay, or its copy in Parkes's possession, had been written by O'Farrell of his own volition: 'if O'Farrell wrote the letter at all it was at the prompting of other parties.'

1 Stanley Leighton, 'Extracts from a Journal, Australia, 1868', Vol.2, pp.26-7 (MSS., 2 Vols., A.N.L.) recorded these jokes during a visit to Sydney about this time. Leighton was the son of an English gentleman and after a tour of the antipodes returned to England and soon after succeeded to his father's seat in the Commons.

2 Dwyer to Sheriff McLean, 11 May 1868, V & P (LA NSW), 1868-69 (2) 215.

3 Evidence of Dwyer (qq.1684-90, p.869) 'Assassination Commityee'.

4 S.M.H., 23 April 1868.
The statement was published by the papers next day, and, together with the circumstances of its release, created considerable controversy. The next evening Macleay, after some procedural difficulties, read to the House a letter from Archbishop Polding intended 'to remove erroneous impressions respecting the declaration of Henry James O'Farrell'. In his letter Polding claimed that O'Farrell had made the statement as partial atonement for his crime; that though advised to make it, it was a free voluntary act; that it was made for the express purpose of being published, not for giving information to the Government, as Parkes seemed to think; and that O'Farrell had placed a duplicate in the hands of a confidential person to ensure its publication. It concluded by arguing that the statement was equivalent to an address made from the scaffold, which was necessarily a public statement and that it ought to be seen as a substitute for this.\textsuperscript{1} The \textit{Herald} thought that Polding's communication should settle the whole affair, claiming that it had always doubted O'Farrell's stories about accomplices as fabrications devised to aid his case. The failure of the police to find confirmatory evidence for such stories seemed to the \textit{Herald}, as to John Robertson, final proof of their falsity.\textsuperscript{2}

Parkes was not prepared to let the matter rest, and instituted an enquiry into how a copy of the document handed him had come into the possession of others. The order setting up the enquiry showed clearly the drift of his thinking at the time. It described the statement given to Parkes by O'Farrell as 'a copy of another document, clandestinely furnished to him for the purpose, through the instrumentality of some officer of the gaol'. Fr Dwyer, the gaol chaplain and a grandson of Michael Dwyer, the Wicklow Chief, was one of those requested to appear before the enquiry. This he did

\textsuperscript{1}S.M.H., 24 April 1868.

\textsuperscript{2}S.M.H., 25 April 1868.
only under protest at the assumptions contained in Parkes's order establishing it. He declined to answer questions, except to say that O'Farrell had written a rough draft of the statement in his presence and that he had that draft in his possession. Parkes suspended Dwyer for his actions respecting the enquiry and for his general display of insubordination 'intolerable in a public servant'. Dwyer replied to the charges against him at some length, arguing rather sophistically that the regulations forbidding an officer of the gaol from conveying letters of prisoners to and from the gaol did not apply to him, and that, anyway, he had a higher responsibility: that of aiding O'Farrell in making restitution for the crimes he had committed against his fellow Catholics for causing false accusations to be made against them. So that the sacrament of O'Farrell's confession was properly completed he had to make sure O'Farrell's statement was quickly published.

Parkes ignored this reply and submitted to the Executive Council that Dwyer be dismissed. Belmore, however, thought that Parkes's reasons for requesting dismissal, while sound, were rather badly stated in his submission, and that Dwyer had obviously some reason for his sharp rejoinder. After some changes the submission was accepted and Dwyer's suspension confirmed. That was on 20 May. On 10 June Dwyer handed copies of all his correspondence to the press when they were published. If he hoped to thus gain satisfaction, he was mistaken, for the daily press criticised his actions, which they thought based on an obsessional mistrust of the Government. The Herald also criticised his attempt to invoke a responsibility higher than that which he owed the Government.

1 'Inquiry by the Sheriff....' V & P (LA NSW) 1867-68 (2) 193-200; S.M.H., 28 April 1868.
2 'Roman Catholic Chaplain, Darlinghurst Gaol. Correspondence respecting....' in V & P (LA NSW) 1868-69 (2) 1-7. See also S.M.H., 11 June 1868.
3 S.M.H., 11 June 1868.
Needless to say, while the Freeman's Journal saw Dwyer's dismissal as yet another example of Government vindictiveness towards Catholics, the Protestant press was full of praise for it, and saw in Dwyer's actions another example of Romish contempt for the public institutions of the country.

Tuesday 28 April was declared by the Government as a day of thanksgiving. It was a public holiday: flags were flown, bells were rung and special services were held in all the churches. For the first time since the assassination churchmen were given a prominent role in the community's response to the event. A number of them proved the reasons for the original exclusion well founded.

The Catholics held masses in their churches, with some special prayers, concluding with a Te Deum. The Protestant Churches, appropriately, placed more emphasis on the spoken word and built their services around sermons. A number of these were simple homilies, recognising the hand of God in the Prince's delivery and expressing grateful thanks. Others, however, drew lessons. The Rev. Hulton S. King of the Anglican Church of St Michael's, Surry Hills, identified the assassination attempt as a crime of a social character, now becoming common in England as well as in Ireland. The cause of these crimes was 'the selfish extravagance, reckless trading, gambling and speculation in the higher and influential classes', which encouraged 'sloth prodigality, intemperance in the lower, who...listened greedily to every ignorant or itinerant demagogue'. The Rev. B. Taylor, of St Stephen's Anglican Church, Newtown, saw the problem nearer home. O'Farrell's action, he said, was 'a righteous judgement which we deserve....Witness our prayerless parliament; legalised Sabbath breaking by the railways....!'

Another theme occurred more frequently. The Anglican Bishop Barker concluded his sermon by exhorting his audience to be duly sensible of the privileges they enjoy as members

1 F.J., 13 June 1868.
2 A.P.B., 20 June 1868; Testimony, June 1868, p.385.
3 S.M.H., 29, 30 April 1868.
of the Church of England - a Church in which they could enjoy Christian liberty and be preserved from the corrupters of the Church of Rome'. The Rev. Zachary Barry was more forthright still. While it was clear from history that true religion was an element in preserving social order, ultramontanism was an element of discord. He went on to claim that the Roman Church sympathised with Fenianism and that O'Farrell's actions were directly inspired by all the talk about the wrongs of Ireland. The Rev. John McGibbon also saw Fenianism as ultimately connected with Rome, and only now repudiated by the priests because it had proved a failure. While hid did not think all Catholics were disloyal, it was certainly true that Romanism, which emphasised the authority of the Pope and encouraged the deposing of kings and the extermination of heretics, was at the bottom of all disloyalty. He concluded by praying that the event would rouse Protestants 'to maintain the truth on which the throne of the Soverign rests - the truth of Protestantism'. The Rev. William McIntyre, of St George Free Presbyterian Church echoed McGibbon's final prayer and hoped that the assassination attempt would direct more earnest attention to the real source of the evil: 'the teaching and influence of Popery'. At the Scots Church the Rev. J.D. Lang compared O'Farrell's deed to the action of certain fanatic Romanists during the Protestant Reformation and described it as having the same object: the subversion of Protestantism.¹

While the sentiments of men like Barry, Lang and McGibbon were shared openly and completely by only a small minority, there was a much larger number, possibly a majority of colonists, whose lives had been touched by this strand of Protestantism, and in whom it was merely a suspended or forgotten, not rejected, set of beliefs. In many of these men the events of March and April 1868 had

¹S.M.H., 28 April 1868. The paper did not carry accounts of sermons by ministers of Wesleyan or other denominations.
begun to revive these beliefs. The process of revival was, in all but a few cases, a slow and complicated one. It required frequent exposure to such sectarian sentiments and to behaviour that appeared to justify them. The attempted assassination of the Duke of Edinburgh did not immediately give rise to widespread growth of Protestant sectarianism, but it did rapidly accelerate a process of growth already begun. The reverberations of that shot were still being heard years later.
Chapter III

The Growth of Protestant Sectarianism.

The attempted assassination of the Duke of Edinburgh gave considerable impetus to organised anti-Catholicism. The Orange Institution more than doubled in size to almost 2,000 members by the end of 1868. The growth of the Protestant Political Association was even more spectacular. Formed after the attempted assassination, it had over 3,000 members by the end of the year. A stridently anti-Catholic paper was started and a number of orange sponsored endeavours, such as the Protestant Alliance Friendly Society and the Protestant Hall fund, received a boost in support.

The attempted assassination induced in many a feeling of insecurity. It demonstrated that the colony was not free from the conspiracies and rebellions of European life, and hinted at possible disruptions of antipodean society. Those affected in this way came mainly from the lower middle class and respectable working class: shopkeepers, small businessmen, tradesmen and the like. They were men with a stake in society, but a stake that was both precarious and, for many, insufficient. They both feared for their position and aspired to improve it. They craved both for economic security and for recognition by their superiors of their

\[1\] I use the term 'class' loosely, much as did the people of whom I am writing. By occupational criteria many of those to whom I am referring are from the working class, but they are mostly self employed and it is this combination of independence and the tenuous social status that it gave that they have in common with those, who, by occupational criteria, are lower middle class. It is their social position and their awareness of it with which I am concerned.
social importance. Many of this class reacted to the threat of social disruption by joining the Volunteers, whose numbers increased by two-thirds during 1868. Others sought security by defining for themselves an identity more specific than that which they possessed as colonists, but which, nevertheless, had reference to some of the ruling values and principles of colonial society. Some of those who had helped organise the indignation meeting of Australians, for example, formed an Australian Patriotic Association. This was committed to work against the introduction into the colony of old world bigotries, but was also concerned to protect the interests of the native born in the public and social life of the colony. Others, whose religious predispositions led them to react more directly to the social divisions encouraged by the attempted assassination, stressed their Britishness and Protestantism in an endeavour to remind other colonists that their social

---

1 What I am suggesting here is that they were prone to pursue what Richard Hofstadter has called 'status politics'. See Hofstadter's essays on pseudo-conservatism in The Paranoid Style in American Politics (London, 1966), pp. 41-92. Joseph Gusfield, in Symbolic Crusade (Urbana, 1963), has in a very interesting fashion applied this concept to the history of the temperance movement in the United States.

2 The Volunteers were a citizens' militia force: part time soldiers meeting once a week for drill and less frequently for rifle practice and manoeuvres. According to the respective editions of the NSW Statistical Register, numbers in the Volunteers had remained steady at about 1,500 from 1869, except for a jump to 1,800 in 1866, probably in anticipation of promised Government legislation giving Volunteers who completed a certain length of service a grant of land. At the end of 1867 there were 1,537 members. During 1868 this number rose by 60 per cent to 2,497. Numbers continued to rise in later years but at less than half the rate.

3 It intended to do this 'by obtaining for them a fair share of public and private patronage and employment'. The Association was formed in August and grew rapidly during September, so that it had by October about 350 members (S.M.H., 1, 15, 22, 30 September 1868). It took over the task of raising funds to complete the statue of Captain Cook, but was seriously weakened as a political organisation by municipal elections in November 1868 and May 1869, when the loyalties of members to the various older factions asserted themselves. (S.M.H., 17 December 1868; F.J., 8, 15 May 1869.)
and political institutions were both British and Protestant, and, particularly at that time, threatened by Irishmen and Catholics. Within three weeks of the attempted assassination an Australian - British Association had been formed 'to protect the interests of loyal British subjects in the colony'. It made very clear that British also meant Protestant. ¹

However, a Protestant protection society already existed in the colony in the Loyal Orange Institution, which was, not surprisingly, flooded with applications for membership. The No. 2 Loyal Orange Lodge held special meetings during March and April to handle applications and initiations of new members. During 1867 the average number seeking membership each month was three. In the second quarter of 1868 (April-June) it was 18. Numbers fell away somewhat after this, but remained high until November, being given a boost in September-October by the renewed controversy that followed Parkes's famous speech at Kiama. ² During this period about 1,500 colonists sought to join an orange lodge, and a number of new lodges were formed as a result. ³ In January 1868 there were eight lodges functioning in and around Sydney. By 1868 there were fourteen and nine had been added to the three already existing in country districts. One new lodge, No. 17, was formed among members of the Volunteers. ⁴

¹S.M.H., 21 April 1868. See above p.146.
²No. 2 Loyal Orange Lodge, 'minute book'.
³This figure is not much more than an inspired guess. Sources of inspiration are rough figures for total orange membership in 1866; slightly more accurate figures for early 1870s; the number of new lodges formed in 1868; a few stray figures for membership of these and knowledge of numbers seeking membership in No. 2 Lodge. If No. 2 Lodge is any guide about 25 per cent of these new members dropped out after a few months.
⁴Figures for new lodges can be calculated more accurately: from advertisements in the A.P.B. and P.S., and from reports in those journals of the opening of new lodges. Most of the new country lodges were formed near Sydney, e.g. at Parramatta, but lodges were started at Newcastle, West Maitland and Armidale.
The spectacular growth of the Orange Institution tapered off after October 1868. Numbers seeking membership of No. 2 Lodge fell away dramatically and remained low (about one or two per month) during 1869, climbing a little at election time at the end of the year. Although the formation of a number of new lodges would have more widely distributed those seeking membership, there would appear to have been a considerable lessening of interest in the Orange Institution at the end of 1868, both in the community generally, and among those already lodge members. Early in 1869 about 25 members of No. 2 Lodge were expelled for failure to pay dues or attend meetings for six months. This represented about 12 per cent of membership, or 25 per cent of numbers joining the Lodge in 1868. It would seem that after a period of time, made longer by Parkes's Kiama speech, the excitement that followed the attempted assassination died down, and the widespread anti-orange feeling in the community so reasserted itself that even men who had joined a lodge no longer found their original motives compelling and dropped out. ¹ It was, after all, a notoriously Irish and sectarian organisation and there was by then an alternative Protestant organisation that was, ostensibly, free of those taints. ²

The Protestant Political Association grew out of the Australasian-British Association. The name change occurred sometime in July, but before that the original title had been reduced to the handier British Association. The first few meetings of the British Association were held at Jacob Blake's Robin Hood Inn, in the Old South Head Road, a meeting place.

¹ There is no conclusive evidence, but it appears very likely for that reason that most of those expelled had joined in 1868. One had joined earlier. He was Thomas Garrett, Robertson's friend. A number of other members of No. 2 lodge sought transfer to other lodges.

² One who joined in October 1868 was Gotha Mann, the Superintendent of Cockatoo Island Prison, who perhaps had some reason to feel himself persecuted by Catholics. As a rather prickly officer and gentleman he would not have found the company enjoyable and appears to have dropped out in 1869.
for the Cowper-Robertson orange faction. The first president was Samuel Kippax, 39, born at Windsor, the son of a wheelwright and the younger partner in Kippax brothers, poulterers. An orangeman, he was treasurer of the Protestant Alliance Friendly Society and a Wesleyan. His elder brother and partner, William, also an orangeman, was a city alderman. Early in June a shift in meeting place was made to the Lyceum school room in Bathurst Street, the central orange meeting place in the city. This move followed a general meeting of the Association which was held, late in May, in the Temperance Hall. There, a manifesto setting out the aims of the Association was adopted. Taking as its motto 'when treason is abroad, loyalty should be organised and ready for action' it went on to express support for the British throne and Constitution as by law established - our connection and adherence thereto; and in the colony our united aid and assistance to Her Majesty's representatives - Parliament and lawfully constituted authorities therein - for the maintenance and preservation of law and order among the people.

It also declared itself against clerical control of education, state aid to religion, and civil servants acknowledging any earthly authority other than the Queen. It would 'endeavour to enforce the principle of a just and equitable distribution of patronage and employment'. Only a small number attended the meeting. Total membership of the Association was then 119.

After the slightly shaky beginning the Association grew rapidly. A change in name late in June, to the Protestant Political Association, and a change in leadership contributed considerably to the growth. During July over 200 men were added and over 400 in August. In August, as well, branches

1 S.M.H., 23 May 1868; A.P.B., 13 June 1868.
2 Ibid.
3 First used in S.M.H., 26 July 1868.
4 The number of men seeking membership at each meeting were given in the weekly reports of these Friday meetings in the Herald and the Banner.
of the association were formed, first in Newtown, and then in West Maitland. By early November, 14 branches had been formed in country centres and Sydney suburbs, which gave the Association a good start towards its target of a branch in every electorate. Total membership at that time was over 3,000.

The organisation of the Association underwent some changes as it grew in size. In July elections were held for executive positions and a Council of ten members was elected as well. Meetings of what became the 'parent branch' of the Association were held every Friday and were reported in the press. By August the Council was meeting during the week preceding the ordinary meetings and executing the administrative business of the Association. It would then report to the weekly meetings of the parent branch of the Association. At the same time the purpose of the Association was clarified and expressed in a set of rules. The first rule stated that 'the Association shall consist of an unlimited number of loyal subjects (Protestants)' and subsequent rules spelt out its primary objects. By now the political aims of the Association had become paramount. It existed primarily to assist in the

---

1 S.M.H., 25 July, 11, 28 August 1868.

2 The exact number of members is a little hard to ascertain as no weekly figures were given for enrolment in branches. As early as 11 September Davies had claimed that there were 2,000 members in the parent association and 13 or 14 branches, which another member claimed had 1,000 members among them (S.M.H., 12 September 1868). These figures are exaggerated, as 14 branches had not been opened until the end of October, although applications for branches had probably been received from these places. However since beginning of August a total of 100 members per month had been seeking membership of the parent Association, and a total of 3,000 members by early November seems not unreasonable. On 25 November, G.L. Wilson, the secretary, told a meeting that 14 branches had been opened and over 3,000 members enrolled (A.P.B., 28 November 1868). There seems to have been little growth during November-December and this figure was probably true as early as 2 November, when branches were opened at Dalton near Yass and Parramatta. Other branches were at Newtown, West Maitland, Waterloo, Redfern, Majors Creek, Bathurst, Dungog, Canterbury, Armidale, Paddington, Balmain, Liverpool.

3 S.M.H., 11, 18 July 1868.
return to Parliament and municipal bodies of 'gentlemen of known liberal Protestant principles'. The subscription rate was set at one shilling per quarter. As early as June it had been suggested that a body be formed under P.P.A. auspices to consist of representatives of all Protestant organisations. The object of this body would be to work for the return of Protestants to Parliament and the City Council. This was not acted upon until September, when the P.P.A. Council drew up a plan based on the idea. The organisation set up by the Council of the Association was called a Delegate Assembly. It was to consist of the Council, plus two representatives from each P.P.A. branch (country branches were allowed two proxies), plus two representatives of any other Protestant association that wished to participate. It was to meet sporadically to co-ordinate Protestant activity in election campaigns and consider any matters referred to it by its members.

The driving force of the Association during these four months, as indeed during its entire existence, was John Davies. Davies, an orangeman, Grand Worshipful President of the Sons of Temperance and, since 1864, president of the Protestant Alliance Friendly Society, had been connected with the Association from mid-June. He was then a vice-president and in mid-July was elected president. An ironmonger, born in Sydney the son of an engineer, Davies was only 29. He had been baptised a Catholic but had been converted to Protestantism in his youth. Davies was a compulsive joiner of organisations and from an early age had learnt how to make himself indispensible, and thus a friend, to leading political figures, as an organiser of votes and general whipper-in. He bore this relationship to the leading members of the Martin government.

---

1 A.P.B., 5 September 1868.
2 S.M.H., 27 June 1868.
3 A.P.B., 19 September 1868. A number of orange lodges appear to have become members of the organisation (No.2, L.O.L., minute book).
government in 1863-65 and again in 1866-68. The Council that was elected with Davies reflected the social composition of the Association. Robert Hughes, the treasurer during the life of the Association, was a furniture broker. The secretary, George Lea Wilson, was a conveyancer, and among the other members were a fruiterer, a produce agent, a coal merchant, an engineer, a clothier and another ironmonger. Rank and file membership was presumably of similar or lower status. None were very distinguished and it was to Davies satisfaction that he was able several times to announce that he had attracted 'several wealthy and influential gentlemen to join the Association'. As far as can be judged no one Protestant denomination predominated, although it was usually only Protestants of evangelical persuasion who shared the simple antipathy to popery that was a necessary prerequisite for membership of such an association. The attitude of the Protestant clergy varied. Those of evangelical persuasion supported it, and while some, like Zachary Barry, thought it not proper for a clergyman to belong to a political organisation, others thought differently. The initiative for the founding of the Goulburn branch came from the Rev. W. Ross, who was at that time, Moderator of

1 A.D.B., Vol.4, forthcoming; F.J., 10 September 1870. During the early months of 1868 Davies had organised a system of cabs to get government members from their accommodation to the House in time for important divisions during the Opposition's filibustering period. It was later revealed, amidst much controversy, that Eagar, the Colonial treasurer, had paid him £20 out of the treasury for his expenses (S.M.H., 10 December 1868).

2 See Appendix III for an incomplete list of names, and occupations of P.P.A. Council members in 1868, 1870 and 1872.

3 For example, S.M.H., 8 August 1868.
the Presbyterian Assembly. It is difficult to be sure of its various national components. In answer to criticism that it was no more than an Irish sectarian society a member replied that only one quarter of its membership was Irish. This was considerably higher than the proportion of Protestant Irish in the community, but it is significant that the first two presidents of the Association, Kippax and Davies, were both native born. This was not a characteristic of orange leadership at that time. A number of the Council were orangemen, but Davies and others often stressed that the Association was not an orange organisation. It certainly lacked the ritual and much of the secrecy of orangeism, and because it did not possess the latter's benefit society function it was cheaper to belong to (four shillings per annum compared to twelve shillings). It was also much easier to join than orange lodge. Joining was simply a matter of applying for membership and being adopted at a meeting. It was not even necessary to attend a meeting in person — a provision designed to allow Davies's 'prominent

1 A.P.B., 24 October 1868; S.M.H., 24 October 1868. At one stage in October an attempt was made to involve the association in a feud that was raging between a section of the congregation of the Anglican Christ Church, St. Lawrence, and their minister over a reredos he had erected in the Church. This they objected to as a distinct move towards popery. The Association decided to allow a petition to be circulated among Anglican members at the meeting but to involve itself no further in what was the affair of a single denomination. (A.P.B., 3, 17 October 1868).

2 S.M.H., 11 November 1868.

3 S.M.H., 13 November 1868.

4 For example, A.P.B., 5 September, 21 November; S.M.H., 21 October 1868. Only one prominent member of the P.P.A. was prominent in the Orange Institution. That was G.L. Wilson, who was secretary of both organisations. Wilson was born in Norwood, England in 1824, the son of a glass merchant. He emigrated to N.S.W. in 1852 and after working as a bookkeeper graduated to the occupation of conveyancer. During the mid 1860s he was a prominent member of the Free Church of England sect in the Colony. He was expelled from the P.P.A. and the Orange Institution in June 1869 after he had been roundly criticised by Mr. Justice Hargraves for flagrantly unethical and possibly corrupt behaviour with respect of a will, the drawing up of which he had supervised. (Empire, 3 June 1869; P.S., 12 June 1869)
citizens' to become members without much difficulty or public exposure. This easy membership had some disadvantages as it allowed spies and Romanists to attend meetings without much difficulty,¹ and by 1872, in orange fashion, passwords and tylers had been added to the paraphernalia of the Association in an attempt to prevent this.²

Despite these differences, the spirit of the Association was much the same as that which inspired the orange lodge. It was based on the sectarian premise that the most significant fact about society was that it was divided between Catholics and Protestants and that, in Australia, where fortunately Protestants, and thus freedom, predominated, Catholics were constantly working for political dominance. The main organisations working to achieve Catholic domination were variously identified as the Jesuits, the clergy generally, and the Fenians. Sometimes, in a more rational attempt to justify the Association's existence reference was made to supposedly political associations of Catholics: the Holy Catholic Guild, the Irish National League or the Catholic Association.³

The ultra-Protestant ideology of the Association was fostered by frequent lectures, given by members on such topics as 'the Battle of the Boyne', 'the Papacy', 'the Gunpowder plot'.⁴ The spirit of an embattled minority was maintained

¹ For example, A.P.B., 11 July, 29 August, 3 and 10 October, 1868.
² Manifesto and By laws of the N.S.W. Protestant Political Association, 1872, pamphlet in M.L. (363/N). As early as September 1868 Davies had spoken of placing tylers at the door to stop the intrusion of spies (A.P.B., 5 September 1868), but they do not appear to have been added to the formal organisation of the Association until after 1870.
³ See for example a speech by Davies and a paper read on behalf of W. Carruthers, the foundation secretary, in S.M.H., 4 July 1868. See also S.M.H., 4 August, 12 September 1868.
⁴ Given in order by John Davies (senior), A.P.B., 26 September 1868; Mr. Marks of Ulludulla, A.P.B., 10 October 1868; and Rev. Wazir Beg, A.P.B., 7 November 1868.
by reference to Romish assaults on, or threats against, Protestants and to the Association's determination to prosecute the Holy Catholic Guild for any breach of the Party Processions Act. In order to combat claimed discrimination shown by Catholic employers for Catholic workmen, the Association, in October, set itself up as a Protestant employment agency. Nor were members allowed to forget what had brought their organisation into being. On 9 November a picnic was held at Clontarf, the first of a number of such gatherings, for Davies was an indefatigable organiser of picnics. Over 3,000 attended and a tree was planted at the spot where the Prince fell.

The flourishing of Protestant sectarianism gave a noticeable stimulus to an ambitious project begun by the orange lodges a year before: the Protestant Hall. The orangemen felt that the erection of a substantial hall would be a symbol of their presence in the city as well as a meeting place. This latter requirement became particularly pressing after March when the large numbers at lodge meetings and the increase in lodges made their main meeting place, the Bathurst Street schoolroom, inadequate. The formation and rapid growth of the P.P.A., which also used the same meeting place, only exacerbated that problem, but, as with the new recruits to orangeism, its membership was a potential source of support. During July there was some tension between the two bodies over who would take responsibility for the project, but in August a number of shares in the Hall were sold, and in mid-September several shareholders met and a proper company was formed. Called the Protestant Hall Company it had a capital

1 See for example A.P.B., 22 August, 18, 26 September 1868.
2 See, for example, A.P.B., 22 August, 28 November 1868.
3 A.P.B., 24 October 1868.
4 S.M.H., 10 November 1868; A.P.B., 14 November 1868.
5 A.P.B., 11, 18 July 1868.
of £8,000 consisting of 8,000 £1 shares. Provision was made for the shares to be purchased by instalment while other rules forbade (in three separate places) Roman Catholics from holding shares in the company. The company's honorary secretary was G.L. Wilson, secretary of the P.P.A., and Grand Secretary of the Loyal Orange Institution. The treasurer was William Coulter, Grand Master of the L.O.I.; while the company's solicitor, and chairman of the meeting which established it, was William McGuire, vice-president of the P.P.A. Other directors included John Davies, William Hezlet, James Pedlow and William Speer, all prominent orangemen or members of the P.P.A. A determined effort was made to sell shares during orange-lodge and P.P.A. meetings and on 23 October it was announced that 1,400 shares had been taken up. As well as individuals, lodges bought shares out of their funds and the Company's directors liked to think that the profits to be made from hiring out the Hall, when built, to other bodies made the shares an attractive investment.

The rapid growth of orange lodges and the Protestant Political Association during mid 1868 helped the Australian Protestant Banner. The Banner reciprocated by providing more detailed accounts of their meetings (especially the P.P.A.) than was given in the daily press and by generally reinforcing the spirit of militant anti-Catholicism that inspired them. Although it had been announced in March, its first issue did not appear until nearly three months later (13 June), indicating that that part of the population who 'were desirous of merging denominational differences...so as to preserve the

1 S.M.H., 18 September 1868.
2 A copy of the Company's prospectus is in Parkes Correspondence, Vol.30, A900, pp.235-37.
3 A.P.B., 24 October 1868.
4 No.2 L.O.L., minute book, entry for May 1870.
5 A.P.B., 17 October 1868.
fundamental truths of our common Christianity, and give renewed vigour to those things decaying within us', was not as large or as enthusiastic as those who issued the prospectus anticipated.¹ They desired 1,500 subscribers to begin with, but by August they still only had 1,400.² By October they were claiming 2,000.³ At 6d per copy (or 20/- per annum) circulation must have been confined to either the dedicated or the reasonably well off.

It was printed and published by George Addison,⁴ and compiled by the Revs John McGibbon, Wazir Beg, Zachary Barry, Barzillai Quaife and John Sharpe; Presbyterian, Free Presbyterian, Anglican, Congregationalist and Primitive Methodist respectively.⁵ As befitted such an ecumenical group the newspaper concentrated on recreating a unity and sense of purpose among Protestants.

¹S.M.H., 27 March 1868; A.P.B., 13 June 1868.
²A.P.B., 16 August 1868.
³A.P.B., 31 October 1868.
⁴Addison was a general printer, publishing among other things Bradshaw's Almanac and General Guide during the late 1860s. He also printed the Primitive Methodist Messenger and the Christian Pledger during the late 1860s. In order to help sales of the Banner, and probably for more honourable reasons he joined an orange lodge on 30 March 1868 (No.2 L.O.L., 'minute book'), and took an active part in the P.P.A. He was once criticised at the P.P.A. for employing Catholics on his staff (S.M.H., 24 October 1868) and was suspended from his orange lodge for non-payment of dues in October 1869. By the 1880s he had moved to Balmain where, among other things, he was printing large numbers of Protestant pamphlets (P.S., 14 August, 4 September 1886).
⁵Addison, speaking at twelfth of July celebrations in 1868 listed names of four helpers. The A.P.B., 18 July 1868, reported them as McGibbon, Quaife, Sharpe and Beg. The S.M.H. in its report (16 July) omitted Beg and included Barry. There is other evidence that all five were connected with it, though Beg's connection was probably stronger than Barry's. Quaife had been both a Congregationalist and a Presbyterian (both at once, even!). He was no longer active in the ministry. He had written leaders for the Empire during Parkes's editorship and edited a number of journals, including the Christian Pledger (A.P.B., Vol.3, p.356). Sharpe was the leading Primitive Methodist clergyman in the colony. He was active as an orangeman, a member of the P.P.A., and in the Temperance movement. In the mid 1860s he edited the Primitive Methodist Messenger from George Addison's offices.
This was to be achieved by reviving that essence of Protestantism still contained in the title, but so sadly lost by many of its practitioners: its Protest against Rome. It conducted its revival on two fronts: it constantly attacked the false, dangerous and morally pernicious doctrines of Rome and it lashed out at the torpor and febbleness of colonial Protestantism. Editorial after editorial assailed the false notions of charity and tolerance which, it claimed, vitiated Protestantism in the colony. The support given by Protestants to Catholic charities, such as St. Vincent's hospital, was a particular object of indignation. In all this it was essentially revolting against the anti-sectarian aspect of the predominating liberal ideology.

More space was devoted to exposing the errors and dangers of Rome. Roman Catholicism was first of all false in its theology - a perversion of true scriptural religion. But while most Protestant clergymen were content merely to spell this out, it was virtually taken for granted by the Banner. What obsessed it were the consequences of Rome's false system. In a word, the system was false because it was sacerdotal: it had created a priesthood and placed them between God and man.¹ To the Banner's contributors this was a distinctly unnatural invention and necessarily had dangerous consequences for ordinary civilised society. A priesthood naturally desired complete control over all aspects of human life. It would attempt to obtain this control by every means and its consequence was the utter degradation of the human spirit and human endeavour: Spain and papal Italy were often invoked as illustrations of the consequences of priestly control over politics. As well, a priesthood threatened the very moral fibre of a free society by threatening the sanctity of the family. The reason for this threat was clear: while priests claimed to demonstrate their superiority to ordinary men by their ability to remain celibate, they could not, and must therefore satisfy their natural desired illicitly. Enabling

¹Geoffrey Best was right in perceiving that anti-sacerdotalism was the centre of nineteenth century Protestant objections to Catholicism. See his essay 'Popular Protestantism in Victorian Britain', R. Robson (ed.), Ideas and Institutions of Victorian Britain (London, 1967), pp.115-142.
them to do this were two institutions which loomed large in popular Protestant demonology: the convent and the confessional. Convents, they believed, existed mainly to provide women, often by coercion, to satisfy the natural desires of priests. In Protestant countries they had the secondary purpose of appearing under the guise of charitable institutions, thus to play on the ill-founded liberality of many Protestants and lull them into false security. Under this guise they could attempt to trap young Protestant girls and to proselytise at every opportunity. The confessional was an even more pernicious institution. It could be used to plan political revolt and assassination, but more frequently was used by the priest to satisfy his lust at the expense of the wife or daughter of some unsuspecting citizen. The power attributed to the priest in the confessional was immense - merely by asking a woman if she felt desire for other men he could create such a desire, and by further questioning and suggestion, focus the desire on his own person and take advantage of it.¹ It was in this way that anti-Catholicism became, in Hofstadter's phrase 'the pornography of the Puritan',²

The above is a summary of the anti-Catholic ideology. It was never expressed in that compressed form, but in articles and stories arguing or illustrating some aspect of it. Parts

¹In the generalised denunciations of the confessional seduction is usually stated or implied as the conclusion of priestly endeavour. In the short stories that were perhaps the more important means of popularising this aspect of anti-Catholicism the priest if often shown as capable of displaying a spark of manly recognition of his error, thus allowing the woman, whose appeals it was that enkindled that spark, to escape. The priest, sometimes, even declares that it is the system of celibacy that has driven him to act in that way. In these stories even the priest was to be pitied as the victim of the unnatural system of celibacy. In that respect those stories differ from most anti-Catholic literature where it is only the ordinary Catholics who are seen as the victims of the system of priestcraft, and to be pitied, while the priests, especially the Jesuits, were held up for condemnation as the manipulators of the system.

²Hofstadter, The Paranoid Style, p.21.
of it had been invoked from time to time in the colony, but it had never been given full expression until its weekly appearance in the Banner, which was entirely devoted to it.¹

¹See Appendix IV for a description of the content of two consecutive representative issues of the Banner. The one precursor of the Banner, the Sentinel, an orange paper published during the late 1840s had a lot to say about the political dangers of Catholicism but virtually nothing on its encouragement of sexual immorality. Published by Ulstermen it expressed a peculiarly Northern Irish view of Catholicism. Mention of the immoral sexual practices said to be encouraged by the Catholic priesthood had appeared previously in the colony, but only occasionally. They were usually reports from overseas: such as the news of the first American 'escaped nun' Rebecca Reed (Roe, Quest for Authority, p.139.) Only once, so far as I can discover, in all the manifestations of anti-Catholicism in the colony in the 1830s and 40s was there expressed concern with the sexually immoral tendencies of the confessional. This was sparked off by an article in the Colonist in September 1838, claiming that a woman near Penrith had had to pay money to a priest to have her sins forgiven. The priest in question sued the Colonist and the Sydney Gazette which had reprinted the story, and the two judges who heard the different cases gave different verdicts. The Sydney Gazette then attacked the confessional for encouraging crime and quoted Peter Den's theology text book, which, it claimed, had been recommended by the Irish bishops in 1810 and again in 1832. Further mention of Den's led them to suggest that the confessional was used for salacious questioning of wives and daughters, a claim which was repeated by one Agnes Byrne, a young Irish apostate from Catholicism, recently migrated to the colony. She was answered by the Catholic Vicar General, Ullathorne. The Monitor, which had previously supported the Catholics, claiming that colonial priests could not indulge in such things, then discovered another book, The Daily Companion, recommended by a priest to a female convert, which also contained mild sexual references in some passages designed to jog consciences. The Australasian Chronicle, the colony's first Catholic paper, was founded to meet these attacks. The affair was prolonged when two drunken convicts attacked Miss Byrne, and were given light sentences by the Chief Justice, Dowling. At no time during the controversy was it suggested that priests did any more than ask salacious questions, and as much, or more, interest was displayed in an older objection against the confessional: that it forgave any crime (sin) for a price. See Sydney Gazette, 13, 18, 20 July; 1, 3, 6, 10, 15, 17 August; 5, 10, 14, 17, 26, 28 September, 1839. See also Payten, 'W.A. Duncan', pp.50-52; Moloney 'Plunkett', pp.90-92.
The one aspect of English or colonial anti-Catholicism omitted from this compressed account is its preoccupation with Ireland and the Irish. The explanation for such a preoccupation is simple. In England and the colony the bulk of Catholics were composed of Irishmen and their descendants. These Irish provided immediate examples of most of the vices thought to be products of Catholicism. They were rowdy, lazy, drunken, ignorant priest-ridden and, en masse, offered a threat to civilised society. It can be seen how at this point the anti-Catholic ideology was at one with the more widespread but less complex anti-Irish prejudice. That latter prejudice could easily become the vehicle to transport someone into anti-Catholicism. It could also strengthen anti-Catholic beliefs if they were already held. Not surprisingly many of the leading anti-Catholics were Protestant Irish (Barry, or a number of leading orangemen) or were from areas of Britain which had experienced large scale Irish immigration (for example, Lang and McGibbon from Glasgow).

The anti-Catholic ideology was much more than anti-Irish prejudice. At this point it is worth devoting some attention to its history and some of the possible reasons for its occurrence. A large part of it, that part which identified Catholicism with heathenism, which ascribed to Catholicism political intrigues of demonic proportions and which dwelt on the torture and physical violence wrought by Catholics at the successful conclusion of such intrigue, had a pedigree stretching back to Elizabethan times. Then, expressed in such seminal books as Foxe's Acts and Monuments (commonly known in later centuries as the Book of Martyrs), anti-Catholicism formed an integral part of the unifying ideology of the newly emerging Elizabethan state.¹ That state had been threatened from without by European Catholic powers and from within by those who retained the old religion and were thus potential allies with the enemies without. It was a time of considerable social upheaval and considerable anxiety, and men turned to the Book of Revelations for understanding. It was clear to

¹W. Haller, Foxe's Book of Martyrs and the Elect Nation (London, 1963), argues this point very convincingly.
most, at that time, that Rome was the anti-Christ, and the short but bloody reign of Mary showed what his reign would mean. ¹ Millenarian anti-Catholicism remained a central part of the thinking of most Englishmen during the turbulent years of the seventeenth century, accepted by all sides, from Archbishop Laud to the Levellers. It only declined in importance as society itself settled down after 1660 (or perhaps after 1688) and the need for a unifying ideology diminished. ²

Even after that it remained a fundamental tenet of the non-conformist sects, and surfaced in evangelical awakenings such as Wesley's in the 1740s. It also surfaced as a partial motive of lower class mobs in the late seventeenth and eighteenth century: a resurrection and reassertion of deep-rooted Elizabethan values as a protest against social change. ³ A similar

---

³ Such protests, while they were a product of a general anxiety about social changes, were often directed against actions of the Government which were seen as directly weakening the old Elizabethan constitution, such as the Roman Catholic Relief Act, protest against which was the immediate cause of the Gordon Riots in London in 1780. See G. Rude, 'The Gordon Riots, a study of the rioters and their victims', Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, 5th Series, VI (1956), pp.94-114. See also G. Rude, Wilkes and Liberty (Oxford, 1962), and 'The London "mob" in the eighteenth century', The Historical Journal, Vol.11, No.1 (1959), pp.2-18. In this latter article Rude examines a number of cases of mob rioting in eighteenth century London, with causes ranging from anti-Irish protest to support for 'Wilkes and Liberty'. In my opinion, his tendency to believe that mob action was ipso-facto radical obscures to him the very conservative sentiments that seemed to motivate these mobs, which, as he shows, were not just a rabble of dispossessed labouring men, but lower middle class. The high price of bread impelled them into the street, but their protest was against symbols of social change, and for the old liberties and values of Englishmen. See also O.W. Furley, 'Pope Burning Procession in the late Seventeenth Century', History, Vol.XLIV (1959), pp.16-23, for a less adequate account of earlier displays of mob anti-Catholicism. E.P. Thompson, 'The Moral Economy of the English Crowd in the Eighteenth Century', Past and Present, Vol.50 (1971), pp.76-136, argues that most riots were against the effect of some social or economic change, such as the marketing procedures for bread. To that extent they were conservative.
display of this deep-seated anti-Catholicism was given by rank and file non-conformists against the directions of their leaders in the protests against the Catholic Emancipation Bill in the late 1820s. Opposition to the Bill saw the formation of an odd alliance between the high Tory 'Church and King' party and lower middle class evangelicals among the non-conformists, Anglicans, Wesleyans and smaller sects. Despite the connection between a non-conformist 'establishment' and Whiggery and Liberalism during the nineteenth century, the alliance between Tories and evangelicals in defence of the 'traditional' Protestant constitution continued, and played an important part in politics for the rest of the century.

During the early nineteenth century a new strand was added to the anti-Catholic ideology. This strand was concerned with the threat offered by Catholicism to sexual morality and the family. Where the original ideology had dwelt on the physical violence practiced by Catholics, this new strand emphasised the sexual misdemeanours of priests.


It is worth emphasising that the anti-Catholicism displayed by these men retained a strong millenarian flavour although it was expressed in a large number of other forms as well. If, as J.F.L. Harrison has remarked, very little is known of the millenarian sects in early Victorian Britain (J.F.C. Harrison, The Early Victorians, 1832-51 [London, 1971], p.132), it could equally be said that little enough is known of the extent and importance of millenarianism in the larger and more orthodox denominations such as the Wesleyans and the Congregationalists. A millenarian conviction did not have to lead to radical social and political action, as a reader of Norman Cohen's The Pursuit of the Mil lenium (London, 1957) might suppose. A millenarian preoccupation could co-exist with more orthodox beliefs. All five clergymen connected with the Protestant Banner, for example, were convinced millenarians.
Where the old ideology had criticised the priesthood for their political power over lay Catholics, the new strand emphasised the unnatural aspects of the celibacy practiced by the priesthood, and worked anti-sacerdotalism into the centre of the anti-Catholic ideology, which enabled it to be usefully invoked against those other nineteenth century scandalisers of the evangelicals: the ritualists.

The exact point of entry into anti-Catholicism of sexual preoccupations is hard to date, although it seems to have been sometime in the 1820s. If Chaucer is any guide, bawdy stories about supposedly celibate priests and nuns were a staple of pre-Reformation English humour, but the removal from Britain of monasteries and convents, priests and nuns, seem to have removed the stories, serious or humorous, about their amours, and this side of Catholicism was not mentioned in early Protestant anti-Catholic literature. Professor Best has suggested that the reappearance of convents, first of all of refugee French nuns, in England in the 1800s, contributed to the resurrection of this interest, not now as humour, but as prurient critique.1 Significantly, one of the first works of this kind, published in England in 1829, was a translation of an eighteenth century Italian anti-clerical work by Scippio de Ricci entitled Female Convents. Secrets of the Nunneries disclosed.2 While the sexual aspect had been absent from British anti-Catholicism, it had not been lacking in continental anti-clericalism, as a perusal of the work of Diderot, Voltaire and other figures shows.3 It would seem that at about the same time as convents were reappearing in England, seeking refuge from the French Revolution, continental anti-clericalism, which had contributed to that revolution, was also entering

1Best, 'Popular Protestantism', p.127.
2This is the earliest example I can find of such a work published in English, although I am handicapped by the virtual absence of any research on this topic. The book is mentioned in Billington, The Protestant Crusade, p.80, n.78. It became popular in America in the 1830s.
3For example Diderot's La Religieuse (The Nun), or Rameau's Nephew.
England, to be adopted by men in all other respects appalled by the turmoil in Europe. Continental anti-clericalism continued to feed English Protestantism during the nineteenth century. Popular English interest in Italian independence had a large element of anti-Catholicism in it, and Italian liberals provided plenty of propaganda to encourage that interest. From 1850 onwards Italian ex-priests, like Gavazzi and Achilli made frequent tours of Britain and Ireland in the evangelical interest and were soon joined by ex-priests and ex-nuns of Irish and American origin.

Social and economic tensions between Catholics and Protestants meant a stronger connection between evangelical protestantism and anti-Catholicism in Ulster than in England. The Evangelical awakening there in 1859, which spread to England and Scotland in the early 1860s helped spread and reinforce popular anti-Catholicism. Many Protestant

---

1 See Edmund Gosse, Father and Son (London, 1970), p.67, for the view of an extreme Protestant sectary. An indication of the extent of Protestant interest in, even veneration of, Italian liberalism and its leader, Garribaldi, was given in Sydney in 1887 when news reached the city of Garribaldi's death. The Italian community and a number of orangemen organised a memorial meeting. At short notice and with very little publicity, upwards of 10,000 attended. (P.S., 17 June, 1887.)

2 Best, 'Popular Protestantism'; Billington, Protestant Crusade. The first 'ex-nun' Rebecca Reed, appeared in Boston in 1834 to be followed a year later by the most famous of them all, Maria Monk. Neither made extensive tours, but both published books of their 'experiences' which ran for many editions and were in no way affected by proof of their fraudulence. Maria Monk's Awful Disclosures is still sold in paperback editions on railway book stalls, and even headed the list for best selling non-fiction in Perth, Western Australia, in December 1970. (I must thank Professor O.K.H. Spate for this piece of information). Its mixture of sex and sadism helps explain its continued popularity, but it is little more than an American (or Canadian) version of stories devised by eighteenth century European anti-clericals.

3 J. Edwin Orr, The Light of Ages (Exeter, 1965), gives an account of this and earlier awakenings.
emigrants to Australia carried anti-Catholicism as an integral part of their religious beliefs, although it did not easily survive in a situation where economic and social mobility were combined with a widespread hostility to such beliefs. Despite the deep roots of anti-Catholicism in English Protestantism, the resemblance between many of the features of anti-Catholicism and other 'paranoid' movements is too close to ignore. The most recent example of paranoid ideology is the anti-Communism of the American radical right, analysed during the late 1950s and early 1960s by Hofstadter, Bell, Lipset and others. Hofstadter explicitly noticed the parallel between anti-Catholicism and anti-Communism, and this parallel is worth briefly pursuing. Each had, for example, a propensity to read history and contemporary events as a conspiracy; to believe that their leaders had surrendered to the enemy, to whom they attributed vast, even demonic powers of cunning and organisation; although the anti-Catholics did not have the pedantic concern with detailing the evidence of the conspiracy shown by the radical right, they outdid the right in their preoccupation with immoral qualities of the conspirators, and thus with the terrible consequences of their victory. Like the radical right the anti-Catholics sought to imitate some of the qualities of the conspirators, such as their unity (thus the emphasis on Protestant unification) and their dedication, and, like the right, they also sought to project onto the enemy a number of fantasies which, if expressed apart from the righteous cause, would deeply offend

1 Hofstadter, op.cit.; D. Bell (ed.), The Radical Right, 2nd ed. (New York, 1964). This contains important articles by Bell, Lipset, Rosman, Parsons and others.

2 Hofstadter, op.cit., pp.19-23.

3 Hofstadter, ibid., pp.29-38, lists these as the characteristics of the radical right.
against the propriety they claimed to uphold.¹

While this suggests one possible function served by the paranoid style, it does not explain the need which this function fulfilled. Hofstadter and Bell offer further explanation that situates the source of the paranoid disposition in social change. As Hofstadter puts it: 'the paranoid disposition is mobilised into action chiefly by social conflicts that involve alternate schemes of values and bring forward fundamental fears and hatreds, rather than negotiable interests, into action'.² Bell talks of 'diffused sense of fear and need to find some story or explanation to explain or justify that fear',³ and sees the fear as a manifestation of 'the disquiet of the dispossessed'.⁴

It had already been suggested that early English anti-Catholicism was sourced in a considerable anxiety about

¹As indeed it sometimes did. Best, op.cit., p.233, mentions a member of the British Protestant Association whose copies of a pamphlet of extracts from a Catholic moral theology manual was destroyed as obscene by order of a magistrate. After two appeals, the Queen's Bench delivered a judgement in favour of the magistrate which became something of a precedent in obscenity law. In Australia Paster Chiniquy's famous book, The Priest the Woman and the Confessional was banned by the customs department in 1904 and again in 1948 as an obscene publication. It had been freely available in the colonies in the nineteenth century and had been published in several editions in Sydney and Melbourne. After the second banning, Protestant Publications of Glebe, arguing it was a Catholic plot (the customs minister was named O'Sullivan) went ahead and published the book themselves 'as an act of Protestant indignation'. (See the preface of the 1950 edition.)
²Hofstadter, op.cit., p.39.
³D. Bell, 'The Dispossessed', in Bell, op.cit., p.15.
⁴Ibid., p.21. Hofstadter, op.cit., p.23, thinks that the anti-Catholics did not possess this fear and that this is one characteristic that distinguishes them from the radical right. I am not so sure. One only has to read Billington closely to get an impression that his 'nativists' did feel in some way dispossessed, and Billington himself tends to exaggerate the power and extent and thus the confidence of the nativist movement.

Catholic sectarianism in New South Wales has already been referred to as having paranoid characteristics. The paranoid complex of Catholic sectarianism differs somewhat from the paranoid complex of Protestant sectarianism. Catholics were

Footnote continued on following page.
England's position in the world\(^1\) and that its later reappearances were at least partly protests against aspects of social change. It is a facile observation, though in the absence of further research one cannot provide much else, that nineteenth century anti-Catholicism was similarly sourced in the anxiety felt by many people caught up in a rapidly changing society. Only much more research could show just what kind of people tended to give this response and what kind of social change or perception of change tended to bring it about. But in this general context, the entry of the sexual element into the ideology is interesting. This occurred simultaneously in England and America, and quickly became central to the whole ideology. John Harrison has recently argued that one of the most crucial social changes which took place in early Victorian Britain concerned the family. At the same time as economic necessity, by forcing all its members to work long hours in different places, broke up the working class family, the middle classes were erecting the idea of the family into a cult and thus into a crucial mark of distinction between themselves and the lower orders.\(^2\)

This new middle class awareness of the family was accompanied by changes in its structure, as the father emerged as the dominant figure in a hierarchical set of relationships. The

footnote continued from previous page...

...more prone to display the classic characteristics of delusions of persecution and of grandeur. As Catholics and Irish they were in fact a minority group, and the sectarians among them exaggerated this minority status. While the origins of this exaggeration are not dissimilar to those prompting some Protestants to adopt the paranoid style (middle class anxiety about status and social mobility), Protestants were not a minority group and did not claim to be. They were conscious of being part of the majority of the society, their only problem being, in their view, that the leaders and many of the members of that majority had fallen away from their true values and interests. The many real differences between Catholic and Protestants in colonial society meant that the form of their sectarianism would not be in every respect similar.

\(^1\)This is the central argument of Weiner, op.cit.

\(^2\)J.F.C. Harrison, The Early Victorians 1832-51 (London, 1971), pp.73-80, for the middle class family; pp.112-124, for the working class.
family became some sort of haven in a harsh changing world and the role of female members was reduced to that of inhabitants of only this haven. The father became not only dominant, but responsible for supporting and protecting the other members. Both the change to and maintenance of the new family structure involved a high degree of control, even suppression, of sexuality. Religion was one of several institutions enforcing this control, and it is not unlikely that the sexual element entered anti-Catholicism to allow many of those Protestants of evangelical or sectarian inclination (and others) some sort of legitimate release from the straits of sexual propriety. As well as releasing illicit desire, these sexual preoccupations of anti-Catholicism could also function, by dramatising the threat, to release anxiety induced in the supposedly dominant male by the responsibilities of his role as protector of the now more highly valued than ever innocence and virtue of his wife and daughters.

The function of providing release from sexual tension applied equally well to colonial anti-Catholicism as to British. It was, nevertheless, in both cases something of a secondary characteristic, providing some of the appeal of the ideology, but not its growth or decline, particularly not its growth or decline as a publically visible phenomenon. This was particularly so in the colony, where there was considerable hostility to such 'old world' forms of prejudice. In the colony the emergence of anti-Catholicism as a large scale social phenomenon depended on other circumstances, such as the development of a rift between the Catholic clergy and the non-Catholic majority of the society. Single, jarring events such as the attempted assassination considerably hastened that process, but even it would not have had the impact it had if it had not been kept before men's minds for another ten months, giving time for the social division it so noticeably acerbated to become permanent. Several events served to do this: an attempted murder of an orangeman at Kiama provided a reminder that the methods of the Irish-Catholic rural assassin could easily be transferred to
New South Wales; a prosecution of orangemen for marching to church on 12 July, although unsuccessful, seemed to Protestant sectarians evidence of the extent of Catholic influence over some of the colony's leading men; and, by no means least, there remained unanswered the question of O'Farrell's motivation and mental state, a question closely linked to the question of Irish and Catholic implication in the crime. This question was further linked to the credibility and motivation of Henry Parkes, which was an issue the Opposition were determined to pursue. The more rapid growth of political Protestantism over the elder style of orange sectarianism was due partly to public hostility to the latter, but was also a direct result of the political arena appearing more clearly divided along religious lines than was the rest of society.

* * * * *

The dismissal of Father Dwyer was not the only event keeping the attempted assassination and the questions it raised before the public eye. On the evening of 28 April, the day of Thanksgiving, John Gray, a farmer and an orangeman, of the Loyal Valley, was shot at as he was nearing home. The bullet grazed his saddle and he saw three men running away, although it was too dark to identify them. Another shooting, again unsuccessful, was reported four days later from the Foxground, a little south of Kiama. Gray had received several threatening letters of the type common in rural Ireland, as had several other inhabitants of the Kiama district, and many local Protestants were fearful. Orangemen

1 S.M.H., 30 April, 2 May 1868.
2 S.M.H., 7 May 1868.
went around armed, even in the daylight, and in the township itself.\(^1\) The police suspected several itinerant Irish farm labourers and eventually made three arrests. But after a trial that attracted a lot of attention in the Sydney press the court found the evidence insufficient and the three men were acquitted.\(^2\) Two of them had worked for a large landowner in the district, Captain Charles, who later represented Kiama in the Assembly. Several times during the trial he affirmed his belief in their innocence and after the acquittal the Catholics of the district, in typical Irish fashion, presented him with a testimonial expressing their gratitude and respect. Their action indicated the strength of the feelings aroused by the incident, as did the action of some of the Catholics who attempted to shift the blame from their co-religionists by propagating the story that the orangemen themselves had written the threatening letters and staged the shooting.\(^3\) The story was an unlikely one and its credibility was further diminished when Gray was again shot at four months later and had his house burnt down early in the new year.\(^4\)

Although the Kiama incident attracted a lot of attention and undoubtedly reinforced suspicions of Irishmen in other parts of the colony, it was an exceptional case, largely because Kiama was an exceptional area. Its hilly coastal country favoured dairy farming and was settled rather more closely than other rural areas of the colony.\(^5\) In this respect it bore a greater similarity to the demographic and geographic pattern of rural Ireland than elsewhere. The resemblance, particularly to Ulster, did not end there. It

\(^1\) F.J., 9 May 1868; Report of Detective Hayden, 9 May 1868, in 'Special Bundle'.
\(^2\) S.M.H., 15 August 1868; see 'Special Bundle' for a record of some of the police investigation.
\(^3\) F.J., 9 May; 30 October 1868.
\(^4\) S.M.H., 10 November 1868; F.J., 30 January 1869.
\(^5\) See Rev. Thomas Sharpe, Papers, A1502 in M.L. Sharpe, an Anglican clergyman, visited Kiama in 1869 and described what he saw in his diary.
had a markedly higher proportion of Irish Protestants, mainly Presbyterian and Methodist, than any other electorate, and they, with the co-operation of an above average proportion of Irish Catholics reproduced many of the socio-religious tensions, so characteristic of Northern Ireland but nowhere else present in the colony.

Another incident which aroused the fears of some Protestants occurred some fifty miles south of Kiama at Ulludulla. There, in July, a certain Mr Marks, a storekeeper, gave a lecture which claimed that the Pope was the anti-Christ referred to in Revelations. Some of the audience disputed this and their controversy carried over into the columns of the *Kiama Independent*. At the same time a number of Irishmen threatened to take more direct action and burn down the house where the lecture had been held. The incident did not receive much notice in the Sydney press, but Marks came to Sydney and spoke at a number of P.P.A. meetings of the lengths to which Romanists would go to suppress Protestants' rights to free speech.

The Sydney orangemen celebrated the twelfth of July 1868 with considerable confidence. The main celebration took place several days after 12 July (which fell on a Sunday) and was held in the Masonic Hall. Over 500 orangemen and their ladies sat down to eat, while another hundred or so observed from the gallery. The food was described as banquet fare and an excellent supply of wines, mostly Australian, was provided. During the meal many toasts were drunk and speeches made, and

---

1 See Census, 1861, 1871. The Protestants in Kiama seemed of a particularly evangelical disposition, and several times knocked down crosses erected on the gables of a new Anglican Church by its ritualistically inclined pastor (F.J., 15 July 1868). See Carruthers, op.cit., pp.27-39, for a description of Methodism in the Kiama district in the 1860s. He mentions a 'revival' there in 1864 (p.29).

2 It was from Kiama that the police received reports of intended attempts to release O'Farrell. Kiama had the first orange lodge formed in the country districts, in the late 1840s.

3 F.J., 11 July; 1, 27 August 1868; A.P.B., 19 September 1868.

4 A.P.B., 19 September, 10 October 1868.
in the interval the German band played patriotic tunes, such as 'The Protestant Boys' and 'Croppies lie down'. After dinner it provided accompaniment for dancing which continued until dawn. The toasts included one to the evangelical Protestant clergy of New South Wales (the term Protestant being specially qualified so as to exclude 'these Anglican clergymen of the Oxford school who might as well be making a pilgrimage to Loretto or to kiss the Pope's toe') and another to the Grand Master, William Coulter. In his reply Coulter referred to 'the numbers who have recently rallied around the Standard of superior wealth and social position' and thought that when his period of office expired a better man would take his place.  

The orangemen were soon reminded that there were still men of superior social position who had little time for them. As 12 July fell on a Sunday, several Protestant clergymen devoted one of their regular services to commemorate the day. One such clergyman was the Rev. W. Wood, the incumbent of the Anglican church at Pennant Hills, who was also Grand Chaplain of the Orange Institution.  

A group of orangemen decided to ride from a church warden's house some miles away to the church, in procession. One of them carried, crooked in his left arm, the framed warrant of their lodge, No.6, Gladesville lodge. Their passage was noticed by a patrolling policeman and by Jabez King Heydon, a resident of the area who was on his way

---

1 A.P.B., 18 July 1868; S.M.H., 16 July 1868.

2 Another clergyman to commemorate 12 July was John McGibbon, who devoted his evening service to an address on 'Duties and Vows of 12 July'. In this he stressed the importance of seeing history as portraying the working of God in human affairs and described the 'Glorious Revolution' of 1688 and William III's victory at the Battle of the Boyne as recent instances of God's intervention on behalf of his chosen people similar to those instances of olden times portrayed in the Old and New Testament (S.M.H., 11 July 1868; A.P.B., 18 July 1868).
to mass. Heydon mentioned the matter to William Forster, another resident of the district, who contacted the Ryde police and asked if they intended to prosecute the orangemen for a breach of the Party Processions Act. They were, and a few days later 18 men were brought before a bench of three magistrates at the Ryde Police Court. Among the accused were G.L. Wilson, the Grand Secretary of the Orange Institution, and William Tunks, the Mayor of St Leonard's and representative of that electorate in the Assembly. None of the witnesses called by the prosecution could say that they actually recognised the warrant carried in the procession as a symbol of orangeism, and the case was discharged on the grounds of insufficient evidence. Before the trial Forster had written a long, pompous, letter to the Herald, defending his actions against some P.P.A. criticism. This, as was perhaps intended, won him considerable praise from Catholics, but at orange lodge and P.P.A. meetings he and the Party Processions Act were roundly condemned. William Carruthers, the foundation secretary of the P.P.A., answered Forster at length in the Herald, describing him as a 'crafty, shifty political eel.... The first Jemmy O'Brien in N.S.W.' , and giving considerable publicity to the P.P.A. as well.

The Public Schools Act and its administration continued to attract controversy during the remaining months of 1868, but decreasingly so. Opposition was just as likely to come from secularists as from denominationalists and the final weeks of the Parliamentary session saw the two viewpoints in

1 Tunks had been supported by the Catholics in 1864 as an ally of Martin and as favourable to State Aid for religion. His conversion to orangeism seems to have come in 1868. He was bitterly attacked by Catholics in 1869. See F.J., 19 November 1864, 18 December 1869.
2 S.M.H., 28 July 1868.
3 S.M.H., 24 July 1868.
4 S.M.H., 24 July 1868; 25 July 1868.
5 S.M.H., 18, 25 July 1868; A.P.B., 1 August 1868.
6 S.M.H., 3 August 1868.
an odd combination. On 1 April, during the debate on the education estimates, John Stewart, who usually supported the Government, suggested that the Act should be amended to make it purely secular. William Forster from the secularist wing of the Opposition supported him, arguing that the public schools were, in their present form distinctly denominational as Catholics and Jews could not use them. Alan Macpherson from the other, denominationalist, wing of the Opposition agreed, and went further, claiming that the object of the Act was to stamp out everything but Protestantism. That debate contained the elements of a possible combination between the secularists and the denominationalists in the Opposition. On the morning of 6 April the Herald published a long letter from the Anglican champion of denominationalism, Alexander Gordon, reviewing the state of the education debate. Gordon made some criticism of the administration of the Act, but the main burden of his letter argued that the schools were not in fact secular, but inculcated a form of Protestant denominationalism. That evening, in the Assembly, Forster moved, as an amendment to the Supply Bill, to have all religious books (the Irish National readers and Scripture books) removed from the schools. He argued that this would make the schools purely secular. This point Forster argued with conviction, for he was a firm believer in the complete separation of church and state. Nevertheless, the motion was supported by Cummings and Macpherson, two of the leading denominationalists. Following Gordon, they wished to see public schools completely secular and adequate support given to the denominational system as well. Forster denied any sympathy with the denominationalists, but quoted Gordon's 'Protestant denominationalism' argument against the public schools. John Stewart, on the Government side of the House, was one who thought it a sham motion. Parkes, as usual, grew very indignant at attacks on the Act and its administration.

S.M.H., 2 April 1868.
and though he began by offering a reasonable defense he concluded by attacking the Catholic clergy, 'the only source of opposition to the Bill', as encouraging opposition 'from a desire to obtain patronage, expenditure of money and distribution of favours'. Robertson with some accuracy remarked that 'whenever anyone criticised the Public Schools Act, Parkes would have a tussle with a priest'. Yet one of the Act's supporters had the best point. In a witty letter to the Herald a few days later Zachary Barry remarked on the irony of those who once attacked public schools as Godless now attempting properly to make them so. It was an indication of the lack of enthusiasm of the legislature and the decline in importance of the education issue that less than half the House was present during the debate. The motion was lost 20-6.

Parkes, four weeks later, opening a new public school at Goulburn amidst a crowd of admirers, defended himself in a more restrained fashion. He effectively sketched out the improvements in education that the Act had brought and defended its religious provisions from the attacks of both left and right. He admitted the act was a compromise, but in a statement that could have been a defence of his whole political career, defended compromise as the essence of successful government:

The success of legislation and of government consists not of carrying out some clever or wise thoughts, but in seizing the opportunities that present themselves, and using the material that lies to your hand - and with this opportunity and out of this material making the best and most complete thing possible to accomplish the object you have in view. (Cheers.)

He refrained from any attacks on the Catholic clergy, but gave the religious affiliations of the 1,288 citizens who, during 1867, had signed petitions requesting the establishment of public schools in their area. Two hundred and eighty-seven of these, 22 per cent, were Catholic.²

¹ S.M.H., 7 April 1868.
² S.M.H., 8 May 1868.
These figures were from the Council of Education Report which had been published in April. In late May, Alexander Gordon again took the initiative and using the figures given in the report attacked the Public Schools Act for costing more than the old system. His letter produced a spate of responses, but no new arguments. It seemed as if Parkes's earlier prognostication that most colonists would quite happily accept the Act once its operation had proved its worth, were being born out. Although the Catholic clergy had not ceased to oppose the scheme, their energies were now directed less at the public arena, where there was little to be achieved, and more at setting up their own alternative system. In March and April the Catholic Association attempted to gather information about Catholic denominational schools, in order to use it against the Government, but while details were collected they were never used. In a tour of the southern districts early in 1868, Polding observed what he claimed was enthusiastic approval for a system of separate Catholic schools, and spoke optimistically of raising £16,000 per year for their support, but by May the total funds of the five months old Association were less than £600. By the end of the year this had increased to 1,600 and the Association had successfully taken over the running of four schools from which government funds had been withdrawn, as well as

1 S.M.H., 25 May 1868. His argument was based simply on per capita expenditure and ignored the fact that if the Public Schools Act was fulfilling its purpose it must involve a large capital outlay to provide schools in sparsely settled areas where the number of pupils was relatively few.
2 For example, S.M.H., 2, 8, 30 May; 1, 3, 4, 8 June 1868; F.J., 20 May 1868; A.P.B., 18 June 1868.
3 S.M.H., 3 April; 8 May 1868.
4 F.J., 21 March 1868.
5 S.M.H., 8 May 1868.
But it was still a far cry from their original hopes.

Gordon raised the education issue again in September, and provoked another extensive bout of correspondence between himself and three of his old opponents, John Stewart, Zachary Barry and Richard Sadlier. Gordon was now proffering a conspiracy thesis of sorts, possibly because he sensed an election in the offing and wished to present the issue as simply as possible. The object of the Public Schools Act, he argued, was to separate religion entirely from education. It was only because public opinion was not prepared for this that a compromise was made, but already steps were being taken to destroy denominational schools. He seemed to be aiming this at conservative Protestant electors, mainly Anglicans, for not only did he threaten the possibility of schools without religion, but, in a later letter, raised the possibility that if satisfaction was not given to Catholics then they might try and take over the whole education system, as they were trying to do in America.

Such appeals could not have had much effect. The continual attacks by the denominationalists on the Public Schools Act had completely failed in their main object. They had nevertheless achieved three things. They had reinforced the ties binding a large section of the laity to their clergy on an issue that was not strictly a religious one, and on which the position of the clergy was widely at variance to that held by the rest of society; they had attracted considerable hostility against all Catholics, and the Catholic clergy in particular; and they had turned the Act into an important symbol for Protestant sectarians in the orange lodge and the

---

1 See report of annual meeting of the Association, S.M.H., 10 December 1868; F.J., 19 December 1868.
2 S.M.H., 10,15,17,18,19,23,26 September; 20 October; 12,19,24 November; 1 December 1868.
3 S.M.H., 10 September 1868.
4 S.M.H., 2 October 1868. American Catholics were, of course, not trying to take over the American education system.
'The Education Act in danger' was one of their election cries by the end of 1868.

The Catholic hierarchy seemed determined to avoid controversy in the months following the attempted assassination. Late in July, Zachary Barry gave a lecture to the Protestant Alliance Friendly Society entitled 'I believe in the Holy Catholic Church, what do I mean?' It had been widely advertised, and was fully reported in the press. Barry argued moderately and with some skill that the Roman Catholic Church was neither Catholic nor a church in the terminology of apostolic times. The Freeman's was indignant that the daily press should have given coverage to the lecture, and the doughty Catholic controversialist Fr Wollfrey announced that he would reply. In a flash John McGibbon indicated he would attend to record what was said and prepare a rebuttal. Rumours spread among Protestants that Catholics were saying that if McGibbon attended the meeting he would not come away alive. Woolfrey's lecture was quietly cancelled and the possibility of confrontation removed.

Despite Polding's determination to avoid religious controversy, it was not easy for Catholics of markedly sectarian disposition to avoid comments that could only have been offensive or provoking to Protestants. One such occasion occurred late in July when Dr. William Bland, a well known old colonist died, and the Freeman's Journal proudly reported that just before his death he had been received into the Catholic Church. Several of his friends offered indignant denials and their indignation was echoed in other quarters.

---

1 For example, speech by Davies at P.P.A. meeting in S.M.H., 31 October 1868 and letter to S.M.H., 13 November 1868.
2 In advertisements in the press and in placards stuck up around the town.
3 S.M.H., 30 July 1868.
4 F.J., 15 August 1868.
5 S.M.H., 21 August 1868; A.P.B., 3 September 1868.
7 S.M.H., 30, 31 July 1868; A.C., 1 August 1868; A.P.B., 1, 15 August 1868.
Before his death Bland had received several visits from Polding and McEncroe who were old friends, but as he had received Anglican communion shortly before his death and had been given an Anglican burial, there seemed little substance and much bad taste in the Freeman's claims. Nevertheless it continued to assert that Bland had in fact been brought into the true fold, arguing against the evidence of the burial that the Church was only interested in his soul, and did not care what happened to his body.

Catholic priests, in particular, made strong efforts during the middle months of 1868 to counteract some of the extreme feelings aroused in Catholics by the events of March. The more sectarian among them did not easily settle into this role of peacemaker but, by focussing attention on the Government and Parkes in particular as the main persecutor of Catholics, even they attempted to counteract any more generalised feeling of alienation from colonial society which might be felt by their parishioners. Fr Dillon, one of the more sectarian Catholic clergymen, expressed this view to a meeting of his Balmain parishioners early in May:

It is a source of unqualified satisfaction... that the people refused to be provoked to attack one another, Catholic and Protestant, despite the efforts of the Government to produce this effect.

A lay speaker at the same meeting listed their objections against the Government. Essentially it was a list of reasons...

1 Ibid.

2 F.J., 8 August 1868. Another example of Catholic anti-Protestantism was given in the Freeman's comments on the Synod of the Church of England. It was particularly hostile towards 'the absurd doctrine of absolute right of private judgement'. (F.J., 15 August 1868.) Similar comments might be made in public lectures reported in the press. They mainly functioned to consolidate pride in Catholicism in general and certain Catholic values, such as the authoritarianism of the Church, in particular. That they might also offend Protestants was not considered important.
for hating Parkes. There was the education act and its administration; the dismissal of Fr Dillon; the dismissal of detective McGlone; the suppression of O'Farrell's final statement, and, perhaps a little incongruously, Parkes flagrant misuse of a letter from a Catholic schoolmaster. ¹

The danger of such tactics was that they encouraged widespread apprehension about a Catholic party in politics and threatened to alienate Catholics entirely from the political structure. Governor Belmore was conscious of this. While he knew that Polding and most other respectable catholics trusted his independence, he was aware that there were others who were hostile to him. ²

When he was informed that some remarks of his from the chair of the annual meeting of the British and Foreign Bible Society had been taken as offensive to Catholics he immediately made a disclaimer and suggested he had been

¹ F.J., 9 May 1868. The Catholic school teacher on question was Michael McGirr of Bathurst, whose school Parkes had praised on a visit to Bathurst in 1867. Parkes had later written asking McGirr his opinion of the books supplied by the Council of Education, which McGirr was using in the school. McGirr replied that they were quite good and added that Parkes could make use of his letter if he wished. Parkes did, in the debate on Forster's 'secularising motion' in April. This caused a considerable stir among the Catholics and Fr Byrne, the Vicar General of the Bathurst diocese, claimed that McGirr's letter had been misused, and that anyway, Catholics had no objection to the books when used by Catholic teachers (which was not what they had previously said). McGirr had to do some hasty explaining to his Bishop. Bishop Quinn wrote a letter to the Herald, condemning Parkes, though in an ironic fashion - saying he had previously thought him sincere in intention (S.M.H., 21, 28 April 1868). Quinn's clumsy irony was lost on Polding who wrote bitterly to Gregory of Quinn 'praising Parkes for his honesty of intention'. Polding to Gregory, 22 April 1868 in Birt, Benedictine Pioneers, Vol.II, p.337. McGirr had certainly not meant to give the impression that he approved of the Public Schools Act. As early as 1859 he had protested against the existence of national schools, arguing that denominational schools were quite sufficient. (F.J., 19 October 1859)

² Belmore to Buckingham and Chandos, 18 May 1868, Belmore Correspondence, p.34.
misunderstood. ¹ He subsequently refused invitations to chair other religious meetings. ²

While Belmore was conscious of the dangers of feeding the sectarian propensities of Catholics, the Government was not, as it demonstrated when it decided to prosecute the *Freeman's Journal*, not for sedition, as had been many times predicted, ³ but for the failure of its proprietors to properly register themselves. Martin had certainly hoped to prosecute the journal for sedition, ⁴ but had been advised by the Crown Solicitor, John Williams, that such a course would be difficult as the three proprietors had failed to swear affidavits to that effect before the Supreme Court when they purchased the paper late in 1866. ⁵ In Williams' opinion this failure could have been a deliberate contrivance to place them beyond prosecution. Martin shared this view and decided to prosecute two of the proprietors, Dolman and Blundell, for this offence. ⁶

The proprietors were surprised at this turn of events and informed the Crown Solicitor that they had not been aware

¹ F.B. Toulmin (Private Secretary) to Fr Corletti (Chaplain to Polding), 12 June 1868, Belmore Correspondence, p.34; see also memorandum by Belmore concerning this, dated 27 June 1868, in Belmore Correspondence, p.42. Belmore's speech had been unexceptional, except for the expression of a millenarian conviction: 'It seemed to be that we in the nineteenth century are in the Saturday night of time, and that a millennium must quickly dawn when Our Lord should reign upon the earth and Satan be bound for a thousand years.' However, as was usually the case at such meetings, a number of speakers, including the Bishop of Sydney, made anti-Catholic references. (S.M.H., 27 April, 1868.)

² F.B. Toulmin to Benjamin Short, 21 May 1868, Belmore Correspondence, p.40.

³ *Empire*, 14, 27 March 1868; S.M.H., 6 April 1868.

⁴ Evidence of Fosbery (qq.498-502, p.817) in 'Assassination Committee'; Evidence of Parkes (qq.1177-85, p.846) in 'Assassination Committee'.

⁵ Crown Solicitor to Colonial Secretary, 5 February 1869, Colonial Secretary, Correspondence Received, file 9/3502, box 4/657, N.S.W. State Archives.

⁶ F.J., 16 May 1868. Dolman had been a proprietor of the paper since 1860. Blundell had been the printer since about the same time.
of their fault. At first they considered themselves fortunate for not having been prosecuted for treason or sedition. They then regretted that the fame this might have brought was to be denied them, but still later, when they discovered that if found guilty they would be liable to fines of £2,000 each, they became highly indignant and argued that the Government's intention was to put them out of business at all costs. The Government's determination to press charges on a technical matter because of its inability to prosecute for sedition won the Freeman's support from a number of country papers, to whom it appeared vindictive. More importantly the Government's action provided an opportunity for Irishmen to rally in support of their paper and, starting at Bathurst, committees were formed in a number of country centres and Sydney to raise funds for their defence. Names of subscribers were published in the Freeman's and ran into thousands. Several priests' names were among them. Sales, it was later claimed, almost doubled as a result of the prosecution. The trial was scheduled for early November, but a change of government caused it to be temporarily withdrawn. It was rescheduled for the next round of court sittings in the new year, but the new government, after some hesitation, decided not to press it and the charges were withdrawn.

1 F.J., 16 May 1867.
2 F.J., 23 May 1867.
3 F.J., 15 July 1867.
4 E.g. Tamworth Examiner (quoted F.J., 30 May 1868) and Yass Courier (F.J., 1 August 1868).
5 S.M.H., 7 August 1868; F.J., 8 August 1868.
6 For example, Araluen (F.J., 15 August 1868); Newcastle, Grafton (F.J., 22 August 1868); Orange (F.J., 29 August 1868); Grenfell, Taralga (F.J., 5 September 1868).
7 For example, F.J., 8 August 1868.
8 F.J., 6 March 1869.
9 Crown Solicitor to Colonial Secretary, 8 February 1869, op. cit.
More immediate memories of the days following the 12 March were evoked when the mail from England in early August revealed that the Imperial government had declined to recommend the royal assent for the Treason Felony Act. The Secretary of State for Colonies, in a despatch to Governor Belmore indicated that his government would be happier if clauses 9 and 10 were omitted, but the colonial government, in a stiffly worded minute, declined to do so. That minute pointed out that the British government could know nothing of colonial realities which called for the Treason Felony Act, and told it to mind its own business. It exaggerated the extent of disaffection existing in the colony before March (calling the Freeman's 'the organ of the Fenian party') and claimed that the proof of the Act's worth was its failure to produce any convictions. Belmore was a little more sceptical, and in a private despatch doubted if any clause of the Act would be passed by the legislature now that things had quietened down. He opposed any amendments being made to the Act in case its re-introduction into parliament renewed the excitement which had accompanied its original passage. The press expressed satisfaction at the Act's failure to gain royal assent, but pointed out that this did not invalidate it. To reinforce the cabinet minute and to justify his previous despatches to the colonial office concerning his

1 It also pointed out that the British Government adopted far more sweeping powers to help it govern Ireland. The minute is contained in Belmore and Buckingham and Chandos, 12 August 1868, C.O., 201/547, ff.270-72.

2 Belmore to Buckingham and Chandos, 12 August 1868 (confidential), C.O., 201/547, ff.274-76.

3 S.M.H., 5, 12 August 1868; Empire, 12 August 1868. In December the newly installed Robertson Government announced that it would repeal some clauses of the Act (S.M.H., 8 October 1868), but before it could do so word was received from England that the Queen had given it her assent (Empire, 1 January 1868). In February Richard Driver made an unsuccessful attempt to have the Act repealed. (F.J., 13, 27 February 1869.)
Fenian hunt, Parkes asked Belmore to forward a further minute from himself to the Secretary of State for Colonies explaining the failure of the police to produce any proof of O'Farrell's story of a Fenian conspiracy. A couple of days before preparing this minute Parkes requested the Inspector General of Police to return to him any papers relating to O'Farrell still in his possession and to give his own views of the affair. McLerie did so on the 10 August and opined that although considerable sympathy with Fenianism existed in the colony, and had been openly manifested before the attempted assassination, O'Farrell's accomplices (he did not doubt that he had them) were probably only visitors to the colony.

The mail had also brought several English journals containing criticism of the Treason Felony Act and the colonial government. Further criticism, some of it unfairly singling out Parkes as the main villain was offered in the colony and Martin indicated to Belmore that his government's position in the House had been weakened by the Imperial government's action. Parkes had all these things on his mind when he made a quick trip to his electorate to deliver a speech on Monday, 24 August. In his speech Parkes ranged

---

1 Parkes to Belmore, 11 August 1868; Belmore to Buckingham and Chandos, 12 August 1868; both in Belmore correspondence, pp.59-60.
2 For example the Spectator and the English Independent. See Australasian, 8 August 1868.
3 For example William Forster in S.M.H., 13 August 1868.
4 It was common practice for members to address their electorates during the (usually) long mid-year Parliamentary recess. Parliament had been prorogued on 27 April until 16 June, and then until 13 October. Martin and Belmore were absent in the Southern districts and Victoria until the end of August and Parkes had planned his Kiama visit since at least 18 August (S.M.H., 19 August 1868). Macleay had already visited his electorate (S.M.H., 27 May 1868) and in the next month a number of other members did so. For example: Burns (S.M.H., 11 September 1868); Garrett (S.M.H., 6 October 1868); and Driver (S.M.H., 9 October 1868).
over a wide number of issues: his participation in a
coopition ministry; the successes of that ministry; the
difficulties of retrenchment; the low quality of the
 Opposition; the great economic prospects of the colony.
Inserted into the middle of the speech were several paragraphs
which were to have wide repercussions. Almost as a postscript
to that section of his speech dealing with the achievements
of the ministry he recalled the Treason Felony Act and the
recent attacks made on the Government in connection with it.
The mere contemplation of such a topic was capable of evoking
Parkes's self righteousness. After a rambling discourse on
how he had remained silent for months in the face of 'the
abuse, lies and vilification' offered of his handling of the
O'Farrell business, he declared that he would, before his
constituents, at last speak his mind. After brief rebuttal
of English press criticism he did so:

But our opponents ask where is the evidence of
Fenianism.... I am tempted to reply can't you
wait a little. It does not follow that because
the government, with wise regard for the peace
of society has not made public evidence, that
evidence does not exist.... I do not hesitate
to say it here, that I have in my possession
evidence which I can produce at any moment that
will satisfy every unbiased independent mind
in the country, that we have just and large
ground for every step that we as a government
took. And though, perhaps, we as a government
might have been content to allow this damning
evidence to have remained unknown, still, if we
are to be taunted, misrepresented and villified
by a complete storm of lies we may, in justification
of ourselves see fit to lay this before the world.
I have this evidence in my possession and I can
produce it at any moment. I can produce evidence
attested by affidavit that leave no doubt in my
mind that not only was the murder of the Prince
planned, but some person who was in the secret,
and whose fidelity was suspected was foully
murdered before the attack was made on the Prince....
As to the claims made against the Government that
they took advantage of the crime and attempted to make
capital out of it. On the contrary we refrained
from giving publicity to anything that would
irritate the public mind.... We were told.... long
before the Duke of Edinburgh landed on our shores
that his life would be attempted, and, if after
he landed, an assassin walked after him and shot
him, we must be mad - the people must be mad, if
they saw no connection between the foreshadowing of the crime and the crime itself. We took precautions and we did undertake the responsibility of passing the stringent measure.¹

The next morning the Sydney papers carried telegraphed reports of the speech. These were brief but mentioned his defence of the Treason Felony Act, and his claim to possess evidence that one of those who had conspired to take the Prince's life had been murdered by his fellows.² The full speech appeared the next day, and the Herald, in commenting on it, made only brief mention of this section, saying that if Parkes's charge was true it was indeed justification for the Treason Felony Act.³

The speech had greater impact on the public at large. Two days later the Herald, in an editorial headed 'The Kiama Ghost', claimed that Parkes's speech had produced in this city a feeling of amazement. Could it be otherwise? On every account it is calculated to awaken the most powerful emotions. Can it be true? Is the enquiry upon every man's lips. Is it possible that the Government can have knowledge of such facts? If so no anxiety they could feel, no precautions they could take could seem excessive. If the impression Mr. Parkes received be just, the statements of O'Farrell made on the last day of his life are false, and if anything remains worthy of belief, it is the original declaration.

The Herald was still sceptical, clinging to its original impression of O'Farrell as a 'fanatic, irritable and vain'. There was nothing in the colony, the Irish National League and the seditious language of some Irishmen included, that indicated complicity in or enthusiasm for the assassination. It observed that if Parkes was correct, then Fr Dwyer, the gaol chaplain, was lying, but warned against accepting Parkes's statements, offered as they were in his own and his ministry's defence: the product of behaviour the very opposite of statesmanlike.

¹ S.M.H., 26 August 1868.
² S.M.H., 25 August 1868.
³ S.M.H., 26 August 1868.
This last observation it developed by pointing out that the only people likely to benefit from Parkes's revelations were 'that considerable body of men who take extremist views to the Roman Catholic population'.¹ The Freeman's Journal, understandably, dwelt on this point in its own critique of Parkes's claims.² Within the next few days it remembered that Martin had said immediately after the assassination that the Government had no prior knowledge that an attempt would be made to shoot the Prince and asked rhetorically which one of them, Parkes or Martin, was lying.³

Orangemen and members of the P.P.A. were greatly excited by the speech and the P.P.A. passed a motion desiring the Government to make public its information when Parliament resumed.⁴ An anonymous Irishman, said to have been a 'failed candidate for electoral honours' called a meeting in the Masonic Hall to consider Parkes's remarks.⁵ Davies urged P.P.A. members to attend in order to thwart any attempts 'to cast a stigma on their worthy Colonial Secretary'.⁶ A disturbance appeared likely, but on Sunday, the day before the meeting, a letter from the Catholic authorities was read in all churches, warning Catholics not to attend. The Hall's trustees refused to make the building available for the meeting. On the Monday evening a number of Protestants turned up for the meeting, and, finding the building shut, gave three cheers for the Queen and Mr. Parkes and then went home.⁷ Davies was censured by some of his followers who objected

¹S.M.H., 28 August 1868.
²F.J., 29 August 1868.
³F.J., 5 September 1868.
⁴S.M.H., 29 August 1868.
⁵S.M.H., 29 August, 1 September, 1868.
⁶S.M.H., 2 September 1868.
⁷S.M.H., 1 September 1868.
to the P.P.A. being made into 'a slavish committee to bolster up Parkes and his government'.

On 9 September the Herald reported in its political summary for the English mail that while the colony was split between those who believed and those who doubted Parkes's speech, all were agreed that he must produce his evidence as soon as possible. It doubted that he could produce the evidence that his statements required, unless it was amongst O'Farrell's effects which had been taken by the police and were said to include a diary. Belmore, who knew full well that this was all Parkes was referring to, was equally sceptical, but granted that there was evidence there to provide a base, however insufficient, for all of Parkes speech, except the part which claimed that the Government had prior knowledge that an attack might be made on the Prince's life. Charitably, Belmore thought Parkes had been misreported.

Before Parliament resumed, and before he had produced his evidence, Parkes resigned from the ministry. The issue which led to his resignation was cabinet's failure to accept an apology from W.A. Duncan, the Collector of Customs, who had been suspended six weeks earlier by Eagar, the Colonial Treasurer, for insubordination. The case was a complicated one, and the last of a series of such disputes.

The Collector of Customs had, before self government, been a member of the Executive Council. After self government he was placed under the jurisdiction of the Colonial Treasurer, but was recognised as having a position slightly superior to that of a departmental under-secretary. Duncan had held the post of Collector since 1859 and his conscientious, high minded administration was invaluable in securing efficiency in an area of government so easily open to corruption, even under a more wideranging, less ambiguous set of laws than at

---

1 Empire, 1 September 1868.
2 S.M.H., 9 September 1868.
3 Belmore to Buckingham and Chandos, 30 September 1868 (confidential), C.O. 201/548, f104.
that time prevailed. Both his position, and his personality made him chary of criticism, and he clashed several times with Eagar during the latter's second period as Colonial Treasurer. Finally in mid-1866 a select committee was appointed to enquire into the running of the Customs Department, and recommended a number of changes. Duncan had been urging similar changes for years, and the failure of the Government to implement them (to do so would have required changes in tariff legislation, a question on which the Government was divided) only worsened relations between Duncan and his superior. ¹ On one other occasion, in 1866, Duncan had been suspended by Eagar, but the rest of the Executive Council had unanimously cancelled the suspension, and Martin had given Duncan a written assurance that Eagar would stop interfering in the administration of the Customs Department. ² Conflict between the two men continued and in 1868 a sectarian element entered the feud. One of the Customs officers criticised Belmore on the day of his arrival in the colony. He was disciplined by the Executive Council, which recommended that he be demoted. The man was a Catholic and Duncan, also a Catholic, tended to discount most of the evidence against him. Eagar, on the other hand, a 'staunch Protestant', was all for strong punishment. The development of an apparently sectarian dimension to the feud between Duncan and Eagar accerbated sectarian tensions between employees, and alienated some still further from Duncan.

The issue which brought about Parkes's resignation was, at the beginning, a simple one. In early July Customs officers

² Empire, 23 July 1866; F.J., 28 July 1866; letter of Duncan in S.M.H., 15 December 1868.
³ Belmore to Buckingham and Chandos, 18 May 1868. Belmore Correspondence, p.36. The description of Eagar is Belmore's. It is clear that Duncan was motivated by annoyance at Eagar's demands that the man be punished, rather than by religious sympathies. This did not stop the latter interpretation being placed on his action.
discovered a small consignment of goods had been undervalued by their importer, Ebeneezer Way, and contained a small quantity of perfume for which no declaration had been made. Duncan was convinced of fraudulent intent, and with Eagar's approval, seized the consignment. A little later, Eagar accepted Way's excuses, and told Duncan to release the goods provided the extra duty was paid. Duncan at first refused, and then bowed to Eagar's instructions, but in an exchange of memos implied that he would refer the whole matter 'to the proper authority'. From this Eagar inferred that Duncan intended to appeal to cabinet over his head, and he determined to dismiss him for insubordination. Duncan had already taken the whole matter to Parkes, who was leading the Government in the absence of Martin, who was in Melbourne. Cabinet agreed that Duncan should be suspended and asked to show why he should not be dismissed. This decision was affirmed by the Executive Council when the Governor, who had been absent from Sydney, returned three weeks later. Parkes had informed Duncan, who was an old friend, that the position he had adopted could not be tolerated in a civil servant, and Duncan subsequently wrote a full apology to the Treasurer. Parkes thought this sufficient to allow Duncan's reinstatement, a view which Belmore and probably Martin shared. Eagar, however, remained adamant and became very hostile towards Parkes after the latter had suggested he accept Duncan's apology. Eagar threatened to resign from the Government if Duncan was reinstated, and, although Parkes indicated he would resign if he was not, Martin and the rest of cabinet stuck by Eagar and Duncan was dismissed. Parkes's resignation followed.¹

¹ P. Loveday, op.cit., pp.265-73, has a good account of the affair. Papers relating to it are in V & P (LA NSW), 1868-9 (2) 75-90; Belmore to Buckingham and Chandos, 30 September 1868 (confidential), C.O., 201/548 ff.93-108; see also speeches by Martin and Parkes in Legislative Assembly, S.M.H., 14 October 1868. The Duncan affair dragged on for months. The Robertson Government determined to reappoint him, but had difficulty, as the officer upgraded to fill his position refused to be demoted. Eventually the Government reappointed him and demoted the officer on the understanding that the reappointment would
On 17 September, the day of his resignation, Parkes prepared for publication the papers on which he had based the claims made in his Kiama speech: O'Farrell's diary; the transcripts of the conversations between himself and O'Farrell; and McLerie's report of 10 August. From Wager and Blakie the two policemen who had been with him when he searched O'Farrell's rooms, he obtained affidavits to the effect that the diary had been found among O'Farrell's possessions, and from Cook, the shorthand reporter, that the transcripts of the O'Farrell-Parkes conversations were true ones. To these he appended an explanatory memo and gave them to the Government printer for publication in the Gazette. He was thwarted in this by Martin who felt the Gazette should not be used for political purposes. Parkes learnt of this the day after his resignation, and left the original documents in the Colonial Secretary's office. After discussion, Martin agreed that the papers were not official documents, and James Byrnes picked them up from the Colonial Secretary's office and returned them to Parkes.

Footnote continued from previous page.

be temporary, and would only last until Parliament approved a Bill to enable Duncan to retire on his superannuation two years before he was due to retire. The Bill was defeated however, and Duncan remained as Collector until 1881. Belmore to Buckingham and Chandos, 29 January 1869 (confidential), C.O., 201/551 ff.35-47.

1When these papers were tabled by Parkes in December the affidavits were dated 18 September. Parkes explained that they had been resworn a day later to make them more explicit. See Parkes interjection in Macleay's speech, reported in S.M.H., 17 February 1869. In his own speech that day reported in the same paper, Parkes claimed that he had been misunderstood when he said at Kiama that he had evidence attested by affidavit in possession. What he had meant was that he had evidence which could be attested by affidavit.

2See speeches of Parkes and Martin in Legislative Assembly, S.M.H., 11 December 1868; Belmore to Buckingham and Chandos, 28 December 1868, C.O.201/548 f.336; memo of W.M. Manning, Attorney General, 14 December 1868 in 'Henry James O'Farrell, Correspondence...in possession of Mr Parkes' in V & P (LA NSW), 1868-9 (1) 732; memo of Mr Goodman, chief clerk, Colonial Secretary's Department, 5 February 1868, in file 'Papers taken by Parkes' in 'Special Bundle'. See evidence of Henry Halloran (q.782,p.827) in 'Assassination Committee' for another opinion that the papers were not public documents.
The public was stunned by the news of Parkes's resignation. As news of the circumstances became available there was widespread sympathy for Duncan and criticism for Eagar, but little praise for Parkes.\(^1\) Such was his reputation that people immediately sought other motives and many found them in his Kiama speech. Many thought he had resigned in order to escape having to justify that speech.\(^2\) Belmore was one close but impartial observer who did not,\(^3\) and the daily press was equally firm in repudiating that source of motivation, although it speculated that he had been growing tired of the ministry and sensed that the Government was near to defeat.\(^4\)

The tabling of a number of papers, and speeches by Martin and Parkes at the resumption of Parliament clarified matters somewhat, but the affair added a further element of mystery to the controversy renewed by Parkes's speech, and led directly to the fall of the ministry.

The month between Parkes's resignation and the resumption of Parliament saw discussion on O'Farrell, Parkes and the attempted assassination as intense as any that had previously occurred. The weight of the discussion was critical of Parkes. On 29 September the Empire claimed that Parkes's statement that the Government had prior knowledge that an attempt would be made on the Prince's life was based on the evidence of a man known in Australia and Ireland as an incorrigible scoundrel,

\(^1\) S.M.H., 19,21 September 1868; The Newcastle Chronicle, 22 September 1868, does contain praise of Parkes. Even the Protestant Banner thought Eagar wrong, although it later changed its mind, A.P.B., 17,24 October; 14 November 1968.

\(^2\) Loveday, op.cit., pp.280-81 mentions some of the suspicions of Parkes's motives.

\(^3\) Belmore to Buckingham and Chandos, 30 September 1868 (confidential), C.O., 201/548 f.105.

\(^4\) S.M.H., 17,18 September 1868; F.J., 26 September 1868. Both of these reasons had a certain weight. See Loveday, op.cit., pp.274-80. Surprisingly, given that evidence existed to allow the case to be expressed in sectarian terms (Protestant minister sacks Catholic civil servant), the Freeman's did not do so. This was probably because Duncan did not see it as such.
The informant was not named but Parkes quickly denied any such basis for his speech. A certain J.W. McCormack, a quack, better known as Professor Mac, thought he recognised himself as the person referred to, although the *Empire* denied it. Mac had told police in February that he had heard that if the orangemen marched at the time of the landing there might be a disturbance and the Prince's life endangered. After the attempted assassination he wrote to the Prince, telling him that he had warned the Government that his life would be attempted, and later used this to pester the Government and Belmore to give him money. A few days later the *Freeman's* published Mac's letter to the Prince, which it said had accidentally come into its possession. It pointed out that its only reference was to a possible disturbance at the time of the landing. Another element of mystery was added to the affair.

While this latest mystery was being discussed other members were addressing their electors. All referred to Parkes's Kiama speech, and even those such as John Stewart and J.F. Burns, who generally supported the Government, were sceptical of Parkes's claims. Opposition M.P.'s were more than sceptical and roundly attacked Parkes for further attempting to divide the country for his own political advantage. It was a view they shared with many Catholic spokesmen. Richard Driver, a Protestant and the son of an orangeman expressed the view succinctly when addressing his

---

1 *Empire*, 29 September 1868.
2 *S.M.H.*, 1 October 1868.
3 *Empire*, 30 September 1868.
4 See 'Attempted Assassination, Correspondence', pp.751-54; also 'Special Bundle' for some of the originals, published in the previously cited. Also see Belmore to Buckingham and Chandos, 30 September 1868, C.O., 201/548, ff.111-113.
5 For a report of Burns's speech see *S.M.H.*, 11 September 1868. John Stewart, despite his scepticism, thought Parkes the heart and soul of the ministry and hoped he would soon form a government of his own. (S.M.H., 5 October 1868.)
electors at Bathurst:

They had all seen the time, and that was not long ago, when Protestant and Roman Catholic had drawn together as brothers, but, through the machinations of a designing man, that, alas, was not now the case. And how had that state of affairs come about? What were the objects of those who had sown the seeds of discord? No doubt Mr Parkes was by those means attempting to raise up in the country a great Protestant party with himself as the head.1

Parkes remained unrepentant. A few days before Parliament resumed he again visited his electorate and delivered a speech at Jamberoo, a small town five miles from Kiama. He denied any hostility towards Catholics, but affirmed that he would never bow to what he called their demands for special treatment. He gave no further information on the Government's prior knowledge of the assassination attempt but mentioned, by way of indirect verification of his claim, that the Government had sworn in 500 special constables to protect the Prince when he landed.2

That speech was published the day Parliament sat. Parkes had the papers he had referred to at Kiama in his possession but no one asked him to produce them.3 This was not surprising. Following speeches by Parkes and Martin explaining Parkes's resignation, Robertson moved an amendment to the Government's Address-in-Reply and after a short debate, which saw several members move from Government to Opposition benches, the amendment was lost, but only on the casting vote of the Speaker.4 The House adjourned, and after a half hearted and unsuccessful request for a dissolution, Martin submitted his government's

1S.M.H., 9 October 1868. See also T. Garrett's speech reported in Herald, 6 October 1868; and a retiring speech by Alan Macpherson in the Legislative Assembly, S.M.H., 28 October 1868.

2S.M.H.13 October 1868.

3Or so he later said, S.M.H., 17 February 1868; Parkes, Fifty Years in the Making of Australian History, p.197.

4S.M.H., 14 October 1868.
Following Martin's resignation John Robertson formed a government. It was formed very largely of his followers, plus Forster, a prickly individual but an ally on most issues except perhaps land. The Postmaster Generalship was given to Daniel Egan, a Catholic. His inclusion as well as that of Forster was criticised by the extreme Protestants. John Sutherland, usually a follower of Robertson, but like Lang a government supporter during the previous session, was given the Works portfolio. He was a staunch Protestant, in no way...

1 The narrowness of the vote surprised Martin, who had calculated he should have a majority of five or six (Belmore to Buckingham and Chandos, 30 September 1868, in Belmore Correspondence, p.76). The three main defectors from the Government side were Windeyer, Land and Sutherland. The latter two usually followed Robertson, but had supported the Government since Robertson's attacks on it over the dismissal of Fr Dillon. Once Parkes had left the Government they saw no reason to continue supporting it. According to Belmore, it was only to please his supporters that Martin looked for a dissolution. He would have been quite happy just to resign (Belmore to Buckingham and Chandos, 31 October 1868 (confidential), C.O., 201/548, f.198).

2 Which portfolio he was given by Robertson, who was criticised for his decision (for example, S.M.H., 30 October 1868).

3 Daniel Egan was born in Windsor in 1803. From 1824-35 he was foreman of the government dockyard. After it closed he became a shopowner and later a wine merchant. Active in municipal politics in the 1840s and 1850s he was elected mayor in 1853. He represented Monaro in the Legislative Council from 1854-56 and in the Legislative Assembly from 1856-58, when he moved to Eden which he represented until 1869. A liberal on such issues as land legislation, he was closely aligned with the Irish party in municipal politics in the 1850s and early 1860s and supported James Martin until 1866, when he voted consistently with Robertson except for his persistent denominationalist opposition to the Public Schools Bill. T. & G.J., 22 October 1870; F.J., 23 June 1853; Loveday, op.cit., p.211.

4 For example, by Davies, Empire, 7 November 1868.
a bigot, but popular with the orangemen, and his inclusion was intended to counterbalance Egan. Saul Samuel filled the important part of Colonial Treasurer.

During the seven weeks following the announcement of the new ministry there were three sets of elections. There were ministerial re-elections; elections for the Sydney municipal corporation; and two important by-elections, one for the important electorate of West Sydney. Together they tested the electoral influence of the growing Protestant sectarianism, particularly the P.P.A.

Under Davies' guidance that organisation had been preparing for elections for some months. Since July, Davies, G.L. Wilson and others had been assiduously scrutinising the

---

1 Sutherland, a Congregationalist, Scottish born, began work as a mechanic, but succeeded as a builder and large scale contractor. A long time resident of Paddington, he represented Philip Ward in the Sydney City Council during the late 1850s and 1860s. A friend of J.D. Larg's he was a conventional liberal on most issues, but supported protection rather than free trade, and identified himself with the workingmen of the city. He gave active support to free selector movements during the 1860s and 1870s and supported the abolition of capital punishment. He was an active member of his church, and in several of the lodge organisations: Masonic, Foresters and Manchester Unity, which provided a very useful political base. He represented Paddington during the 1860s and 1870s and Redfern during the 1880s. During the 1870s and 1880s he was a director of several companies such as the Australian Mutual Fire Insurance Company, along with other staunch Protestants, including orangemen like Hezlet. See Sir Alfred Stephen to Lord Kimberley, 17 May 1872 (Confidential), C.O., 201/569, f.439; S.M.H., 1, 14 January; 28 March; 3 April 1868; F.J., 12 June 1869; P.S., 27 December 1873; 6 July 1887; C.G. Karr, 'Political Protest and General Development in Rural N.S.W. 1865-95' (Ph.D. thesis, University of N.S.W., 1969), pp.19 and 69.

2 Or so Belmore thought. Belmore to Buckingham and Chandos, 31 October 1868 (Confidential), C.O., 201/548, f.201. The only other problem faced by Robertson was the Attorney-Generalship, offered in turn to Dalley, Manning and Butler, all of whom refused. Eventually Manning took it in a non-political sense; meaning he did not take a seat in the Cabinet.
city electoral lists, adding names of eligible supporters, and removing the names of people no longer eligible which might be used by their (Catholic) opponents.¹ That sort of work was straightforward. When it came to deciding its attitude to the new ministry the P.P.A. almost fell apart. In mid-October Davies had ruled out of order a motion condemning Robertson's attempt to form a ministry and praising Parkes as 'premature and not in keeping with the objects of the association'.² Formally the objects of the Association were to oppose any Catholics standing for election, but this purely watchdog function could hardly have given it a viable political existence when Catholic candidates for either municipal or colonial honours were so few. Given Davies's personal political affiliation, and the general hostility of sectarian Protestants to the old Opposition, it was clear that the bulk of the Association would oppose Robertson's government. It was also clear that a significant minority of Protestants would not agree to this: a section of the orange movement had always supported Robertson; the Protestants' two arch opponents, Macleay and Macpherson, were not in the cabinet, while Sutherland, a well respected Protestant was; and, like Sutherland, J.D. Lang, that great Protestant hero, was again supporting his old friend Robertson. Late in October the Council of the Association recommended that the ministry be opposed. Davies, in advocating this decision to the parent branch of the Association, said that the time had come for the Association to exert its influence, and spoke of the education act being in danger. He also reviewed the various members of the new ministry, attacking Robertson for his membership of the Irish National League; Samuel for trying to reinstate Duncan; Forster for attempting to stop Protestants attending church on Sunday and Egan as 'morally and politically incapable'. Several members objected

¹A.P.B., 13 July, 14 August, 5 September, 1868.
²A.P.B., 17 October 1868.
to his analysis.\(^1\) The *Empire*, which was supporting the new Government gave so much prominence to these objections that the Council of the Association felt obliged to hold a special meeting and issue a statement criticising it: claiming that opposition to the decision to oppose the new Government had been minimal.\(^2\)

The Waterloo branch of the Association emerged as the main centre of support for Robertson. Its vice-president, M'Court, had been Davies's main opponent at the previous Association meeting and he announced by advertisement that the Council's decision would be considered at the Waterloo branch.\(^3\) He took the chair at the meeting and defended Robertson and Samuel from Davies's attack. A motion forbidding the Council from speaking on behalf of the Association without the expressed opinion of the latter was debated at length. Davies attended the meeting and angrily defended the Council's decision.\(^4\) It was clear from this meeting and from correspondence in the press\(^5\) that there was strong dissent from the Council's ruling and that the squabbling weakened the Association. A week later Stephen Styles Goold, the president of the Waterloo branch, and who had missed the previous meeting, apologised to branch members for the wild behaviour of Davies at the previous meeting, gave qualified support to the ministry, and hinted that 'certain job hunters' were trying to use the Association for their own purpose.\(^6\) Nevertheless, Davies eventually managed to re-assert his control. Two weeks later, the secretary, G.L. Wilson, attended a branch meeting in place of Davies and, without opposition, was able to urge them to refer all important matters to the Council for decision, as 'it was better able to judge, especially on political

---

1. *A.P.B.*, 31 October 1868; *Empire*, 31 October, 6 November, 1868.
2. *S.M.H.*, 3 November 1868; *Empire*, 3 November 1868.
4. *Empire*, 5 November 1868; *A.P.B.*, 7 November 1868.
5. *Empire*, 6 November 1868.
matters'.  

A week later, Goold, who was unsuccessfully to contest for the presidency of the Association against Davies, spoke strongly against the ministry.

The arguments over whether or not to support the ministry were largely theoretical, as only one of the new ministers, Sutherland, was seeking re-election for a seat in the city, where the Association was strong, and he was not likely to be opposed. Approaches were made to Henry Clarke to oppose Daniel Egan and Henry Palser to oppose Forster for the Hastings, but both declined. In the end only one minister was opposed, and then not by the P.P.A. Saul Samuel, the Treasurer, was opposed for Wellington by P.R. Holdsworth, a Sydney protectionist. Such was the fear and confusion the P.P.A. produced, that merely by standing Holdsworth was taken as one of their candidates and denounced as such by Samuel and Fr Woolfrey who visited Wellington to work on Samuel's behalf.

---

1 A.P.B., 28 November 1868.
2 S.M.H., 5 December 1868.
3 A.P.B., 14 November 1868; S.M.H., 21 November 1868. Clarke, a wealthy, Ulster born Presbyterian was influential in Temperance and other Protestant activities in Sydney. He owned land, and had once farmed, at Moruya, in the Eden electorate, which he was later to represent for many years. He had been one of those who saw O'Farrell shoot the Duke of Edinburgh and had appeared as a crown witness at the trial. See A.D.B., vol.3, p.414. Palser, a large scale grocer and importer, specialising in teas, was active in the temperance movement and in other Protestant causes such as the City Night Refuge. He owned land on the Manning River in the Hastings electorate. A.P.B., 11 July 1868; S.M.H., 25 March, 11 July 1868, 13 January 1869.

4 S.M.H., 16 November 1868; A.P.B., 28 November 1868; J.D. Lang to Parkes, 30 November 1868, Autographed letters of Australians, M.L., A62, p.68. Holdsworth was a Sydney boatbuilder. He had been vice-president of the Irish National League for several years and was a leading protectionist. An Anglican he had opposed the 1866 Public Schools Act. He was also an active temperance advocate and by the early 1870s, through this, had been drawn into the orange orbit. (A.P.B., 11 July 1868; F.J., 26 October 1864, 6 May 1871). During the campaign he denied membership of the P.P.A. and the P.P.A. equally repudiated him. (A.P.B., 14 November 1868).
The municipal elections were a more important test of the Association's influence, although the absence of a Catholic candidate meant the absence of an electoral contest easily dramatised as being between good and evil. Only five of the eight wards were contested, and only three of those seriously. The P.P.A. was active in all three contests. The worth of several of the candidates was discussed at meetings during November, and four days before the election the Council listed the candidates it supported and circularised its members to this effect. Yet, despite its more formal organisation the P.P.A. was little more than a slightly larger version of any of the municipal machines that already existed. The other, non-sectarian alignments and issues of ward politics exerted at least as much influence as the P.P.A.

The most straightforward contest was in Denison ward, encompassing Ultimo and Pyrmont, between Joseph Wearne, a wealthy flour miller, active in Methodist and temperance circles, and John Woods, the retiring alderman. Wearne was strongly backed by the P.P.A., although he does not seem to have been a member, and was not, at that time, an orangeman either. Woods, although an Ulster born Presbyterian was not a sectarian and was active in Irish causes usually only supported by Irish-

---

1 *Empire*, 21 November 1868; *A.P.B.*, 28 November 1868. These circulars were delivered on the Saturday before the poll and caused one ultra-sensitive Protestant to protest that by so doing the Association was encouraging members to think and talk of politics on the Sabbath. His protest, together with the circular he had received was published in *A.P.B.*, 19 December 1868. The circular read as follows:

Sydney 28 November 1868.

Dear Sir - In persuance of a unanimous resolution of this Association, your vote and interest are requested on behalf of Mr Alderman Bradford, a candidate for Brisbane Ward. Be early at the Poll and secure a triumphant majority.

Yours faithfully,

John Davis (sic), President.
William M'Guire, v. President.
George Lea Wilson, Secretary.
Catholics.  

He had nevertheless joined the P.P.A. when it first started, but had asked to have his name removed from the books 'when he found that it was used to set class against class'. This, together with his friendship with John Robertson, provided reason enough for the P.P.A. to oppose him. Woods had been leader of opposition in the Council to the Mayor, Charles Moore, and he used this well known fact to suggest that Wearne was merely a candidate being brought forward by the Mayor. This issue was more important than any the P.P.A. could raise. In a strongly Protestant ward there was little chance of the P.P.A. polarising Protestant support around Wearne, and anyway, Woods had the support of two Protestant favourites, Lang and Sutherland. After a lively campaign, Woods was returned comfortably.

The second lively campaign took place on the other side of the city in Fitzroy Ward, encompassing Woolloomooloo and Darlinghurst. There the retiring alderman, Charles Kidman, was opposed by James Oatley, an M.L.A., who had earlier in his career represented Philip Ward. Again, both candidates were Protestants. Oatley was an Anglican of mildly evangelical persuasion, active in the temperance movement and charities such as the City Night Refuge and Soup Kitchen. Native born, he was a member of the Australian Patriotic Association and received their support in the election. He also received P.P.A. support, although he was not a member. Kidman, also an Anglican, had at least demonstrated sympathy with orangeism by attending the 1868 twelfth of July celebrations. He was no bigot though, and had two weeks earlier attended the St. Vincent's Hospital ball. 

---

1 For example, he was on the St Patrick's Day Committee in 1868 (F.J., 7 May 1868) and in 1886 gave his support to the Home Rule movement. (F.J., 3 July 1886)
2 S.M.H., 21 November 1868.
3 S.M.H., 28 November 1868.
4 S.M.H., 16 July 1868.
5 S.M.H., 1 July 1868.
received strong support from Catholics such as James Hart and Denis Kearney, who usually backed Cowper-Robertson candidates. He was attacked by other Catholics of more conservative sympathies, such as Richard Creagh, who called him an oratorian and advised Catholic voters to overlook Oatley's support of the Public Schools Act and vote for him. On the other hand some P.P.A. members, such as Goold, opposed Oatley, and it was clear that other factors such as the degree of support the respective candidates could be expected to give the Mayor, were important. Oatley had a narrow win over Kidman.

The third important contest was in Brisbane ward. This resulted in a close win for the retiring alderman, Bradford. Again, the entry of the P.P.A. was of minor importance. Both candidates were Protestants, but Bradford, the publican grandson of an Anglican clergyman was a member of the P.P.A. and had the Association's support. He attended a meeting later to thank them for their assistance, but during the campaign he had claimed that he had only been once to a P.P.A. meeting and finding it a failure had given it up. The turnout of voters in the three most strongly contested wards was a little over 50 per cent, which was about five to ten per cent higher than in the other contested wards. Several papers remarked that there was more interest shown in the election than there had been for some time past. The entry of the P.P.A. into the contest undoubtedly contributed to this, but municipal council meetings during the past year had been more controversial than usual and had culminated in charges and counter charges of corruption in the two months preceding the election.

1 S.M.H., 16, 17 November 1868.
2 F.J., 21 November 1868.
3 S.M.H., 3 December 1868. At the close of the poll, Moore, the Mayor, said that Oatley was in league with his opponents Woods and Sutherland.
4 A.P.B., 4 December 1868.
5 S.M.H., 30 November 1868.
6 S.M.H., 2 December 1868.
7 F.J., 31 October 1868; S.M.H., 2 December 1868.
8 F.J., 26 September, 3 and 10 October 1868.
The Legislative Assembly had resumed before the by-elections for the electorates of West Sydney and Central Cumberland, and the acrimonious debate there heightened the drama of the extra-parliamentary contest, especially in West Sydney. For a while it appeared as if the election there would be between the same contestants who had just fought it out for Denison ward, but Robertson, who placed a lot of importance on the election, was able to persuade young Willie Campbell, of the old and influential Campbell family, to stand and Woods withdrew. Once again it was difficult for the P.P.A. to dramatise the election along simple sectarian lines. Campbell was a Protestant and supported the education act. He was a partner with his uncle in Campbell's wharf and in his campaign much was made of family's reputation as fair employers of labour. He received considerable support from the native born, and the liberal establishment of the city: from Cowper; from George Hill; from Dalley; from Raphael. Catholic ward politicians like Frehill, O'Connor and Curran gave him solid backing, a fact which was stressed by the P.P.A. backers of Wearne. Wearne had been asked to stand by Henry Clark and Henry Palser, the two men the P.P.A. had unsuccessfully approached to stand on its behalf at the time of the ministerial by-elections. He was backed by orange, P.P.A., temperance and Methodist celebrities, and by a number of aldermen. In part the conflict appeared to be/long established commercial interests on the one hand and newer, retailing and manufacturing interests on the other. Henry Parkes campaigned strongly on Wearne's behalf and into his nomination speech intruded a vicious attack on Campbell, his family and his friends. After what the Freeman's Journal described as a

1 S.M.H., 4 December 1868.
2 See S.M.H., 8,9,12 December 1868 for accounts of Campbell's meetings and lists of his supporters.
3 S.M.H., 16 December 1868.
4 Such as Davies, S.S. Goold, Samuel Goold, G.W. Allen, Richard M'Coy and Aldermen Bradford, Murphy and Horden. See S.M.H., 9,10,11,14 December 1868.
5 S.M.H., 15 December 1868.
great contest Campbell was returned with a 200 vote majority, out of four and a half thousand (53 per cent of eligible voters) cast.¹ The P.P.A. had been confident of victory and had printed a number of placards to be stuck up all over the city in celebration. Their message was simple: it read 'Croppies lie down'.²

The Freeman's thought the Catholics had behaved nobly and had voted for Campbell to a man.³ Such was unlikely, although the only, very rough, indicator of voting behaviour suggests a heavy Catholic vote for Campbell. The figures for each of the six polling booths were published in the press. Each booth was divided according to the letters of the alphabet. In only one of the six booths did one or other candidate poll more than 70 votes more than the other. That was in the L to O booth where Campbell polled 531-343 votes.⁴ That booth, being the voting place of the 'Mc's' and the 'O's' would presumably have had a high proportion of Irish and thus Catholic voters. It is at best though, a very imperfect indicator.

The central Cumberland election resulted in a victory for the Opposition's candidate, Samuel Lyons. Neither he nor his opponent, James Jones, a wine merchant, who received support from Robertson and Driver, were residents in the area, but Lyons at least had the backing of local identities like Richard Sadlier and James Byrnes.⁵ The two P.P.A. branches in the area urged support for Lyons, but the city organisation

¹ S.M.H., 16 December 1868.
² F.J., 19 December 1868.
³ Ibid. Parkes thought so too. In a speech to the Legislative Assembly, attempting to belittle the Government's victory, he spoke of all the influence arraigned on Campbell's side: 'the largest family influence in the colony, the wealth of the candidates, the licensed victuallers...the influence of the Cowper party and the Roman Catholics massed as one man.' (S.M.H., 23 December 1868.)
⁴ S.M.H., 16 December 1868.
⁵ S.M.H., 15 December 1868.
was too busy campaigning for Wearne to spend any time mounting a campaign in another electorate.  

The combined result of the two elections was welcomed by each side in Parliament as an important victory. Parliament had resumed 8 December. The first day's sitting was short. Robertson outlined the policy of the Government and in a brief answer to a long and detailed question from Macleay said that the Government had no evidence in its possession which supported the statements made by Parkes in his Kiama speech. The next day, on behalf of the Opposition, Parkes moved no confidence in the Robertson-Forster ministry. Debate on the motion preoccupied the House and the public for the next two weeks. It was, as Belmore observed, 'a debate chiefly remarkable for personalities'. It was also a debate remarkable for the bad feeling which was displayed between the two sides of the House. The Opposition attack had in it little of substance. It concentrated on the composition of the ministry and on one or two promises the Government had made, such as the reinstatement of Duncan. The Government in turn attacked the previous ministry for maladministration and kept them so busy defending themselves that at times the debate seemed to be about want of confidence in the previous rather than the present ministry.

Government ministers also concentrated their attack on Parkes for his Kiama speech. In his opening speech Robertson suggested Parkes was moving no confidence in the Government merely to avoid enquiry into his own actions when Colonial Secretary, and in particular, his Kiama speech. The next day Macleay moved for the tabling of all papers connected with the attempted assassination, and went on to claim that such a

---

1 A.P.B., 12 December 1868.
2 S.M.H., 9 December 1868.
3 Belmore to Buckingham and Chandos, 31 December 1868 (Confidential), C.O., 201/548, f.381.
4 As the Herald commented, 14 December 1868.
5 S.M.H., 10 December 1868.
motion should have precedence over the no-confidence motion. This enabled him to renew Parkes's handling of the attempted assassination and its aftermath and to renew his accusation that Parkes had deliberately sought to stir up religious bitterness over the issue. Parkes denied the charges and defended his actions in a forthright style, concluding with a challenge to anyone who had known him to prove that he had ever exhibited prejudice to his fellow colonists on account of their religion. After more acrimonious debate the motion was carried, and Parkes said he would table the papers in his possession as well.¹ Five days later Macleay moved for a select committee to be appointed 'to enquire into the existence of a conspiracy for the purposes of treason and assassination, alleged to have existed in this country'. One of the reasons Macleay gave for his motion was Parkes's 'apparent refusal' to produce the papers in his possession. After a debate which ranged over most of the information and more of the conjecture available to the public, the motion was passed, and Parkes tabled the papers he had originally tried to have published on the day of his resignation.²

Public reaction to Parkes's papers was anti-climactic. Startling revelations had been expected and many consequently condemned Parkes, accusing him of exaggerating their significance for political purposes.³ Those who had always

¹ S.M.H., 11 December 1868.
² S.M.H., 16 December 1868. Macleay's tactics of pressing Parkes over his Kiama speech were his own and not the ministry's, although they were happy to have him pursue this line of attack. He and other backbenchers such as James Hart obtained detailed information from the colonial secretary's files via Robertson, but Macleay's motion for a select committee was his own idea. Belmore, seeing the motion on the notice paper, expressed to Robertson the hope that it might be abandoned as it was likely to cause further division. Robertson demurred and Belmore agreed that for the Government to oppose the motion would give more importance to the matter than was at that time desirable. (Belmore to Buckingham and Chandos, 28 December 1868, C.O., 201/548, ff.337-338.)
³ Australasian, 19 December 1868.
claimed O'Farrell insane found vindication in his diary and in his far fetched descriptions of Fenian plans.\(^1\) The Herald, which had always been sceptical of Parkes's claims, granted that Parkes could genuinely have believed what he had said at Kiama, but disagreed with him.\(^2\) The publication of the papers at least had the effect of deflating the mystery which had surrounded Parkes's Kiama speech.\(^3\) It had little effect, though, on the sectarianism which was a most noticeable characteristic of the no-confidence debate. Most of this was contributed by Opposition members desperately searching for some weapon to attack the Government. In doing this they were confirming the accusations of Macleay and Driver that they wished to divide the country along religious lines for their own gain, but equally they could argue that it was the present Government and its supporters which had begun the tactic by encouraging Catholics in their opposition to Martin and Parkes. J.B. Wilson, Martin's lands Minister was one who gave a sectarian dimension to his speech. His attack consisted of a systematic and considerably biased denigration of Duncan and included the charge that he had constantly shown favouritism to Catholic employees during his administration of the Department.\(^4\)

The most remarkable contribution of this kind came from Henry Parkes. In the final speech of the debate Parkes replied to many of the charges which had been made against his and

\(^1\) F.J., 19 December 1868. In one place he said Fenians intended to turn England, Scotland and Ireland into three separate republics.

\(^2\) S.M.H., 17 December 1868.

\(^3\) This was the view of Belmore, who admitted that he had feared the consequences had an election been held while the Kiama mystery still remained. Belmore to Buckingham and Chandos, 28 December 1868, C.\(^r\)., 201/548, f.383.

\(^4\) S.M.H., 12 December 1868. The charge was manifestly unjust and was rebutted by Duncan three days later, S.M.H., 15 December 1868.
Martin's Government. Predictably, he devoted a lot of time to defending his education act. He concluded with the remarkable charge that the ministry were 'the mere instruments of a dominant and insolent priesthood' and went on to outline a clerical plot that could almost have been plucked straight from the pages of the Protestant Banner:

After an ecclesiastical agitation they [the priests] had come to the conclusion that in the open field or with fair means they would be powerless, and they had decided in all instances when the general election came on to adopt as their candidate liberal Protestants; what he (Parkes) called accommodating Protestants, persons who had not thought on subjects of Government who had not given any attention to the public business of the country, who had no particular object before them in life, and no special motive to guide them, but who, for the sake of getting a seat in the House would privately pledge themselves to have justice done to this priesthood....What was the position of the Government in this great conflict that was before us - aiming at the propagation of one particular sect in the country at the expense of the public money? We know well enough that by some contrivance or other, by means, of course, we should not see or be able to prove, they would get the support of this compact force, with the Catholic priesthood at its head, and we know that they dare not do anything that would forfeit that support. [Robertson: It's false!]

The no-confidence motion was lost by 29 votes to 25.¹

Just how much Parkes believed this, and how much he was aiming for a certain political effect is hard to judge. That he was hoping for a political effect is certain. During November he had several times communicated with J.D. Lang urging him to desert the Government on the grounds that to support them was to support the Romish priesthood. Lang agreed, but cunningly argued that if the Government and the influence of the priests were to be properly checked it must be done in an election. If an election were held then, Lang argued, the Government might even be returned, because the influence of the priesthood over them was not yet clear to most voters. He therefore would support the Government until such time as it had, by its actions, convinced all but the

¹S.M.H., 23 December 1868.
most obtuse of its priestly direction.\(^1\) Parkes no doubt hoped that the Government's conduct in the no-confidence debate may have persuaded Lang, or some of its other staunch Protestant supporters to respond to such a call and bring about its defeat. If that had happened there would either be an election, or, remotely, Parkes would be asked to form a government. Parkes seemed convinced that there would be an election. In a letter to Lang he had written:

I am certain you misunderstand Mr Robertson's position in the country. The battle which must be fought within a few months - the sooner the better - will be that of Protestantism and Progress against Roman Catholicism, usurpation and regression. Mr Robertson will be the recreant chief on the one side, fighting under false banners and, I dare to predict he will be utterly vanquished.\(^2\)

It is difficult to believe that in this letter and in his speech a month later Parkes did not believe in some sense what he was saying. The indignation and paranoia is too pronounced to be an invention. Parkes's personality had always contained a strand of paranoia and the often vicious attacks on his reputation during the previous two and a half years had brought that strand to the surface. These attacks had increased after his Kiama speech and had robbed him of any praise or recognition which he might rightly have expected after his resignation. Neither did that resignation in any way abate their intensity. Parkes was not far wrong when he described the select committee set up by Macleay to enquire into the attempted assassination, as nothing more than an attempt to

---

\(^1\)Lang to Parkes, 30 November 1868, Autographed Letter of Australians, M.L., A62, p.68. A few days later Lang became annoyed at Parkes pestering, saying that he was as much to blame as anyone for the present Government being in power. Lang to Parkes, 3 December 1868, Parkes Correspondence, A924, pp.200-203. For some of Parkes's earlier letters see Parkes to Lang, 26,27 November 1868, in Lang papers, M.L., Vol.22, A2242, pp.23a-43.

Yet, at the end of 1868, indignation was a far more noticeable characteristic of Parkes's speeches and writings than paranoia. While other men saw Parkes as fiercely ambitious, he regarded his involvement in politics as a product of high minded, self sacrificing concern for the public good. It was indignation at the thought that this was not recognised that led him to denounce other men who would venture into politics without such concern. That he should also see them as tools of a designing priesthood indicated the second object of his indignation: the Catholic clergy,

1 Parkes to Lang, 11 February 1869, Lang Papers, Vol.22, M.L., A2242, p.51. See also Parkes's speech on the report of the select committee, S.M.H., 17 February 1869. Macleay, it should be said, suffered from his own form of madness: an intense high tory hatred of Parkes in whom he saw embodied the forces which had destroyed much of the power and status of the old colonial families Macleay felt himself to represent. It is interesting, and no accident, that Parkes's two most persistent and extreme opponents, Macleay and Macpherson, should both be members of families of Scots landed gentry who had been active in the British Colonial Service and occupied senior posts in New South Wales. Both were Anglican. Macleay was the nephew of Alexander Macleay, the early Colonial Secretary and had married the daughter of his successor, Edward Deas Thompson. By birth and by marriage he was related to other early colonial families of stature: the Macarthur-Onslows, the Dumaresqs, the Blaxlands, the Lawsons, the Icelys (information from David Denholm, research scholar in History, R.S.S.S., A.N.U.). Macpherson's father had been clerk of the Executive and Legislative Councils from 1837 to 1859, when he succeeded to his family seat at Blairgowrie, Co.Perth. Alan Macpherson resigned his seat in the Legislative Assembly in 1868, in order to succeed him. (Bourke, Landed Gentry, (London 1937), p.501.) Both men identified strongly with the sort of world their fathers and uncles ruled and resented the power and status that had been taken from them by the liberals and democrats, especially those of low social origin like Parkes. For them the education act became an important symbol of a world governed by men like Parkes, and they opposed it with the tenacity of a ruling caste opposing the final indications of the social change that has already swept them from power.
whose unremitting and unfair attacks on him saw as the main cause of his high mindedness going unrecognised. Parkes believed that by their power over their congregations, which he exaggerated, and by their refusal to accept compromises he thought necessary in the colony's plural society, the Catholic priesthood was a danger to society. He saw himself as their victim and the paranoid strand in his make-up, and his own heightened sense of political drama combined to lead him to vent his indignation in an exaggerated description of their power. Parkes had thus come to Protestant sectarianism by a path roughly similar to most P.P.A. members, but he was not fully committed to it, and as he regained his confidence and shook off his enemies, he avoided it.

It was still the embattled Parkes who attended all of the fifteen sittings of Macleay's select committee. There he attempted by skill, obduracy and petulance to produce from the witnesses evidence to justify his Kiama statement. The committee met in late December, and during January. It took evidence from thirty-eight witnesses, including the senior police officers and all ten detectives in the force at the time of the attempted assassination. Summaries of evidence were published in the press each following day and the complete evidence was published after the report had been presented to Parliament. While the committee was sitting large collections of the papers connected with the attempted assassination were tabled in the House and published in the press.

This maintained considerable public interest in the affair and sometimes contributed new 'evidence' and new witnesses to appear before the committee. Such witnesses were not without their problems for Henry Parkes. After reading in McLerie's evidence that Reardon, the American whose luggage was searched under the Treason Felony Act, was thought to be a Fenian, D'Arcy Murray, who had lodged with him and overheard Baker trying to persuade their landlady to testify against him, concluded that Baker had been sent by the police and wrote a letter to the Empire saying so.\(^1\) He was called

---

\(^1\) Empire, 21 December 1868. See above, p.123 for details of Reardon.
before the committee and testified that Reardon was not a Fenian. In his speech to the Assembly a month later, criticising the committee's report, which had made a lot of Murray's evidence, Parkes attempted in a nasty fashion to belittle Murray's evidence by reading Tasmanian newspaper reports to the effect that Murray had persuaded a friend to act as co-respondent with his wife to enable him to divorce her, and had then stabbed the friend. Murray informed Parkes that this had been a story concocted by his erstwhile friend, and which had been shown by subsequent court proceedings to be completely false. This was of little concern to Parkes who published the speech in pamphlet form. Murray sued him for libel and won a £100 judgement.¹ Another witness came forward with evidence of Fenians. This was Francis Kean, a brickmaker late of Shoalhaven. He had approached Parkes, who brought him forward as his star witness. Kean testified that Fenian meetings and Fenian sympathies abounded on the South Coast. Parkes made much of this testimony in his reply to the committee's report. This resulted in a large meeting at Shoalhaven totally repudiating Kean's evidence and indicating that he had always been known as a bit of a liar.²

By Macleay's resolution the committee was composed of members of the Robertson and Martin ministries or their close supporters. It was evenly balanced, with Macleay having the casting vote. Macleay, Forster and Parkes attended all the meetings. Macleay was constantly searching for evidence against Parkes's claims; Parkes constantly for evidence to justify them; while Forster applied a cutting logic to the testimony of most witnesses, particularly those, like Fosbery, who firmly believed, although they could not actually prove it, that Fenians existed in the colony. 'Fenianism', Forster forced Fosbery to admit, was little more than disaffection.³ Martin refused to attend at all, despite Macleay's appeals to the House.

¹F.J., 26 February 1870.
²F.J., 6 March 1869.
³Evidence of Fosbery (q.q.428-40, pp.814-15) in 'Assassination Committee'.
to force him to. He treated the affair with lofty disdain, although he attended the final meeting to vote for the minority report.

The committee, as was to be expected, produced two reports, a majority report drawn up by Macleay, and a minority report, written by John Stewart. The majority report found that no conspiracy for treason and assassination had existed and went on to attack Parkes for suggesting it did. It was published on 4 February. Twelve days later, in Parliament, Macleay, rather than simply move for its acceptance, proposed a series of resolutions based on the report, which amounted to little more than an attack on Parkes. That was a mistake. The committee had been set up to enquire into the existence of a conspiracy for the purposes of treason and assassination which had been suggested by Parkes. Even if it found that such a conspiracy did not exist, it was not empowered to enquire into or to comment on Parkes belief that it did. Parkes seized upon this point and in a long (three and three-quarter hours) speech asked the House to reject Macleay's resolutions. They had, he argued, little bearing on the purposes for which the committee had been established but were specifically engineered as an attack on him. Parkes defended his judgement that a conspiracy had existed and, rather unfairly, castigated a number of the witnesses whose evidence Macleay had used to support his case. He moved as an amendment that the House reject the committee's report and affirm that the Government had reason to believe a conspiracy existed to take the Prince's life. Their two speeches took up that evening's sitting. The next evening was something of an anti-climax. The Government and Macleay had clearly expected debate to continue for several days, but their motions for adjournment were constantly defeated by a majority on the opposition

1 S.M.H., 21 January 1869.
2 S.M.H., 17 February 1869.
benches. The galleries were crowded with Parkes's supporters. The debate dragged on, devoted more to procedural matters than the resolution or its amendment. A spirit of hilarity infected the Opposition. Finally, after a long drawn out attempt by a half-drunk Cummings to talk opposition members to bed, a vote was taken at ten to four in the morning. Parkes's amendment was passed by 32-22. The House rose after three cheers for the Queen. Despite the late hour an enthusiastic crowd greeted Parkes outside Parliament.

Parkes did not escape further criticism from the press for his Kiama statement, but he had at least obtained vindication from the Parliament and could begin to rebuild his reputation. A month after that debate he politely rebuffed the Protestant Political Association, which had earlier passed a resolution approving his general conduct. He stressed that he had always followed an independent course,

---

1 A similar number of members (54 out of 72) voted on the select committee report as voted on Parkes's motion of no-confidence in the Government, which was lost (25-29). In both cases voting was along party lines. No one who voted for the Government on the no-confidence motion voted for Parkes's amendment, or vice versa. A number who had supported the Government on the no-confidence motion stayed away from the division on the select committee report, while Parkes was able to muster much more support for his opposition to the report than for his no-confidence motion (S.M.H., 23 December 1868, 18 February 1869). The different results indicate the importance of absenteeism in colonial politics, and suggest that for a number of backbenchers it was as important as a vote in their range of possible political responses.

2 S.M.H., 18 February 1869.

3 For example, Empire, 17 February 1869; F.J., 20 February 1869.

4 Parkes remained convinced that O'Farrell had been part of a Fenian conspiracy, and he and the police carefully investigated every case that looked as if it might turn up evidence of Fenians. They never did. See Parkes to McLerie, 10 March 1869, Parkes Correspondence, A915, p.11; Fosbery to Parkes, 17 October 1874, Parkes Correspondence, A883, pp.214-15; D. Goldie to Dr Badeworth, 25 December 1884, included in Fosbery to Parkes, 17 September 1885, P.C., A883, pp.231-35.
(thus informing them that he had no intention of throwing his lot in with the Association) although he did appreciate their support. ¹

The rejection of Macleay's report finally ended the controversy begun by the attempted assassination, although the Herald was right when it pessimistically concluded that there is a peculiar adaptation in our parliamentary forms to revive questions that lapse, and renew debates which, in their proper merits, have been brought to a conclusion. We shall therefore, perhaps, for many a long day, have renewed in the Legislative Assembly subjects which are now nominally settled.

* * * *

For the Protestant sectarian organisations called forth by the attempted assassination, 1869 was a year of consolidation, rather than spectacular growth. The divisiveness to which such groups were particularly prone contributed to this, and almost destroyed the efforts of the previous year.

The Australian Protestant Banner rapidly decreased in size during February and finally ceased publication. ³ A dispute between Wazir Beg and the other clerical contributors seems to have contributed to this, although George Addison, the printer,

¹ Parkes to Charles Reynolds, 10 March 1869, Parkes Correspondence, A901, pp.77-86. This, and the Association's letter are published in Dickey, Politics in New South Wales, pp.96-97. Parkes had been a little sharper with the Association six months earlier, when, following his 'Kiama ghost' speech they had written to him expressing their support and their hostility to attempts to raise the matter in public before Parkes had a chance to table the papers in Parliament. In reply Parkes pointed out that they did not fully understand his meaning, and that he would not permit himself to be influenced in any course of action other than that which appeared to him correct. (G.L. Wilson to Parkes, 29 August 1868, Colonial Secretary, Correspondence Received, file 68/4796, box 4/632, N.S.W. State Archives. The letter contains the rough draft of Parkes's reply.)

² S.M.H., 20 February 1869.

³ A.P.B., 27 February 1869. By then it was reduced to six pages.
went out of business at the same time.\textsuperscript{1} Meetings of subscribers were held to discuss resurrecting the venture, but could not agree over financial arrangements.\textsuperscript{2} After a month a new Australian Protestant Banner appeared, edited by Beg alone.\textsuperscript{3} In May its name changed to the simpler Protestant Banner. It was not a success, having a circulation of no more than 300, mostly in country districts.\textsuperscript{4} Beg's style was far too eccentric and far too violent to attract many supporters and the paper ceased publication in September. A libel action for an editorial published in July, referring to a certain Protestant woman who had married a Catholic as a whore, cost the printer, though not Beg, £5 and costs.\textsuperscript{5}

During March and April the other four ministers previously connected with the Banner sought to start another

\textsuperscript{1} P.S., 1 May 1869. The remarks of the Protestant Standard, which filled the place left by the Banner, are vague as to the cause of the Banner's decline, but seem fairly definite that it was not because it was not paying its way. It hints at some sort of mismanagement.

\textsuperscript{2} No.2 L.O.L., minute book, entry for 12 March 1869.

\textsuperscript{3} A.P.B., 3 April 1869. Appropriately, given Beg's background, it had as its masthead a quotation from Binman, an early nineteenth century Indian Muslim writer who lived in Delhi: 'truth is violated by silence, or by consent'.

\textsuperscript{4} F.J., 20 November 1869.

\textsuperscript{5} The case was typical of the sort that preoccupied many Protestants like Beg. A woman, once a Protestant, had married a Catholic and became one herself. When her father, a Protestant, was dying, she called a priest, claiming that her father had requested it. He died, and was buried a Catholic. Protestant neighbours were suspicious, claiming that just before death he had asked for a Protestant minister, which the daughter had refused. This was reported by a letter to the Banner by someone who had heard it second hand, and was published, with appropriate comments by Beg. No name was given, but enough circumstantial evidence supplied for the woman's neighbours to know who was meant. What made the letter a little more exceptional than others of such a kind was a statement that the woman had been a prostitute before her marriage. She sued, and won a surprisingly light judgement. See report of trial, reprinted from S.M.H., in F.J., 20 November 1869.
paper. Their driving force was John McGibbon. On 1 May there appeared the Protestant Standard, edited by McGibbon, and claiming to take up where the old Banner had left off.¹ The publisher was the wealthy Congregationalist and temperance activist, Samuel Goold.² Costing 6d per issue the Standard consisted of 16 pages and was better laid out and printed than the Banner. It was subtitled 'a journal of political and religious freedom' and had as its masthead an open bible intertwined with a standard inscribed "This is the secret of England's greatness and England's glory" — Queen Victoria.' Although it claimed to have the same purpose as the Banner it was more firmly situated in the main stream of evangelical Protestantism than the Banner. It still gave expression to the full anti-Catholic ideology, but in a less offensive fashion than previously. Its tone was more confident than had been the Banner's. The goings on of Catholicism were treated almost as frequently with condescending humour as with indignation or hysteria, and it once declared that its main objection to Rome was its hypocrisy: that the priests did not believe what they taught the laity to believe.³ More importantly, its anti-Catholicism was married to other issues close to the evangelical heart. The Standard contained a temperance column, for example, and frequently denounced drunkenness, horse racing and other forms of gambling, the theatre (because

¹ P.S., 1 May 1869.
² Samuel Goold had been a city missionary in London and had been appointed by the Pitt Street Congregational Church in 1849 to work among the poorer classes in Sydney. In 1869 he was secretary of the New South Wales Political Association for the Suppression of Intemperance. See W.W. Philips, 'Christianity and its Defense in N.S.W., c.1880-1890', (Ph.D. thesis, A.N.U., 1969), p.150; N.S.W. Political Association for the Suppression of Intemperance, First Annual Report, 1868; Second Annual Report (1869). Goold may not have remained publisher for long. When the Standard was registered as it was required to be by law, in July 1869, John McGibbon was described as the proprietor and publisher. See N.S.W. Register of Newspapers, N.S.W. State Archives, 4/7819.
³ The Empire remarked on its less offensive tone (Empire, 7 May 1869).
of the immorality encouraged by its circumstances, rather than playacting itself), debt, sabbath violation and other issues more commonly associated with the broad stream of Protestant evangelical. Although it demonstrated its sectarianism by frequent attacks on liberal or accommodating Protestants, and on the public media, especially the Sydney Morning Herald, for encouraging popery, it was less sectarian than the Banner, and frequently published editorials devoted exclusively to questions of social reform not associated in any way with the machinations of popery or the apathy of Protestants. It identified itself broadly with the 'liberal side' of politics.\(^1\) It was a journal better equipped to win a larger number of adherents to the orange cause than the more sectarian Banner.

The Protestant Political Association also suffered from internal dissension during 1869. During the six months following October 1868 only six new branches were added and one closed. The one closed was in Balmain, but one was opened in nearby Glebe, in the same electorate. One of the other new branches was formed by splitting the parent branch in order to provide a branch in the East Sydney electorate. In May a municipal by-election for Brisbane Ward (in the West Sydney electorate) provided practice for the organisation. The contest was between a Protestant candidate William Day, supported by Davies, Henry Clarke, William Kippax and Spear, and one of the '40's generation' Catholics, Thomas McCaffrey.\(^2\) McCaffrey's supporters played it hard, attempting to split the

---

\(^1\)P.S., 1 May 1869.

\(^2\)William Day was a member of the Church of England. He had been influential in forming the Australian Patriotic Association and was vice president during 1868 (S.M.H., 21 January, 16 September 1868). Though not an orangeman or in the P.P.A. he received their support. He also received backing from the A.P.A. which was active in this and a second by-election, for Bourke ward, which was taking place at the same time. McCaffrey was a commission agent, and had been the object of police suspicion during the Fenian scare following the attempted assassination.
Protestant vote by illicitly nominating Graham Coulter, a brother of the Orange Grand Master, and attaching to his list of supporters the names of John Davies and William Coulter. It was of little avail. Day won by 474 to McCaffrey's 219. Coulter received one vote.2

The first annual meeting of the Association was held early in June. The Temperance Hall was only half filled and the secretary's report regretted that 'the parent branch, for some months past, has declined to send delegates to the central council, preferring to act independently of other branches'. The president's name was given as Gilbert H. Smith, of Parramatta.3 Davies alienation from the central council was not lengthy. By election time in November he was again in control, and his trusty lieutenant, G.L. Carter, was one of the Association's two secretaries.4

In the course of his June report, the secretary of the P.P.A. (a Mr Reynolds), regretted that the Protestant Hall Company had not been completely formed. Such a project seemed to require organisational and financial skill beyond the scope of the Protestant sectarians at that time. G.L. Wilson had not been an efficient secretary, and his expulsion from the Orange Institution in June left the affairs of the Protestant Hall Company in disarray. A meeting of interested parties was held late in July. An attempt was made to give the meeting prestige by asking Parkes to chair it, but he

1Empire, 5 May 1869; P.S., 22 May 1869.
2P.S., 22 May 1869.
3S.M.H., 10 July 1869; A.P.B., 12 June 1869.
4George Lord Carter was a native of the colony. A tailor, employed at Farmers' and Co., Carter was 28. Like John Davies, in whose shadow he walked, Carter was destined for greater things: for municipal honours and a seat in the Assembly (South Sydney, 1880). The other secretary of the Association at this time was Thomas Armstrong, a member of the St. Paul's (Anglican) Redfern literary society, and presumably a man better connected with regular denominations than either Davies or Carter.
refused and the task was left to John McGibbon. Despite claims made almost a year earlier that by then over 1,500 shares had been sold, it was stated at the meeting that the share list stood at £79. Only 90 remained in the account. Despite McGibbon's rousing pleas at the meeting and later in the Standard, little enthusiasm remained for such a venture.

For the orange lodges 1869 was not a year of noticeable growth. Nevertheless, it provided an opportunity to develop new styles of entertainment which were gradually/significantly to change the whole character of the movement. Numbers joining lodges were small and few new lodges were formed, but the patronage of those who remained after the noticeable decline in interest late in 1868 remained high. It was encouraged by the use of forms of meeting common in church and temperance circles but not previously used by orangemen: the tea meeting and the soiree. These were held independently of lodge meetings and were open to the families and friends of the orangemen. As many as 1,000 attended such gatherings, which were usually reported in the press. Militant Protestant values were invoked in speeches, songs and hymns were sung and a general spirit of Protestant good fellowship prevailed, and did much to lessen English Protestant prejudice.

---

1 James Calder Jnr. to Parkes, 22 July 1879; Parkes to James Calder Jnr., 23 July 1869, Parkes Correspondence, A900, pp. 230-33.
2 For example, as reported in A.P.B., 23 October 1868. Since shares could be bought by instalment, it is probable that this figure represented the number of shares on which at least one instalment had been paid.
3 P.S., 31 July 1869.
4 Only sixteen joined No. 2 L.O.L. during the whole year. By May 1869 there were 22 lodges, an increase of four in as many months. (P.S., 8 May 1869.)
5 For example: 380 at a tea meeting of No. 2 lodge, Empire, 16 January 1869; 1,000 at a tea meeting and soiree of No. 3 lodge, P.S.; 1 May 1869; and 600 at No. 7 lodge tea meeting, where McGibbon spoke of the progress temperance had made amongst orangemen, 'the majority of whom are Sons of Temperance'. P.S., 4 September 1869.
against orangeism.¹

Seven hundred people, 200 more than in 1868, were squeezed around tables in the Masonic Hall for the 1869 Boyne day celebrations. At the 1868 celebration the Grand Master, William Coulter had expressed the hope that his place would soon be taken by someone of 'superior social station'. This hope had not been realised, for he was still Grand Master, although illness prevented him from attending the celebration. His place was taken by Alderman James Murphy.²

John Davies was in the vice-chair. In between the dinner and the dancing an innovation of a more Irish character was introduced. The bretheren, all in regalia, formed a long line, two deep and marched around the Hall to the accompaniment of 'the Protestant Boys'. The procession was headed by Andrew Alexander, carrying a bible on an orange and purple cushion, and surrounded by two sword bearers. After once around the Hall, the bretheren formed a large circle and 'fired forth a volley of Kentish fire'.³ They then danced until dawn.⁴ In a society where public displays of even

¹The change from alcohol to tea as the preferred orange beverage would have done much to hasten this process.
²James Murphy ran a wood and coal yard at the foot of Liverpool Street. He had been converted to Methodism by 'California' Taylor in the early 1860s and was an active member of that church. He was prominent in charitable institutions such as the City Night Refuge and in the temperance movement and was chairman of the Australasian Freemason's Hall Company. He had been active in municipal politics since the late 1850s. He was a protectionist. See Bickford, Autobiography, p.202; S.M.H., 10 March 1867, 28 August 1868; A.P.B., 12 July 1868; Empire, 12 August 1868; P.S., 12 February 1870.
³Kentish fire is said by the Shorter Oxford Dictionary to have evolved in Kent as a form of dissent for use at meetings advocating Catholic emancipation. Whatever its origins it was a hallmark of ornamen by the mid nineteenth century. As far as I can gather, it involved co-ordinated handclapping, two slow followed by three fast claps. Foot stamping may be used as well (my information is from an old orangeman who was a bit cagey about it).
⁴P.S., 24 July 1869.
orange emblems were forbidden by law, such a performance was the closest they could come to the full scale procession with flags and drums which was so important in encouraging the martial spirit central to this sort of Protestantism.

The growth of militant Protestantism during 1869 was not given much assistance by Irishmen and Catholics who lay low for most of the year. The Catholic community received a blow early in January when the temporary Cathedral, erected after the 1865 fire was itself totally destroyed by fire. In the circumstances it was natural that there should be talk of a Protestant plot and of revenge, and although an inquest returned an open verdict, several public men referred regretfully to the religious tensions in the colony and concluded that the possibility of arson could not be entirely rejected. The building was partly insured, and donations of less than £2,000 enabled a more substantial temporary cathedral to be built within five months. The event was less significant than the 1865 catastrophe and produced nothing like the display of public sympathy. It nevertheless provided the religious journals opportunity for typically contradictory comment. The Australian Churchman urged Protestants not to assist the re-building; the Freeman's Journal claimed that they were assisting, and found this gratifying evidence that bigotry had not yet taken hold; while the Banner, typically perverse, claimed that there were in

---

1 _Empire_, 6 January 1869; A.P.B., 9 January 1869.
2 For example, Polding, who wrote to Bishop Lanigan in Goulburn, 'one can scarcely attribute it to accident at such an hour of the morning, yet to give proof that it was not accidental may be out of men's power'. Polding to Lanigan, 8 January 1869, Polding Papers, Box C, S.A.A. The Sydney Morning Herald (6 January 1869) blamed the Freeman's and the Banner for encouraging a spirit which could lead people to commit such an act. Edward Butler, at a meeting of Catholics, blamed Protestants alone for introducing religious dissension (S.M.H., 7 January 1869).
fact few Protestants on the subscription lists, and rejoiced that Protestants had realised their responsibilities.  

The Catholic authorities were less vocal in their protests at the educational system. Their hostility had not diminished, but there was little they could do, and by then most colonists had become used to the protests that occasionally appeared in the press. The pastoral letter which emerged from the second Provincial Council of the Australian bishops, in Melbourne in April 1869, received little notice. It did no more than reiterate previously stated objections to indifferentism, mixed (or public) schools and mixed marriages. It concluded with a plea for a renewed mission to the aboriginals and for more finance.

The financial situation of the Catholic Association was, by then even, beginning to look serious, although the authorities did not seem aware of it. Their second report, published in November, exuded an air of confidence. After a ritual attack on the Public Schools Act and the Council of Education, it proudly announced that it supported 13 independent Catholic schools and assisted in some way seven schools still connected with the Council. It had opened all but one of the schools closed down by the Council. Expenditure had been just under £1,200. Receipts had been £2,400, leaving about £1,200 in the bank. What these figures did not show was that nearly £1,500 of the £2,400 of receipts had been carried over from the Association's first year of operation, when receipts had been high and expenditure minimal. In 1869 expenditure had exceeded receipts by £400.

---

1 A.C., 23 January 1869; F.J., 16 January 1869; A.P.B., 6 February 1869.
3 F.J., 6 November 1869.
4 The balance sheet for 1869 does not specifically refer to the £1,500 balance referred to in the 1868 report. It was already included in the receipts. A real figure for receipts during 1869 of £900 would be in keeping with receipts (which steadily declined) for 1870 and 1871.
The Irish community was still giving evidence of the divisive tendencies induced by the attempted assassination. Most Irishmen were concerned to allay suspicions of their disloyalty and chary of anything that might hint of Irish separation. This feeling even influenced some of those who had been active in the controversial Irish State Prisoners Fund. Two of them, William Dolman and J.C. O'Connor, were, respectively, chairman and secretary of the St Patrick's Day Committee in 1869. They organised a very decorous celebration: a picnic at Balmoral. The Governor and the Duke of Edinburgh, who was again visiting the colony, were invited, but were prevented from attending by the Governor's illness. Sir Terence Murray presided at the ceremony, as he had done in years past, and the ministry and many of their supporters attended. Not all Irishmen were happy with such accommodatory moves. One protested in the Freeman's Journal that the whole affair, with its fawning on men who wanted to hang Fenians and who helped pass the Treason Felony Act was an insult to Irish pride and nationality. O'Connor was indignant and wondered how the Freeman's could have published such a letter, and William Dolman, who was one of its proprietors, had to apologise that Richard O'Sullivan, another proprietor and the editor, had full control over what was inserted in the paper. O'Sullivan said he thought it was honest comment and could not see any reason for fuss. This widened an already existing breach between O'Sullivan and his other two proprietors, although they allowed him to continue as editor under protest.

1 It was said that during the day the Prince wore a shamrock in his button hole and had his horses done out in green ribbon, F.J., 20 March 1869.
2 Ibid.
3 F.J., 10 April 1869.
4 F.J., 17 April 1869. In another letter in that issue Fr Woolfrey commented that the criticism 'seemed to bear out the truth of the old saying that if an Irishman was put on a spit, another would be found to turn it'.
5 F.J., 20 November 1869.
A more serious dispute was in the offing. In May news reached the colony that the British Government had decided to pardon 34 of the Fenians arrested between 1865 and 1867 and incarcerated in Western Australia. It did not intend to assist them to leave the colony.\(^1\) Spontaneously, Irishmen in three centres, Bathurst, Seven Hills and Grenfell, sent donations to the Freeman's office to assist the released prisoners to return home.\(^2\) O'Sullivan decided the fund raising should be properly organised, and set up a committee, operating out of the Freeman's Journal office. Like himself most of its members had been connected with the Irish National League or the State Prisoners' Fund.\(^3\) In editorials O'Sullivan defended the committee from the frequently levelled charge that the fund raising would embitter 'the other party' just when things were settling down. 'To argue this way', he said, 'is to make them master and Irishmen slaves'.\(^4\) A little over £1,500 was collected, most of it from within New South Wales.\(^5\) Judging from the subscription lists published each week in the Freeman's from July to October, over 4,000 Irishmen contributed an average of about 6/- each.\(^6\) Given the hostility which the appeal aroused,\(^7\) this figure indicates the existence of a substantial body of Irishmen for whom loyalty to Ireland's cause counted more than assimilation into colonial society. Lists of subscribers

\(^1\)F.J., 27 May 1869.
\(^2\)F.J., 5 June 1869.
\(^3\)Thomas O'Neil, the confectioner, and lay member on the board of the controversial Pitt Street South school was chairman. Other members included the butcher, Bernard Gaffney and the pawnbroker, John Speerin. (F.J., 12 June 1869.)
\(^4\)F.J., 5 June 1869. See also F.J., 19 June, 7 August 1869.
\(^5\)Some was received from Freeman's Journal subscribers in Queensland and New Zealand.
\(^6\)The approximate total collected was given towards the end of the collection. The average contribution is based on the subscriptions lists published in the Freeman's Journal, for six different weeks, selected randomly.
\(^7\)S.M.H., 18 September 1869; P.S., 19 June, 7 August 1869.
came from all parts of the colony, but convey the impression that contributions from the small country centres proportionately out-numbered those from the towns. Perhaps there were less social pressures against subscribing in these places. Very few men previously prominent in Irish or Catholic affairs subscribed. Many who did were clearly poor men and several collectors noted scornfully that fear of social ostracism prevented better-off Irishmen from contributing.\(^1\)

The fears of the more assimilated Irish increased when it was announced that most of the Fenian prisoners would spend a short time in Sydney before embarking for America or Ireland. The Victorian Government was partly responsible for this. Under pressure from that colony's more influential orange body it invoked an old law prohibiting ex-convicts from settling in Victoria, and forbade them permission to land.\(^2\) Attempts were made by the P.P.A. and the orangemen to pressure the Robertson Government into a similar refusal, but were unsuccessful.\(^3\) The ex-prisoners landed quietly in early October.\(^4\) A little later all hell broke loose.

O'Sullivan had already been teasing the colony's loyalists with eulogies on the American flag flown by the visiting U.S.S. 'Kearsage' ('the only flag in the world that flies over a really free people'), and reminders that the 'Kearsage' had vanquished 'the British pirate' (or Confederate cruiser)

\(^1\) For example, F.J., 3 July 1869. Similar criticism was later levelled at 'better off' Catholics for not giving enough to Catholic education. Some of the '40's generation' Irish, like O'Connor, who had been displaying signs of wishing to avoid controversy, found the pull of the cause too strong, and did some collecting.

\(^2\) F.J., 24 July 1869. It later relented and allowed them to stay a day, but they needed longer than that to obtain passage, and so sailed on to Sydney, F.J., 7 August 1869; Australasian, 7 August 1869.

\(^3\) Empire, 2 October 1869.

\(^4\) F.J., 9 October 1869.
'Alabama'.\(^1\) Three weeks later he and his committee announced that a picnic to welcome the ex-prisoners would be held at Clontarf. Orangemen were incensed and most colonists indignant.\(^2\) O'Sullivan admitted that the choice 'was political': it showed that 'we could not look on them as criminals and that we do not approve of the present condition of their native land'.\(^3\) The day that editorial appeared Robertson warned them that the Government would prohibit their picnic and asked them to desist.\(^4\) The next day, Sunday, an announcement was read in all Catholic churches condemning the picnic and urging Catholics not to attend.\(^5\) The picnic was cancelled. O'Sullivan wrote a letter to the Empire attacking the Catholic authorities for interfering in what was not a religious matter.\(^6\) He signed it with his own and the names of several other committee men, two of whom later apologised to the Vicar General, pleading ignorance of the letter's content.\(^7\) When his two co-proprietors found that he had prepared for publication an editorial attacking those who did not support his plans as 'flunkeys, loyalists and political traitors', they dismissed him.\(^8\) A little later members of his committee fell to acrimoniously fighting among themselves over what was to be done with a surplus of £50.\(^9\) The Irish cause did not fully

---

1 F.J., 27 August 1869. For a reaction see P.S., 29 August 1869.
2 See for example S.M.H., 16 October 1869; P.S., 16 October 1869.
3 F.J., 16 October 1869.
4 Halloran to O'Sullivan, 16 October 1869, published in Empire, 19 October 1869.
5 Empire, 18 October 1869.
6 F.J., 20 November, 4 December 1869.
8 Ibid.
9 F.J., 29 January, 5 February 1870.
recover for some years. O'Sullivan sold his share in the Freeman's and departed for California. 1

The purchaser of his share was Thomas Butler, the younger brother of Edward Butler, the ex-Young Irelander and ex-Crown Prosecutor, who had just been elected to the Legislative Assembly, where he assumed leadership of the Catholic group, such as it was. The tone of the Freeman's immediately became milder. It still displayed a typically Catholic paranoia on issues like education but did not seek to provoke feelings over that issue or over Ireland. Without O'Sullivan it lacked a writer with the skills to do that anyway. Within six months Butler, who was acting as editor, had bought complete control of both the paper and its press. 2 In 1872 Edward Rubie, a wealthy businessman and Cathedral Catholic was brought in as co-proprietor. 3 The arrangement lasted two years. In 1874 Butler entered into partnership with Michael McGirr, who took over the business side of the paper. 4

---

1 Where he became editor, and later part proprietor, of the Monitor, the San Francisco Irish Catholic paper. He studied law and was admitted to the bar within twelve months. He died ten years later. F.J., 1 January, 3 September 1870; Express, 21 February 1880.
2 N.S.W. Register of Newspapers, N.S.W. State Archives, 4/7819.
3 Rubie had commenced his career in the colony as a printer. Success had caused him to widen his business activities. He had been active in the Australasian Holy Catholic Guild from its foundation in 1845. He was chairman of the St Joseph Permanent and Benefit Building Society, and an initiator of the St Mary's Gold Mining Company, a gold mining venture whose profits were to help the St. Mary's Cathedral building fund. Rubie was the sort of wealthy Catholic on whom his Bishop could rely. He was one of the co-proprietors of the Express, Archbishop Vaughan's 1880 attempt to replace the Freeman's mouthpiece of the Catholic Church in the colony. Nevertheless, he displayed an interest in Irish affairs and in 1883 was one of the few Irishmen who risked public obloquy by welcoming Redmond to the colony. F.J., 23 October 1869, 28 September 1872, 18 July 1874, 24 February 1883.
4 Michael Mullins McGirr was the Bathurst school teacher whom Parkes had praised in 1867 and whose subsequent letter to Parkes had so embarrassed his Bishop. McGirr had developed business interests while teaching and in 1874 moved to Sydney to devote his attention to them. In 1876 he was a director of the Australian Building Society. A staunch Catholic, and by

Footnote continued on following page...
By this time the *Freeman's* had settled into a style it was to retain for a decade or more: defensive rather than paranoid, non-provactive, slightly snobbish. By and large it reflected the views of a respectable Irish-Catholic middle class.

The controversy surrounding the visit of the Fenian ex-prisoners provided the P.P.A. with a welcome opportunity to play on Protestant fears as elections approached. Simultaneously Henry Parkes provided them with further opportunity. In a speech opposing an assisted immigration bill introduced by Robertson, Parkes voiced the fears and the determination motivating members of the P.P.A.

He had no desire that his adopted country, the birth place of his children, should be converted into a province of the Pope in Rome.... He did not want to see the majority of the people of this colony of the Roman faith. He could not forget that he was of a nation that was essentially Protestant... and could not give consent to a scheme that would increase in undue proportion the influence of the Church of Rome.

The P.P.A. published his speech as a pamphlet and distributed 5,000 copies throughout the city.

Despite appearances, Parkes was not just playing to Protestant prejudices. Robertson's bill had been designed to do no more than give legislative sanction to existing administrative practice in providing government assistance to immigration, and Parkes had offered other objections of more substance than no-papery. Even that argument had some...
substance, for, as he pointed out, of the 20,000 assisted immigrants arriving in the colony between 1860 and 1867, 15,000 were Irishmen and 12,800 were Catholics. To the demographically naive it did in fact appear that in time the Catholic descendants of Irish settlers would predominate.1

Ever since the priestly attacks on him over the education act and the O'Farrell affair Parkes had brooded about the Irish-Catholic portion of the population.2 With other colonists he was disturbed by the priests' refusal to accept courses of action which appeared necessary to successfully harmonise the different races and creeds of the colony, and when the Irish themselves seemed inclined to agree with the priests he concluded that to continue to encourage their excessive immigration would only exacerbate the problem. As well, Parkes was still embittered about the attacks on his reputation which had culminated in Macleay's committee. His success in persuading the Assembly to reject Macleay's report had somewhat allayed that bitterness, but his ego and his sense of political responsibility both craved to have his actions favourably judged by that ultimate court: the electorate. Looming financial failure added a certain desperation to his moves. The no-popery remarks of his immigration speech were a product of that exaggeration he tended to display when he imagined his personal reputation was under attack, and of his desire for electoral support. The Protestant Political Association was the result of a collective reaction among a number of Protestants to that same assertion.

---

1 In fact, as has been noticed above p.10, the growth in the colony's population from immigration was minimal compared to its natural growth rate, and even the heavy predominance of Catholics among the immigrants could not much change the already existing proportions of the colony's population. During the seventies, in fact, the proportion of Catholics in population actually decreased.

2 He talked about nothing else when Stanley Leighton, the young English gentleman tourist interviewed him in his office in the middle of 1868. See Stanley Leighton, 'Extracts from a Journal, Australia, 1868', Vol.II, p.26, in A.N.L.
of Catholic intransigence that had Parkes as its main victim. It was natural that the P.P.A. should look to Parkes as a champion, and that he should welcome their approval and encouragement. He welcomed their support to the extent of indirectly accepting a small testimonial they raised after the Macleay committee affair, but he rebuffed attempts to have himself more closely identified with them. Both psychologically and politically they needed a hero, and Parkes needed support.

Parliament resumed on 28 September. Obstructionist tactics by the Opposition made it almost impossible for Robertson to push through legislation. Finally, on 19 November, he had the Governor dissolve the House and call an election. Government candidates attacked the Opposition's obstructionism as the cause of the election, but one had to be called, for the five year term of the Parliament elected 1864-5 ran out in January. It was the first time since responsible government that Parliament had run its full term.

A general election was what Davies and the P.P.A. had been waiting for. Municipal elections were held just prior to the colonial elections and gave them an opportunity to test their organisation. It proved effective. Two of the three retiring Catholic aldermen were opposed and both were defeated. P.P.A. strength was particularly evident in Fitzroy ward, in the East Sydney electorate. There the Catholic James Butler

---

1 He allowed it to be used to purchase for his wife the house in which she and his children were living. M.D. McLaurin, Sir Henry (Sydney, n.d. [1957]), p.67.

2 For example, when refusing to take the chair at a public meeting called to raise funds for the Protestant Hall, he wrote 'I have never thereto been identified with any political or religious body, and while I do not disguise from myself that a time may come when a conflict pertaining of a religious character may be inescapable from our political struggles, no one would regret more than I such a painful necessity'. Parkes to James Calder Jnr., 23 July 1869, Parkes Correspondence, A900, p.230.
was heavily defeated by the P.P.A. candidate Green.\textsuperscript{1} The 63 per cent turn out was one of the highest ever for a municipal election. The turn out in the other contested ward in the East Sydney electorate, where a P.P.A. man easily defeated a Protestant who had Catholic support, was also higher than usual. The victory of the P.P.A. man Bown over George Hurley in Philip ward in the West Sydney electorate was far less impressive, even though Hurley had campaigned very little.

The elections were fought very largely on local issues: road surfaces, water supplies, sewerage and the like. Sectarian appeals were absent and the results suggest the strength of the P.P.A.'s organisation.\textsuperscript{2}

The colonial elections were more dramatic. The absence of any significant policy difference between the Government and Opposition made it inevitable that symbolic appeals would be used. This was particularly the case in the two big city electorates of East and West Sydney, which were too big for personal considerations to carry the weight they did in the smaller country electorates where issues of broad policy were absent. Some attempts were made to polarise the elections around policy differences. The Government's intention of abolishing the ad valorem duties was thought by some to introduce the fiscal issue into the election,\textsuperscript{3} but most candidates at least theoretically agreed with the intention, and the presence of free traders like Parkes in tandem with the protectionist Martin made it impossible to divide the party leaders along fiscal lines. Halfway through the elections, J.B. Wilson, who had been Martin's Minister for

\textsuperscript{1}Green was not a member of the P.P.A., but he welcomed their support. He had support of his own as well, as he was something of a professional ward politician, able to attend orange and Irish celebrations without difficulty (for example, F.J., 25 October 1872; P.S., 20 July 1878).

\textsuperscript{2}As opposed to their propagandizing, which was publicly hardly used. For reports of the election campaigns and their results see Empire, 24, 26 and 30 November, 3 December 1869.

\textsuperscript{3}For example Empire, 27 November 1869; S.M.H., 3 December 1869.
Lands, gave a speech about the Opposition's land policy and the Empire and other Government supporters were able to get up a cry that the Land Act was in danger. ¹

Education was seen by many to be an issue. It was, but in a symbolic rather than a rational sense. No candidate wished to change the Public Schools Act, unless to make it more secular, and while some candidates vaguely thought that the Act 'might be better administered' it was clear that it was in no danger whatever the composition of the Parliament that was returned. Before the election there had been calls for its amendment from a few Catholic priests and their spokesmen, but these merely served to demonstrate their isolation from public opinion. ² Quite early in the election the Sydney Vicar General, Sheehy, disavowed any desire on the part of the Church to have the Act changed. ³ Yet 'the education act in danger' was a major cry in the city and some country electorates and was linked with other slogans that conjured up a spectre of ecclesiastical government and associated it with the Robertson Government. Government supporters, particularly W.B. Dally in several brilliant speeches, ridiculed the idea, and pointed to Protestant champions like Lang and Sutherland on the Government side, but for those who wanted mainly to cast a vote against the priests, such rational appeals were of little avail. It was enough that the priests supported Robertson

¹*Empire*, 17 December 1869.


³*S.M.H.*, 24 November 1869. Sheehy did have general criticisms to make of the way the Act was administered. Parkes replied and challenged Sheehy to be more specific. The *Herald* thought it would be a proper contest, but Sheehy declined, *S.M.H.*, 26 November 1869.
and opposed Parkes.

The indiscretion of a priest in Yass a little before the first polling provided anti-Catholics with supporting evidence. It was widely reported in the Sydney press that Fr Duigan had told a meeting in Yass that 'he and his Vicar General could put up a man who would oppose the Public Schools Act and the Council of Education' and had promised that David Buchanan would be greeted with rotten eggs if he had the temerity to stand for Yass.¹ The Protestant Standard in an attempt to arouse Protestant indignation published extracts from a scurrilous London Catholic Truth Society pamphlet on John Knox, which it claimed was being circulated among the Catholics in the city.²

Apart from ridiculing its premises, the Robertson-Cowper faction attempted to counter this exercise in paranoid politics by blaming Parkes and Martin for destroying the social harmony of the country and by invoking their own direct descent from the great liberal party that had won for the colony manhood suffrage, the secret ballot and the land laws and had abolished state aid. The decision of the veteran politician Charles Cowper to come out of retirement and stand for East Sydney, which had returned him in the past three elections, was part of this attempt to evoke the past, and his failure indicated the strength of the new forces at work in the electorate.³

The campaign in the city, particularly in East Sydney was a rowdy one. Parkes was a particular object of vituperation

¹See S.M.H., 23 November 1869; P.S., 27 November 1869 for comment on the remarks. The Yass Courier, 19 November 1867 has a full account of the meeting where the remarks were uttered. For Duigan tried to deny that the remarks were meant to be taken seriously, and claimed they had been offered privately, after the meeting had concluded, but several others at the meeting denied this. (Yass Courier, 30 November 1869.)
²P.S., 4 December 1869.
³This was the opinion of the Maitland Mercury, 4 December 1869.
for a group of largely Irish rowdies who attended his meetings and attempted to howl him down. On these occasions Parkes gave as good as he got, making references to their priest encouraged ignorance and threatening them with the Treason Felony Act. ¹ He devoted most of his speeches, however, to cataloguing the Government's faults over a large range of issues. ² It was left to David Buchanan, the volatile Scotsman, who had just returned from two years in England, to give the fullest expression to no-papery during and after the campaign.

Buchanan was the third member of the P.P.A. bunch. The first two were Parkes and Martin, each of whom had been persuaded to stand for East Sydney (they were also standing for other seats) by a requisition of over 2,000 names organised by the P.P.A. ³ The P.P.A., particularly Davies, Carter and Armstrong, arranged all their meetings and organised hundreds of voters on polling day. It devoted its greatest effort to the East Sydney election. John Davies was not unaware that if successful it would not only be a victory for Parkes and Protestantism, but for John Davies as well.

The Government gathered together a bunch of four candidates for East Sydney: Cowper; J.H. Neale, a Scots Methodist butcher with squatting interests who was a retiring member; ⁴ Julian Salomons, a Jewish barrister; and George King, a company director who was widely regarded as representing the mercantile interest. ⁵ Of these only King, who began campaigning as an independent, mounted anything like a significant campaign, using, among others, the rump of the

¹ See for example the report of the nominations in Empire, 3 December 1869.
² See for example reports of his speeches in Empire, 30 November, 2 December 1869.
³ Empire, 30 November 1869.
⁴ S.M.H., 12 June 1868; F.J., 20 April 1872. Neale was an active temperance advocate as well, S.M.H., 8 July 1868.
⁵ F.J., 11 December 1869.
orange faction which had supported Cowper-Robertson candidates in the past.¹ King was also supported by a few of the Irish ward politicians like John Hourigan, but most of the 'forties generation' Irish were absent from the campaign.² One of them, James Hart, who had won one of the East Sydney seats in 1864 announced his candidature and then withdrew. It was said he had done so in order to avoid provoking the extra sectarian hostility that a genuine Irish Catholic candidate would attract.³ Other Irish Catholic organisers might have lain low for similar reasons.

Polling day for the East Sydney election was less rowdy than many had feared, and the troops who had been kept in the barracks under arms were not required.⁴ A group of City Council workmen downed tools and ran, jeering, after Parkes who was forced to shelter in a shop, but there were no reports of any violence.⁵ Interest in the election was intense and a crowd of up to 20,000 waited at the hustings for the declaration of the poll. Partly because of the fear of demonstrations this was not made until the next morning, when the crowd had largely dispersed, but Parkes announced the unofficial results that evening to a huge crowd which had gathered outside Punch's hotel, where his committee rooms were. 'Cowper's beaten', he cried, at which the crowd yelled triumphantly. He himself had topped the poll easily. Martin was second, followed by Buchanan. King filled fourth place. Martin had been campaigning in Newcastle and had the same day been defeated there. Jubiland supporters, led by Parkes, gathered at the wharf where his steamer was due, and as he stepped ashore to their cheers a band played 'Hail the

¹ For example, Benjamin James who chaired one of King's meetings at Jacob Blakes, Robin Hood Hotel, Empire, 27 November 1869. See also Empire, 26 November 1869.
² Empire, 26 November 1869.
³ S.M.H., 3 December 1869.
⁴ Empire, 6 December 1869.
⁵ F.J., 11, 25 December 1869.
Conquering Hero Comes'.

It had been a triumph for the P.P.A.. Robertson admitted that the superior organisation of the Opposition had carried the day. The Herald also referred to the importance of the organisation supporting Parkes, but argued that it was above all a personal victory for Parkes, and for the Public Schools Act as well. The P.P.A. was less successful in the West Sydney election. Joseph Wearne, the leading member of their bunch topped the poll, but the second place was filled by John Robertson. The P.P.A. supported candidates, Windeyer and the orange alderman, Speer filled third and fourth place. Geoffrey Eager, the fourth of the P.P.A. bunch came in sixth, behind Willie Campbell, the other Government candidate.

Anti-Catholicism was a less successful issue in the countryside. The country electorates voted heavily against those identified with the Martin Government. In Newcastle Martin took the opportunity of some rash remarks by the local parish priest to whip up some anti-Catholic support, but was easily beaten by the Congregationalist and independent, Lloyd. Nevertheless, the Maitland Mercury opined that it might have

1 S.M.H., 4, 6, December 1869; Empire, 4, 6, December 1869; E.W. O'Sullivan, 'From Colony to Commonwealth', MSS in M.L., p.76.
2 Fifty seven per cent of the registered voters voted, which was 8-10 per cent more than polls in 1860, 1864 and 1872. S.M.H., 11 December 1869.
3 S.M.H., 4 December 1869.
4 S.M.H., 10 December 1869. It is probable that the P.P.A. did not organise this electorate as thoroughly as East Sydney, and left a lot of the task to the orange lodges, which seemed to begin the elections independently of the P.P.A., and at a meeting decided to ask Buchanan, who was already standing for East Sydney, to run in the West. (Empire, 27 November 1869). At that meeting they decided to run Speer as well. At the declaration Speer singled out the orangemen for special thanks, but did not mention the P.P.A. (Empire, 11 December 1869.)
5 The priest, Fr Kenyon, who had been something of a firebrand when stationed in Sydney, was reported to have warned his parishioners not to vote for the men who 'would encroach upon our rights as Christians in the honour of our holy religion... (and) who would throw open the doors of our blessed sisterhood, the nunneries to the vulgar gaze and inspection of the curious'. Newcastle Chronicle, 2 December 1869. See also P.S., 4 December 1869.
done him some good, for, as a protectionist and a champion of
the southern over the northern railway line he polled rather
better than might have been expected. 1 He was strongly
supported by the previous member, the local businessman,
James Hannell. 2 The feeling against the old Martin
Government was particularly strong all over the northern
area. When the one time champion of the working man, David
Buchanan visited the heavily Protestant mining electorate of
Northumberland on behalf of a Martin candidate, the miners
took to him with rotten eggs and stones. 3 In the Hunter,
the sitting member J.F. Burns was defeated by the twenty-one
year old Catholic solicitor John Dillon, but local
dissatisfaction with Burns, stemming from his support for
Martin was a more potent reason for his defeat than any
Catholic opposition to his support for the Public Schools
Act. 4 In the Patricks Plains electorate the retiring member
J.B. Wilson attempted to use anti-Catholic slogans to whip up
support, but he, too, was repudiated by the electorate. 5

In some cases where the sectarian cry was raised it was
simply used to supply a local squabble with a dimension of
national significance. 6 Even where Catholic candidates stood
for country electorates that had P.P.A. branches, such as
Fallon for the Hume (Albury), and Dillon for the Hunter, the
anti-Catholic cry was of little significance and was

1 Maitland Mercury, 7 December 1869.
2 D. O'Donnell, 'The Political and Municipal Contributions of
James Hannell 1856-1876' (M.A. Thesis, University of
Newcastle, 1969), pp.192-208.)
3 Empire, 13 December 1869. The description of Buchanan
comes from R.B. Walker, 'David Buchanan: Chartist, Radical,
4 Maitland Mercury, 18 December 1869.
5 Empire, 30 December 1869; F.J., 1 January 1870.
6 As at West Maitland, in the campaign against D. Liddle.
P.S., 4, 18 December 1869.
repudiated by other Protestants. Even where a Catholic was
defeated, as was Egan at Eden, the reason can be more easily
found in the fact that he was not a local man, and was
opposed on that occasion by Henry Clarke, who had large land
holdings in the area.

Despite considerable discussion about it, there does not
seem to have been a particularly important 'Catholic vote'.
The claim that it existed in significant proportions was
made exclusively by those who had a vested interest in
conjuring up images of disciplined Irish hordes for their own
electoral advantage. A candidate who evinced strong anti-
Catholicism might well have lost a lot of Catholic support,
but there is no reason to suggest it went solidly to another
candidate. Many may just have not voted. The absence of
activity among Irish-Catholic organisers in East Sydney, for
example may have been caused in a number of cases by a
disinclination to work for Martin whom they had previously
supported. That some priests, in Irish fashion, attempted to
influence their congregations is undeniable, but their
noticeable lack of success in influencing the course of

---

1 For example, see Border Post, 22 December 1869. In the
Hume, as at West Maitland local squabbles were given wide
significance by the introduction of the sectarian issue. The
second Albury paper, the Albury Banner was the main source of
anti-Catholicism in the campaign against Fallon, and was
repudiated by his opposing candidate, Mate. (Border Post,
29 December 1869.)

2 There is reason to believe that Fr Kenyon was not the only
priest who advised his congregation in that election. A
letter from Dean Hanly in Yass to Fr M'Encroe (1 February
1866, M'Encroe papers, S.A.A.) throws light on some priestly
tactics, this time in a ministerial re-election in February
1866: 'I think there is not the least doubt of Isaacs
election. His friends are those who gave Mr Faucett such a
large majority. All the Catholics and the most influential
and the best of the Protestants. Fr McAlroy spoke to the
people at Grabinen Gullen last Sunday, and he will advise
those at Gunning next Sunday .... The Wesleyans and Jews have
been so often and so well beaten that it is a wonder they
again came to the scratch.' Isaacs won, but it was rare
for someone to be beaten in a ministerial re-election. He
had been elected in a by-election only a few months before.
colonial politics suggests that the electors who were swayed exclusively by that influence were few.

The only significant violence in the election occurred in the southern gold fields town of Araluen, in the Braidwood electorate. There, the sitting member, Michael Kelly, a Braidwood storekeeper who had been elected in a by-election earlier in the year, was opposed by Edward Greville, a Sydney merchant and newspaper proprietor. Kelly was a supporter of the Public Schools Act, but an Irishman, while Greville was incorrectly rumoured to be a P.P.A. candidate. The Irish diggers at Araluen determined to prevent all but known Kelly supporters from voting, and on polling day they surrounded the two polling booths and by threats and force turned away those of whom they did not approve. The only policeman in the town was powerless and one of the booths was forced to close early. Next day voting was opened again and a squad of police, including mounted troopers, was on hand to preserve order. The Irish were kept away from the polling area, but armed with staves, they prowled in small groups along the several roads, leading to the polls, intimidating would be Greville voters unless they themselves were forced to flee by police. ¹ Kelly was elected, but the election was overturned and a new one held in October 1870. By this time branches of the P.P.A. had been formed in Araluen and Braidwood, and on polling day the Protestants of the district formed up 400 strong outside the Araluen Oddfellows hall, intending to march in force to the polls. They did, but not before a large body of police had searched them and confiscated a number of revolvers. Overawed by Protestant and police power the Irish remained quiet. This time Greville was victorious. ²

The 1869 election resulted in a victory for the Robertson faction. He himself was unable to savour it, as insolvency

¹ S.M.H., 13, 21 December 1869; Empire, 21 December 1869; P.S., 25 December 1869.
² P.S., 12 February 1870; S.M.H., 15, 18, 19 October 1870; T. & C.J., 1, 8, 15, 22 October 1870; F.J., 22 October 1870.
forced him to vacate his seat and Charles Cowper formed a
government. A number of new and fairly independent members
made it difficult for Cowper to govern and in 1870 he
retired to the post of Colonial Agent-General in London.
Martin formed a government with the support of Robertson, who
had returned to Parliament, and a section of the old Cowper-
Robertson faction. The Parliament returned in 1869 was one
of remarkably small achievement. The elections helped
restore the confidence of Henry Parkes, who was returned for
his old seat of Kiama, as well as for East Sydney. He became
far less provocative in his views than he had been during the
previous twelve months. Like Robertson he went through the
insolvency courts during 1870, and was out of Parliament for
a large part of that year and most of 1871. His absence from
the public arena served to lessen hostility to him and paved
the way for his successful allegiance with some of the Catholic
politicians in 1872.

The election gave a great fillip to the Protestant
Political Association. Although their anti-Catholic
propaganda was not completely successful electorally, it
stimulated many Protestant electors to seek the protection of
the Association. Fifteen new branches were opened within two
months of the election. The old executive was triumphantly
elected for a new term of office, and viewed the future with
some confidence. In April the P.P.A. held a picnic at
Clontarf. Over 6,000 attended, including Parkes, Eagar,

1Loveday and Martin, Parliament Factions and Parties, p.50.
2See for example his speech from the hustings at the
declaration of the East Sydney poll (S.M.H., 6 December 1869)
or his speech on immigration a couple of months later (S.M.H.,
25 January 1870).
3Parkes, Fifty Years in the Making of Australian History, pp.
211-25.
4Report of George Carter to P.P.A. meeting, S.M.H., 18
January 1870. Carter probably meant that 15 applications for
new branches had been received; some, such as those at
Braidwood and Araluen, were not opened until February.
5P.S., 4 January 1870.
Buchanan, Windeyer and Wilson. It had a two fold purpose: to raise funds for the Protestant Standard, and to help Parkes pay the costs of D'Arcy Murray's successful libel action. In December Belmore described them as 'the only well organised political association in the Colony'.

The most important consequence of the election was the breaking down of the liberal-nativist taboo on sectarian comment. This was largely a consequence of the weakening of the taboo in society over the previous three years. The failure of Cowper's, Robertson's and Dalley's attempts to evoke the anti-sectarianism of the liberal ideology and use it against the sectarianism of their opponents could not have succeeded. Their use of it as a party cry against Parkes during the previous two years indicated and also accelerated its weakening influence. Social restraints on sectarianism did not completely disappear, but they had been loosened enough to allow sectarianism to become a common if varying feature of all subsequent elections and to permit the rapid growth of orangeism during the 1870s.

---

1 P.S., 23 April 1870.
2 No. 2 L.O.L., minute book, entry for April 1870; P.S., 23 April 1870.
3 Belmore to Kimberley, 26 December 1870 (confidential), C.O., 201/559, f.393.
The eighteen seventies saw the full emergence and consolidation of a sectarian Protestant subculture. This was matched by an expansion of sectarian Catholicism, so that by the end of the decade there existed two large and mutually antagonistic subcultures tending to polarise society between Catholics and Protestants. Only on some occasions, such as during the controversy surrounding the 1880 education act did such a polarisation actually occur, but fluctuating sectarian tensions remained a feature of colonial life and exerted an influence on subsequent generations.

The years 1870-76 saw a prodigious rise in the membership of the Loyal Orange Institution. At the end of 1869 it had about 2,500 members in 28 lodges. By December 1876 there were 19,000 orangemen in 130 lodges. This was about 15 per cent of that portion of the population, Protestant males over seventeen, who could belong to it. It never again achieved this remarkable degree of participation. Membership climbed slightly to about 20,000 in 1877 but tapered off a little over the next two years. It climbed again from 1880 to 1882, when the highest ever figure of 25,000 was reached. After fluctuating between 20 and 25,000 for another four or five years, it gradually declined.¹

¹ These figures for orange membership are approximate, and mostly based on occasional statements by orange leaders reported in the Protestant Standard. It is to be expected that they would be given to exaggeration, but not unduly so. For the period up to 1876 a rough check exists. From mid-1871
Three factors interacted to bring about the spectacular rise in the 1870s: the noticeable weakening of the anti-sectarian ideology in the 1869 election; the firming of the identification between orangeism and evangelical Protestantism; and the organisational skills of Stephen Styles Goold, Grand Master of the Institution from 1870 to 1875.

After a year of negligible growth in 1869, over 1,500 joined the Orange Institution in 1870. Twenty-three new lodges were opened during the year, most of them in country districts. The sectarianism generated by the 1869 election created an atmosphere favourable to the growth of orangeism. This was particularly true of the districts where the sectarian issue had been emphasised during the campaign. In February orange lodges were reported to be 'increasing wonderfully' in the Newcastle district, and a long

Footnote continued from previous page

the Protestant Standard published weekly reports of the monthly meetings of five or six orange lodges. These mostly gave figures for numbers initiated at that meeting. By averaging these figures out over a month and by multiplying by the number of lodges in existence that month, one can arrive at an approximate figure for numbers joining the Orange Institution in that month. When this is averaged out over a year and added to a running total, that total is not far behind the figures given by orange leaders at any specific time. By December 1876 it came to 18,900, while the figure given by the Grand Master, Richard McCoy, in July that year is 20,000. I have chosen the more conservative estimate to calculate the proportion of the eligible population in an orange lodge. The figure for the Protestant male population over 17 is calculated by obtaining a proportion of Protestant males over 17 (39.4 per cent) from the 1871 census and by assuming the proportion is the same in 1876, when only a figure for the total population, itself only a projection, is given by the Statistical Register. Strictly speaking, a candidate for admission to an orange lodge had to be over eighteen (Loyal Orange Institution of N.S.W., Laws and Regulations (Sydney, 1868), p.16), but I have come across some instances of 17 year olds being admitted, and suspect that the regulation may frequently have been waived.

1P.S., 12 February 1870.
correspondence was conducted in the Newcastle Chronicle concerning them. Those who opposed their growth argued that orangeism was vicious, bigoted and Irish. Their supporters affirmed its synonymity with evangelical Protestantism. ¹ Pro-orange correspondents claimed that most leading citizens had joined the Institution during the previous month. That was certainly an exaggeration, but James Hannell was one prominent resident who proudly announced his membership in April 1870. ²

Quite a number of the new orange lodges were opened in or around Sydney,³ but more were opened in country districts in the colony usually as a direct result of tours by the newly elected Grand Master, Stephen Styles Goold. Goold, a native of Wiltshire, had emigrated to New South Wales in 1841, aged 24. A painter and glazier by occupation he had achieved success as a building contractor and by the late 1860s owned several houses which provided him a moderate income. He had been a member of the Orange Institution since the late 1840s but had not been particularly active in it until stirred by the attempted assassination in 1868. He joined the newly formed P.P.A. at the same time. Goold was a prominent lay preacher in the Primitive Methodist Connexion and a trustee of their Kent Street Chapel, which, early in 1869, became the orangemen's main city meeting place. Goold brought four

¹ Newcastle Chronicle, 19, 24, 2 February, 5, 10, 19 March 1870.
² P.S., 23 April 1870. See also O'Donnell, 'The Politics... of James Hannell', pp.142-46. Hannell was born in Parramatta in 1813 of convict parents who moved to Newcastle not long after. Following a short career in the police force he opened a hotel and gradually diversified his business interests, entering particularly into land speculation. Active in municipal politics in the 1850s (elected Mayor for the first time in 1859), he was returned to the Legislative Assembly in 1860 and 1864. He was a trustee of the Anglican Christ Church Cathedral during the 1860s. See O'Donnell, ibid., pp.1-29, and The Christ Church Cathedral Controversy 1861-1866 (Newcastle, 1967), passim.
³ For example, Randwick (No.41) opened on 30 September (P.S., 8 October 1870); Bringelly (a little to the west of Liverpool) (No.43) on 3 November (P.S., 19 November 1870); Leichhardt (No.44) on 14 December (P.S., 24 December 1870).
important attributes to the position of Grand Master. He was English, a prominent member of an evangelical denomination and a practiced speaker and sermoniser. As well, his financial independence allowed him to donate a considerable amount of time to orange activities. Early in 1870 he visited the southern districts, including Braidwood and Araluen, and in July he made a quick trip to Bathurst and the western goldfields, opening orange lodges and establishing P.P.A. branches and agencies for the Protestant Standard. In summing up his first year as Grand Master, Goold was able proudly to boast that not only had 23 new lodges been started, almost doubling the number that had existed previously, but he himself had been present at the opening of 20 of them.

Evidence that the Orange Institution was beginning, by 1870, to lose its Irish connotations was given by the number of young men of native birth and upbringing who were becoming members. Of strict evangelical upbringing, many became mainstays of the Institution in subsequent decades, and held important positions in colonial society. They included John Wheeler, Grand Master of the Institution for eighteen years, an M.L.A., and, for many years, chairman of the Local Government Conference; S.E. Lees, a member of the Grand Lodge during the seventies M.L.A., M.L.C., and Lord Mayor of Sydney; and Thomas Jessep, Grand Master in 1889 and 1915, a Sydney alderman, M.L.A., and, for many years chairman of directors of the N.S.W. Fruit Exchange.

1 He was also something of a singer and during his period as Grand Master usually led off the religious celebration on twelfth of July with hymns, frequently composed for the occasion (for example by Zachary Barry, P.S., 19 July 1873). When defeated by Goold for Phillip ward in 1870 George Hurley, by way of explanation, remarked that 'Mr Goold was of course a good speaker. It was his trade' (F.J., 10 December 1870).
2 P.S., 12 February 1870.
3 P.S., 16 July 1870. The P.P.A. seems to have been employing him in some way as their agent (P.S., 7 January 1871).
4 P.S., 25 February 1871.
5 For more biographical details of these three men see Appendix IIc.
The association between orangeism and evangelical Protestantism received its greatest publicity during 1871. The growing strength of the organisation naturally attracted an increasing amount of criticism, and the Grand Lodge requested their greatest publicist, the Rev. John McGibbon to answer it. McGibbon did so in a lecture delivered in the Masonic Hall on 19 June 1871. Entitled 'Orangeism and its Slanderers', the lecture lucidly, if incorrectly, described the origin and principles of the orange organisation and rebutted the major criticisms levelled at it.

McGibbon ignored the rural disorder of late eighteenth century Ulster which was the real birthplace of the Orange Institution and painted a picture of more noble origin. The orange movement, he proclaimed, was directly descended from the original Orange Confederacy (Russell, Shrewsbury, Danby, Sydney and the rest) who had encouraged William of Orange to invade England and throw the papist James II from the throne in 1688. Its objects then were its objects now: 'to defend the Protestant religion, and to maintain the laws and liberties...of England'. Out of these central objects, McGibbon argued, arose the four major characteristics of an orangeman. These were perfectly expressed in the orange rule book and could be summarised by saying that an orangeman was religious, moral, loyal and neighbourly.

McGibbon elaborated each of these characteristics in turn, quoting liberally from the Laws and Regulations of the Institution. The religion of an orangeman was that common Protestant religion 'in which Episcopacy and Presbytery, Wesleyan and Baptist are perfectly agreed'. As the rules put it, an orangeman possessed above all 'a steadfast faith in Jesus Christ, the Saviour of Mankind, believing in him as the only mediator between God and Man' (McGibbon's emphases). The morality of an orangeman 'was that of the New Testament'. It

---

1 The first third of his speech was devoted to chronicling the terrible evils of James's reign.
knew nothing of the conditional morality of Catholicism and its many mechanisms, such as the confessional, for making sin and wickedness easy. Again he quoted the rules: 'An orangeman should cultivate truth and justice, brotherly kindness and charity....' An orangeman was loyal but not in the way a slave was loyal, from fear of his master's retribution. His loyalty was that of men 'who have assented to laws, who own the supremacy and majesty of the law, and whose right to have free and liberal government have been won as a price of their forefathers blood'. Finally, an orangeman was neighbourly. He distinguished between the members and the system of Roman Catholicism. The latter he hated and opposed at all costs, but the former he treated at all times with charity. As the rules put it, the Orange Institution refused membership to 'persons of intolerant and persecuting spirit, who would injure and upbraid any man whatever for his religious opinions' (McGibbon's emphases). It could be seen from all this, McGibbon concluded, that orangeism was nothing like the bigoted, unchristian, secretive organisation that its detractors described.

McGibbon's lecture was a great success. It was published as a pamphlet and 1500 copies were distributed immediately. A second printing followed within a month. It was noted by the doughty old Anglican controversialist, Alexander Gordon, who devoted two long letters to countering it. In the first of these he described the banning of the orange organisation by the House of Commons in 1835 and in the second quoted a large number of authorities hostile to orangemen. The letters elicited renewed defences of orangeism. Two were from expected

1 It did not receive much notice in the daily press: the Herald gave it only a short and sarcastic report. (S.M.H., 20 June 1871.)
2 Rev. J. McGibbon, Orangeism and its slanderers: a lecture by the Reverend Dr McGibbon.... (Sydney, 1871).
3 It was printed a third time during 1873 and again in 1881.
4 S.M.H., 15, 27 July 1871.
sources: Zachary Barry and John Stewart, but a third was from a respected Anglican attorney, William Barker, who claimed to know little about orangeism, but found Gordon's arguments unconvincing. His two letters showed him to be an Anglican of moderately evangelical persuasion, clearly disturbed by the inroads ritualism was making into the Church of England, and thus favourably disposed to orangeism, which he saw as no more than virile Protestantism. A month later Barker was given a heroes welcome at a soirée to celebrate the 25 anniversary of the No. 1 Lodge. He indicated that he might soon become an orangeman.

The definitive reply to Gordon was delivered by McGibbon in another public lecture on 31 August. McGibbon had mentioned in his original lecture the banning of the Orange Institution by the House of Commons in 1835 and had argued that it was a result of weak politicians succumbing to the unexpected power of Daniel O'Connell. In his lecture he elaborated this point at considerable length and conjured up fearful images of priest driven Irish hordes as well. Published as a pamphlet it ran to two editions before the end of the year.

The orange cause was further publicised that year by the appearance of another pamphlet on the origins of orangeism. It was by the Irish born policeman, George Hudson Sparkes, who had only that year arrived in the colony from New Zealand.

1 S.M.H., 19 July 1871.
2 S.M.H., 18, 26 July 1871.
3 P.S., 9 September 1871. The Sydney Punch thought Barker might have had his eye on the next election (quoted, F.J., 22 July 1871). He stood for East Sydney on an orange ticket in 1872 (F.J., 12 February 1872). For another critical review of the correspondence, particularly sharp with John Stewart, who considered himself something of a free-thinker, see Australia's Free Religious Press, 7 August 1871.
4 This time the Herald gave him much fuller coverage. S.M.H., 1 September 1871.
5 [J. McGibbon], Orangeism vs Mr Gordon (Sydney, n.d. [1817]). Both editions of the pamphlet are in the Ferguson Collection in the A.N.L.
Sparkes, like McGibbon, argued that orangeism began with William III, but, appropriately for an Irishman, devoted more attention to describing William's battles in Ireland. His pamphlet had been written some years before and was revised for colonial publication by Zachary Barry, who added a short concluding section on the origins of colonial orangeism.

This was rather inaccurate, and paid little attention to Richard McGuffin who had organised the first non-military orange meeting in the colony. Early in the next year McGuffin published a small pamphlet of his own to set the record straight. Wazir Beg also joined in the mid 1871 controversy, publishing, as a justification of orangeism, a pamphlet entitled The Pope as Political Chief, or Popery as a Political System.

During the 1870s the twelfth of July continued as the main feast day in the orange calendar, but nowhere was the transformation of the Institution so clearly demonstrated as

1G.H. Sparkes was born in Ireland. He served in the Royal Irish Constabulary and later in the British Army, in which he saw action in the New Zealand Maori Wars. Leaving the army in New Zealand he worked as a policeman and then left for Australia under a cloud. He arrived in Sydney early in 1871, and after two years service with the police force, he found work as a storeman, first with John Frazer and Company and later at Montefiori's where, by the mid 1880s, he had become head storeman. He settled in Camperdown soon after arriving in the colony and eventually became an alderman in the Camperdown Municipal Council. Stewart, Early History, p.40; V & P (LA NSW), 1883 (1) 465; V & P (LA NSW) 1885/6 (2) 127.


3Not surprisingly, since Barry himself had only been in New South Wales since 1865.


5The pamphlet was given a long review in the Presbyterian, July 1871. It would seem that no copy has survived. I have not been able to find it in any library and it is not mentioned in Ferguson. It comprised largely of quotations from various Catholic writers of past centuries 'illustrating the monstrous pretensions of the Romanists to exercise temporal as well as spiritual domination over mankind'.
in the changed format of this celebration. Orangemen were commanded by their rules to attend divine worship on 12 July and 5 December. During the late 1860s some clergymen had held special services in their churches on those days, but a number were coming to think it desirable for orangemen to worship together, at least on the twelfth. In July 1871 Zachary Barry attempted to obtain the use of St Andrew's Cathedral for special religious service, but, not surprisingly, was refused permission. The twelfth of July that year was celebrated in the usual fashion, with a dinner and a ball. The venue was the Exhibition Building, the largest hall in the city. Over 1,000 guests attended. This form of celebration was coming under increased criticism. In the following week two Methodists criticised, in the Herald, the dancing at the celebration and pointed out that dancing was strictly forbidden to Methodists. The official Methodist paper, the Christian Advocate and Wesleyan Record also criticised the dancing, while at the same time praising orangeism in general. The following year, 1872, saw a radical break with the dinner-dance tradition. The Exhibition Building was again the venue, but the celebration took the form of a soiree (light refreshments, no alcohol). Hymns were sung, and ministers of every Protestant denomination addressed the gathering. The only things retained from the old celebration were the long report on the progress of the Institution during the year and the procession of orangemen in regalia around the Hall. It began at six-thirty and was

---

1In the latter case 'in thanksgiving for God's gracious deliverance of the Protestant Parliament from the intended Popish destruction by gunpowder'. Loyal Orange Institution of New South Wales, Laws and Regulations (Sydney, 1868), p.11.

2P.S., 8 July 1871.


4S.M.H., 20, 21 July 1871.

5C.A.W.R., 1 August 1871.
all over at ten o'clock. The changed format clearly proved popular, as between 4,000 to 5,000 attended.¹

The procedure was repeated again in 1873 to a slightly larger audience. In 1874 the twelfth fell on a Sunday and the celebration was split into two. An exclusively religious celebration was held at the Exhibition Building on the Sunday and hymns were sung and sermons given by a number of clergymen on themes pertinent to the occasion. The next day the Exhibition Building was the venue for a more secular celebration. Due to numbers attending no refreshments could be provided, and it consisted of little more than a report, some addresses (again, mostly by clergymen), songs (popular-respectable and patriotic) and the procession. Over 5,000 attended each celebration.² The dual celebration of the twelfth of July was repeated in following years. The 'secular' ceremony was usually held on the twelfth, and a religious service on the nearest Sunday.

Numbers attending the ceremony continued to increase. Over 8,000 attended each of the 1875 celebrations and even more in 1876. Numbers declined somewhat in 1877 but were back at 8,000 in 1878. 10,000 attended the religious service in 1879, and in 1880, under the impact of the storm aroused by the Catholic bishops' pastoral and the new education act, over 12,000 attended each service. Highest attendance was reached in 1882 when a reported 15,000 packed into the Exhibition Building. For the rest of the 1880s numbers reportedly remained at between 8-12,000.³ These twelfth of July celebrations functioned largely as the main social function for the Sydney orangemen. The speeches were reported in the Protestant press, but rarely heard by more than half the audience because of the appalling acoustics of

¹P.S., 20 July 1872; T. & C.J., 20 July 1872.
²P.S., 18 July 1873; T. & C.J., 18 July 1873.
³These figures are extracted from reports of the celebration in appropriate editions of the Herald and the Protestant Standard.
the Exhibition Building. For many it was an occasion to show off regalia, renew acquaintances and enjoy the martial (if somewhat incongruous) spectacle of the procession. Admission was one-and-six per head.

The only break with the puritan mode of celebration occurred in 1878. The two usual gatherings were held in the Exhibition Building, but a dinner and a ball were also held at the Protestant Hall. Permission for these had been granted by the Grand Lodge, which was that year under the Grand Mastership of Alderman William Kippax, who had been a prominent member of the Institution as early as the 1860s. Other political orangemen, such as Davies, Carter and Aldermen Chapman, Green, Taylor and Carpenter were present. An attempt to organise a similar celebration in 1879 was firmly forbidden by the new Grand Master, Henry Hicks, a staunch Methodist. Hicks was indignant that a day as holy as the twelfth of July should be celebrated by something as profane as a dance.

The rising status and increasing respectability of orangemen during the early 1870s was nowhere more clearly demonstrated than in the political fortunes of the Grand Master, Stephen Styles Goold. Fifty-two when elected to the position Goold had not, before 1868, been active in public life. Late in 1870 he was elected for Philip ward to the Municipal Council, a position he held until his death in 1876. In 1871 he was appointed a magistrate of the City of Sydney and in 1874 he was elected Mayor. At the end of 1874 he successfully contested the seat of Mudgee for the Legislative Assembly. Goold's electoral successes were a result of effective P.P.A. and orange organising, and his

---

1 The Protestant Standard often complained of the acoustics (e.g. P.S., 19 July 1873). For a somewhat irreverent account of a twelfth of July celebration see a long article by 'Pasquin' in F.J., 17 July 1880.
2 P.S., 20 July 1878.
3 P.S., 21, 28 June, 12 July 1879.
4 Apart from successful agitation in the 1850s for some improvements to Botany Road, Waterloo, where he owned several houses. (S.M.H., 25 November 1970.)
magistracy a reward from a grateful James Martin for the
electoral support the orange lodges were able to provide.
His career partly exemplified the way the orange society won
at least partial respect by its political effectiveness.
Nevertheless, despite the origins of his success, Goold acted
in public life responsibly and without prejudice. He died on
28 August 1876. His funeral indicated some of the
contradictions as well as the achievements of his past eight
years. Although a committed Primitive Methodist for most of
his life, he was buried by Zachary Barry according to the
rites of the Anglican Church. Over 1,000 people attended
the graveside and his pall bearers included the Premier, the
Speaker and the Mayor of Sydney. At the close of the
service the Primitive Methodist choir sang 'Safe in the Arms
of Jesus'.

Those who succeeded Goold as Grand Master were also
respectable, moderately successful men, able, if not always
willing, to utilise the political advantages extended to them
by their office. Richard McCoy became Grand Master in 1876
and held the position for two years. Born in County
Fermanagh, Ireland, he had come with his parents to the colony
in 1845 while still a boy. He had begun his career as a
bootmaker in partnership with his brother, but by the 1880s
was a large-scale importer of boots and other leather goods.

1S.M.H., 1 September 1876.
2James Smith McCoy who was born in Co. Fermanagh in 1837. His
obituary in the Weekly Advocate (10 March 1878) stated that
he had been 'converted' at the age of 16. (Possibly his
brother was also 'converted' at about the same time, although
'converted' here could merely refer to that experience which
a good Methodist youth was supposed to have in his teens or
earlier.) Following that, he was very active in the Methodist
Church, particularly as a Sunday School teacher. In the
late 1870s he was a lay delegate to Methodist Annual
Conferences. He was a Worshipful Master of No. 10 L.O.L. in
1868 and a member of the Waverley Municipal Council in the
same year. He died of consumption in 1878. (A.P.B.,
8 August 1868; C.A.W.R., 5 February 1877.)
Originally resident in George Street he moved to a substantial residence in Marrickville in the early 1880s. Although unsuccessful as a candidate for Sydney municipal honours he later held a seat on the Marrickville Council and among other offices represented the suburban municipalities on the Fire Brigade Board. He was a magistrate and a director of several building companies and in the mid-seventies was elected by orange influence to the Board of the Benevolent Society and the Society for Destitute Children. McCoy was a Methodist, active in temperance and Methodist youth groups in Chippendale in the 1860s and later a trustee of the York Street Chapel. He was also prominent in the Masonic Lodge.

McCoy was succeeded by William Kippax who had been a prominentorangeman in the 1860s. Kippax was a poulterer and general provider, but more importantly, a successful ward politician, representing Cook ward for nearly 30 years. He was a Methodist and native born, but his election as Grand Master was partly a reversion to the older style of leadership. It lasted only a year. Kippax was succeeded by Henry Hicks, who held office from 1875 to 1883. Hicks was a stern Methodist, who was 35 when elected to lead the Orange Institution. Born in Sydney, he partnered in and then succeeded to his father's produce merchandising business. He was an unostentatious man who devoted his life to his

---

1He and G.L. Carter split the orange vote between them when standing for Goold's old ward in 1876, allowing the Irish-Catholic Daniel O'Connor to get in. (P.S., 9 December 1876.) McCoy unsuccessfully opposed O'Connor again in 1878.

2The Sydney Municipal Council was represented by another orangeman S.E. Lees V & P (LA NSW), 1886 (2) 1015.

3For example, Town and Country Land Building and Investment Company, P.S., 26 September 1885.

4He was at the time Deputy Grand Master of the Institution (F.J., 7 February 1874.).


6Bulletin, 15 October 1898.
business and the Protestant religion. Under his firm
guidance the Orange Institution grew to its largest ever size
in the nineteenth century.

The criticism was sometimes made during Hicks' period as
Grand Master that the position ought to go to a more prominent
figure. 2 When Hicks returned as Grand Master in 1883 he was
succeeded by Richard Lennon Murray, who had been Deputy Grand
Master the year before. Murray was a surveyor and M.L.A.
for Inverell since 1880. An Anglican, he had been born in
Tipperary, Ireland, in 1840, the son of a denominational
school teacher. He emigrated to New South Wales in 1869.
Although an M.L.A., Murray was hardly a more prominent figure
than Hicks and he may have been assisted to his position by
the fact that he was a brother-in-law of Richard McCoy. 3
He was a sick man and died early in 1887, after only one year
as Grand Master. John Roseby, the temperance advocate,
philanthropist and sometime politician, succeeded Murray as
Grand Master, but relinquished the position after six months. 4
Richard McCoy took over for the remainder of the year. He
was in turn succeeded in 1886 by John Wheeler. Wheeler was
destined to lead the Institution for a total of eighteen
years, but on this occasion held the position for only one
year, and was followed by an Anglican minister, the Rev. E.D.
Madgwick. Madgwick was Grand Master from 1887 to 1888, and
in 1889 was succeeded by Thomas Jessep who was followed in
turn by the politicians William Stephen (1890) and J.C. Neild
(1891-3).

---

1 He did however accept a position as a director on the
Randwick Anglican, open to any leading orangemen. For other
details see his obituary, Methodist, 30 November 1907.
2 For example, P.S., 12 February 1881.
3 P.S., 19 March 1887.
4 For fuller biographical details of Roseby and others
mentioned in this paragraph see Appendix IIc.
The growing respectability of the Institution during the 1870s is also shown in the other officers of the Grand Lodge. Full lists of members of what amounted to the executive of the Orange Institution are hard to obtain prior to 1879 but one exists for 1871 and the names of several other office holders of the seventies are obtainable. A comparison between the Grand Committee of 1871 and that of 1881 reveals a transition from the small, lower class, mainly Irish clique of the mid 1860s to the much larger, more established organisation of the 1880s. Membership in 1871 is lower middle-class - respectable working class, but contains only two Irishmen. Only two of the six members are native born. In 1881 four are natives; only one is Irish; and the status of all the members is somewhat higher: one has private means; one has a reasonably substantial business; one is an accountant; two are school masters. Only one, a draper, is a small-businessman - tradesman of the kind more common in the earlier Grand Committee. The social profile of the 1881 Grand Lodge officers is virtually identical with that of other Grand Lodge officers during the 1880s. Ten men held at different times most of the six executive positions in each Grand Lodge (excluding the position of Grand Chaplain). Biographical sketches of the officers of the Grand Lodge for these years and some of those for the 1870s, not already given, can be found in Appendix IIc.

1 According to the 1868 Laws and Regulations of the Loyal Orange Institution of N.S.W. (pp.12 and 13), the Grand Lodge had eight Grand Officers: a Grand Master; Deputy Grand Master; Past Grand Master; Grand Chaplain; Grand Secretary; Assistant Grand Secretary; Grand Treasurer and Assistant Grand Treasurer. The latter position seems, in practice, to have been replaced by a Foreman of Grand Committee. Five others were to be elected from the Grand Lodge to form a Grand Committee. These positions were elected in February by the Grand Lodge which consisted of the Worshipful Master, Deputy Master, Past Worshipful Master, Secretary, Treasurer and Foreman of Committees of all subordinate lodges. The Grand Lodge met at least four times a year. In practice the administrative business of the Institution was carried out by the officers and committee of the Grand Lodge.

2 See Appendix IIb for full list of the names and occupations of these officers.
Several characteristics of the orange leadership in the late seventies and eighties are worth remarking on. Most notable is the high proportion of Methodists among them. Of the nine men who filled the office of Grand Master for the twenty years between 1870 and 1889 six were Methodists (including Goold, a Primitive Methodist). A Methodist or a Primitive Methodist filled the office for sixteen of the twenty years. The official Methodist newspaper gave the Institution encouragement from the early seventies onwards, always giving enthusiastic coverage to the twelfth of July celebrations. The only other denominational papers to give encouragement in the seventies were the Rev. George Sutherland’s Australian Witness and Presbyterian Herald (November 1872–December 1873) and Witness and Australian Presbyterian (1874–1884). They circulated largely among the Free Presbyterians. Sutherland himself was Grand Chaplain of the Institution from 1878–1880. Yet the preponderance of Methodists among the lay leadership was not a product of clerical support being confined largely to the Methodists. None of the major orange publicists among the clergy were Methodists and by the late 1870s most Protestant clergymen of evangelical commitment were favourably disposed to the Institution, even if they were not all actually members. There were usually about twenty clergymen drawn from every Protestant denomination on the platform at the Sydney twelfth of July celebrations, and at least two or three at country celebrations. Most, if not all, Primitive Methodists, Baptists and Free Presbyterian clergymen were

1 Another, the Rev. E.D. Madgwick, had been a Methodist clergyman before joining the Church of England in 1880.
2 Until 1877 it was known as the Christian Advocate and Wesleyan Record; after this date as Weekly Advocate (until 1891, when it became the Methodist).
3 The Rev. Wazir Beg’s Orangeman and Protestant Catholic, which ran from March 1877–December 1878 was largely designed as an orangeman’s paper, in opposition to the Standard, but like Beg’s Protestant Banner, in 1869, it was too eccentric and too slight to command a large readership.
 favourably disposed to orangeism. This was by no means true of Methodists, Presbyterians and Congregationalists. A small number of Anglicans were positively hostile. Younger clergymen, particularly immigrants, were more likely to favour the Institution than were older men, who had in some way been affected by the liberal anti-sectarian ideology. The Rev. J.D. Lang shared many of the views of the orangemen, but opposed the Institution for its secrecy and its deliberate offensiveness to Catholics.

Almost all members of the Grand Lodge were connected in some way with the temperance movement. They were members of that large group of Christians, middle class and evangelical,

---

1 In 1871 the Freeman's Journal drew attention to the number of lodge meetings that were held in denominational schoolrooms, particularly Anglican (F.J., 4, 11 March 1871). Their protest had some success. By 1872 the Standard was complaining that some Anglican clergyman had forbidden lodge meetings in their schoolrooms forcing at least one lodge to meet in an hotel (P.S., 13 July 1872). In 1875 correspondents in the Anglican Australian Churchmen attacked the practice of allowing Anglican schoolrooms to be used by orange lodges, which were described as unchristian. Defenders of the lodge affirmed its pure Christianity (A.C., 28 August; 9 September 1875; P.S., 9 October 1875). Similar attacks were made on the lodges in 1876 (P.S., 10 June 1876), and in 1877 orangeism was attacked in the Anglican Synod by Shepherd Smith, who regretted that some Anglican schoolrooms were still being used for lodge activities. Orangeism was defended by Revs Allwood, Barnier and Barry and W.J. Foster (P.S., 20 March 1877). The debate over orangeism in the Australian Churchmen was closely related to a larger debate over whether the Church of England was Protestant or not. This debate was started by Bishop Barker's assertions, made when laying the foundation stone of the Protestant Hall, that the Church of England was Protestant. Those who opposed orangeism tended to argue that it was, rather, Catholic (though not Roman). See A.C., 11 December 1875; 8, 29 January, 5, 19 February, 4, 11 March 1876. See also A.C., 13 May 1880 for editorial assertion that the Church of England was Catholic, not Protestant.

2 In July 1882, Hicks boasted that in the previous year 174 clergymen had joined the Institution (P.S., 15 July 1881). Most new clergymen, Catholic and Protestant, were immigrants (W.W. Phillips, 'Christianity and its Defence in N.S.W. circa 1880-1890' [Ph.D., A.N.U., 1969], pp.96-103).

who desired to reform society by changing the life styles of its inhabitants to more closely approximate their own. They were among those who saw social reform coming about through an extension of social control. But the orangetmen were further distinguished by a fear of the Catholic portion of the community, and by a desire to see them and their activities checked and controlled.

No single occupation predominated among them, although the professions of law and medicine were not represented and most fell under the general description of 'business men'. There were fewer small shop keepers, tradesmen and commission agents who were a mainstay of the Grand Lodge committee before and during the early 1870s and those there were did not usually remain long. During the eighties orange leadership was drawn from a more successful strata of the population than it had been during the eighteen sixties. Beneath them, however, the second level of leadership of the Institution (the executives of the subordinate lodges) remained the same - only much larger. Beneath them again were the mass of the rank and file. Yet it would be a mistake to imagine that the rank and file came from a lower strata of society than ordinary lodge officers. While there was an understandable tendency for the Grand Lodge to elect as its officers men of some standing in the community, within the ordinary lodges there was little heed for such a concern with public image, and selections were made on the basis of other criteria. Quick-witted youth, for example, was more likely than wealth to achieve subordinate lodge office. After all, many of the Grand Lodge officers in the late seventies and eighties began as apprentices.

There is unfortunately little evidence available to enable the construction of even a rough picture of the social character of ordinary orangetmen. What is available bears out the above impressions. A columnist in the Freeman's Journal, 'Pasquin' wrote a long article about a twelfth of July celebration he attended in 1880. It gives an amusing, but presumably biased account of the participants
and their goings-on. The tawdriness of the occasion was the main impression he attempted to convey. To reinforce this impression he emphasised the commonness of the participants:

The women were, without exception, the worst dressed and most ordinary looking representatives of the fair sex it had ever been my lot to encounter. The men - who seem almost exclusively to be composed of the lower class - would perhaps not have attracted attention to the seediness of their garments had it not been for the gaudy trumpery with which they were bedizened.

Pasquin went on to ridicule orangeism by noting the presence of a large number of men high in the order but low in social status: 'five buck niggers...the young man who drives Peat and Harcourt's van; my butcher's assistant...a wharfinger belonging to the Hunter River S.Ship Co., the old messenger from Parliament House....' Yet in carrying the ridicule further he gave testimony to the democratic aspect of the Institution:

I observed...Hezlett, the member for Paddington; and the man who drives our milk cart. There was also Mr. Barbour MLA, and the person who keeps the oyster-stall in York Street; Mr. Fawcett MLA, and the peripatetic tripe merchant; 'Ikey' Josephson, and the man who used to 'look after' the door at Roberts's....

Presumably part of the appeal of the orange order was the opportunity it gave to the poor to rub shoulders with the well-to-do. And Pasquin was almost certainly picking the poorest of the gathering to make his point; interestingly there are no labourers among them. But, given his testimony

---

1 Not surprisingly: an educated middle class Catholic would invariably feel superior about the splendour and pageantry of his own church. It is an interesting point though, that these violently anti-ritualistic orangemen should be so committed to the gaudy show of their regalia and the incongruous pageant of their procession.

2 F. J., 17 July 1880. Pasquin revisited the orangemen two years later. His view of them had changed little. This time he emphasised the surreptitious drinking, both inside and outside the hall, to emphasise their tawdriness and hypocrisy.
to the democracy of the Institution, it is likely that the rank and file orangemen came from the same strata of society that provided the P.P.A. leadership in the 1860s and early 1870s: from shopkeepers and tradesmen and, to be wide-ranging, apprentices (for there were a lot of young men in the order) and government servants (clerks, policemen, warders and the like). From time to time in the 1880s the Protestant Standard noticed the death of some orangeman. There was little or no comment, and the men were mostly ordinary rank and file orangemen, whose death had been brought to the paper's attention by relatives or friends. In some cases occupations were given. They bear out the picture sketched above. One case confirms Pasquin's unintended testimony. It concerned a William John Strutt, born in Ireland, resident in the colony since 1884 and Worshipful Master of No.176 Lodge when he died in 1891. He was an attendant at the Callum Park Asylum. Others were a

---

1 The police force and associated occupations, such as prison warders, drew a high proportion of their membership from immigrants, particularly those who had some military service. Many of them were Irish and a good proportion were orangemen. In 1870 a Brother McKee, to whom No. 2 L.O.L. had just provided funds to buy himself out of the artillery, asked the secretary of the lodge to remove his name from the books for a few months, as he wished to join the police force. He had been informed that he would be asked if he belonged to any secret society, and he wished to be able to say he did not (No.2, L.O.L., minute book, entry for 23 August 1870). Some constables were temporarily suspended for attending twelfth of July celebrations in 1868 (A.P.B., 5 September 1868) and others were suspended at about the same time for attending the orange funeral of one of their fellow constables (P.J., 27 June 1868). In 1884 Henry Wager, the Deputy Commissioner of Prisons, published a notice reminding all officers of the Prisons Department that they were not allowed to participate in any secret society (P.S., 28 June 1886). In practice the prohibition was usually overlooked.

2 P.S., 21 November 1891.
butcher, a tobbacconist, a master mariner, a transport commission, and the clerk of Mudgee Council.1

Consideration of the ordinary functioning of an orange lodge throws some light on the social background of its membership, and on their motivation. Ordinary lodge meetings were held monthly. A person wishing to join had to be proposed and seconded by existing members and pay one shilling. He had then to present himself at the next monthly meeting for balloting, 'one black bean in seven to exclude'. If accepted he would be initiated at that meeting. Accompanied by his two sponsors and carrying a bible and a book of rules and regulations, he would be led before the Master and the Chaplain (a clergyman if one belonged to the lodge, if not, an ordinary member elected to the position). With biblical quotations they would enjoin him to lead a good life; support the monarchy, while Protestant; be faithful to brother orangemen in all matters; and vote for orange or Protestant candidates in elections. Afterpledging his fidelity to these and promising to keep lodge proceedings secret at all costs, he would be invested with the insignia of the order, and given the passwords of

1They were in order: George Jackson of Redfern (P.S., 28 June 1886); A.F. Joy of Paddington (P.S., 26 November 1887); J. Harold Pearce (P.S., 5 December 1885); George McIlreen (P.S., 24 September 1887); Mr Lovejoy (P.S., 5 December 1885).
There were two such passwords, both taken from scripture: one a permanent one, and one which changed every financial year. These had to be given before gaining entrance to a lodge meeting. No one who had at any time been a Catholic, or had been married to one could join an orange lodge, except by permission of the Grand Lodge.\(^2\)

Within the Orange Institution there was a second, higher order, the purple, which orangemen could join. Meetings of the purple degree holders in a lodge were called Royal Arch Purple (R.A.P.) and meetings were held separately (and monthly) from the regular meeting. An orangeman could seek membership of the purple after six months, and had to be balloted in and initiated (in a slightly different fashion) as before. No one could hold office in a lodge or belong to the Grand Lodge who was not in the purple. Orangemen

\(^1\)The above account is taken from H.W. Cleary, *The Orange Society* (Melbourne, 10th edition, 1897), pp.401-6. Cleary was a Catholic priest, later to become a bishop in New Zealand. He was hostile to orangeism, but considered that it damned itself by its own words and actions. He consequently provided a considerable amount of factual material, mainly from British sources. In this case he claims to be quoting verbatim a pamphlet (published in Victoria in 1897) setting out the ritual to be followed. The pamphlet contradicts some of the more spectacular accounts of initiations which he himself gleefully repeats on other pages - accounts of rides on billy goats; tossing in wet blankets; and revolver play (p.117; see also Stewart, *History of Orangeism*, p.29, for reference to billy goat rides as a joke). An old orangeman with whom I spoke more or less confirmed this account, but mentioned the giving of the passwords which Cleary's pamphlet omits. He did mention however that initiation procedures for women (women's lodges were first formed in N.S.W. in 1894), differed slightly from the men's for physical reasons, but would not elaborate on this cryptic remark. The orange initiation was nothing like as bizarre as that of the Catholic Knights of St Christopher (St Columbas?) described by James T. Farrell in *Studs Lonigan* (New York, 1965), pp.560-83.

\(^2\)Any member marrying a Catholic would be automatically expelled. The rules also specifically enjoined members to do all in their power to discourage such mixed marriages among others. Such endeavour the Catholic bishops could only have encouraged.
were required to wear regalia (at least an orange or a purple sash, and usually a collar as well) at each meeting. For those orangemen who enjoyed this sort of arcane ritual there was a separate organisation called the Royal Black Preceptory, which was open only to holders of the purple degree, and which, masonic-like, provided eleven more orders into which they could be initiated. It and a similar, smaller, organisation called the Knights of Malta, were essentially Protestant masonry; the staunch Protestant orangemen objecting to the easy going deism of the masonic order. Many orangemen belonged to the 'black' but its structure was quite independent of orangeism, and it was not involved in politics in the same way.

Each member paid his lodge one shilling per month. As well, fines of sixpence or one shilling could be levied for a number of offences, including failure to attend meetings clean and sober, misbehaviour in meetings, continuing to hold conversations after the lodge had been opened, and failure to wear the colours at a meeting. The No.2 Lodge by law specified that monthly dues might be split up into thirds:

---

1 Regalia was usually the property of a lodge and could often become quite expensive. Benefit societies also provided themselves with elaborate regalia as one of their first moves, a fact which was always criticised by official enquiries into friendly societies in the nineteenth century. See for example, 'Report of Royal Commission...into the Working of its Friendly Societies Statute', Victorian Parliamentary Papers, 1876, No.44 (Vol.3).

2 A.C., 28 August 1875. During its early years the orange society in Ulster had a lot of difficulty in asserting its authority over the various orange societies which emerged and claimed some sort of allegiance to the Grand Lodge, but offered more exotic degrees and ritual. Eventually the Grand Lodge barred all but orange and purple degrees, but came to some sort of modus-vivendi with the Black Preceptory (see Senior, Orangeism in Ireland, pp.79,115,141-42, 195-99). The Black Preceptory in N.S.W. as late as the 1920s continued to operate under the Irish Constitution.

3 There were among the by-laws of No.2 L.O.L. (see minute book, entry for January 1868). Other lodges were presumably little different.
one third to go to administrative expenses; one third to a beneficent fund; and one third to providing quarterly refreshments. The general orange rules stipulated that if required, a sum of £5 should be provided from lodge funds to provide a coffin for any member who died. In practice the funds seemed more frequently to go to a living recipient. In September 1868, for example, J.W. Goulden, the Worshipful Master of No. 2 Lodge was given £5 to assist him at the time of illness in his family. In March 1869 £10 was given to the family of a member who had died; and £1 was given to another member, said to be in distress. Sometimes charity was made dependent on the would-be recipient's behaviour. In January 1870 Brother Nixon, from No.16 Lodge, applied to the members of No.2 Lodge for work or assistance, as he was unemployed. A number objected to aiding him because he had had his father buried by a Catholic undertaker.

Politics provided another drain on lodge funds. In January 1870 the Deputy Grand Master approached the No. 2 Lodge for assistance in meeting the costs of the unsuccessful campaign to have a Major Shepherd elected for the Nepean. He hoped they would meet the balance still outstanding which was £14.10.00. They gave £3. Two months later another request was made for assistance towards John Stewart's successful campaign for Illawara. The total cost had been £120 and the P.P.A. and L.O.I. had together agreed to pay half. After some disgruntled comment about the 'nonsense' of elections, it was decided to open subscriptions. The lodge had no money in reserve at the time.

One important function performed by the lodge was that of solving disputes between members. The rules provided for

---

1 Loyal Orange Institution of New South Wales, Laws and Regulations, p.19.
2 No. 2 L.O.L. minute book.
3 Ibid.
complaints and other accusations brought by one member against another to be tried by the lodge to which the accused belonged, and for appeals to the Grand Lodge. ¹ Five such cases came before the No. 2 Lodge between 1869 and 1870. Details were few, but all seemed to involve one member's failure to meet his financial obligations incurred in the course of business with another member. Goulden, a tailor, and Worshipful Master of the lodge, was the object of several complaints. One was by McGibbon and concerned a sum of £6.10.0 owed by Goulden for advertisements taken in the Protestant Standard. Goulden had refused to pay and McGibbon instructed his canvasser to have suits made up to the value of the debt. When they were ready Goulden refused to hand them over without payment so they were forced to sue him anyway. Just as they did Goulden was declared insolvent. The lodge deliberated this case several times and finally decided to suspend him until his debt was paid.² Such grievances were petty but could easily divide a lodge and even the order if allowed to fester. As well, the reputation of the Institution and thus all its members, could be endangered by the malpractices of a few, and quick disciplinary action was thus important to clear the Institution of unsavory imputation.³

The Orange Institution provided its members fellowship, a certain amount of assistance in sickness or death and ritual to provide some colour or significance to their lives. Yet the various benefit societies provided as much and more. The orange society had an additional appeal. To those who would join it offered not only security but a righteous ideology which proclaimed that they alone were the

¹Loyal Orange Institution of New South Wales, Laws and Regulations, p. 8.
³For example the Grand Secretary, G.L. Wilson, was expelled in mid 1869 after criticism by a judge of his conduct as a conveyancer.
guardians of the essential interests and values of society. It offered a holy cause: the defence of society against an enemy within whose existence was unrecognised by its rulers. Orangeism was a paranoid ideology in that it posited the existence of a threat which could hardly be justified by the evidence available. It was a sectarian ideology in that it regarded questions of religious affiliation and interest the primary ones in society and politics and encouraged hostility to much of the prevailing order of society.

Orangeism appealed to those in whom anxiety and frustration bred insecurity. It possessed a strong attraction for migrants who had not found in the colony the instant success they had expected; to young natives engaged in a struggle for advancement and recognition against an older generation; and to evangelical clergymen, distressed by the irreligion of the colony and preferring to blame Rome rather than any more obvious cause. It also appealed to those in whom the achievement of a modicum of respectability and security had bred a vast anxiety for that achievement. Orangemen were, generally, insecure men: some dour, and repressed; others unstable and temperamental.

That some orangemen were ambitious to improve their status was given a dramatic demonstration in the early seventies by their successful attempts to secure places on the boards of the three major charitable institutions of the colony: the Sydney Infirmary; the Randwick Asylum for Destitute Children; and the Benevolent Asylum, (for destitute women and children). Each institution was managed by a board of twenty or more who were elected, seven or eight each year, by the subscribers. Edward Deas Thompson, the old ex-Colonial

---

1 For many of these, particularly those from the second group, membership of the orange society was only transitional. As sought after goals were achieved the reason for belonging to the orange society disappeared and they gave it up. For example, S.E. Lees and William Henson, two prominent orangemen in the seventies and eighties were not associated with it in later years, and when they died, not even the Methodist mentioned, in otherwise full obituaries, their membership.
Secretary and one of the leading figures in colonial society was president of all three bodies. A high proportion of other directors similarly devoted their attention to two or three. Together they constituted a charitable 'establishment' in the colony. They were, largely, wealthy businessmen: colonists of high standing who had intentionally retired from business and devoted themselves to charitable pursuits. Several clergymen, Anglican, Catholic and Presbyterian, were among them. The institutions also received the ministrations of many of the leading ladies of the colony. Dealing as they did with the dying or with the young parentless children the three institutions received a close scrutiny from clergymen, both Catholic and Protestant, who were determined to detect and prevent the faintest hint of proselytism. Accusations of this sort were treated seriously by the institutions because of their potential danger to public support. They were invariably found false. ¹

In July 1870 the Protestant Standard made a series of accusations about the Sydney Infirmary, and in particular, Miss. Lucy Osburn, the Lady Superintendent. The Standard accused her of styling herself, convent fashion, Lady Superior; of forcing other nurses to worship at the High Anglican service at Christ Church; of showing favouritism to the Catholic nurses and servants; of appointing only Catholics to the staff, and dismissing Protestants; and, most importantly of all, of arranging to have some bibles, supplied for use in the Infirmary, taken away and burnt. ²

Lucy Osburn had been the centre of controversy ever since she arrived from England in early 1868. She and five trained sisters had been sent by Florence Nightingale

¹ For example, in 1863 the Christian Pleader made accusations about the proselytising visits of nuns to the Sydney Infirmary. Their accusation was examined by a sub-committee of the Infirmary's Board and was found to be false (F.J., 3 August 1863). See also A.P.B., 30 January 1869, for similar sort of accusation about the Randwick asylum.
² P.S., 11, 18 July 1870.
in answer to a request for nurses trained in her methods, made to her in 1866 by the then Colonial Secretary, Henry Parkes. Parkes hoped that Miss Osburn and her assistants could achieve a much needed improvement in the standard of the Infirmary. Up to a point they did, but a number of the medical staff and some of the directors were profoundly suspicious and resentful of a woman in such a position of responsibility, and were obstructive. As well, the sisters who had come from England with her were stimulated by their new environment, and resented the rules and the authority which Miss Osburn found necessary to assert. Considerable friction grew up between them. In the sectarian climate of 1870 it was not surprising that at least one of the sisters should formulate her resentment of Miss Osburn in sectarian terms. Nor was it surprising that she should be eagerly listened to and believed by the proprietors of the Standard and some of the other better-off orangemen of the city.

Miss Osburn was a close friend of the Countess Belmore, Miss Deas Thompson and some of the other ladies of Sydney high society. The Standard was deeply suspicious of such society, suspecting it of too great a liberality in its dealings with Catholic priests. A year earlier it had recounted with some satisfaction how a Romish priest had violently objected to copies of a small tract which the wife of Commodore Lambert (head of the British naval force in the colony) was distributing in the wards of the Infirmary. He had snatched one from her and trodden it underfoot. The Standard was pleased: 'it will show our Protestant ladies who move in higher circles and who are...

1See Parkes, Fifty Years in the Making of Australian History, pp.174-80. See also F. MacDonnell, Miss Nightingale's Young Ladies (Sydney, 1970), Chapters 1 and 2.
2Ibid.
3Ironically, Miss Osburn's greatest supporter was that hero of the P.P.A. and orangeman, Henry Parkes. See ibid., pp. 62, 84-85.
very much disposed to look tenderly on Romanism and its agencies...what a Romish priest is like when at home'.

The board of management of the Infirmary appointed a committee to investigate the charges made by the Standard, and, despite the presence of two or three members pre-disposed to believe them, the charges were found to be completely false. The Protestant Standard was far from

1 P.S., 26 June 1869.
2 Miss Osburn's main opponent was 'a sour faced, bigoted, harsh, cruel looking Presbyterian minister who appeared all the time as if he would like to flay me before burning me'. This was the Rev. Robert Lewers. 'A violent loud spoken Jew' (J.G. Raphael) was also opposed to her (Lucy Osburn to Florence Nightingale, 7 September 1870, Florence Nightingale, Letters Received, M.L., MSS 1262, pp.45-47. [The Mitchell Library has a copy of the correspondence between Lucy Osburn and Florence Nightingale.]) Another member of the committee was Fr Dwyer, O'Farrell's confessor. In her same letter Lucy Osburn described the relationship between Dwyer and Lewers, which might be thought typical of relations between clergymen in the charitable institutions in the seventies: 'After this something turned up which set the R. Catholic priest onto the Presbyterian minister and the bickering and fighting and sparring and temper shown were quite amusing, that about ended the session nobody would calm down after the excitement to ask anything, so away I went.'
3 S.M.H., 17 September 1870, published the report. It was tabled in the House on 8 November 1870, together with a summary of the evidence. See V & P (LA NSW), 1870-1 (4), pp.123-48. From an examination of the evidence it can be seen that jealousy and thwarted ambition on the part of two or three of the English sisters were the cause of most of the trouble, although Lucy Osburn may have been rather too aloof. The 'Bible-burning' had arisen when Miss Osburn had instructed the gardner to burn a number of books, including bibles, which had become so infested with vermin to make them unsuitable for use in the hospital. He had not done so. Miss Osburn suspected Sister Annie Blundell as one of the Standard's informants (the chaplain, the Rev. W. Allworth, she thought the other). (See L. Osburn to Florence Nightingale, op.cit.) The evidence given to the committee bears this out. It was Sister Annie Blundell who claimed to have been forced to attend Anglican worship, at the Infirmary Chapel, against her wishes, she being a Congregationalist. However, the Rev. John Graham, the Congregationalist minister of the church where she sometimes surreptitiously worshipped claimed that she had only discovered a desire to worship

Footnote continued on following page...
satisfied and devoted several leaders to criticising the
court of the committee and its report. 1 In the assembly
David Buchanan, who believed the worst of Miss Osburn, kept
public attention on the affair with a series of questions
and wild speeches. 2 During the controversy the Freeman's
Journal, naturally took the side of Miss Osburn. 3 The
Standard kept up the pressure during early 1871, attacking
various members of the Infirmary board, particularly the
defenders of Miss Osburn. 4 On 28 February elections were
held for the board of the Infirmary.

The Protestant Standard and the orangemen ran a ticket
for the eight directorships up for election, and for one of
the secretary's positions. Interest in the election, which
was by ballot, was intense. 5 The orangemen had only mixed
success. They replaced one of the secretaries, J.E. Manning
with a Presbyterian minister, the Rev. Robert Lewers, but
obtained places on the board for only two of their candidates,
the Rev. Thomas Smith and J.B. Holdsworth. The Standard
nevertheless saw it as some sort of victory. Interestingly
enough, they did not see it as a victory over Romanism, but
simply a victory over 'a clique' which, until the Standard
drew attention to it, had conducted the affairs of the
Infirmary to its own advantage and with great inefficiency.

---

1 P.S., 17, 24 September, 18 October 1870.
2 S.M.H., 9, 14, 21 September 1870.
3 F.J., 23, 30 July, 24 September 1870.
4 P.S., 28 January, 11, 18 February 1870.
5 S.M.H., 1 March 1871.
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there after she had felt herself aggrieved in some matter by
Miss Osburn. He thought her motivated entirely by spite
against Miss Osburn, and she had several times resisted his
attempts to arrange a reconciliation. Most of the staff
at the Infirmary were shown to be Protestants, including
those recently hired.
The *Standard* also indignantly and somewhat hypocritically detailed the way in which 'the clique' had gone about trying to round up the votes of various subscribers.¹ A little later, at a meeting of the P.P.A., John Roseby had occasion to refer to the many reforms wrought by the P.P.A. Foremost in the list was 'the great infirmary case'.²

The sectarian elements of the controversy were well to the fore at a special meeting of subscribers called in mid-March. One of the matters to be considered was a resolution to change the title of 'sister' to 'head nurse'. McGibbon, Davies, Beg and a large group of supporters were in the body of the hall, as were a rowdy group of Irishmen, who seemed to many at the meeting to be following the cue of the Rev. Felix Sheridan, a Catholic priest and a member of the Infirmary board.³ Sheridan attempted to have the meeting

¹P.S., 4 March 1871. The *Freeman's Journal*, 4 March 1871, thought the orangemen had failed.
²S.M.H., 15 March 1871.
³Fr John Felix Sheridan was born in Co. Meath Ireland in 1824 and educated in Ireland and at the Benedictine College at Ampleforth, Yorkshire. He came to Australia with Polding in 1847 while still a student. On completing his studies at St Mary's seminary, he was ordained, as a Benedictine, in 1852. He was immediately appointed to Lyndhurst College as procurator, a post he held until 1857 when he was put in charge of Darlinghurst parish. In 1864 he was made Dean of Lyndhurst and in 1867 appointed to establish a parish at the Haymarket. In 1873 he was made Vicar General of the Archdiocese, a position he held until Moran's arrival in 1884. Short in build he was reported to be a great mixer. An ardent temperance advocate, he was described as 'the Father Mathew of Australia'. He began the Catholic Young Men's Society in 1858 and was for many years Chaplain of the Australian Holy Catholic Guild. He was elected a fellow of St John's College in 1858. He was one of the few priests of the archdiocese who interested himself in public charitable organisations, devoting considerable attention to the Benevolent Society for the Relief of Destitute children, the Sydney Infirmary and the Home Visiting and Relief Society. He was also active in the public temperance movement. Despite his sociability he was easily excited and was unsettled by the development of sectarianism in the late sixties and the entry of the orangemen into the charitable bodies of which he was a member. He came, over-dramatically,' to see himself as fighting a rear guard action against the forces of anti-Catholicism and infidelity, and probably
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ruled out of order, on the grounds that it had been
improperly called. His objection was not at first
successful, and some business was done, but when he put it
again, just as the title changing resolution was to be
considered, its force was recognised by the chairman and
the meeting was closed. 1

Their comparative success in obtaining seats for two of
their number on the Infirmary board emboldened the orangemen
to try the same tactics with the Society for Destitute
Children, which managed the Randwick Asylum. Even before
the Sydney Infirmary election, steps had been taken to
encourage orangemen to become subscribers to the Infirmary
and the Randwick Asylum. In some cases money was even taken
from lodge funds to secure a vote for selected members. The
annual meeting of the Society for Destitute Children was held
at Randwick in January 1872. This time the orangemen were
organised by John Davies. Two sets of carriages, one
organised by the directors and one by Davies plied between the
city and the Asylum for several hours before the meeting,
which was largely attended.

When the time came for election the Rev. Robert Steel
proposed a ticket of candidates, consisting, with one
exception of the retiring directors. Davies immediately
moved that they be considered individually and was opposed
by Rev. Sheridan, who said he knew what Davies was about,
and went on to argue that it was unfair to sacrifice tried
men merely to satisfy the whim of a religious faction. There
was an uproar from the body of the hall, and the children
from the Asylum, who had been standing on show around the
wails, were quickly hustled outside.

Footnote continued from previous page...
estranged Protestants of good will with his wild accusations.
He soon became a popular target of Protestant suspicion. See
N.B.R.; C.M. Forster, 'Lyndhurst and Benedictine Education'
in Australasian Catholic Record, Vol.24, (1947), p.29; F.J.,
12 May 1877; Sunbeam, September 1860; S.M.H., 4,8 July 1868;
P.S., 8 December 1877; 20 May 1883.
1 S.M.H., 21 March 1871; F.J., 21 March 1871; P.S., 25 March
1871.
Most of the ladies present accompanied them. Inside, the chairman, Deas Thompson, deplored the introduction of religious differences, and refused to rule Sheridan out of order, as the orangemen were vocally demanding. The most vocal of the orange contingent was the Rev. (by then Canon) Thomas Smith, who had, the previous year been put on the board of the Sydney Infirmary by the orangemen. 'What have Roman Catholics done for the Institution', Smith shouted. Another time, more revealingly, he cried out that he was an orangeman, and that it was time orangemen stood up for their rights. 1 The orangemen opposed J.M. Raphael, standing again as treasurer, and four of the eight directors. They were completely successful, and George Moore (as Treasurer), William Hezlet, Isaac Josephson, 2 P.R. Holdsworth and

1 Rev. Thomas Smith was born 21 December 1829 at Leominster, Herefordshire, the son of a wool buyer. He was educated there and at King's College, London. Given over to 'evil ways' in his early life he had been a gin shop owner and a drunkard. Converted from this path he prepared for Anglican orders and wrote a book about his early life entitled A Brand Plucked from the Burning, or My Life (London, 1856). He was sent by the Bishops' Commissioners to N.S.W. a year later. Ordained in 1858 he was appointed to St Barnabas's, Glebe, a small church taken over from one of the sects. The church was in the area adjoining Blackwattle Swamp and was poor and disorderly. Nevertheless Smith succeeded in building it into a workingman's church. By the late 1860s he was active in a number of charitable concerns: the Working-man's Book Society and Book-hawking Society; the Sydney City Mission; the Sydney Ragged Schools; the British and Foreign Bible Society. He was also very active in the temperance movement. It was Smith who caused a stir at the main Sydney indignation meeting on 13 March 1868, by attempting to speak after the chairman had ruled clergymen out of order. In 1871 he was made a Canon of St Andrew's Cathedral and in 1873 he was sent to Bathurst, as Canon of the Cathedral. There he became Bishop Marsden's right hand man until they fell out over the 1880 Public Instruction Act, which Smith supported. He returned to Sydney and died two years later of cirrhosis. See N.B.R.; T. & C.J., 13 August 1870; S.M.H., 14 March, 28 April, 16 June, 8, 18, 30 July 1868.

2 Isaac John Josephson was born in Sydney 6 April 1824, son of Jacob Josephson a jeweller, transported for forgery in 1814, and his wife Emma (née Moss) who had joined him in 1820. He was a younger brother of Joshua Frey Josephson, a
E.T. Penfold joined the board.¹

They had similar success with the Infirmary election a month later. Wearne, Falser, Hezlet, and Josephson were elected to the board. Other orangemen were elected to the two institutions in following years. The orangemen seemed a little less interested in the Benevolent Society, but by 1874 five or six had been elected and this increased during the next four years. They seemed content to have between one quarter and one third of the places on the board of each institution. Having obtained these positions they

Footnote continued from previous page...

close friend and brother-in-law of John Robertson. Educated at Cape's Sydney College, he determined upon a commercial career and entered the employ of the auctioneer, Samuel Lyons. He quickly achieved a prominent position in the firm. On the death of his father he inherited a valuable home and landed estate and retired from business to devote his attention to charitable activities, and, unsuccessfully, to politics. In 1851 he married Juliet Hanson, and on the death of her father became the trustee of yet more estate. He actively supported the Australian Patriotic Association in 1868, becoming their treasurer, giving them free use of the Victoria Theatre which he owned, and standing, unsuccessfully, as their candidate for municipal honours in 1869. He was on the committee of the Royal Sydney Yacht Squadron in the 1870s and 1880s. Despite the advantages of wealth and native birth, he was a man alienated from the society in which his brother mixed so easily. Of Jewish extraction he was a fiercely evangelical member of the Church of England. He was a leading member of the Orange Institution: Grand Master of an orange lodge and office holder in the Royal Black Preceptory. He was one of the key instigators of the orange takeover of the three major charitable organisations. During the 1875 Royal Commission into the Sydney Infirmary he was described by Raphael, another wealthy Jew, as having 'so much conceit he thinks he could gobble up all the directors in one bunch'. See S.M.H., 1 September, 5 December 1868; Empire, 6 May 1869; P.S., 4, 25 February 1871; F.J., 6 May 1871, 3 February 1872, 7 February 1874; Bulletin, 2 October 1880; V & P (LA NSW), 1873-4 (6) 68-78, 189; V & P (LA NSW), 1887-8 (3) 94. See also article on J.F. Josephson in A.D.B., Vol.4 (forthcoming). ¹

¹ Others standing for re-election were Protestant champions like J.D. Lang, John Frazer, Henry Clarke, and John Dawson. S.M.H., 30 January 1872; F.J., 3 February 1872. The Freeman's report is a little confused on just who comprised the official ticket. The Herald is presumably the more accurate.
became, by and large, firmly opposed to any changes in the functioning of the bodies, as were coming to be advocated by some of the older directors.

The factors contributing to the rapid growth of the Orange Institution in the early 1870s encouraged the development of other sectarian Protestant organisations. A Protestant Institute, a Protestant Servants Training School, Protestant benefit societies and orange building societies emerged and grew rapidly in this period. Together with the orange lodges, the Protestant Standard and the Protestant Hall they testify to the existence of a strong sectarian Protestant subculture, and one which was developing many of the characteristics of a subcommunity. ¹ A sectarian Protestant subcommunity did not emerge to the same extent as a sectarian Catholic subcommunity - it did not have its own hospitals and schools - but the existence of such separatist institutions witnessed to the desire of many Protestants to separate themselves in a number of areas of life from the great majority of their society.

The New South Wales Protestant Institute was begun in October 1870. The main initiator was the Rev. John McGibbon. It was intended to provide a weekly forum for the discussion of Protestant ideas, and, up to a point, to combat the newly formed Catholic Truugh Society. ² It was organised along the lines of a society, with office bearers, a minister secretary and balloting for membership. The main event of the Monday

¹ I have argued at the beginning of the chapter that the 1870s saw the emergence of a sectarian Protestant subculture; while very conscious of the difficulty of all terminology in the area I wish to follow Gusfield, Symbolic Crusade, p.21, as seeing a subcommunity as a more visible (and thus stronger) phenomenon than a subculture because it is expressed in institutional form. A subcommunity will have a subculture, but not necessarily the other way about. It is a vague terminology, but there does not seem to be any better available.

² P.S., 3 November 1870. It is possible that McGibbon wanted a more intellectual forum for the presentation of Protestant thinking than the orange lodges or the P.F.A.
evening meetings was a paper read by one of the Members, which was followed by discussion. Papers exclusively dealt with some aspect of the superiority of Protestantism over Catholicism. By May 1871 there were signs that interest in the Institution was falling off, but it seems to have continued in a sporadic fashion for some years more.¹

In April 1870, Captain Scott, the Sydney Police Magistrate, held a small meeting in the central police court to discuss the establishment of a school for training young girls of Protestant parents as servants. Part of Scott's motivation was a desire to stop such girls running wild in the streets, but his emphasis on religious qualifications indicated his prejudice. The Freeman's Journal thought it a very bad precedent that such a sectarian meeting should be held in the Police Court.² The Protestant Standard on the other hand thought it a commendable plan, as it would reduce the preponderance of 'Biddies' and 'Bridgets' among the colony's servants.³ It took the opportunity to sketch a horrifying account of Romish Priests using the confessional to discover from Catholic servants the secrets of Protestant families.⁴ No orangemen had been present at the first meeting, but several, such as the ubiquitous Davies and Alderman Murphy attended the second, which was chaired by J.D. Lang.⁵

The initiative for the school came from a higher strata of society than most orangemen belonged to, and within a couple of months, it had received the patronage of Governor

¹P.S., 6 May 1871.
²P.J., 9 April 1870.
³Which they blamed on Caroline Chisolm. P.S., 9 April 1870.
⁴Ibid.
⁵P.S., 1 April 1870.
Belmore and his lady.\(^1\) It was fully functioning by early 1871, but was officially referred to as the Female Servants Training School.\(^2\) There was no indication though that the original qualification had been dropped. Orangemen and the Protestant Standard continued to take an interest in its functions.\(^3\) It also provided the Freeman's opportunity to complain of what it called 'Kitchen Sectarianism' - to wit, the specifying in the advertisements for servants that they should be Protestant.\(^4\) The Freeman's somewhat exaggerated the frequency of such occurrences. A check of advertisements in several editions of the Herald in 1871-2 reveals no more than four or five percent of advertisements so specified.

Protestant benefit societies proliferated during the early 1870s. The Protestant Alliance Friendly Society had been in existence since 1861, but had not grown greatly in that time. In 1871 it had 150 members and a balance of £1,000.\(^5\) One shilling per week qualified a member to receive one guinea per week sickness benefits, and £25 for his family at his death. He would receive £15 for the death of his wife and £3 for the death of a child.\(^6\) The P.A.F.S. served as a front for the orange lodges during the 1860s (orangemen could march in its regalia while forbidden by law to march in their own) and a number of leading orangemen such as John Davies and S.E. Lees, held high office. It grew only little during the 1870s\(^7\) but it served as inspiration to a much faster growing Protestant benefit society of the same name.

\(^1\) F.J., 14 May 1870.
\(^2\) S.M.H., 8 March 1871; Sands, Sydney Directory, 1871.
\(^3\) P.S., 28 June 1871; No.2 L.O.L., minute book, entry for 2 January 1871.
\(^4\) See, for example, F.J., 9 December 1871, 14 September 1872.
\(^5\) P.S., 21 January 1871.
\(^6\) P.S., 25 May 1872.
\(^7\) In 1876 its assets were only a little over £1,000. P.S., 15 August 1876.
A Protestant Alliance Friendly Society had been started in Victoria in 1868, but hardly functioned until a burst of enthusiasm in 1871 among some Protestants in Ballarat. The Society grew quickly and many branches were formed in New South Wales, Queensland, Tasmania and New Zealand. The first New South Wales branch was formed at Redfern in 1871. It distinguished itself from the existing P.A.F.S. by referring to itself as the Extended Order Protestant Alliance Friendly Society, or E.O.P.A.F.S. Several approaches were made to the 'parent association' offering union, but were rebuffed. By the end of 1872 the E.O.P.A.F.S. had twelve branches, or lodges, and by mid 1874, when it established itself independently of the Victorian organisation, it had 29 lodges and 1103 financial members. In 1883 there were over 3,000 members. As in the original society membership was restricted to Protestants, with Protestant wives. The rules were devised to encourage members to retain their Protestant faith. Should a man or his wife cease to be a Protestant, or send their children to a Catholic institution, or consent to one of their children marrying a Catholic, all monies paid would be forfeited.

---

2 P.S., 2 March 1871.
3 See evidence of W.B. Smith, Arthur Walker and W.B. Walker in 'Minutes of Evidence of Royal Commission on Friendly Societies', V & P (LA NSW), 1883 (3) 378-84, 447, 574-78 respectively.
4 P.S., 23 November 1872.
5 P.S., 13 June 1874.
6 Evidence of W.B. Smith, op.cit.
7 This was still part of the rules of the society in 1945. See *Constitution and Rules of the Protestant Alliance Friendly Society of Australasia* (Sydney, 1945) in M.L.
Other exclusively Protestant benefit societies included the Wesleyan or Protestant Union Benefit Society, begun in 1846 for the benefit of Wesleyan ministers; the Loyal Orange Benefit Society established in 1876;¹ and the Protestant Mutual Benefit Society, also started in that year.² All three were small, and in 1883, in some danger of collapse.

An orange building society had existed since mid 1865.³ In 1874 the Queen Victoria Building and Investment Society was formed with S.S. Goold and Joseph Wearne as trustees; Speer, Roseby, McCoy and Graham as directors, and W.H. Davis as secretary. It was recommended in the Protestant Standard as an orange building society.⁴ As well, several orangemen such as William Hezlet were among directors of the Sydney Permanent Freehold Land and Building Society when it began in 1875. Building societies were giving way to companies by the late seventies, but the latter society was still functioning ten years later,⁵ when the Town and Country Land and Building Investment Company was formed. This had Lees, Wheeler, Henson and Abigail as its directors.⁶

As the sectarian Protestant community grew in number it was inevitable that further attempts would be made to finish the Protestant Hall. Unsuccessful attempts were made to revive the cause in 1870 and 1871.⁷ In that year, however, a Protestant Hall was erected at Tambaroora in the western goldfields, where Goold had been active a year earlier on

¹Evidence of P. Forbes, 'Minutes of Evidence of Royal Commission or Friendly Societies', op.cit., p.481.
²Evidence of G. Lillie, ibid., p.510.
³S.M.H., 1 September 1868.
⁴P.S., 9 May 1874.
⁵P.S., 18 July 1884.
⁶P.S., 26 September 1885. See N.G. Butlin, Investment in Australian Economic Development, 1861-1900 (Cambridge, 1964), pp.251-2, for details of Sydney building societies and companies and an account of their importance.
⁷P.S., 13 July 1870, 20 May 1871.
one of his first recruiting campaigns as orange Grand Master. The man responsible for the erection of the Hall was the wealthy mining speculator and orangeman, John Hurley. In 1872 Hurley was elected to the Assembly for Central Cumberland and, on arriving in the city, attempted to set the ball rolling and make a name for himself among the city's orangemen by taking £1000 worth of shares in the old Protestant Hall company. The Standard launched yet another publicity campaign for the Hall, and by May was able to publish a new prospectus for the company, and announce a list of provisional directors.

This attempt, however, also failed to gain sufficient support. Early in 1875 suitable land became available in Castlereagh Street, a little south of Bathurst Street. Four men raised the capital between them and purchased the land. A new company was formed and plans made to issue 8000 £1 shares. On the 9 November, the Prince of Wales' birthday, the foundation stone of the Hall was laid by Bishop Frederic Barker the Anglican Bishop of Sydney.

It was a gala day for the city's orangemen and for other Protestants. The day began with a procession from the Domain to the site of the Hall. In the afternoon there was a programme of sports and musical entertainment at the Prince Alfred Park. In the evening a more serious musical function was held in the Exhibition Building and addresses given by a number of clergymen. Almost ten thousand marched in the procession, which was headed by Alexander Gilchrist, the

---

1P.S., 22 July 1871. Hurley had been born in Sydney in 1844. It was said, but denied by him, that he had been a Catholic when young. A noisy anti-Catholic during his parliamentary career he fell out with McGibbon in 1878, after he had attacked McGibbon's subbatarian objections to the opening of the public library on a Sunday. He made and lost several fortunes. See article in A.D.B., Vol.4, forthcoming and P.S., 2 September 1871, 27 September 1873, 2 March and 20 April 1878.

2P.S., 6 April 1872.

3P.S., 11 May 1872.

4Speech of Richard McCoy at opening of Protestant Hall, P.S., 10 November 1877; also see P.S., 4 September 1875.
L.O.I. Grand Secretary, carrying an open bible. Over 1,000 orangemen had travelled in from the country to march. Members of various friendly societies were present in full regalia, and although orangemen had been strictly instructed not to wear their colours, a number did, and many women were decorated with orange and purple sashes, ribbons, rosettes and streamers.¹ Some even had large oranges impaled on the ends of their umbrellas. Another 20,000 were estimated to have viewed the procession. After laying the foundation stone, Bishop Barker delivered a powerfully Protestant speech. In it he affirmed England's Protestantism and Protestantism's continuing assertion of scriptural truth against the absurdities of Catholicism. He concluded with the advice:

Towards the church of Rome we must live in an attitude of opposition, by argument, by counsel, by exhortation, by prayers...let no man sanction the marriage of his child to a Roman Catholic (Great cheering). Let no man subscribe to the building of Roman Catholic places of worship (Great cheering). Be kind, be neighbourly, give relief in distress -(cheers)- help in sickness -(cheers)- but do nothing for the advancement of a religion against which our name is a perpetual protest.

Thus, when in the right company, even Bishop Barker could affirm the sectarian potential of the Protestant religion.

Sir Alfred Stephen, late Chief Justice of the colony chaired the evening's celebration. In a short opening speech he struck a different note to his Bishop. After explaining that because the building was to be used by the various Protestant denominations and societies, he, as a Protestant, could not have declined the invitation to attend, he continued: 'Recognising, nevertheless, that different Religious Beliefs exist among us, I would at all times far rather consider the points, however few, on which we agree, than those on which we differ.' His point of view was not

¹Fosbery the new Inspector General of Police was present and, together with Grand Master Goold, instructed a number of these men to remove their colours. As both the Freeman's and the Herald observed, it was hard to tell illegal orange and legal P.A.F.S. colours apart.
shared by the two clergymen, the Revs George Sutherland (Free Presbyterian) and Joseph Kirby (Congregational) who followed him.¹

The celebration was marred for some by the absence of John McGibbon. McGibbon objected to the plans of the committee, led by Richard McCoy, to have Barker lay the foundation stone of the Hall. He thought the ceremony should be performed by a layman, for the Hall had no particular denominational connection, and he considered those who wanted the Anglican Bishop sycophants.² Editorially he criticised the speakers for their failure to recognise the achievements of the orangemen. For the past ten years they alone, of all the colony's Protestants, had stood up to Rome and made the colony a freer, fairer place.³

The opening of the Hall exactly two years later was more to McGibbon's satisfaction. This time, after another procession of orangemen and friendly societies, the Hall was opened by the Grand Master of the Orange Institution, Richard McCoy. He was followed by McGibbon, who delivered the inaugural address. An excursion to Chowder Bay took place that afternoon and a concert was held in the evening. A week of celebrations followed. Another concert the next evening was succeeded by a religious service the following afternoon and a sermon, by the Rev. Canon Smith, that night, Sunday. A lecture on William III was held Monday evening. It was followed by 'a Service of Sacred Song' on Tuesday and lectures by Smith and Zachary Barry on Wednesday and Thursday.

¹P.S., 13 November 1875; O'Farrell, Documents in Australian Catholic History, Vol.1, pp.432-3, quotes part of Barker's speech.
²His first explanation was given in P.S., 27 November 1875. Those who favoured Barker apparently argued that Vaughan had laid the stone of the Catholic Guild Hall a little earlier, they should have Barker for theirs. McGibbon offered the further description in a private letter to Buchanan who had attacked him for his absence in a letter to the Herald. Buchanan had McGibbon's letter published in Stockwhip, 5 February 1876.
³P.S., 13 November 1875.
evenings respectively. The celebrations concluded with a monster tea meeting and soiree on Friday. 1

The laying of the foundation stone of the Sydney Protestants Hall provided an incentive to orangemen and other Protestants in the country centres of the colony. The foundation stone of the Newcastle Protestant Hall was laid late in December 1875, after a ruction caused by the carrying of an orange flag in the procession. 2 The Hall was opened in May 1876. 3 In the meantime a small Protestant Hall had been erected in Wallsend 4 and the foundation stone of the Queanbeyan Protestant Hall laid by Richard McCoy. 5 Other halls soon followed 6 so that by early 1877 the Protestant Standard could claim that there were twenty such institutions in the Colony. 7 On each occasion, orangemen were most prominent in securing their erection and at their openings the principles of orangeism were warmly extolled by the speakers.

The Sydney Protestant Hall cost £10,000 to build. 8 By August 1878 only 4,255 of the £1 shares had been taken up in full, and 1,500 partly paid for. 9 The financial outlook gradually improved as the Hall, the second largest in the city, proved its ability to make money from outside hire. In 1883 the land and building had appreciated in value to

1 P.S., 17 November 1877.
2 P.S., 1 January 1876. It denied the S.M.H. telegraphed report of the orange flag. P.J., 8 January 1876, took the opportunity to regret 'the yet further evidence of the break in the truce tacitly entered into by all the Christian sects in colonial society'.
3 P.S., 3 June 1876.
4 P.S., 10 June 1876.
5 P.S., 29 April 1876.
6 For example, Wollongong (P.S., 5 December 1877); Dungog (P.S., 9 February 1878); Grafton (P.S., 29 May 1879); Jamberoo (P.S., 20 March 1880).
7 P.S., 10 February 1877.
8 P.S., 17 November 1877.
9 P.S., 17 August 1878.
£18,000. 1 By the mid eightees it was making £1,600 a year profit and returning a dividend of 10 per cent. Almost all shares had by then been taken up, and had doubled in value. 2 By mid 1887 the building was finally cleared of debt. 3

The Protestan Standard continued during the seventies as the official organ of the Orange Institution and the leading non-denominational paper in the colony. It had begun as a 16 page weekly costing 6d. After a year it reduced in size and price by half, in 'an attempt to step up circulation among the working class'. 4 In July 1876 it increased its size to 12 pages and its price to 4d. 5 In 1877 its circulation was described as 3,000 per week. 6 Despite several changes in proprietorship its guiding force during the seventies was its editor, the Rev. John McGibbon. In 1871 Rev. Zachary Barry joined McGibbon as sub editor. By the mid seventies McGibbon's health had begun to deteriorate and he spent most of 1876 overseas, on his doctor's orders. Barry took over the paper during his absence. McGibbon's health did not improve and in April 1881 he retired from active duties. Barry again took sole control of the paper, which he retained after McGibbon's death from heart disease in July 1882. Barry continued as proprietor and editor of the paper till it merged with the Australian Christian World in July 1895. 7 Since about 1890 it had been dwindling in

2 P.S., 2 February 1884, 2 August 1884, 7 February 1885.
3 P.S., 6 August 1887.
4 P.S., 16, 30 April 1870.
5 P.S., 8 July 1876.
6 McGibbon to Colonial Secretary, 7 March 1878. Col. Sec., Correspondence Received, file 78/2171, Box 1/2404. McGibbon was requesting that the Protestant Standard be given a similar number of government advertisements (particularly from the immigration office) as the Freeman's Journal. Fitzpatrick agreed.
7 P.S., 27 July 1895. A year later, in September 1896, a new Protestant Banner was started. It had the same mast-head as the old Standard 'a journal of political and religious freedom'. It ran until 1906.
circulation and losing money. 1

Under McGibbon's and Barry's control the Standard did much to further and maintain sectarian Protestant sentiment. It carried a regular quota of attacks on Catholicism, both generalised criticism of its theology and practice, and, more frequently, accounts of its evil and dangerous consequences, drawn from the colony and abroad. Its Protestantism possessed a strong positive aspect nevertheless. McGibbon departed far from the Calvinistic assumptions of Presbyterianism when he wrote that 'man has a moral freedom which cannot be abnegated in religion or politics...if man be brought to perfection, both political and religious freedom are indispensible for his symmetrical perfectioning.' McGibbon saw the history of the English nation illustrating the way men must proceed to perfection: the fight for political freedom, (for example the Magna Carta) went hand in hand with the fight for religious independence. 2 That such an outlook would view Catholicism with hostility was obvious, though whether it was formed from or actually preceded his anti-Catholicism would be hard to discover.

Such a view certainly informed McGibbon's view of the responsibilities of government. On that question McGibbon drew a clear distinction between morality and religion. Religion was a spiritual thing, to do with God and eternity. Speaking through the heart it was expressed in doctrine and worship. The only responsibility a government bore towards religion was to protect it against aggression. Otherwise it must entirely leave it alone. Morality on the other hand, was the social and personal conduct of human beings. A government had a responsibility to order human society so as to encourage men to grow towards perfection. 3 Thus a

1 P.S., 1 July 1893.
2 P.S., 2 August 1870.
3 P.S., 1 January 1870. McGibbon's support for 'secular' education can be seen following directly from this view. A certain quota of 'generalised' or 'common' Christianity was important as the basis of morality it was the state's duty to impart.
government had a responsibility to legislate against all things which led men into sin and imperfection. It should legislate against public houses, prostitution, seduction and so on.\(^1\) McGibbon frequently and strongly assailed the sexual vices of city life, and upheld the cause of temperance: in the latter case to the extent of facing several court appearances on libel charges collected during a campaign to prevent the opening of a public house opposite his church.\(^2\) McGibbon frequently assailed gambling, dancing and sabbath breaking, and when he discovered Catholics involved in or encouraging any of these three vices he was doubly indignant.\(^3\) In this way McGibbon happily linked a respectable if somewhat excessive Protestant puritanism with less savoury anti-Catholicism.

McGibbon held and proclaimed a firmly sectarian view of society. Statements of the anti-sectarian liberal ideology he abominated and frequently attacked. Against its hopeful view of religious harmony he asserted an inevitable struggle between Protestantism and Popery: a struggle between good and evil.\(^4\) He naturally found Protestants who propounded such anti-sectarian beliefs weak and vacillating, and not

---

\(^1\)For example, P.S., 12 March, 22 August 1870, 11 February, 11 March 1871, 27 February 1875.

\(^2\)See P.S., 5 April, 31 May, 14 June, 16 August, 11 October 1879, 28 February, 12 June, 19 June, 27 November 1880.

\(^3\)For example, he condemned the excursion to and celebration accompanying the opening of a Catholic chapel at Tarban Creek. (P.S., 25 February 1871.) He also denounced a land lottery at Singleton and an art union at Yass used to raise funds for Catholic chapels. (P.S., 1 June, 3 July 1871, 12 March 1881._

\(^4\)See for example his denunciation of the Governor for his approval of the Bethel Union as non-sectarian (P.S., 4 January, 1871); his attack of Hill End Times for editorialising that as men became more liberal the beauties of one religion would expand into another (P.S., 29 November 1873); his attack on editor of Gulgong Argus for saying that a more accurate classification of religions would be between sectarian Protestants, sectarian Catholics, and Christian liberals, of which groupings only the latter were truly Christian (P.S., 27 March 1875).
truly Protestant. He regarded the Sydney Morning Herald with almost the same degree of hostility as did the editor of the Freeman's Journal. He frequently attacked it, not only for encouraging by its coverage the immorality of the theatre and horse racing, but for giving a far fuller coverage to Catholic ceremonies and sermons than to Protestant. ¹ He favoured a vague form of Protestant unity, based on the evangelical tenets common to all true Protestants, and frequently blasted ritualistic practices on the Church of England. Yet he often displayed the psychological drives towards sectarianism common among those at his end of the Protestant spectrum, with sniping attacks on many of his anti-Catholic allies. ²

The Protestant Standard kept a close watch on colonial politics. It constantly reduced and simplified it into a struggle between three groups: the Catholics, the good Protestants, and the vascillating majority, any one of whom would make himself an instrument of Rome for a small addition of influence. Such a simple formula was difficult to apply in the complex world of faction manoeuvring that was colonial politics. An even simpler reduction: that there were two main parties: one Protestant and one Catholic, was even more difficult to maintain. This was the position that the Protestant Political Association was committed to support. Its unreality foretold the Association's failure and indicated the impossibility that politics would ever do more than occasionally reflect the sectarian dimensions emerging more noticeably in society. A certain set of political contingencies had, during 1868-70 given impetus to the emergence of sectarian divisions in society. After 1871 the complicated world of political allegiances acted as a damper on sectarian pressures.

¹ P.S., 2 February 1872, 1 May 1873, 6 July 1878.
² For example, on Wazir Beg (P.S., 24 November 1873; Rev. George Sutherland (P.S., 15, 22 November 1875); Daniel Allen (P.S., 26 November 1879).
magistrates; jobs were available for needy friends and relatives and the opportunity to expand its influence by the generous application of patronage was gratefully accepted. The high point of the Association's existence was reached in May 1871 when over 400 gentlemen, three quarters of them orangemen, braved heavy rain to attend a dinner in the Masonic Hall. Two ministers, Wilson and Windeyer attended, and Davies announced that they had 80 branches and 10,000 members.

Such success was short lived. Political perks for the few were no substitute for a sense of danger for the many. By October 1871 the P.P.A. was requesting the orange lodges for assistance and the Protestant Standard was attacking the Government over one of its appointments. More important was Parkes's return to politics early in 1872. Re-elected to the Assembly for Mudgee after an absence of over a year, he proceeded to attack the ministry with his old vigour. Two of its extravagantly Protestant supporters, Buchanan and Davies, received special attention. A general election was held almost immediately afterwards.

The elections rang the death knell for the P.P.A. Even before Parkes was returned for Mudgee it was widely

1 F.J., 12 August 1871.
2 For example, George Carter's brother was appointed postmaster at Mudgee, although a more suitable local person was available. The appointment was questioned in the Assembly (F.J., 20 May 1871).
3 For example, if the Freeman's (20 May 1871) is to be believed, Davies wrote to P.P.A. branches and orange lodges in Camberwarra district (in the Shoalhaven) suggesting that as it was important that such organisations should have their members appointed to influential positions, they might get up a petition on behalf of two of their better-off members to have them made magistrates. Martin had indicated to him that he would act on such petitions.
4 P.S., 27 May 1871.
5 No.2 L.O.L., minute book, entry for 9 October 1871; P.S., 14 October 1871.
6 F.J., 3 February 1872; P.S., 3 February 1872.
rumoured that he had arranged some deal with the Romanists. That he was opposed for Mudgee by J.G. O'Connor, the secretary of the Catholic Association, was welcomed by the Standard as evidence that he had not strayed from the path. Nevertheless, Parkes's behaviour, once elected, intensified the rumours. But Parkes, when approached by anxious Protestants, skilfully evaded the burden of their questions and the rumours were never verified. Davies and the P.P.A. worked hard for Robertson and Martin, but without great deal of success. The coalition had not been particularly popular or particularly active. The issue that precipitated the election, their intransigent stand against the Victorian government over the means and extent of payment of border customs duties, confused and alienated support. It completely disenchanted the southern districts of the colony.

Parkes again topped the poll in East Sydney, but this time the P.P.A. opposed, while the Catholics supported him. Martin and Buchanan, retiring members, and J.B. Wilson, another P.P.A. candidate, were defeated. The Protestant Standard admitted that some Protestants had continued to support Parkes, because they still did not suspect him. Robertson was again elected for West Sydney this time with P.P.A. support, but other P.P.A. successes were few. A little violence was added to their repertoire. At Parramatta a group of orange P.P.A. toughs, led by the push leader and sometimes pugilist Sandy Ross attended the nominations and attacked opponents of James Byrnes until the locals rallied and drove them off. Byrnes was defeated and two Parkes supporters elected.

1 P.S., 6 January 1872.
2 See for example, Parkes to the orangeman-pamphleteer G.H. Sparkes, 28 February 1872, P.C., A909, pp.113-5. Parkes simply denied one part of the rumour which was bothering Sparkes: that he had communicated with any priests (he had not); and dismissed other, unspecified, rumours as 'similarly false'.
3 F.J., 17 February 1872.
4 P.S., 17, 24 February 1872.
5 F.J., 24 February 1872.
The final humiliation occurred three months later. Martin delayed calling the House together after the elections. When he finally did, he was defeated. Parkes was eventually asked to form a government, which he did, including in it the Catholic, Edward Butler, as his Attorney General. The rumours that he had been courting Catholic support seemed fully proven, and the orangemen determined to defeat him in his ministerial re-election. John Robertson also wished to see Parkes defeated, as did his friend W.B. Dalley, who, perhaps a little jealously, thought Butler had misled the Catholics in organising their support for Parkes. Another friend of Robertson, James Jones, stood against Parkes, but was heavily defeated. The main meeting to support his candidature was held at the Masonic Hall. Davies, Goold, Carter and Josephson were forced to sit behind their one-time enemy, W.B. Dalley, as he delivered a powerful oration in Jones's support, attacking Parkes for his anti-Catholicism and condemning Catholics for their folly in supporting him. It added to the insult that Jones was a grog merchant, and the Catholics, joyfully savoring the irony, distributed election dodgers reading 'Sons of Temperance, Vote for Mr. J. Jones, Wine and Spirit Merchant!'

The P.P.A. did not survive such a shift of political allegiances. Davis attempted to keep it going with dinners and lectures, but by August it was meeting only every second Friday of the month. In June 1873 it began meeting monthly, and received no further notice in the Standard.

1 F.J., 28 May 1872.
2 Ibid. The speech was quickly published as a pamphlet: A Speech Delivered by the Honourable W.B. Dalley M.L.C. at the Masonic Hall (Sydney, 1872). In 1880, during controversy over Parkes's 1880 Public Instruction Bill, it was republished under the title of A Terrible Indicement - Dalley on Parkes in 1872 (Sydney, 1880).
3 P.S., 1 June 1872.
4 For example, a dinner for Buchanan, who attacked Parkes as a traitor and proudly affirmed his own orangeism. (P.S., 4 May 1872.
5 P.S., 31 August 1872.
6 P.S., 21 June 1873.
The failure of the P.P.A. clearly indicated that society would not easily be polarised along sectarian lines. The orange lodges continued to grow rapidly, but their impressive membership was probably not indicative of the number of fully committed Protestant sectarians. Even if the Protestant Standard was read by two other men beside the purchasers, it would have reached less than half the orangemen, and membership of orange benefit societies and the like was smaller (about 3,000 in 1876). Lodge membership was indicative only of the number who felt it necessary to give some recognition of their feelings of fear and hostility towards Catholics. More than they shared their feelings, but did not give that recognition. Less than they felt strongly enough to want to oppose and withdraw from not only Catholics, but all those who did not share their feelings. The core of committed Protestant sectarians was only a few thousand.

Nevertheless, these committed Protestant sectarians influenced a wider subculture and while Catholics continued to adopt sectarian postures, their influence could only grow. Catholic sectarianism had created the circumstances which allowed, even encouraged, Protestant sectarianism to grow. Its continuation meant that the liberal nativist ideology would not react strongly to the growing Protestant sectarianism as it had previously. Once the orange lodges began to grow again after the 1869 election, much of the public opposition to them fell away. Their existence was still deplored by a number of men, like John West and his successor to the editorial chair of the Herald, Andrew Garran, but the orangemen were, by the early 1870s a significant group in colonial life, and could not be argued

---

1 Its circulation in 1878 was 3,000. There were then 20,000 orangemen.
2 See article on Garran in A.D.B., Vol.4 (forthcoming).
away. The Herald did, at least, give them rather less attention than it might otherwise have given a similarly sized group.

*   *   *   *   *

The sectarianism displayed in the 1869 election helped the formation of a separate Catholic subcommunity. At the same time, its extent and virulence amazed and disturbed Catholics and, in fear of further hostility, curbed their tendency towards paranoid assertiveness. Catholics mostly continued to respond to social pressures pushing them into a separate subcommunity, but it was a fairly haphazard response because, until 1874 they lacked effective leadership.

Their clerical leaders were weak. Polding was old, despairing and wanting to retire; his Vicar-General, Sheehy, had suffered the humiliation of having Polding's nomination of him as his coadjutor rejected in Rome; McEncroe was dead.1 In the country dioceses, the Irish suffragen bishops were more decisive but they could exert little influence on the metropolitan diocese. The Catholic tradition made it extremely difficult for any layman to wield much influence. The only way any lay influence could have been exerted was by playing on the Irishness of most Catholics. This Polding could never have allowed, for it could only have increased that alienation of Catholics from colonial society which he deplored.2 It was Polding's tragedy that he could not see

---


2 Polding blamed the Irish bishops for much of the anti-Catholic bitterness. Polding to Gregory, 25 March 1840; Birt, op.cit., p.363.
that the Church's intransigent position on education was the main cause of that alienation.

The absence of Catholic leadership was no more obvious than over education. It was the intransigence of the Catholic clergy on this question which had attracted so much hostility and had induced the first serious weakening of the anti-sectarian ideology. Yet this was one issue on which the clergy remained intransigent and combative.

In May 1870, recognising the danger of complete political ostracism which such a position involved, the prominent Catholic layman, W.A. Duncan, contributed a series of articles to the Freeman's Journal suggesting that Catholics could accept the public schools if they were represented on the Council of Education as they had been on the National Board. He warned of the grave social dangers inherent in their present position and criticised the clergy for offering nothing but total opposition to the legislation from the start. He pointed out that far from being 'godless' the public schools allowed one hour a day for dogmatic religious instruction. He thought it was the clergy's duty to take advantage of this opportunity to instruct the many Catholic children who were attending the public schools.

Yet Duncan, too, had been deeply shocked by the anti-Catholic hostility of the previous two years, and presented his case tentatively and ambiguously. He believed, as he had always believed, that mixed or public schools were by far the best for reasons of economy and efficiency, but he was becoming wary of them because of the extent to which they made the religion of Catholic children dependent on the goodwill of Protestants - a commodity he was beginning to think more scarce than he had believed in the past. He lamely concluded that if Catholics could not co-operate in the public school system then they should begin positively to agitate for an alternative system. He suggested the scheme put forward by Thomas Holt in 1856. This provided for a system of payment by results, and would have been the very opposite of efficient and economic.
Despite the tentativeness of his arguments Duncan was condemned by a number of correspondents for daring to question the bishops and clergy. One of his milder chastisements came from Bishop Quinn, who informed him that the weight of Catholic opinion the world over opposed mixed schools. Quinn also pointed out that for the bishops to send priests or catechists into public schools would be to recognise them, which was of course impossible.¹ Thus political considerations became more important than pastoral.

Yet, while the Catholic authorities would have no truck with the public schools, they made no attempt to suggest an alternative acceptable to other colonists as well as themselves. It was their assumptions of the naturalness of their position as a persecuted minority which so disturbed Duncan and led him to recommend some other positive course of action if it proved impossible to accept the public schools. The Catholic Church remained characterised by a desiring persecution complex for the next few years. It was a state of mind which inhibited and confused action even within the limited framework of possibilities the clergy had allowed themselves.

Towards the Council of Education the Catholic authorities adopted a stance of unchanging hostility. They believed that it existed mainly to destroy denominational schools.² But while they declared this possibility inevitable, even imminent, they did little to prepare for its eventuality. A few teaching orders were recruited to the colony and, for a while, the Catholic Association continued to provide for between 14 and 16 lay-staffed independent schools. It attracted little enthusiasm and, it would seem, little accounting know-how from its administrators. During 1870 and

¹These articles, which the Freeman's published as contributed editorials, were signed 'Delta'. It is clear from internal evidence that Duncan was their author. They and the replies of a number of his critics are in F.J., 2, 21, 28 May, 4, 11, 18 June 1870.
²For example, F.J., 7 January, 2 May, 2 December 1871; Catholic Association Reporter, 9 February, 11 April 1871.
1871, while its spokesmen continued to praise its success, it continued to spend over twice its income and collapsed early in 1872.¹ The schools it had been assisting were closed.² Some schools, run by religious orders, continued independently of the Council of Education. The Catholic authorities favoured these, but no attempt to co-ordinate them with their existing schools. In 1872 the teachers at both the Kent Street North and Kent Street South Catholic denominational schools complained of a decline in numbers because their children were being encouraged to attend the Marist Brothers' school newly opened in the vicinity.³

Despite their expressed dislike of the limitations placed on religious teaching by the denominational schools and their clear preference for schools under their exclusive control, the Catholic authorities made no further attempt to provide an alternative system of Catholic schools or, indeed, to comprehend why their original attempt had been unsuccessful. They continued to sporadically denounce public schools, but large numbers of Catholic children continued to attend them. During the seventies about one-fifth of the children in public schools were Catholic.

About half the Catholic children being educated at schools administered by the Council of Education were attending public schools.⁴ These may well have been the children of parents too poor, too timid, or too worldly to heed their

⁴ The figure drops to a little below half only if Catholics attending the half-time and provisional schools in remote areas, are excluded. See Council of Education Reports on public and denominational schools in various volumes of V & P (LA NSW). The proportion attending public schools in the metropolitan area was about 40 per cent. (Fogarty, op.cit., p.212.)
bishops' commands, as Catholic authorities argued at the time. They may also have been the children of parents reasonably unimpressed by what appeared to most other colonists as the absurdity and unreality of the bishops' denunciations of public schools. Such parents may have wanted a better education for their children or they may have thought it neither good for their children nor society to have Catholic children educated separately. By no means all the people who described themselves as Catholic shared the sectarian assumptions of the clergy and a number of the laity. That at least some of the clergy and their lay followers seemed determined to exclude from the description of Catholic those that did not share their assumptions indicated the depth of their sectarianism.

In the country dioceses a little more direction prevailed, particularly in Bathurst, where Bishop Quinn determined to follow Fr Tennison Wood's South Australian example and provide a system of Catholic schools independent of the state and financed from Catholic resources. He also used the provisions of the denominational system to extend Catholic schools as widely as possible. Wherever a Catholic school was available he threatened to withhold the sacraments from parents who continued to send their children to the public school. In Maitland, Bishop Murray, at a slower pace, attempted to follow Quinn's initiative. In Goulburn Bishop Lanigan was even slower to act and by 1879 had few independent Catholic schools.

---

1 Ibid., pp.210-6.
2 Ibid., pp.237-8; S.M.H., 11 January 1870.
4 Ibid., p.29.
The Catholic authorities' intransigence over education continued to arouse hostility. Their threats of withholding the sacraments from parents received particular notice. To non-Catholics, unable to comprehend, and certainly unable to sympathise with the immense authority accorded the episcopacy of the Catholic Church, such exercise of authority seemed like coercion. It also pointed up the contradiction in the bishops' position: on the one hand they said Catholics had a conscientious objection to attending public schools; on the other hand they had to threaten them with grave spiritual disabilities to stop them attending public schools.

The constant harping of the Catholics on the alleged injustices perpetrated by the Council of Education also strengthened those who wished entirely to end state assistance to denominational schools. The Council of Education was determined to administer the Act fairly, but to make no concessions for denominational schools. The Act was, unfortunately, a little ambiguous, in that its provision for allowing the establishment of new denominational schools: that is, that they must be within two miles of a public school and the combined total of the two schools should be more than 120, could be fruitfully applied within the heavily settled city area in the interests of denominationalism. Such an application would have been

---

1 See V & P (LA NSW), 1870-1 (4) 369 PP. for several cases of persons being threatened for sending their children to public schools. The Protestant Standard comment on these is in P.S., 12 November 1870. Another involved a Fr Lanigan who tried to persuade the Protestant wife of a Catholic warder at the Berrima gaol named O'Brien, to send their children to a Catholic school. He told her that as her husband refused to obey her instructions he was a bad Catholic, and if he was unfaithful to his Church he would obviously be unfaithful to her. (P.S., 8 July 1871.) Papers containing the report of the conversation were tabled in the House, but on the last day of sitting, and the Catholic James Hart was successfully able to stall a motion that they be printed, until the Assembly was required to attend to the Council Chamber to hear the Governor prorogue the sitting. (S.M.H., 26 June 1871.) Members were of course able to view the documents and broadcast their content.
against the intentions of the Act, and the Attorney-General ruled in 1867 that the Council could not be compelled to grant a certificate under that provision of the Act. This was first tested in mid-1871 when the Council refused to certify an Anglican denominational school established at Petersham. The Council acknowledged that the strict requirements of the Act had been complied with, but pointed out that there were several public schools, a Catholic and even another Anglican denominational school near the new school. The Council felt it was important to make this stand 'lest denominational schools be opened indiscriminately in the city and big towns and draw heavily on the resources of the Council'.

At about the same time the Council was refusing to grant a certificate to a Catholic school newly opened at Grenfell. On this occasion the reason they gave was that it was conducted in a church. This was not illegal, as the regulations allowed a denominational schoolroom to be used as a church and therefore, presumably vice-versa. This point the parish priest reiterated in a series of letters to the Council. The Council seemed to be relying on the judgement of the chairman of the Grenfell public school board, and their inspector, that the Grenfell public school would soon be capable of accommodating all the children of the district, and, when it was, that the numbers at the Catholic school would fall away. They continued to stall. Eventually the papers were tabled in the House, which, by a note of 30-2 criticised the Council for acting illegally. Parkes was one of the main critics and confessed that he thought it had acted illegally in the Petersham case as well.

---

1 See 'Correspondence Relating to the Refusal to grant a Certificate to the Church of England School Petersham', V & P (LA NSW), 1872-3 (3) 21-40.

2 Interestingly, the Catholic priest involved, Fr Fr Finnigan believed that had Parkes been on the Council of Education the trouble would not have arisen. See Fr Finnigan to Parkes, 17 April 1872, P.C., A 922, pp.343-5.
Those suspicious of his motives claimed that his dependance on the support of Catholic members governed his response. A number of other members voted for the criticism, but expressed the hope that denominational schools would soon be cast aside by the state. Several of the Council of Education resigned as a result of the criticism.¹

The Catholics had proved victorious on this occasion, and were satisfied. Yet, on other occasions, even when the Council of Education acted to meet Catholic criticism, Catholic spokesmen were not satisfied. At Eden, for example, the public school teacher was accused by the parish priest of tampering with the faith of the Catholic children. He had called into question before his class Catholic doctrine, including papal infallibility and the efficacy of praying for the dead. The priest had a statement from four children to prove that he had. The Council ordered an inquiry. The inspector who conducted the investigation found that at least one of the boys had not even been at the school when some of the offensive remarks to which he attested were made. The other three were brothers. All four gave the impression of having been drilled in what to say, and none of the other children at the school had a clear idea of what had been said. The inspector concluded that the teacher had been a little unwise in his expression and the Council strongly censured him. The Freeman's Journal felt he should have been dismissed at least.²

¹See debate reported in F.J., 23 November 1872; the papers and correspondence connected with the case are in V & P (LA NSW), 1871-2 (2) 681-896; 1872-3 (3) 47-62. A letter from Edward Butler to Parkes regarding the case is in Autographed Letters of Notable Australians, A69, pp.413-5. Butler does not seem to have fully understood the case, and claims that there is clear evidence that the inspector was rigging his figures in continuing to recommend against the granting of a certificate. See also F.J., 30 November 1872. Also see P.S., 23 November, 7 December 1872; 25 January 1873 for hostile comment.

²F.J., 18 September, 5 October 1872. For the correspondence and reports relative to the matter, see V & P (LA NSW), 1872 (2) 697-709. See also P.S., 5, 19 October 1872.
The Council of Education was not only acutely aware of Catholic criticism, but displayed considerable restraint in dealing with the Catholic authorities. In doing so it weakened not only its own position, but the 1866 Act as well, and thus hastened the end of the denominational compromise which that Act involved. One concession it made concerned the registering of nuns as teachers in Catholic denominational schools. One important purpose of the 1866 Act was to improve the standards of the colony's schools by instituting a system of classification by examination for their teachers. The examinations were to be of two kinds: an assessment by an inspector of their teaching, and a written examination. The Catholic authorities were opposed to having the sisters teaching in denominational schools examined in this fashion. After rejecting an absurd request by Sheehy that a board of priests be empowered to examine the nuns, the Council decided to temporarily waive the requirements of a written examination and examine them on their class work only.

The same problem arose a little later at Bathurst, where two nuns had been temporarily given a low grading. Bishop Quinn and the Vicar-General declared that this was an insult and demanded that they be given a high grading. The Council replied that they would have to be examined first. It suggested that the nuns attend an examination of other teachers in the district to be held at the public school. The Catholic authorities refused, claiming that it would force the nuns to mix with 'company in which no gentlemen would like to see a lady'. The Vicar-General informed the Council that they should follow the Irish practice and recognise the novitiate training of nuns as evidence enough of their abilities. This was of some importance as there were several girls being trained in the local convent as novices. Eventually the Council agreed with another suggestion of the Vicar-General to examine only novices, and to grade the fully professed nuns on the teaching performance alone. One of the leading opponents of denominational schools had the correspondence tabled in the House and
printed. The arrogance and deceit displayed by the Catholic authorities could hardly have won them sympathy. It was perhaps no wonder that late in 1871 Jabez King Heydon, an ardent opponent of public schools, should have written to the Freeman's Journal observing that Catholics were disadvantaged in their dealings with the Council of Education by the tone and attitude adopted by the bishops and clergy. He suggested a committee of laymen to deal with the Council.

While the clergy and most of the leading Catholic laity were incapable of coming to terms with the political and social climate of the colony over education, there were many among them who shared Duncan's fear of complete social ostracism. In the early years of the seventies - indeed, for the next one hundred years - two forces were at work within the Catholic sub-community. One was sectarian: tightening the perimeters of the sub-community and lengthening the distance between Catholics and other citizens. The other was assimilative: pushing Catholics into social and political endeavours with other men and lessening the separation of Catholics from society. The first was, overall, the more powerful force.

As was the case during much of that hundred years, the two forces or tendencies were represented by its own journal. The Freeman's Journal was not exactly an anti-sectarian or assimilative force - that would have been too radical a course for any Catholic paper to adopt at that time - but it at least published anti-sectarian views, such as Duncan's,

---

1 V & P (LA NSW), 1873-4 (5) 465-505. See P.S., 1, 8 November 1873 for hostile comment. Their arrogance was displayed in remarks such as Quinn's reported reply to the inspector's suggestion that he might conduct the examination of the nuns in their own schoolroom. Quinn said that it was his business and he would see to it. Their deceit was evinced in the selective quoting of the Council's letters to the Sydney archdiocesan authorities, making a concession, but only for one year. The Bathurst authorities quoted this selectively to imply it was a permanent concession.

2 F.J., 2 December 1871.
which were; and it played an important role during 1871-2 in preparing Catholic opinion to support their arch-enemy Parkes. It mostly displayed a quietly despairing persecution complex, which led it to misread society, but at least in terms of existing social groups. The Freeman's Journal was convinced that the Council of Education and public schools were a Methodist plot, which was far fetched, but not as far fetched as the conspiracy theory advocated by its more sectarian contemporary, the Catholic Association Reporter. That journal believed that public schools were masonic and communist inspired and part of the great materialist conspiracy against religion. The Reporter was the journal of the Catholic Association. It appeared monthly from October 1870-71. It was edited, published and printed by J.G. O'Connor, a 'forties generation' Irishman and lay secretary of the Association. It was a small production and had none of the Freeman's aspirations to being a public journal. In it, news of the cosmic conspiracy and the tribulations of the Holy Father mixed incongruously with the trivia of colonial Catholicism: the meetings of priests; the doings of the good sisters; the activities of the Catholic Association; the endeavours of Catholic temperance; and the picnics, bazaars and other entertainments designed to keep Catholics together and raise funds for the Church. It had a highly developed sense of the necessity of lay subservience to the clergy in all matters.

The Catholic Truth Society, begun by Jabez King Heydon in 1870 was informed by the sectarian tendency. Like the pamphlet on John Knox circulated during the 1869 election, the C.T.S. pamphlets were reprints from the English C.T.S.

---

1 See for example _F.J._, 20 August 1870, 7 January, 2 December 1871.

2 Catholic Association Reporter, February, May, September 1871 for the masonic plot; August 1871 for the communist.

3 Almost a complete run of the Catholic Association Reporter is in the S.A.A.

4 It was said after the publication of the first few pamphlets that Polding, or someone appointed by him, revised each tract before printing. ( _F.J._, 5 May 1871.)
Their object was to express Catholic doctrine in simple language, to strengthen the faith of Catholics and to convert Protestants. The doctrines emphasised were those of ultramontanist Catholicism, and the attempts to convert Protestants involved misrepresentations of Protestantism at least as serious as Beg's or McGibbon's misrepresentation of Catholicism. The Freeman's noted with satisfaction that the pamphlet condemning mixed marriages caused something of a stir 'among the "milk and water" children of the church'. At the same time it thought the pamphlet on infallibility simplistic, for which it was roundly abused by the Catholic Association Reporter:

...does Dollinger come to 199 York Street [the Freeman's address] too...it would be better for the Freeman's writer to leave to the clergy...these duties which it is the proper office to discharge.

The Protestant Standard devoted many leaders to the pamphlets.

The Catholic Association Reporter did not even last as long as the Association. The style of Catholicism they represented was not, in the early 1870s, as widespread as it was in later decades. That other potent source of colonial Catholic sectarianism, Irish nationalism, was not as popular in the early 1870s as it had been a little earlier. It had its own journal, the Irish Citizen, which began late in 1871 and ran until 1873, but attracted none of the attention given

1 The first few titles indicate the bias: The Definition of Infallibility of the Pope; Who Believes in the Bible? The Catholics or the Protestants?; The Presence of God on Earth; Mixed Marriages; Our Lady of Lourdes; The first twelve pamphlets are bound together under the title of the first in the A.N.L.
2 F.J., 1 July 1871.
3 Catholic Association Reporter, July 1871.
4 See, for example, P.S., 14 January, 20 May, 15 July 1871.
The *Freeman's* under O'Sullivan's editorship.¹ The split in the Irish which appeared after the attempted assassination remained, and only healed by the middle of the decade. St Patrick's Day 1870 was, as in 1869, a very demure affair: a picnic at Clontarf chaired by Sir Terence Murray.² Those who objected to this 'boot licking' approach attended the picnic and distributed a pamphlet, printed in green ink, attacking Murray for his anti-Irish remarks following the attempted assassination. Murray objected to this and a sharp correspondence ensued in the *Freeman's*. One of his critics was O'Sullivan's compatriot in the 1868 welcome to the State Prisoners, Bernard Gaffney.⁴ St Patrick's Day, 1871, was celebrated in similar fashion, with the addition of special church services in the morning and a ball and supper in the evening.⁵

The arrival in the colony in July 1871 of a second batch of pardoned Fenians, previously imprisoned in Western Australia, helped a little to unify the Irish. A collection had been held to assist them, but attracted none of the public attention of two years before. A banquet in their honour, chaired by Daniel O'Connor and Bernard Gaffney, was attended by J.G. O'Connor, the chief organiser of the past.

---

¹No copies of this paper seem to exist. It was said by the Protestant Standard, (8 June 1872) to be the journal of the Home Rule party. Richard O'Sullivan, the previous editor of the *Freeman's* contributed to it from California. (F.J., 1 February 1873.)

²The advertisement for this appearing in the Herald conveyed the spirit of the occasion: 'Sir T.A. Murray will be in the chair, supported by an influential committee of Irishmen well known for the important and respectable position they occupy in society'. (S.M.H., 17 November 1870.)

³F.J., 19 March 1870; P.S., 19 March 1870.

⁴F.J., 26 March, 2 April 1870.

⁵S.M.H., 18 March 1871; Catholic Association Reporter, April 1871.
three St Patrick's Days.¹ St Patrick's Day 1872 was similar to the previous three years.²

Something of the old split re-emerged in 1873, when the recently formed Hibernian-Australasian Catholic Benefit Society, attempted to capture the organising of the St Patrick's Day celebrations. Its secretary, Daniel J. O'Connor³ claimed that it had done so only because no one else seemed interested, but his claim was vehemently repudiated by J.G. O'Connor on behalf of the regular committee.⁴ Two picnics were held, one at Balmoral and one at Prince Alfred Park, where an Irish dancing competition was held in the Exhibition Building. Among the events at the Park was a special flat race 'for scholars attending public schools'. There were several Irish concerts in the evening.⁵ More co-ordination was achieved the next year when the Hibernian's organised a picnic and an evening concert, while the old committee arranged a banquet in the evening.⁶ About 4,000 attended the picnic, the largest crowd for some years. 1875 was celebrated in a similar fashion.⁷

The Hibernians were essentially a benefit society. Their growing influence over the St Patrick's Day celebrations gave these occasions a lower class and isolationist flavour previously lacking. In the mid 1860s St Patrick's Day had been celebrated by a regatta and a banquet. The leading Irishmen of the colony mixed easily

---

¹ F.J., 8, 29 July 1871.
² S.M.H., 19 March 1872.
³ I am not sure if this is the same Daniel O'Connor who chaired the pardoned prisoners meeting with Bernard Gaffney in 1871, and whether one or both are synonymous with Daniel O'Connor, later M.L.A.; but I suspect so.
⁴ F.J., 8, 15 March 1873.
⁵ S.M.H., 15 March 1873.
⁶ F.J., 21 March 1874; S.M.H., 18 March 1874.
⁷ S.M.H., 18 March 1874.
with prominent men of native or English birth and Protestant religion at these two typical forms of colonial celebration. By the mid-seventies these had been replaced by Catholic Church services in the morning; a picnic, sports and Irish dancing during the day; and a concert of Irish songs in the evening. Few Irishmen of any prominence attended.

St Patrick's Day celebrations were beginning to be held regularly in other towns in the colony. They were of a similar kind. The older customs were resurrected from time to time during the late seventies and eighties, but the banquets were no more than appendages of the main celebrations. They did not receive the prominent patronage that they had in the 1860s.

The Irish community was completely united in the 1875 celebration of the centenary of Daniel O'Connell's birth. The day had been carefully organised in previous weeks by a large committee. It was eagerly anticipated by the colony's Irishmen, and a number of firms gave their employees a holiday for the occasion. It began with a procession. Guilds and societies, Catholic and non-sectarian; contingents from Goulburn, Bathurst and other country centres; a large number of bands; and members of the public marched from near

---

1 Australia Day, for example, was celebrated in a similar fashion.
2 For example, F.J., 23 March 1878, for descriptions of celebrations at Goulburn and Bathurst.
3 See, for example, F.J., 25 March 1882. This was the best attended St Patrick's banquet in over a decade. W.B. Dalley gave the oration and John Robertson was among the guests. A little later news of the Phoenix Park murders and the following visit of the Redmond brothers attracted a lot of hostility to Irishmen and split the Irish community much as had the attempted assassination in 1868.
4 S.M.H., 14 July 1875. James Garvan, the forties generation Irishman, later cabinet minister, and founder of the M.L.C. insurance company was one secretary. The second secretary was Thomas Michael Slattery, who was to be a cabinet minister in the eighties and, until 1875, active in municipal politics. He was a brother-in-law of J.G. O'Connor.
5 P.S., 28 August 1875.
St James church to Prince Alfred Park. Many of the marchers sported green and blue rosettes, representing the national colours of Ireland and Australia, thus beginning the Irish-Australian tradition of duel, but anti-Imperial, nationalism. An afternoon of sport was followed by an evening’s entertainment in the Exhibition Building. This consisted of Irish melodies played on the organ; the performance of a cantata, specially written for the occasion by Charles Badham the Vice Chancellor of the University; and an oration on O'Connell by Archbishop Vaughan.  

The occasion did not pass without criticism. The main objection of the critics was that the procession would constitute a breach of the Party Processions Act. W.B. Dalley, the Attorney-General at the time, ruled that as it was a national celebration and did not relate to any religious or political distinctions, it would not breach the law. But there were many who disagreed with him.  

It was hotly debated in the Assembly, with an odd opposition alliance between the high churchman Alexander Stuart (soon to join the ministry) and the orangeman Davies. The orangemen indicated that if the Irishmen were allowed to march, so would they, next twelfth of July, and the Herald regretted that the authority of the Act had been so weakened. As it turned out the orangemen marched three months later to the laying of the foundation stone of the Protestant Hall, and seemed satisfied with that.

The most extreme instance of the sectarian tendency in colonial Catholicism was the formation in mid-1871 of a Catholic Protection Association. This was a direct response to the growing strength of the Orange Institution and the P.P.A. During 1870 there had been talk of the need for a

---

1 S.M.H., 7 August 1875.
2 S.M.H., 7 August 1875.
3 S.M.H., 6 August 1875.
4 S.M.H., 5 July 1875.
Catholic protection society. In July 1870 a meeting of Catholics was called in the Temperance Hall for the purpose of forming such a society. To a crowded meeting a William Eyles introduced himself as the provisional president of the Association. George Hurley, the Irish ward politician, unsuccessful in the past two elections was introduced as the Vice-President. Eyles spoke at length of the need for such a society to protect Catholic interests. They had seen the growth of organised opposition to Catholics and had waited for the formation of a coalition of Catholics and liberal Protestants to oppose that organisation. They had waited in vain. Their opponents, he went on, 'had said they would not dare form such a society except at the expressed instance of their clergy, but they would show them that although they were all Catholics they had not all abdicated their undoubted rights as citizens'. He spoke of how Catholics were underrepresented in Parliament and on municipal bodies, and how Catholics had been kept out of employment in the Corporation and the Government railways. The Catholic Protection Association, he affirmed, would use the constitutional means available to Catholics to destroy the orange society. They would exercise their votes to put into power liberal Protestants and staunch Catholics. Membership of the Association would be open to Catholics and liberal Protestants and would cost sixpence per month. He concluded by assuring

1 F.J., 17 December 1870.
2 Eyles was a strange individual. A Protestant, active in temperance circles (Sons of Temperance; N.S.W. Political Association for the Suppression of Intemperance; United Temperance Alliance) he had converted to Catholicism late in 1870. At about the same time he had assisted George Hurley in his unsuccessful campaign against S.S. Goold in Philip Ward. (P.S., 29 July, 26 August 1871; S.M.H., 8 July 1868, 30 November 1870; Empire, 11 March, 15 July 1869.)
3 After his defeat by Goold in 1870 Hurley had hinted at the need for a Catholic organisation to oppose the orangemen and the P.P.A. (S.M.H., 3 December 1870.)
4 By which he implied most Catholics in Parliament were not true to their religion.
the meeting that although it was a lay society, the clergy would, as individuals, assist them, provided they did nothing as a society inconsistent with their religious duties.

Eyles was not quite accurate in his assurance. The politically sectarian nature of the proposed organisation could hardly have appealed to the clergy, who were not prepared to seek social antagonism by such direct political action. The Vicar-General, Sheehy, attended the meeting on his own initiative, accompanied by the popular Fr Tim McCarthy. Sheehy spoke after Eyles. He objected to the term 'Catholic' in the title. It would not be a 'Catholic' society, he explained, for the Archbishop and his clergy knew nothing about it. He would however, be happier if the term 'lay' were inserted, making it the 'Lay Catholic Protection Association'. At the same time he must condemn such an association. He greatly feared that it would bring trouble upon them and scandal upon the Church. He wished to assure the meeting that such an organisation had no ecclesiastical sanction whatever. Fr McCarthy, when asked by the audience to speak, repeated Sheehy's censure. He warned that they were 'throwing down the gauntlet to men who would multiply themselves against them a hundred, aye, a thousand to one'. The priests then left the meeting, which was then addressed by George Hurley, who, in truly paranoid fashion, waved an orange rule book and assured them that they must adopt the organisation of their enemies. He reminded them of how the Irish vote was sought after in America. At the conclusion of the meeting a large number were enrolled.¹

The new association received a mixed reception. The _Freeman's Journal_ struck a pose of noble forebearance. After dwelling at length on the abundance of anti-Catholicism which had turned the thought of Catholics towards a protective organisation, it agreed with Sheehy's denunciation of the

¹_F.J., 29 July 1871._
movement. Confidently, it asserted:

...we are strong enough in number, in station, in character to hold our own against ten times the number of dingy blackguards who would provoke us to an emulation of their animosity....Our security, our glory in this country is that the law is strong enough to afford us the most absolute protection. We have the support of thousands of our noble hearted Protestant fellow citizens to them as to ourselves we owe much, to them for their courage and justice, to ourselves for our forebearance. Shall we forfeit so much that is glorious in our history, and a friendship so priceless as we have experienced to play the dirty games of Orangemen with its own dirty implements.¹

The Catholic Association Reporter merely repeated the arguments of the two priests. Other reaction was more hostile.² The Evening News described it as an aggression society,³ while the Protestant Standard, fascinated by the priests' reaction to it, thought it was probably too blatently political for their liking.⁴

By no means all Catholics agreed with the Freeman's or their clergy. The Lay Catholic Protection Association continued to grow. It issued rules, membership cards and passwords; began checking the electoral roles; held a series of lectures on orangeism and related topics.⁵ By November several branches had been formed, and applications received for others. One such application, containing over a hundred signatures, came from Mudgee.⁶ In the 1871 municipal

¹ F.J., 29 July 1871.
² Catholic Association Reporter, August 1871.
³ See Eyles's comments on the Evening News in F.J., 5 August 1871.
⁴ P.S., 29 July 1871.
⁵ F.J., 29 August 1871. One lecture, by J.D. Delony was subsequently published under the title Orangeism. A Historical Retrospect. Lecture Delivered before the Lay Catholic Protection Association of New South Wales (Sydney, 1871). (Copy in M.L.)
⁶ F.J., 18 November 1871.
elections, Hurley stood for Gipps ward, for the position held since 1859 by the Catholic Owen Caraher, who was retiring. Catholics stood in two other wards and received Association assistance.\(^1\) After a heavily sectarian campaign all three were defeated.\(^2\) At its first annual meeting in August 1872 the Association resolved to disband and divide the balance of its funds between the House of the Good Shepherd and the Marist Brothers.\(^3\) By then the political fortunes of Catholics, at least at the parliamentary level, had considerably improved.

The hand of Edward Butler, the elder brother of the editor-proprietor of the *Freeman's Journal*, could be perceived in the *Freeman's* condemnation of the Lay Catholic Protection Association. Butler, the M.L.A. for Argyle, had been shocked by the sectarianism of the late sixties. Like Duncan, with whom he was once associated on the National School Board, he was aware of the dangerous consequences which could follow if Catholics became completely estranged from the political life of the colony. Before emigrating from Ireland in 1852 Butler had been a member of the Young Ireland group and a sub-editor of Duffy's *Nation*. As a nationalist he felt strong sympathy for his 'poor countrymen'; as an educated man he felt responsible for them.\(^4\) He regretted his Bishop's opposition to the Public Schools Act, but was even more disturbed by the anti-Catholicism which that opposition engendered. He recognised that the use made by Robertson and the rest of the Opposition of the Catholic grievances

\(^1\) John Hughes for Fitzroy and John Murphy for Denison. F.J., 19 November 1871.

\(^2\) P.S., 2,9 December 1871; F.J., 9 December 1871. The *Freeman's* referred to the P.P.A. candidates as 'the Sydney Reds' — a reference to the communists of the Paris commune, who similarly sought to destroy religion.

\(^3\) F.J., 17 August 1872.

\(^4\) See his warning to the newly arrived Gavan Duffy in 1855. 'I have another reason for writing. Do not fling yourself into the embraces of our poor countrymen who would run away with you beyond the grounds of discretion.' Gavan Duffy, *My Life in Two Hemispheres* (London, 1898), Vol.II, p.137.
had added to that hostility and he sought election in 1869 so that he might try and free the Catholics from this allegiance.¹

In this task he was partly successful, but he recognised that more positive action was required to allay the bigotry and lessen Catholic estrangement from the polity. Parkes's retirement from politics and the alliance between Robertson and Martin provided him with such an opportunity. Butler had been close friends with Parkes in the fifties and early sixties. He had introduced Parkes and Gavan Duffy, between whom a friendship also flourished. Parkes's role in the O'Farrell affair had seriously strained his friendship with the two Irishmen, but by late 1870 Duffy was expressing sympathy with Parkes for the interruption of his political career.² Parkes, isolated and relatively friendless,³ responded eagerly:

Some time or other you will begin to understand that "you and the race from which you spring" [quoting Duffy's previous self-description] have persisted in reviewing my conduct when in office through the false light of men who are not more my enemies than the enemies of your "race", but who could do nothing without using the Irish people....I may have been urged on by the influence around me and by circumstances of irritation from without to do extreme things in office, but all my actions were so falsely coloured by the deluders of your "race" that I would hardly recognise one of them in the form in which they discussed them.

A little later in the same letter he combined his genuine desire for religious harmony with a natural suspicion of the clergy:

I fervently pray to God that a way will be found for your race to mix with mine as fellow citizens, apart from that power which hitherto

---

²Duffy to Parkes, 14 December 1870, P.C., A921, pp.34-6.
³Parkes. Fifty Years in the Making of Australian History, p.213.
in every political crisis has guided them in one direction, right or wrong.\(^1\) Duffy must have hold Butler of this apologetic Parkes, for by early 1871 Butler and Parkes were corresponding in an amicable fashion.\(^2\)

What remains of the correspondence between the two does not indicate precisely when a political pact was formed. It does, however, clearly show that the initiative was Butler's, and that Parkes remained, right up until their electoral success, inordinately suspicious of the Irish-Catholic support Butler was bringing him.\(^3\) The correspondence also

---

3. I disagree radically with A.W. Martin who argues that Parkes sought out the Irish Catholics as the third part of an incongruous alliance between anti-Catholics (Lang and Wearne) and merchants (Montefiore) (A.W. Martin, 'Faction Politics and the Education question in New South Wales', E.L. French, ed., Melbourne Studies in Education 1960-61 (Melbourne, 1962), pp.39-41). Martin's interpretation will not stand a close reading of the correspondence between Parkes and Butler. His view of Parkes is far too simple. For a start the labels 'anti-Catholic' and 'merchant' for Lang and Wearne, and Montefiore suggest that Parkes was cultivating them as representatives of interest groups. They were, rather, all old friends of Parkes. Wearne was an orangeman, but not closely identified with them and had been acceptable to the Catholics in 1869 (F.J., 18 December 1869). Lang was an old liberal and sometime ally of Parkes. Parkes had good reason for thinking he was opposed to the alliance of his usual ally, Robertson, with James Martin. A.W. Martin's view that Parkes was by early 1871 plotting and planning his return to politics relies heavily on a letter from Parkes to his sister in January 1871 expressing his confidence that he would 'soon be Prime Minister'. But if Parkes was sometimes confident he could also be despondent, as other correspondence shows. He was still particularly sensitive about his financial failure, as Butler discovered, when he wrote to him in August 1871, in an attempt to turn his thoughts towards renewing his political career. In his letter Butler pointed out that to do so would be 'following out to its close the investment you have made in your life before' (Butler to Parkes, 16 August 1871; P.C., A872, pp.294-7). Butler had to spend much of his next letter reassuring Parkes that he had meant no irony; that the expression had reference to Parkes's public life; and that
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it was meant to be complimentary (Butler to Parkes, 26 August 1871, P.C., A919, pp.625-7). Several times, after some remark or other by another Catholic M.P. had been reported to Parkes, Butler was forced to exert all his tact and charm to reassure Parkes that he was not the victim of some Catholic conspiracy. (Butler to Parkes, n.d. [1871], P.C., A872, pp.200-3; Butler to Parkes, 18 December 1871, P.C., A872, pp.186-7.) Then again, when J.G. O'Connor opposed Parkes's attempt to regain Parliament by standing in a by-election for Mudgee, Butler had to reassure Parkes that

a large number of Irish R.C.'s held themselves aloof from such proceedings, if many of them did not vote for you. But in Mudgee as in Sydney there is doubtless an unthinking lot easily misled by such as require the Irish Citizen as an organ because the Freeman's Journal will not go to the lengths they want for them. But surely we know as in Sydney that this is an uninfluential rabble!. I am in a position to assure you - and no one in the country is in a better position to do so - that the great bulk of the Catholics, clerical as well as lay are well pleased at your election. Of course they have grievances with you, but not withstanding they prefer you much to the men in power and they hope for justice at your hands.

Butler believed O'Connor was being used by Robertson and Martin (Butler to Parkes, 9 January 1872, P.C., A872, pp.306-9). Again, when the planning for the campaign was well under way Butler suggested on behalf of his Catholic friends, that Parkes might like to suggest some other names as candidates for East and West Sydney, so that a bunch could be made (Butler to Parkes, n.d. [late January-early February 1872], P.C., A919, pp.610-6). Parkes apparently saw in this some attempt by the Catholics to use him and reacted angrily. Butler again had to mollify him:

Permit me with the liberty of a friend to say that I feel you are unreasonable in the way in which you answer as to the support of the Catholics - For causes which we will not now discuss the Catholics and yourself have got into positions of hostility - each honestly believing the other to be as wrong as wrong can be. I tell you of my own knowledge that honest men in the Catholic body, Bishops, priests and laymen are endeavouring to reconcile those differences without exacting any compromise from you or upon either side. I have told you of an apprehended difficulty in getting you all the support they desire and the proposal to get over it by having other persons standing for East Sydney representing the Opposition....But you tell me in response to all this what would be

Footnote continued on following page...
reveals that Butler, by swinging Catholic support behind Parkes, hoped to reduce the sectarian animosities and prejudices which plagued the political and social life of the colony at this time.¹

That he was able to do so was a remarkable achievement. Robertson's alliance with Martin had considerably weakened his Catholic support and Butler's reputation among the Irish was second to none. Nevertheless it could not have been easy to swing Catholic support to the man previously considered their arch-enemy. Butler's letters reveal only two or three of those he worked with to achieve this reversal: Eyre Ellis, a Catholic solicitor and a close friend of his and Duncan; and Bishop Quinn of Bathurst, who, despite lack of success, seems to have revelled in the politicking.² He clearly had the support of the Irish ward politicians in the city, for the Irish mobs which in the past election had howled at Parkes, now cheered him and

Footnote continued from previous page...

offensive if I do not know you so well, that all our people want are dishonest politicians, now and in history, which history you must have read from a wrong source.

(Butler to Parkes, n.d. [February 1872], P.C., A872, pp.208-11.)

¹ During the Campaign he wrote: 'I am very happy to be able to report my assurance that a number of our followers are reliable on you - for the which you may or may not in due time think I have done service not for you so much as the State.' Butler to Parkes n.d. [February or March 1872], P.C., A919, pp.631-6. See also Butler to Parkes, n.d., [January 1872], P.C., A872, pp.200-3.

² On Ellis, see Butler to Parkes, n.d. [early 1872], P.C., A919, pp.648-50; on Quinn, Butler to Parkes, n.d. [early 1872], P.C., A919, pp.637-9 and 641-2. One of Quinn's failures was his attempt to turn the Catholic William Cummings out of East Macquarie. He had been confident of success, but 'Cummings had one story for the Protestants and one for the Catholics, both lies', and won. Butler to Parkes, P.C., A919, pp.645-7.
directed their howls at his opponents.† Butler's influence spread wider than Sydney and Bathurst and many of his letters implored Parkes to find candidates for other country electorates so 'our people' would have someone to support.‡ His overriding desire was to have Parkes victorious and he promised to support even orangemen, provided they were loyal Oppositionists.³

Parkes's and Butler's victory destroyed the power of the P.P.A. and did much to dissipate the more noticeable manifestations of sectarianism in colonial life. Catholics no longer felt excluded from politics, and found in Parkes's censure of the Council of Education over the Grenfell school case some reward for their support. Yet there was a flaw at the heart of Butler's reasoning. His successful alliance with Parkes went some of the way towards lessening sectarian feeling, but much more was required to counter the effects of the previous few years. Colonial society was still slowly polarising along sectarian lines. The Orange Institution was growing rapidly in size and sectarian pressures were still strongly at work within the Catholic body. Butler's whole success rested on a sectarian assumption - that Irishmen and Catholics would vote as a

---

† F.J., 17 February 1872; P.S., 17 February 1872. The Irish were not overly enthusiastic for Parkes, however: 'our people are being instructed not to raise their sweet voices at the hustings in your favour for fear of giving an R.C. look to the proceedings'. Butler to Parkes, n.d. [February 1872], A872, pp.224-5.

‡ For example, Butler to Parkes, n.d., P.C., A919, pp.610-6 and pp.637-9.

as a block.¹ It was this that many colonists feared, and Butler's success in manipulating this block, as it became known, hardly diminished their fears.

These fears, prejudices in some cases, but by no means all, became obvious in late 1873 when the Chief Justice, Sir Alfred Stephen, announced his intention of retiring. According to English precedent, Butler, as Attorney-General, had first refusal of the position. With a Protestant wit Stephen chose 5 November, Guy Fawkes Day, as the day he would step down. It was by no means automatic that Butler receive first offer of the position. Stephen himself had been appointed to the position in 1844 over the claims of the Irish-Catholic J.H. Plunkett, the then Attorney-General. Colonial opinion was not predisposed to automatically accept a precedent which allowed a party politician to succeed to such an important position, simply because he held a certain political office at the time. As well, and more positively, it had been well known for some years that James Martin, at the time leader of the Opposition, coveted the position, and his qualifications, both legal and social, were superior to Butler's.² Finally there were many who contended that the position of Chief Justice, above all other positions, ought not go to a leader of the Irish-Catholic faction. Parkes

¹Not that they did of course. Cummings, a Catholic, won in East Macquarie against Bishop Quinn's efforts; Patrick Higgins was said to be working for James Byrnes, much to Butler's consternation (Butler to Parkes, n.d., P.C., A919, pp.645-7), and Dalley, of course, opposed the whole alliance. At least one priest worked in opposition to the Butler-Parkes alliance in 1872. See L.F. de Salis to Parkes, 5 March 1872, quoted by A.W. Martin, 'Electoral Contests in Yass and Queanbeyan in the 70s and 80s', J.R.A.H.S. Vol.43, Pt.3 (1957), p.129.

²In mid-1868 the English writer Stanley Leighton recorded of Martin (whom he believed to be native born) 'He was supposed to be looking out for the seat of Chief Justice and to be anxious to retain office till it became vacant'. Leighton 'Extracts', Vol.II, p.31. For the other details of the following two paragraphs, unless otherwise stated, see Martha Rutledge's excellent article 'Edward Butler and the Chief Justiceship, 1873', Historical Studies, Vol.13, No.30 (March, 1968), pp.207-22.
for a while thought differently and offered the post to Butler. Later he discovered the extent of the opposition to the appointment and received warnings that his Government might fall if he persisted in it. Parkes found himself in a difficult situation. He panicked and wrote a letter to Butler telling him that he did not seem quite fitted for the position. It was an inelegant, insulting letter and left Butler little choice but to resign. In Governor Robinson's opinion, had Parkes explained to Butler his dilemma and appealed to his friendship, Butler would have been satisfied. Butler, however, later indicated that he had by then concluded that the opposition building up against him was purely sectarian, and he had determined to resist it. Butler seems, at this crucial point, to have confused personal ambition with the social fortunes of his race and to have made his elevation to the Chief Justiceship the acid test of Irish assimilation into the community. When asked by Parkes and other ministers to reconsider his claim he said he could not recede from his position because 'to do so would be to compromise in my person the civil rights of my R.C. fellow citizens, and if so they would never forgive me'.

Butler assumed Parkes had given way to purely sectarian pressure. On 11 November he announced his resignation and explained that Parkes's failure to keep his promise over the Chief Justiceship was its cause. Parkes was surprised that Butler should have made their breach public. He denied that he had given way to sectarian pressures, but, as was usual when under personal attack, he adopted a hurt and devious tone. Public opinion widely condemned Parkes, and praised Butler for his dignified behaviour. For most Catholics Parkes had displayed himself in his true colours. The Freeman's, reflecting Butler's views, aimed most of its fire

---

1Butler to Parkes, 14 November 1873, P.C., A872, pp.219-22. Miss Rutledge (p.216) quotes Parkes's version of this, namely that Butler could not recede because of 'his people'. The recollected version of Butler's is presumably the more accurate.
at the orangemen, whose influence it saw as the real reason for Parkes's actions. It found in the incident evidence of an all-pervasive hostility towards Catholics. Thus Butler's attempts to assimilate Catholics into society ended in a manner which reinforced Catholic separateness. It was a significant co-incidence that a little over a month after Butler's resignation there should arrive in the colony a man who would restore Catholic pride, but at the cost of leading them in the opposite direction to that in which Butler had been striving.

Archbishop Roger Bede Vaughan arrived in the colony 16 December 1873. Born in 1834, the second son of an English Catholic squire he had been educated at home and by the Benedictines, which order he joined in 1853. From 1855 to 1859 he studied in Rome where he was ordained. After two years at Downside he was appointed Professor of metaphysics and moral philosophy in the Benedictine house of studies at Belmont. He was made Prior a year later and remained there until appointed to Sydney in 1873. Five of his brothers were priests; his elder brother, Herbert, becoming the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster.¹ Vaughan was proud of the ancient lineage of his family and prouder still that theirs was the old religion of the English race. It was a reactionary, insular pride. In 1865 he published a pamphlet arguing that to allow Catholics to go to Oxford and Cambridge would be to destroy the English Catholic tradition.² To this pride in the ancient heritage of Catholicism he added the authoritarian ecclesiology and paranoid theorisings of the European ultramontanists. He devoted several years of his stay at Belmont to researching and writing a massive two volume study of Thomas Aquinas,³ whom he regarded as 'the

²Ibid., p.414.
anti-dote against rationalism, infidelity, licentiousness, softness and lawlessness'.

Vaughan was immensely energetic, but his energies had been narrowly channelled. He was hardly fitted by training or disposition to the difficult task of leading a minority Irish-Catholic community in a society that suspected Catholics; believed in progress; and was ostensibly Protestant. Vaughan viewed himself as a living protest against the liberal spirit of his age which he saw inspiring all human endeavours not directed by the Church. He sought and relished adversity as a sign of a successful apostolate. Adversity he obtained in abundance.

Despite rumours that the Irish suffragan bishops had protested against his appointment, urging Rome to appoint an Irishman, Vaughan was given an enthusiastic welcome by Sydney Catholics. Addressing him, Sheehy, on behalf of the clergy of the archdiocese, expressed the hope that under Vaughan's leadership they would be 'better able to protect the education of the rising generation from the blighting influence of anti-Catholic secularism'. In his reply Vaughan identified that influence as 'earth worship' and indicated that it would be best attacked by the completion of the Cathedral, which would stand as an ever-present protest against it, and by fostering Christian education. Diplomatically he expressed himself grateful that those priests with whom he was called to work were Irish.

---

2 See reports of the rumours in F.J., 17, 24, 31 May, 7 June 1873. The rumours were correct. O'Farrell, The Catholic Church in Australia, pp.123-4 and 142-3.
3 F.J., 20 December 1873.
Although his relationships with the other bishops did not much improve, Vaughan's standing with the Irish laity was excellent. He accurately accounted for this in a letter to his friend Bernard Smith in Rome in 1877.

I am rather amused and slightly disgusted that a report is circulated in Rome that I am against the Irish - you would not think so if you saw the intense enthusiasm with which they welcome me and the continual ovations I receive from those who are the most Irish of the Irish....The real fact is I have written, spoken and published more in favour of the Irish people than all the Irish Bishops in Australia put together. After twenty years of shame and fear...I have done more to make them respected and to improve their condition in the mixed community in which we live than those episcopi who, after my consecration, protested against my appointment. The fact is I have knocked them all in a cocked hat.

Vaughan frequently praised Irish piety and devotion to the faith. His oration at the O'Connell celebration was a brilliant performance and climaxed his wooing of Irish support. After referring to the penal days experienced by English as well as Irish Catholics he went on to praise O'Connell for

---

1 They began to improve as the bishops welcomed his powerful attacks on the errors of the age and his spirited defences of Catholicism (see Lanigan to Vaughan, 17 December 1873, Vaughan Papers, S.A.A.). They deteriorated when Vaughan referred to Rome the case of Bishop Mahoney of Armidale, another cousin of the Quinns and Murray, who had been accused of drunkenness and immorality. The Irish bishops thought Vaughan should have cleared him. (See O'Farrell, op.cit., pp.143 and 148). To describe the opposition of the bishops to Vaughan as national is to give it its most noble description. There are indications that they wished to have the colonial church ruled not just by Irishmen but by their own Irish friends and relatives.

2 Vaughan virtually took over the administration of the archdiocese on his arrival and was forced to devote considerable attention to repairing the chaos which had developed under Polding's lax rule. Although a reactionary, he had none of Polding's desire to see the archdiocese a Benedictine stronghold.

3 Vaughan to Dr Smith, 3 August 1877, photocopy of letter, Vaughan Papers, S.A.A.
achieving Catholic emancipation. Famous English figures, among them Pitt, Fox, Bourke and Swift were invoked as blessing or precursing this achievement, and O'Connell was described as superior to them all. Little mention was made of his repeal activities, but the influences of Ireland and Catholicism on his childhood and youth were superbly and evocatively portrayed. The Sydney Morning Herald printed the entire speech over two full pages. When a correspondent queried some of its factual detail, Andrew Garran, the editor, replied that it was not a work of history, but an oration: a work of art.

Vaughan had a remarkable impact on the colony. Tall, slightly pudgy, but of commanding presence, he was probably the finest orator the colony had seen. His strength lay in the originality and power of his language and the subtlety of his arguments. The Herald published all his major addresses in full; the Cathedral was packed by Catholics and non-Catholics alike to hear him preach; and on country tours whole townships attended to hear him. At a time when men still admired oratory, Vaughan represented in colonial society a fine example of this aspect of English culture. Catholics could afford to be proud of their leader.

Such fame was not without its unfortunate consequences. The assumptions of Vaughan's speeches and sermons were sectarian. He emphasised the superiority of Catholicism, denigrated other religions and constantly condemned liberalism. He provoked considerable hostility. Protestant clergymen were fascinated by him. As champions of the word against ritual they were amazed to find their master among the Romanists. His style was brilliant, they argued, but

---

1 S.M.H., 7 August 1875.
2 He claimed it was as silly to criticise Vaughan's address on historical grounds, as it was to criticise on the same grounds, Shakespear's plays (S.M.H., 12 August 1875).
3 Some estimate of the way he was viewed by non-Catholics can be gauged from the comments passed on him after his death. Birt, op.cit., Vol.II, pp.456-99 publishes a number of these.
his assumptions false. He inspired many of them to defend Protestantism, and during the last half of the decade the amount of sectarian speechifying and pamphleteering rose appreciatively.

The reaction to one of his more famous speeches illustrates his impact. In an address opening the Catholic Guild Hall Vaughan devoted his attention to the 'hidden springs or unseen influences' that motivated the world. He identified three major springs or influences, each in turn exerting its strongest influence in the past, the present and the future. They were Paganism, Supernaturalism and Materialism. Catholicism was the heart of Supernaturalism, which was engaged in deadly struggle against Materialism, at whose centre was a secret society, unmistakably freemasonry. The various Protestant denominations were in the process of surrendering to materialism, and men who truly believed in supernatural religion were turning to Catholicism. The spring of Materialism could be seen behind the demands for

1 See for example, C.A.W.R., 2 January 1874, 3 May 1875; P.S., 24 April 1875; W.A., 14 July 1877. On one occasion the Weekly Advocate (14 March 1877) criticised a pamphlet criticism of Vaughan by the Rev. J.A. Dowie on the grounds that it was far below the standards set by Vaughan: 'in it there is too much name calling, too much violent rhetoric'.

2 Apart from Beg's entry into the 1871 orange lodge controversy there had been no anti-Catholic pamphleteering in the first few years of the seventies. By 1875 Vaughan was provoking Protestant reaction: Rev. T.C. Ewing, Dr Vaughan Answered by the Highest Historical Authorities: The Ancient Church and Faith of England not Romish but Apostolic (Sydney, 1875); Rev. Daniel Allen, The Roman and Spanish Inquisition (Sydney, 1875) and The Pope vs the Queen in the Vatican Decrees (Sydney, 1875). Following Bishop Barry's Protestant Hall address, Vaughan delivered a series of Advent lectures defending Catholicism and attacking Protestantism. He was answered by the Rev. Thomas Kemmis, Five Lectures on the Antiquity and Independence of the British Church with a brief Sketch of the English Reformation and some account of the growth of false doctrine as the Papal System, delivered in St Mark's Church, Darling Point (Sydney, 1876) and Wazir Beg, Reply to Archbishop Vaughan's First Advent Conference... (Sydney, 1876) and Murder and Assassination inculcated by the Church of Rome (Sydney, 1876).
national education and all other liberal programs. It was wildly fanciful and paranoid, but vintage Vaughan. The Herald published it in full. Editorially it noticed it only to comment critically on Vaughan's assumption that the church must dictate to the state. The Protestant press found it more provocative. The Baptist Banner of Truth summed up the effect of the speech and Vaughan's impact generally:

If the aim of Dr Vaughan's policy is to provoke the ire and hostility of one and all classes not in actual subjection to Rome, he is certainly working with marked effect. His latest public deliverance, to which he gave the enigmatic title of 'Hidden Springs' has set by the ears not only the entire Protestant church, but has put into a defensive attitude that highly respectable and influential body of philanthropists known as 'the Freemasons'.

It went on to point out that Catholicism with its rituals and superstitions was more akin to Paganism than Supernatural religion, and to defend the benevolent brotherhood of masonry from Vaughan's slurs. If masonry did have a more sinister character, it argued, it was only in those countries where Rome has long been the dominant religion. A number of clergymen announced lectures and sermons in defence of Protestantism and masonry. Most were

---

1 This was not the first attack by a Catholic prelate on the masons, but such was Vaughan's stature that it became the most famous. Polding had vaguely attacked freemasonry 'an attempt to substitute a scheme of benevolence for the Gospel of Christ' as early as 1859 (O'Farrell, Documents of Australian Catholic History, Vol.1, p.216). In 1870-71 the Catholic Association Reporter frequently carried denunciations of freemasonry, and the Freeman's had occasionally reported some of the paranoid theorisings of European Catholics. (e.g., F.J., 12 January 1871.) In 1874 the Freeman's published an attack on freemasonry by Archbishop Redmond of New Zealand (F.J., 10 October 1874).

2 S.M.H., 10 October 1871. It was published as a pamphlet entitled Hidden Springs or the Perils of the Future and How to Meet Them (Sydney, 1876).

3 S.M.H., 24 October 1871.

4 Banner of Truth, 15 November 1876. It was republished in P.S., 2 December 1876.
of a popular kind. 'Rome's Polluted Springs' was the topic of the Rev. J.A. Dowie's denunciation of the paganism and idolatory of Catholicism. Vaughan welcomed the reaction.

Archbishop Vaughan was not the only Catholic attracting the hostile attention of Protestants at that time. Since the late 1860s the activities of the Catholic clergy had been more closely scrutinised than previously. Not all the clergy were aware of, or cared about, the attention, and their overzealous, even arrogant and violent, actions were duly noted in the Protestant press, and sometimes even in Parliament. The attention attracted by their occasional interference in elections and attempts to force Catholics to patronise church schools have been mentioned. Overeagerness to win a dying soul, or a young child for the Church provided numerous other instances.

In 1872, for example, Fr Garaval was charged by a Dr Reid with assault. Reid had been attending a patient close to death from the D.T.'s. Garaval and an Anglican minister had both attended to claim the patient as their own. Reid had ordered them both away as they were likely to excite the patient. Garaval disputed this and ended by taking the doctor by the throat and throwing him on the bed. He was fined 20 shillings. In early 1879 a woman

1 S.M.H., 18 October 1876. It was also published as a pamphlet with that title. Other rebuttals came from Daniel Allen, 'Rome's Hidden Spring Opened in Fire and Blood' (later, in 1877, published as a pamphlet); Wazir Beg, 'Masonry and Popery....Light and Darkness' (also published as a pamphlet before the end of the year) and J. Tyerman, the freethinker who devoted several of his Sunday evening lectures to defending masonry.

2 O'Farrell, Catholic Church in Australia, p.126, quotes Vaughan as writing after the episode 'it has roused up the Freemasons like a nest of ants. I find that straight speaking and the whole teaching of the Church does those Australians much good. Religion is looking up and is respected'. Such were his delusions.

3 F.J., 31 August 1872; P.S., 24, 31 August, 7 September 1876. See P.S., 27 May 1876 for a similar case.
Bathurst had to take court action to force a priest to return her young son. A Protestant, she had been married to a Catholic, who was a drunk and treated her badly. She eventually left him, taking her two daughters. A little later she went back for her son. Finding him in an uncared for state she took him away. The father took him back and handed him to a Fr O'Donnell for safe keeping. The woman re-claimed her son, but the priest took him back. The father then died but the priest would not give up the child until ordered to by the court. ¹ 'Popery', the Protestant Standard declaimed 'is a multiform curse, and its tyranny and cruelty are matchless'. ²

Other cases which attracted attention concerned the power which the Catholic clergy sought to exercise over even the dead of their own religion. The most famous of such cases involved the body of the Post Master General in Robertson's 1868-70 government, Daniel Egan. Egan, a Catholic, had died suddenly in October 1870. Polding had given him last rites, and a large number of the clergy, as well as many of Sydney's prominent citizen's had attended his funeral. ³ Within two months rumours began circulating that his body had been secretly disinterred and re-buried in unconsecrated ground. This had been done by the Church authorities when they discovered that Egan had been living with a woman, not his wife (his wife had been drowned in the wreck of the 'Dunbar Castle' years before). The rumour turned out to be correct. Questions were asked in Parliament and a motion to appoint a select committee to enquire into the matter was lost only by the Speaker's casting vote. Catholic members such as Butler and Fitzpatrick were indignant at the behaviour of their clergy, although Butler claimed that Archbishop Polding had known nothing of it.

¹ P.S., 15 February, 26 April 1879.
² P.S., 15 February 1879. See P.S., 28 August and 20 November 1875 for similar cases.
³ F.J., 27 October 1870.
From information published in the press it appeared that Polding was the only clergyman who did not know. Vicar-General Sheehy, Fr McCarthy and Fr Corletti, his personal chaplain, were all reported to have had a hand in it. Non-Catholics were appalled at the assumption implied in the affair, that priests had the right to judge a man's place in eternity. A less important case occurred three years later when questions were asked in the House about a Fr McGuinn, who had instructed his servant to destroy a wooden palisade erected around the grave of the deceased wife of a Catholic warder at Berrima gaol. McGuinn was said to have claimed that the warder had not paid his Church dues. The police investigated but could do nothing when the warder declined to prosecute.

Similar instances, even less significant than these, could be multiplied. Their public significance was small, but each provided first hand evidence for a few people, mostly Protestant, sometime Catholic, of arrogant and dictatorial behaviour by Catholic clergymen. Such behaviour was easily generalised. It provided fertile material for the growth of a low level prejudice against Catholics and their clergy.

1 P.S., 3, 24 December 1870, 7 January, 4 February, 11, 28 March 1871; S.M.H., 2 March 1871.
2 S.M.H., 31 October 1873; P.S., 25 October, 8 November 1873. The priest later claimed that he had pulled down the palisade as it enclosed too much of the cemetery, which may have been true, but his unilateral action could only have attracted hostile attention.
3 For example: a young girl walked past the St Benedict's Chapel. She stopped briefly and looked in. A priest grabbed her and asked if she was 'Going in?' She replied 'no', so he cuffed her and said 'on your way'. (P.S., 31 September 1878. The Standard said he hit her with a whip - a detail which was probably an embellishment.)
4 Many of my own contemporaries whose parents express anti-Catholic prejudice (e.g. 'I wouldn't want my daughter to marry one') report that at the basis of this prejudice is often an instance of an over-eager clergyman coming to claim for the Church the soul of some member of the family who was dying, and clashing with other members who do not desire his presence. The death of a Catholic partner of a mixed marriage often gives rise to such conflicts.
The growing strength of sectarian Protestantism, evidenced by the proliferation of orange lodges, encouraged the Catholic clergy to see themselves as victims of Protestants plots. This frequently led them to overact and cry persecution every time any resistance was offered to their claims. This in turn exasperated their fellow colonists. This sequence of events most frequently occurred when Catholics and Protestants were ostensibly co-operating in common endeavours.

The breakdown of inter-denominational co-operation on the boards of charitable institutions provided a paradigm of the deterioration in relations between Catholic and Protestant in the community generally. During the fifties and sixties clergymen of different denominations had belonged to the various charities, and although inclined to mutual suspicion, had generally co-operated amicably. The growth of sectarianism in the community during the late 1860s and the successful orange assault on the charities in the early 1870s changed this dramatically. At first the orangemen and other Protestant clergymen were the main offenders. They vigorously pursued their vendetta against Miss Osburn at the Sydney Infirmary and were only partly mollified by a Royal Commission enquiry into the management of the Infirmary in 1873. The Commission found much of the blame for the inefficiency of the Infirmary to reside in the large and unwieldy nature of the board and in the presence on it of clergymen who wasted considerable time with their sectarian disputes. It recommended that clergymen be excluded from the board.¹

At the Randwick asylum an early point of dispute concerned an altar the Catholics had erected in 1870 in one of the schoolrooms. Although mostly screened by a map, several Protestant visitors and the Protestant chaplain

declared it offensive and the board, which had not authorised its introduction, ordered it removed. An attempt at a compromise, whereby the altar could have been placed in a cupboard when not being used, was blocked by the Protestant clergymen among the directors. 1 From that point, the two priests on the board, Fathers Sheridan and Garaval treated every suggestion by non-Catholic members of the board with extreme suspicion. They came to put their own requests in an imperious fashion, that almost guaranteed that they would not be granted. 2

The most frequently occurring point of dispute at both the Randwick and the Benevolent Asylum, concerned the denominational affiliations of children admitted. Protestants claimed that Catholic priests were baptising orphan children immediately prior to their admittance so they might be registered as Catholics, 3 while Catholics accused Protestants of various attempts to undermine the faith of Catholic children, such as presenting all children leaving the institution with a bible. 4 One case which received considerable attention concerned a boy named Eastwood. He had been admitted to the institution in 1869 and registered as a Catholic. When, in 1873, the time came to apprentice him, he claimed to have been baptised and brought up a Protestant, and requested to be indentured to a Protestant master. The Catholic chaplain said he was lying and

---

1 See 'Report of the Board of Inquiry into the Randwick Asylum', V & P (LA NSW), 1875-6 (6) 105-44, especially Appendix: 'Minutes of Board and House Committee re removal of R.C. Altar from girls' school room', pp.142-3.

2 See, for example, Garaval's request that he be allowed to see the records of children apprenticed out. The house committee opposed this, on the grounds that the other chaplain did not want it, but, judging from the correspondence resentment at the high handed accusatory tone adopted by Garaval from the start influenced their decision. P.J., 21 September 1878.


4 P.S., 23 October 1875. See also P.S., 8 December 1877 for an account of Fr Sheridan's objections to Protestant women taking flowers around to the patients of the Benevolent Asylum.
resisted his request, while the Protestant clerics hunted around and produced evidence to verify the boy's claim. Each side claimed to possess a birth certificate supporting their claims. The committee of the Asylum decided to accept the boy's request. An enquiry in 1875 into allegations of violence at the Randwick Asylum recommended more generally that the size of the board be drastically reduced, and that clergymen be excluded from membership. It commented that the Catholic section of the community was in danger of being estranged from the public charities and blamed the orange faction for that, and for the unpleasantness which had characterised board meetings since the early 1870s. Catholic complaints about the management of the two institutions grew more frequent as the decade progressed. A frequent complaint was that the boards were orange controlled and that Catholics could not get elected to them. The paucity of Catholic membership was exaggerated, but the claims had some substance and reflected the gradual separation of the Catholic subcommunity from the rest of society. During the next decade Catholic membership of non-Catholic societies, such as charitable organisations, benefit societies and the like was officially discouraged, or condemned, by the Catholic hierarchy. Much of the tension on the boards of the two Asylums disappeared when the boarding-out system of providing for orphaned and destitute children was adopted in the early 1880s.

Catholic complaints that they were discriminated against in the administration of the public charities frequently

1 P.S., 31 May, 5 July 1873; F.J., 28 June, 30 August 1873. For a similar case see F.J., 24 May 1878.
2 Report of Board of Inquiry into Randwick Asylum, op.cit. In 1874 the result of elections for the house committee of the asylum had resulted in the exclusion of clergymen, much to the annoyance of the Freeman's (F.J., 31 January, 21 February 1874).
3 F.J., 7 October 1876, 2 April 1877, 12 October 1878, 8 February, 2 April, 10 May 1879.
provoked a Protestant rejoinder that their meagre contributions deserved no more. ¹ This was an aspect of a wider Protestant reaction to Catholic claims of mistreatment, particularly their claims that they did not receive their full share of the public purse. The high proportion of Catholics in the orphanages, homes for the destitute, the public hospitals and, above all, the gaols was held up by Protestants to show that not only did Catholics draw on more than their share of the public purse, but that Popery conduced to a lower morality. ² This was a point on which Catholics were particularly sensitive. They argued with some justification, that there was a higher proportion of Catholics among the criminal class for the same reason as there was a high proportion of Catholics among the poor and destitute. The types of crime in which Catholics were over represented were drunkenness, fighting and petty theft - all products of the life of poverty to which an overly large proportion of Catholics were condemned. ³ This, however, did no more than admit the case that the Protestants were arguing.

Other indications of the deterioration of Catholic-Protestant relationships proliferated in the early 1870s. Accusations that the Volunteers were discriminating against Catholics were revived in 1870. Again they centred on alleged discriminations practised by the St Leonard's Volunteers, who were said to have blackballed two Catholics who applied for membership. Questions were asked in Parliament and a bill (the Volunteers Admission Bill) was introduced to prevent such practices. In a stormy debate defenders of the St Leonards Volunteers denigrated the two rejected men, who seemed on the face of it, to have been unjustly treated. ⁴

¹ For example, P.S., 12 May 1877.
² See, for example, P.S., 8 February 1873, 28 November 1874, 13 July 1878, 18 September 1880, 18 August 1883.
³ F.J., 15 January 1871, 6 July 1878.
⁴ F.J., 17 September, 19,29 October, 12 November 1870, 18 March, 29 April 1871.
The Freeman's warned of the dangerous consequences of sectarianism in the Volunteers, while orangemen like Wearne justified it by arguing that too many Catholics in the Volunteers would weaken its effectiveness if the Irishmen ever began any civil disturbance. A Catholic correspondent in the Freeman's had a similar thought in mind, only he saw the possible aggression coming from a different source. He urged Catholics to join the Volunteers: 'If they [the Catholics] do not maintain a balance of power in the ranks, the day will come when they will most certainly rue their neglect. Let us put our trust in God, but let us also have our rifles, balls, powder and 50 acres of land.'

Even the sporting fraternity were not unaffected by sectarian divisions. In March 1871 a prize fight was held between Larry Foley and Sandy Ross. Foley was described as the champion of 'the Green' and Ross of 'the Orange'. The fight was stopped by police before the end, but Foley was clearly getting the better of it. The orange leadership was embarrassed by the episode as it damaged their claims to respectability. A rematch was arranged four years later.

---

1 F.J., 24 September 1870.
2 Letter by Craig Barry, F.J., 14 December 1872.
3 F.J., 29 October 1870.
4 K. Roberts, Captain of the Push (Melbourne, 1963), pp.23-30. According to Roberts, Ross, whom I have already noticed as a P.P.A. bully-boy in Parramatta in the 1872 election, was the leader of one of the 'pushes' that inhabited the rocks area. Foley, Roberts claims, had earlier led a rival 'green' push into Ross's area and had decided to fight Ross single handed, rather than have their rival gangs fight it out. Foley was born in 1849 near Bathurst. At the age of 14 he was employed as the servant to a Fr O'Connell, and was intending to study for the priesthood. He became one of the most famous nineteenth century Australian pugilists and trainers (A.D.B., Vol.4, forthcoming).
5 P.S., 20, 27 May 1871. See also Australian Free Religious Press, 10 April 1871, for critical comments.
Foley, who was later to become Australian champion, was the easy winner. The police, tipped off by orange Grand Master Goold, arrived too late to interfere. ¹

Orange celebrations were a frequent target for Irish trouble-makers. In 1875, the impending O'Connell celebrations seemed to give strength to their arms. A large stone was thrown through the gallery window of the Exhibition Building at the conclusion of the twelfth of July celebrations. ² At Queanbeyan a Union Jack was torn down and trampled, while at Gladesville an attempt was made to set fire to the tent where the brethren were gathered. ³ Elections also provided opportunities for popular invocation of orange and green, and a sectarian terminology was frequently used by electoral agents and sometimes the press in predicting and explaining voting patterns. Even children were not unaffected by the sectarian divisions within society. In 1873 two girls, aged 8 and 10, both students at St. Benedict's Catholic school were brought before the court. Together with two other girls they had broken into St. Barnabas's Anglican church. They had stolen some cushions and bookmarks, damaged chandeliers and other fittings, and 'scattered about the Church a quantity of filth not necessary to be described more particularly'. One of the magistrates reflected that it was difficult to believe that children so young could act thus, unless prompted. ⁴

Despite such occurrences, the strength of sectarianism in the community could be easily exaggerated. The St Leonards Volunteers was the only Volunteer company that was accused of discriminating against Catholics, and the Protestant Standard was sometimes moved to deplore Catholic volunteers

¹Roberts, op.cit., pp.65-71; P.S., 27 February 1875.
²P.S., 14 July 1875; S.M.H., 13 July 1875.
³P.S., 14 July 1875.
⁴S.M.H., 25 October 1873; P.S., 1 November 1873. The fact that the children attending the St Barnabas's school and Sunday School were attending a picnic that day may have provided a motive for the Catholic girls.
marching to Church on Sunday.1 Some Irishmen might threaten violence to orangemen in the twelfth of July, but they rarely went beyond threats and acts of symbolic violence (such as the destruction of flags). Even the goldfields, with the most unstable population in the colony, orange-green fights had a ritualised character about them.2 In the country districts orange lodges could sometimes serve to provide entertainment for the whole community. The No. 107 Lodge, for example, reported that it had celebrated 5 November 1875 in fine style:

The celebration was held in a stone building in Mr Stotts paddock....Dancing was kept up until daylight next morning....The meeting was graced by the presence of some liberal minded Roman Catholic friends who enjoyed themselves to the fullest extent.3

Accusations that Catholics voted as a block had been made by commentators and participants at every election since 1843. But such accusations were largely a way of simplifying and over-simplifying a complex phenomenon. There was similarly a Methodist vote, an orange vote, a temperance vote, a publicans vote and a squatters vote - and each description applied with an equal degree of accuracy or inaccuracy.4 If a Catholic

1 P.S., 27 April 1872.
2 D. Friend, Hillendia (Sydney, 1956), pp.36-7. Friend quotes from Hal Eyres Hillenites. According to Eyre's old informant the orangemen and the Irishmen marched each 12 July and 17 March respectively. The orangemen, after their twelfth of July march, which was a family affair, would leave their families at the sportsground and wander into town where they would have a few drinks and brawl with the Irish faction, who had come into the town especially for the occasion. At tea time they would lay off fighting and take their families home for supper. They would adjourn to the pubs again for another fight. The same ritualised character, and the disinclination of the native born children of Irishmen to participate in such brawls, is superbly captured in Victor Daly's long poem 'The Glorious Twelfth at Jindabye' (Bulletin, 9 July 1898).
3 P.S., 27 November 1875.
4 See Butler to Parkes, n.d. [February 1872], P.C., A919, pp.645-7; W.H. Cooper to Parkes, 21 November, 25 November 1873, P.C., A878, pp.41-4; H.W. Stephen to Parkes, n.d. [1885], P.C., A871, pp.9-12, for examples of electoral discussion in terms of religious and other interest groups.
propensity to vote as a block came in for special attention it was only because some Catholics cultivated it and boasted of it. Certainly, by the eighties, it was becoming more common as Catholics withdrew into a separate subcommunity, but its extent could still be overdrawn. In 1885, for example, H.W. Stephen, campaigning in Cooma, boasted to Parkes that although supported by most of the orangemen, he was actively assisted by a Cooma priest, who was an enemy of the priest supporting his Catholic opponent.¹ Most electoral sectarianism in the seventies and eighties occurred in areas of above average Catholic population: Queanbeyan-Yass; Maitland; Bathurst; East and West Sydney. This was largely because the presence of a high proportion of Catholics persuaded local sectarian Catholic politicians to act as if it was Ireland, and try and polarise the electorate to their own advantage.² Orange attempts to organise a Protestant vote were largely dependent for their success upon the extent of the Catholics' efforts.

The closing years of the seventies were marked by a hotting up of the sectarian climate. Vaughan's provocative speeches and their Protestant rebuttals contributed to this. The visit to Sydney of two well known evangelists, Dr James Sommerville and Henry Varley, in late 1877 and 1878 respectively gave an impetus to evangelical Protestantism³ which another

¹ H.W. Stephen to Parkes, op.cit.
² Nonetheless, Martin in 'Electoral Contests in Yass and Queanbeyan' overstates the part played by sectarianism in electoral contests, even in an area of above average Catholic population. His penchant for the colourful metaphor leads him to emphasise sectarian over pedestrian but more important factors such as personal friendships and enmities; whether a candidate was a local man or not; the interests the candidate was thought to represent; and so on. Because it was a conventionality even in the eighties to deprecate sectarianism, the appearance of sectarianism was often given greater prominence than it deserved in the comments deploiring its presence.
³ Weekly Advocate (8 September 1877) commented 'I think we are on the eve of a great religious movement in this city'.
visitor, the famous French Canadian ex-priest Pastor Charles Chiniquy directed into anti-Catholic channels. At the same time a mild depression produced unemployment and consequent social unrest. 1

The increasing number of young larrikins who jostled and pushed among the crowds gathered to hear the Sunday speakers in Hyde Park provided one indication of the growing social unrest caused by unemployment. Despite the sectarian disturbances in 1866, Hyde Park had remained a popular Sunday meeting place and had been the scene of minor disturbances in subsequent years. 2 A regular Hyde Park Sunday sermoniser was the Rev. Daniel Allen, Particular Baptist clergyman, millenarian, temperance lecturer, pamphleteer and anti-Catholic extraordinaire. Allen was from the extreme fringe of Protestant sectarianism. 3 In the field of anti-Catholic demagogy he specialised in exposing the iniquities of convents and the political power of the Jesuits. 4

1Butlin, Investment in Australian Economic Development, p.390, says there were in colonial N.S.W. only two periods of relatively marked unemployment: 1878-79 and 1885-86.

2F.J., 24 April 1869, 20 October 1875. The latter case was an interesting one. A certain Jacob Avdent, a Jew, had been in the habit of lecturing there on the theme that Christ was not the Saviour. Some of the crowd at one of his meetings became incensed at this and called him 'a Christ killing, pork eating Jew'. Someone cried out 'let's kill him' and as the crowd moved forward he foolishly taunted them with being a priest ridden mob. The police then intervened, arrested Avdent and charged him with using insulting language. He was fined 20 shillings.

3Even the Protestant Standard found him so occasionally (P.S., 17 February, 18 August 1877).

4During 1877-78 he published a series of tracts, originally delivered as lectures, entitled The History of the Convent. He republished these as a large book in 1878 (P.S., 7 September 1878). He had been commissioned to deliver these and subsequent lectures which he gave in Hyde Park, by the Protestant Tract Society and Protestant Lecture Agency, London. This organisation, under the patronage of that puritan Admiral, Sir William King Hall (Q.N.B., Vol.VIII, p.979), and a General Alexander, had as its objects the countering of Romanism, Ritualism and Rationalism (Orangeman and Protestant Catholic, 15 March 1878). In 1886 Allen contributed a long series of articles to the Protestant Standard arguing that Gladstone and a number of other English statesmen were tools of the Jesuits.
On Sunday 10 March 1878 a few young men attempted to prevent Allen from speaking. As they jostled with his supporters they were joined by a large number of others and in the ensuing melee Allen was knocked to the ground. Eventually, with some difficulty, he was escorted out of the Park by his friends and took refuge in his Castlereagh Street residence. Several arrests were made although the police were powerless to stop the fight. Although Allen tended to describe it as a dastardly Romanist attack on his life, it was clearly only larrikinism, albeit with sectarian overtones.

The orange Grand Lodge discussed the issue and an overflowing meeting in the Protestant Hall condemned the incident as an attack on religious liberty and determined to uphold the rights of British subjects. The scene seemed set for a mighty sectarian battle and a crowd of between 15 - 20,000 turned up the next Sunday, St Patrick's Day, to see it. The authorities were prepared for trouble and a large detachment of foot and mounted police were on hand. Another large group of police were in reserve and detachments of artillerymen (the only regular troops in the colony) were stationed at several points in the city. The day proved anti-climactic. Allen spoke briefly with little interruption and adjourned to his residence. Many of the crowd, still curious, followed and completely blocked the street for hundreds of yards either side of his house. Up till then the only violence had been caused by larrikins, making pushes into the sides of the crowd. Then some men with orange rosettes appeared, walking jauntily down Liverpool Street.

1 S.M.H., 11 March 1878.
2 See his letter in S.M.H., 12 March 1878. Witnesses claimed that the riot leaders (who possessed the un-Hibernian names of Strich and Stapleton) had shouted 'Let us drive the heretics off'. See report of trial, S.M.H., 16 March 1878.
3 S.M.H., 11, 13, 16 March 1868.
4 Evening News, 18 March 1878; File on Hyde Park disturbance, Col. Sec., Correspondence Received f78/2549, Box 1/2405.
From among the crowd stones were thrown at them. The police moved in to apprehend some of the culprits, and received some stones in return. They decided to clear the streets and vigorously rode their horses into the crowd. Some clearance was affected but a crowd of 2-3,000 remained, and grew in number later in the evening. It was past midnight before the streets were empty. ¹

The Herald thought such preaching as Allen's unsuited to a public place, but criticised Catholics for being so quick to take offence. ² The Freeman's Journal echoed the first point, while the Protestant press took up the second. ³ In the Assembly, Fitzpatrick, the Colonial Secretary, and John Robertson, for the Opposition, condemned Allen for his provocative speeches, and McGibbon, Barry and other orangemen for trying to present him as a martyr. Robertson thought religious preaching should be forbidden in the Park. ⁴ The St Patrick's Day performance was repeated with minor variations and declining crowds on three subsequent Sundays. Despite the provocations of a group of larrikins sporting orange neckties there were no disturbances. ⁵

In the week following the first disturbance the Herald had congratulated Fitzpatrick for rebuffing the attempts of his co-religionists to obtain government assistance for St Vincent's hospital. It pointed to the high level of sectarian feeling in the colony as a reason for resisting a claim which could only further encourage such feeling. ⁶ While Fitzpatrick, Robertson, the editor of the Herald and other reasonable men feared an increase in sectarianism, the orangemen welcomed it. The lecture tour by Pastor Charles Chiniquy, which they organised in October, was calculated to provoke it.

¹ S.M.H., 18 March 1878.
² S.M.H., 21 March 1878.
³ F.J., 23 March 1878; P.S., 23 March 1878; W.A., 23 March 1878; A.C., 21 March 1878.
⁴ S.M.H., 20 March 1878.
⁵ S.M.H., 25 March, 1,7, April 1878.
⁶ S.M.H., 15 March 1878.
Chiniquy was well known to colonial Orangemen as an ex-Catholic priest who had won 25,000 converts from among fellow French Canadians whom he had led to settle in Illinois. For this he had been persecuted and calumniated by the priests. He had been invited to lecture in Australia by the Rev. George Sutherland, at that time Grand Chaplain of the Orange Institution. A sprightly seventy-year old, Chiniquy was a practised platform performer, and had the authority of first hand experience to support his horrifying picture of the beliefs and practices of Roman Catholicism. Speaking with a marked French accent he portrayed the absurdities, iniquities and dangers of Romanism with simple stories taken from his own life. He avoided theological arguments which might have taxed his audiences' intelligence. One of his lecture routines was to produce a piece of machinery resembling two flatirons, hinged at one end. This, he would explain, was used by Romanists to make hosts, which they believed were turned into the body and blood of Christ, merely by some priest saying a few Latin words over them. He would then proceed to make some

1 They had read about him in, for example, P.S., 5 August 1871, 28 August 1875, 24 June 1876, 6 June 1877, 12 October 1877; Orangeman and Protestant Catholic, 15 December 1877; Witness and Australian Presbyterian, 25 February 1878. The number of converts he is reputed to have won is no doubt greatly exaggerated.

2 Rev. George Sutherland had been born in Glasgow, Nova Scotia in 1830. After joining the Free Presbyterian ministry he ministered in Canada and Dunedin (New Zealand) before accepting a call to St George's Church, Castlereagh Street, the leading Free Presbyterian Church in the colony. Within four days of taking up his charge in 1872 he had started a newspaper (the Australian Witness) and he devoted much time in subsequent years to publicising the Protestant cause. A prolific writer, he produced several long pamphlets on anti-Catholic themes, such as The True Church: Letters to the Roman Catholics of Australia (Sydney, 1877) and Papal Domination (Sydney, 1879). Although an active Orangeman (Grand Chaplain 1878-80), he clashed several times with McGibbon, who at one time accused him of vicious sectarianism (P.S., 28 August 1880; see also P.S., 21 August 1875 and Robinson, Free Presbyterian Church of Australia, pp.158-9.
hosts out of bread and say the words over them. 1 Audiences were fascinated. Prurient tendencies were tapped by special lectures on confession, some for men and others for women only. The Sydney Protestants had never seen such a performer and they flocked to his lectures. The Catholic authorities tried to ignore him and hoped that co-religionists would do likewise. 2 However a Mrs Constable, better known as Joey Gongenheim, a comic actress of some repute, was moved to deliver, as a 'Catholic lady', several lectures criticising Chiniquy's description of the confessional. 3 The orangemen met this challenge with their own female champion, a Mrs Margaret Dillon. Mrs Dillon had, not long before, been driven from Catholicism by the shameful attentions of one or two priests of the Sydney archdiocese. The details of these attentions and their authors she retailed to audiences in support of all Pastor Chiniquy had said. 4

Although Chiniquy's visit to Sydney did not have quite the effect it had in Hobart, which hovered for several days in the brink of civil war, 5 it excited the orangemen and provoked Catholics. A few stones were thrown at Chiniquy at Paramatta and the incident was magnified by the Protestant press into attempted murder. 6 While the visit was condemned

---

1 Good taste, however, seemed to prevent him finishing the show in the way he did in other countries - by throwing the consecrated hosts on the floor and treading on them. His lectures were fully reported in the Protestant Standard during October and November 1878 and published as a small book: Rev. Charles Chiniquy, A Series of Lectures delivered by the Rev Charles Chiniquy in the Protestant Hall Sydney (Sydney 1878). This ran to at least three editions and 20,000 copies. Colonial editions of Chiniquy's The Priest, the Woman and the Confessional and Papal Idolatory were also published.

2 F.J., 5, 12 October 1878.

3 F.J., 2 November, 14 December 1878; Evening News, 26 October 1878; S.M.H., 21 November 1878.

4 S.M.H., 19, 28 November 1878.


6 F.S., 19 October 1878.
by some of the press,¹ the Standard and the Witness were scathing in their attacks on those who regretted its sectarian impact, and were full of warnings of the growing power of Romanism.² Society had not had time to settle when Archbishop Vaughan and his co-adjutors launched their fierce attack on the public schools of the colony. Not surprisingly they provoked a violent reaction.

* * * * *

The sectarianism surrounding the Catholic bishops' joint pastoral on education and Parkes's Public Instruction Act serves as a final variation on the themes in this thesis. The conjunction of these two events and the sectarianism which accompanied them has led historians to argue that sectarianism was an important, even the main cause of the Public Instruction Act.³ I would argue the contrary. The

¹ Evening News, 17 October 1878; Punch, 16, 23 November 1878. Chiniquy was refused the use of several halls by their committees - e.g. at Balmain. P.S., 19 October 1878.
² P.S., 16 November 1878; Witness and Australian Presbyterian, 9 November 1878.
³ For example, Austin, Australian Education p.66 rejects the 'common view' that 'the alleged secular nature of the legislation was the result of sectarian conflict'. He does however see the anti-Catholic hostility aroused by Vaughan's pastorals as an important factor on the timing and the content of the 1880 Act (pp.208-12). Interestingly, in his list of influences directing men towards a system of secular education Austin omits the Irish example, which is clearly the most important. Barcan 'Opion, Policy and Practice in N.S.W. Education', p.50 agrees that the Catholic Church did not cause the 1879 education act, but argues that by issuing the joint pastoral, it precipitated it. Most recent Catholic historians have withdrawn from Moran's extreme view (History of the Catholic Church, pp.871-88) that the 1880 Public Instruction Act was aimed at the destruction of the Catholic schools, and was the result of secularist and anti-Catholic agitation. They agree rather with Barcan that the joint pastoral raised a sectarian storm that precipitated the 1880
Public Instruction Act was the final result of pressures building up since 1836 for the reform of education along certain lines. These pressures were the political expression of a liberal vision of society that, among other things, wished to eliminate sectarian division by means of a national system of education. The 1866 Act was a compromise between this vision and the older view which saw the Church as primarily responsible for education. It was inevitable that in the course of time the compromise would be resolved in favour of the liberal view. It was not even the case that the sectarianism provoked by the joint pastoral determined the date at which the compromise was removed. Parkes had announced his intention of introducing a new education bill before the bishops composed their pastoral, and it was clear that if it was to have any chance of success it must abolish denominational schools. The joint pastoral was itself an extremely sectarian document and the reactions it provoked were as often anti-sectarian as they were Protestant sectarian. The sectarianism which surrounded the passage of the 1880 Public Instruction Act was, as it had been since the 1860s, the result of the Catholic Church's obscurantist opposition to the liberal's vision and its unjust criticism of the schools that embodied that vision.

Between 1872 and 1879 at least eight attempts were made to amend the 1866 Public Schools Act. These attempts were the product of the same pressures for educational reform which had been operating in society since the 1830s. They contained no propositions which had not been suggested

Footnote continued from previous page...

Act. (See Fogarty, Catholic Education in Australia, Vol. I, p.251, or O'Farrell, The Catholic Church in Australia, p.127.) O'Farrell writes:

The reaction to the joint pastoral was prompt.... A sectarian convulsion gripped New South Wales as the Bishop's condemnation of Public schools tapped better springs of vengeance. Fierce storms of controversy blew from every corner. Riding on the gales of hate and abuse that swept in on Vaughan... came Henry Parkes with the 1880 Public Instruction Act, abolishing aid to denominational education and establishing secularism.
previously, and were simply the revival of demands which the 1866 Act had only partly met. They grew more frequent as the decade advanced and as the imperfections of the 1866 compromise became more obvious. They manifested the growing strength of public support for more thorough educational reform.

The first attempt to amend the 1866 Act was made by William Foster in December 1872. Foster was reacting against the House's criticism of the Council of Education over the Grenfell school affair. He felt that such criticism weakened the constraints on denominationalism which the Act contained, and to that extent reverted to the pre-1866 situation. He wished the House to agree with the introduction of a bill to make the 1866 Act more secular and to end aid to denominational schools. The motion was lost 26:16 on an amendment of Parkes's of approving the 1866 Act.¹

The second attempt was made in November of 1873 by John Stewart. Stewart's motion asked the house to agree that the continued existence of denominational schools encouraged effective opposition to the full development of public education. It pointed out that the 1866 Act promoted the multiplication of schools, dissipated educational funds and perpetuated sectarianism. These were all objections which had been made against the pre-1866 dual system. The motion concluded by asking the House to withdraw certificates for denominational schools by 1875. After a debate it was put and negatived.²

In June 1875, G.R. Dibbs, only recently elected for West Sydney, proposed that the House agree to the introduction of a bill to amend the Public Schools Act. The bill should, among other things, provide for the discontinuance of funds to denominational schools. After several days debate during the following two months it was lost 21-7.³ Dibbs' bill was

¹V & P (LA NSW), 1872-3 (1) 64, 77, 105, 111-2.
²V & P (LA NSW), 1873-4 (1) 149.
³V & P (LA NSW), 1875 (1) 182, 228, 243, 272, 303.
the product of an extra-parliamentary movement formed in mid-
1874 for the purposes of agitating for the reform of the
Public Schools Act. Called the Public Schools League it had
been initiated by a Baptist minister, the Rev. James
Greenwood. Greenwood, an M.A. from London University, had
arrived in the colony four years earlier from England.¹
In the same manner as Wilkins and other educational reformers
in the 1850s and 60s, Greenwood gathered statistical evidence
of the failure of the 1866 Act to provide education for
anything like a full quota of the school age population.
Backed by the Sydney Morning Herald, for which Greenwood was
soon writing editorials, the Public Schools League conducted
a colony wide agitation for an education act that was 'Free,
Secular, Compulsory'.² Dibbs had stood as a P.S.L. candidate
in the 1874 general election.³ During the election the
League at least had the satisfaction of forcing from Parkes
minor concessions making education less expensive and the
administration of the Act less favourable to denominational
schools.⁴

¹James Greenwood was born in 1839, the son of a Lancashire
factory worker. Via chapel he took out an M.A. from London
university in 1866, and became pastor of a Nottingham Baptist
Church. Emigrating to Australia in 1870 he became pastor of
the Bathurst Street Baptist church. He combined radicalism
with intelligence, but while he was a good writer, he did not
possess an attractive personality and was a bad platform
speaker. A somewhat unstable man he soon found the confines
of the Baptist church too narrow and drifted into free
thought. He died virtually friendless, aged only 44, in
1882. Alcoholism was a contributory cause of death.
(A.D.B. file; P.S., 17 June 1876, 12 November 1881, 11
November 1882; F.J., 28 February 1880.)
²A.R. Crane, 'The New South Wales Public Schools League 1874-
1879', E.L. French ed.; Melbourne Studies in Education, 1964,
(Melbourne 1965), pp.198-229, supplies a sometimes facetious,
often inaccurate account of the League that nonetheless gets
the broad outlines right.
³F.J., 26 December 1874.
⁴S.M.H., 4 December 1874. See also D. Morris, 'Henry Parkes-
Publicist and Legislator', Turney ed., Pioneers of Australian
Education, p.179.
Early in 1876 Robertson introduced a Bill drafted by himself and his Attorney-General, W.B. Dally. The Bill embodied a number of frequently mooted reforms. It substituted a Department of Education under a minister for the Council of Education; raised the minimum attendance required for a denominational school to retain its certificate and prohibited the establishment of further denominational schools. After several days debate it passed a second reading by 32-28. As it was being debated in committee it was discovered that it had been incorrectly introduced and was withdrawn. 1

In 1877 David Buchanan asked the House to agree to a motion similar to that introduced by William Foster in 1873. After a short debate it was lost 23-6. 2 Then, early in 1878, James Greenwood asked the House to approve the introduction of a bill providing for national, compulsory, secular and free education. Greenwood had been elected for East Sydney a few months before in an election many saw as a victory for the views of the Public Schools League. 3 His motion was greeted enthusiastically. 4 After some debate Parkes moved that the matter be referred to a select committee. This move was defeated. After further debate the motion was lost, but under circumstances that justified the Herald's earlier criticism that Greenwood had aimed for too much, (particularly

---

1 V & P (LA NSW), 1875-6 (1) 136, 140, 145, 186, 204, 221, 235; Barcan 'Opinion, Policy and Practice in N.S.W. Education', pp. 488-91.
2 V & P (LA NSW), 1876-7 (1) 273.
3 E.J., 15 December 1877. Greenwood had been asked to stand by the League, (E.J. Keik, An Apostle in Australian Life - Reminiscences of Joseph Coles Kirby [London, 1927] pp.110-12) but during his campaign claimed that he was not under the auspices of the League (Crane, op.cit., p.222). He was elected third in East Sydney. Parkes was defeated. It was an election which saw the expression of widespread dissatisfaction with the old political leadership.
4 S.M.H., 13 February 1878.
5 V & P (LA NSW), 1877-8 (1) 89, 115, 187.
regarding free education. 1 A little later Windeyer moved that the House ask the Governor to include in the 1879 estimates provision for the establishment of secondary or grammar schools at Maitland, Bathurst and Goulburn. This was eventually agreed to. 2 In February 1879 Angus Cameron asked the Government what steps had been taken in this direction and was told that it would probably involve legislation. 3 A month later Dr Bowker moved that education be placed in the hands of a responsible minister, instead of the Council of Education. Parkes agreed reform was required, but counselled delay. 4 On 13 May, in a speech at Sutton Forest, Parkes commented on some of the defects of the 1866 Act and indicated that some remedy would be attempted within the year. 5 In mid-June, during a debate on the estimates he indicated that a bill would be introduced in the next session. 6

Parkes had never claimed that the 1866 Act was anything more than a compromise. During the seventies he had defended it on the grounds that it was supported by the majority of the population. 7 By the end of the seventies it had become extremely doubtful whether the Act retained that public support. It was clear, too, that a majority of Parliament favoured some sort of educational reform and Parkes determined to take advantage of his large majority to introduce a comprehensive new education bill. Parkes sketched the details of his bill on the 5 November 1879. It included most of the reforms previously proposed. The Council of Education would be replaced by a department, under a ministerial head; at

1 S.M.H., 13 February 1878.
2 V & P (LA NSW), 1877-8 (1) 175, 152, 167, 208, 289.
3 V & P (LA NSW), 1878-9 (1) 247.
4 V & P (LA NSW), 1878-9 (1) 315.
5 S.M.H., 14 May 1879.
6 S.M.H., 19 June 1879.
7 As well, he was loath to see his position as the colony's educational reformer usurped.
least three high schools for boys and one high school for girls would be established; the history of England and Australia would be taught; attendance would be gradually made compulsory, and fees would be reduced to 3d per child. After three years state assistance to denominational schools would cease.

The latter provision aroused the most controversy outside Parliament, being condemned by the Catholics and deprecated by the Anglican clergy. It was, however, supported by the Presbyterian, Wesleyans and Congregationalists. In the Parliament other clauses of the Bill came in for as much criticism. As with the abolition of state aid clause attacks were made from both sides. Some deplored the ending of aid for denominational schools, thought cheap education obnoxious and opposed the principle of compulsion. Others thought aid to denominational schools should be ended immediately, and declared that the Bill did not go far enough towards abolishing fees and enforcing attendance. As with most of Parkes's legislation, the Bill was a masterly compromise. Had it been too radical it would have been in danger of defeat. Had it not presaged the abolition of state aid to denominational schools it would have been opposed by the secularists, and probably defeated. As it was, it received huge majorities. It passed a second reading 49-9 and a third reading 42-6.

1David Buchanan had been agitating for this during the '70s. See O'Donnell 'Sectarian Differences and the Inclusion of History in the Curriculum of N.S.W. Public Schools', passim.

2A copy of the Bill is in F.J., 27 November 1879. A slightly edited copy of the Act (the Bill with slight amendments) is in Griffiths, ed., Documents on Establishment of Education in New South Wales, pp.163-68.


4All of whom petitioned in its favour. V & P (LA NSW), 1879-80 (3) 391-461.
The changing attitude of the Anglican Church to the 1886 Act's provision for dogmatic religious instruction in public schools was an important factor persuading Parkes that support for public schools was increasing. In 1878 the Sydney diocesan synod decided to take advantage of the provision and in June 1879 a committee appointed in the previous year made detailed recommendations. Anglican clergymen had already that year been visiting a large number of schools. Thus the most important denomination in the colony had come to accept the religious provisions of the Public Schools Act. As well, the increasing number of Anglican and Catholic children at public schools seemed to indicate that although the clergymen might prefer denominational schools and denounce public schools, the laity of the two Churches were by no means as convinced. Over half the Catholic school children in the colony attended public schools. Even after the denunciation of these places by the bishops in their joint pastoral the number of Catholic children in Sydney public schools decreased by less than one fifth. The decrease over the whole colony was far less. Numbers soon began to rise again.

2 A total of 4679 visits to 77 schools. The other denominations were far less active. See Table III in Davis, 'Bishop Barker and Denominationalism', p.149.
3 This figure was announced by the Herald after a spot check on a few Sydney public schools. It was hardly an indication that Vaughan's words had had a considerable impact as some historians have suggested, (e.g., Barcan, op.cit., p.495; Fogerty, op.cit., Vol.I, p.251). People at the time took it as indicating the opposite. (S.M.H., 9 August 1879.)
4 The attendance of Catholics at public schools in the four quarters of 1879 was: December 1878, 12,600; March 1879, 14,314; June 1879, 14,539; September 1879, 13,923; December 1879, 13,784. By December 1880 numbers attending had increased to 16,345. (Report of public schools in respective V & P (LA NSW). Parkes and the Herald pointed out 31 per cent of parents signing petitions requesting public schools were Catholics. (S.M.H., 16 August 1879.)
The importance of the Anglicans' decision to utilise the religious instruction provisions of the 1866 Act was shown by the concessions Parkes embodied in his 1879 Bill to further facilitate the visits of clergymen to public schools. They could take the children of their denomination for an hour's instruction at any time of the day, instead of the first or final hour as required by the 1866 Act, and they were to be provided with a special class room wherever possible. These extra provisions were attacked by some members as involving too great a concession to denominationalists. The precedent of the Bill was nowhere as clearly illustrated as in these provisions. Whatever the Bill was, it was not anti- or even a-religious. It was the culmination of a struggle to implement a vision of society that grew out of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century Ireland, and had been adopted by an increasing number of colonists from the 1830s onwards as appropriate for their own society. In many respects it was an outdated vision. It aimed to end sectarian divisiveness, but by 1880 that was an impossible aim. Nonetheless, such was the strength of the original vision that it prevailed against the efforts of a few total secularists who wished entirely to end the recognition of religion by the state. The 1880 Act was concerned to more widely disseminate schools which taught a common Christianity as well as literacy. In time the Irish National readers (by then, even, 40 years old) were replaced by local books, and the common Christianity content in education faded away. New South Welsh schools thus became more like their Victorian counterparts, although they still allowed regular visits by clergymen. Real secularism came by default rather than by struggle.

The erosion of the common Christianity content of education has been one factor persuading historians to incorrectly see the 1880 Public Instruction Act as
instituting secular, meaning non-religious, education. That it abolished aid to denominational schools is another reason. But equally misleading has been the persistent assertion of the Catholic authorities that it was anti-religious. In the same way, their constant cry that it was designed to destroy the Catholic religion has helped establish the view that the anti-Catholicism which preceded and surrounded the passage of the Act was causally connected with it. The opinions of those Catholic spokesmen are extremely unreliable.

The denunciations by Catholic clergy and journals of the Council of Education have already been noticed. The contradictions in the Catholics' criticism, indicated by the Freeman's denunciations of the Council as an instrument of Methodism and the Reporter's belief that it was inspired by Communism and Freemasonry were never resolved. The 1880 Act was denounced as Protestant and atheistic in turn. Such inconsistency illustrates the irrationality of the official Catholic view. Criticism of the educational reform movement in the seventies was, if anything, even more extreme. The Public Schools League was, at various times in late 1874, referred to as 'productive of atheists'; 'leading to Internationalism'; 'similar to the communists'; 'floating

1 That the belief in the importance of the common Christianity content in education was not passed on to the next generation is significant and worth study, but it is anachronistic to claim that the liberals commitment to that belief was weak or unrealistic as Austin seems to imply in the case of Victoria (e.g. Australian Education, p.187). The failure of the generation after that of Parkes to ensure the continuation of common Christianity was more a testimony to the destruction by sectarianism of the hopes such a scheme embodied, and a recognition that it involved the state in supporting a religion (in this case Christianity), than to irreligion. The strictly secular nature of the Victorian schools - the product of similar forces to N.S.W. - was eventually watered down to allow clergymen to visit schools. In New South Wales, in time, more and more clergymen came to take advantage of the provision allowing them into schools. Even the Catholics eventually accepted the public schools to that extent.
scum'; and 'colonial communism'. Reference was also made to it as 'bigotry in action' and the comment was passed on the apparent contradiction of 'the sectarianism of the men (in the P.S.L.) dedicated to eradicate it'. Such remarks, referring to the considerable support given the movement by leading orangemen, had only a superficial accuracy.

A number of leading orangemen, particularly McGibbon and Barry gave the League full support. Their support, though, was the product of radical voluntaryist principles rather than bigotry. They believed that it was the duty of the state to provide for the education of all children, and that the churches must be completely independent of the state. At the same time they favoured the teaching of the common tenets of Christianity in schools. These were the basis of morality, which it was the state's duty to inculcate.

Their support for the League sometimes led them into violent conflict with other orangemen and evangelical Protestants. Late in 1874 Bishop Barker began the Church of England Defence Association to oppose the League's agitation for the abolition of denominational schools. One argument which he no doubt hoped would appeal to the evangelicals among his co-religionists was that only in denominational schools could the whole Bible be used. This point was taken

1 F.J., 26 September, 3 October, 24 October, 14 November 1874, 2 January 1875, respectively. See also Crane, op.cit., pp.206, 211, for some equally far fetched descriptions offered by Vaughan.
2 F.J., 19 September 1874.
3 F.J., 26 August 1875.
4 Barry was second only to Greenwood in the councils of the League and toured the country districts on its behalf (Crane, op.cit., p.206).
5 Barry claimed at the time of McGibbon's death that he and McGibbon had prevented others in the P.S.L. from demanding the abolition of the common Christianity content in education as part of the League's platform (P.S., 1 July 1882).
6 F.J., 3 October 1874.
7 P.S., 31 October 1874.
up later by the Bible Combination, who wished to have the whole bible used in schools, instead of the Irish scripture lessons. These they saw as tainted with popery. The Combination had wide support among evangelicals and orangemen, and for a while appeared more powerful than the League. Among its prominent members were Revs George Sutherland, Wazir Beg and Daniel Allen; W.J. Foster and John Roseby. McGibbon and Barry were tireless in attacking these organisations. The Combination's view they thought outdated and vastly impractical. One reason was that its policy would render public schools quite unsuitable for Catholics. The Bible Combination hit back with the charge that those who opposed the use of the bible in the schools were disloyal to the throne. It was the Bible Combination with its play on the symbols of orangeism (bible and throne) that represented the sectarian Protestant tradition, rather than the rational-reformist approach of the League. If League spokesmen like Greenwood and Barry occasionally represented the League in no-popery colours it was only to try and win support from their more sectarian fellow Protestants.

Such distinctions were not likely to be comprehended by Catholics. The sectarianism of the previous few years led them to view all orangemen alike and see any movement in education with which they disapproved as anti-Catholic inspired. But while the bigotry they had experienced in previous years was an important influence on their reaction, the obscurantist ideology of sectarian Catholicism was a

---

1 P.S., 1 April 1876.
2 Crane, op.cit., pp.219-20.
3 P.S., 29 April 1876.
4 P.S., 17 February 1877. Allan had previously given a series of lectures on 'The Bible and the Throne', arguing that the former was the foundation of the latter (Crane, op.cit., pp.215-6).
5 For example, Barry's appeal in the 1877 election (ibid., p.222). Similarly Greenwood's original hamfisted attempt to win support from Bishop Barker (ibid., pp.202-3).
deeper influence. It was this that had conditioned their original rejection of common schooling, which had raised such a storm of hostility against them. The influence of that ideology and its deeply distorted view of the world had been strengthened considerably by Vaughan, who possessed it in its pure European form. It was also strengthened by the suffragan bishops and many of the clergy, who possessed it in its Irish form, which mixed the European Catholics' fear of masonry with a conviction that Englishmen would always try to persecute Irishmen and their Catholic religion. The suffragan bishops tended to act in the colony as their fellow bishops acted in Ireland: ordering about Catholics and issuing directives to the government as if Catholics were in the great majority, and as if the opinion of non-Catholics counted not at all. When non-Catholic opinion was aroused they simply imagined their assumptions about the persecuted condition of Catholics verified.

Despite Vaughan's denials of any political intentions it is difficult to see the issuing of the joint pastoral as anything other than a political action. Vaughan and the Irish bishops had previously communicated on the education question, but without producing concerted action. Polding's dislike of the Irish bishops and the apparent security of the 1866 compromise during the early and mid-1870s prevented any sort of concerted action. Vaughan was too busy repairing the chaos into which the affairs of the archdiocese had fallen in the latter years of Polding's episcopacy. Even after Polding's death, and despite advice that state aid must eventually be removed from denominational schools, little action was taken. Mutual suspicion following the O'Mahoney incident seemed to have prevented it. Finally, in May 1879, as it became obvious that a new education bill would soon be introduced, Bishop Quinn, at the prompting of Lanigan, called

1 Rummery, 'The Significance...of the Joint Pastoral of 1879...', p.62, quotes letters between Vaughan and Murray and Lanigan.
on Vaughan to see if the bishops could be called together to
discuss a common policy of opposition to any further extension
of secular education. ¹ Vaughan called the bishops together
at St John's college on 27 May. ² Following the meeting
Vaughan drafted the pastoral, which was circulated to the
other bishops. It was published in the Herald on 25 July
1879 and read in Catholic churches two days later. ³

The purpose of the pastoral was clear. It condemned
public schools in violent and exaggerated language, and
ordered Catholic parents to remove their children from them.
It pointed out to the Government and the public at large that
as Catholics could not use public schools, they must, if
justice was to be done, be given one third of the education
revenue to use on their own schools. It contained no
argument or authority that had not been quoted before. Only
the language was different. It was more provocative.

Vaughan followed up the joint-pastoral with a series of
pastorals of his own, arguing the necessity of separate
Catholic education as a bulwark against the evils of the
modern world. His purpose was to convince Catholics that
only Catholic schools were suitable for their children. ⁴

¹ O'Farrell, Catholic Church in Australia, p.146.
² Rummery, op.cit., p.63.
³ S.M.H., 25 July 1879, 28 July 1879. It was not published in
the Freeman's until 2 August 1879.
⁴ F.J., 9, 16, 30 August, 6 September, 18 October 1879. Perhaps
the most charitable judgement on some of his arguments was
that his arrogance blinded him in their very considerable
faults, and even more odious implications. People were just
discovering social statistics, and their use made of them in
arguments was far more enthusiastic than accurate. Vaughan
argued in one of his pastorals that the lower number of
criminals in gaol in the southern, late-slave owning states of
America when compared to the northern states showed the
superiority of Christian education. The northern states had
public schools, while the southern states had church schools
(F.J., 6 September 1879). In replying to this the Herald
desisted from drawing the obvious implication and merely
pointed out that the statistics he had used further showed
while the northern states had a far higher degree of literacy,
the criminals in the gaols were largely illiterate. Thus,
while crime and illiteracy were related, public schools in fact
encouraged a higher degree of literacy (S.M.H., 4 September
1879).
At one stage he refused to confirm children who were attending a public school, but then changed his mind after being assured by the parish priest that they would soon attend the Catholic school. It was an Irishman, Bishop Quinn, who showed that the bishops really meant business. A month before the pastoral was issued (but after the contents had been decided) he refused to allow a Catholic burial to a Richard Kenna, a Bathurst publican, on the grounds that his two children were attending Protestant schools (one was at Sydney Grammar, the other in Tasmania). Non-Catholics were appalled at the blatant use of sacramental powers to enforce obedience, and discovered in it portents of the pastoral to come.

The pastoral and the steps taken to reinforce it had an immense influence on the colony. A new education bill was eagerly awaited, and most colonists happily anticipated the extension of public schools which it would involve. Protestant sectarian feeling had been brought to a high pitch by the Hyde Park incident and Chiniquy's visit the year before. Part of the reaction to the pastoral was sectarian, but, given the circumstances, it was relatively mild. Protestant journals said they expected no more, and expressed the hope that it/unite Protestants and open the eyes of a few Catholics.

1 W.A., 2 August 1879. Vaughan later claimed to have been misunderstood. He had said that he would confirm the children if the parents had good reason to send them to the public schools (P.S., 13 November 1880).

2 P.S., 28 June, 12 July 1879; F.J., 26 July 1879. The P.S. (19 July 1879) reflected that this case must have embarrassed Vaughan, as a number of children of prominent Sydney Catholics were attending the same school. Richard Kenna, Irish born, had settled in Bathurst in the 1850s. He had been an active supporter of Irish causes and was treasurer to the Bathurst committee raising funds for the Freeman's Journal in 1868 and for the released Fenian prisoners in 1869. His elder brother, Patrick, was Mayor of Orange during the 1870s (S.M.H., 7 August; F.J., 5 July 1869).

3 See for example, W.A., 2 August 1871; P.S., 19 July 1879.

4 For example, P.S., 16 August 1879; Presbyterian, 16, 30 August 1879; W.A., 2 August 1871. The latter journal claimed that large numbers of Catholics walked out of Goulburn Cathedral as Bishop Lanigan began reading the pastoral.
Most Protestant clergymen referred to it in sermons,\textsuperscript{1} and it was widely discussed in the letter column of the daily press. The joint pastoral seemed to precipitate the steady change in public opinion towards public schools which had been occurring in the previous few years. This new opinion was expressed in affirmations of the worth of public schools against the absurd Catholic criticism. If some of the expressions of this opinion contained scathing references to Catholic views and Catholic education it was all the bishops deserved.

The \textit{Herald} kept up an almost daily argument with Vaughan and the other Catholic spokesmen for nearly six months, but at all times argued coolly and with considerable good sense. Its original comment pointed to the contradiction in the pastoral, which claimed that Catholics could not in conscience accept public schools and yet ordered the large numbers of Catholics, quite happily making use of public schools, to withdraw their children. The \textit{Herald} argued that while the state should grant liberty of conscience, it was not at all clear that any class had the right to demand that its conscience should dictate the policy of the state.\textsuperscript{2} It was unable to accept that church authorities had the right to dictate, as opposed to guide, the consciences of their adherents, and it wondered if the state could afford to allow this clerical dictation, especially when it involved issues which concerned all the citizens, and not merely questions pertaining to the beliefs which defined membership of the church. Even if the state could allow such an exercise of clerical authority it was totally inappropriate for a church to cry persecution when its wishes, which happened to be contrary to the wish of the majority, as expressed through the government, were not granted.

\textsuperscript{1}\textit{Presbyterian}, 30 August 1879. See \textit{P.S.}, 16 August 1879,\textsuperscript{--} for a mild Protestant reply by the Congregationalist James Jeffries. For a more rough and tumble, sectarian reply, by the Rev. M. Gray, see \textit{P.S.}, 4 October 1879.

\textsuperscript{2}\textit{S.M.H.}, 26 July 1879.
The Herald's view of the state was not a particularly liberal one by nineteenth century standards, nor a plural one, but underlying it was a realistic assumption that the resources of a colonial state were limited and could not be squandered to satisfy the whims of a minority.¹ Basically the Herald, like most colonists, just could not accept the Catholics' objections to the schools, and thus their demands for separate schools, as reasonable.

The Catholic authorities and spokesmen did not help their cause when, almost immediately after the first criticism of their arguments, they cried 'persecution'. For a while pride in the impact 'hard hitting Catholic truth' was having on 'those living in a moral twilight' mixed with outrage at the reaction to their criticism. But, by November, Vaughan was talking of the public schools as 'modern "Scavengers Daughters"': instruments of torture designed to squeeze the Catholic faith out of Catholic children. Yet Vaughan was not shocked by the public response. Writing to his friend Dr Smith in 1880 he blandly commented: 'Of course, we have got infidels and free thinkers and the lower row of Protestants against us. But that is so

¹See for example S.M.H., 15 August, 18 September, 16, 21 October, 18, 20 November 1879. It also used the argument of economy against the Catholic demand for a system of payment by results. As well, it argued that payment by results would tie teaching too closely to an examination system, thus discouraging true education, and would, more importantly, return education to the Churches and be thus largely a reversal to the pre-1866 state of affairs. It did not think that the state could afford to give up its responsibilities.

That public opinion largely supported the Public Instruction Bill was borne out by a by-election for East Sydney which easily returned a supporter of the Bill over an Anglican opponent, who was heavily back by the Catholic clergy (S.M.H., 16, 18 December 1879). Parkes several times pointed out to the Catholics that there had to be a general election before the cessation of aid to denominational schools, and that would provide them with an opportunity to test their assertion that the majority of the population opposed abolition of aid to denominational schools.
everywhere: and we must expect the world ever to be itself!  

Such were the massive delusions of the man. Earlier in his letter he expressed himself content because the Catholic body had got torpid and indifferent in many ways, and wanted raising up. Hence the pastorals. I am glad to tell you that they produced the best possible effect, and have united the Catholic body as never before.

If the Catholics were more united than previously it was because of the public criticism aroused by the pastorals, rather than the pastorals themselves. Letters to the Freeman's Journal referred mainly to the attacks on their religion, by which they meant the criticism of their bishops.

The widespread public discussion and criticism of Catholic claims confirmed the sectarian predisposition of many Catholics, and increased the tension experienced by Catholics who were not sectarian but who felt strong ties with the community of their fellow Catholics who were.

The argument that the Catholic church was not united behind the bishops was a telling one. The Catholic authorities were anxious to have respected laymen support their stand. When W.B. Dalley spoke on the value of Christian education at a special meeting chaired by Vaughan, his speech was immediately published as a pamphlet and distributed through the colony. The bishops could not have

---

1 Vaughan to Dr Smith, 15 March 1880, photostat of letter in Vaughan papers, S.A.A. Rummery, op.cit., pp.76-8, thinks with good reason that Vaughan was trying to win Anglican opinion to his side. Bishop Barker, however, was no Moorehouse (Anglican Bishop of Melbourne, whom Catholics enthusiastically, though probably incorrectly, claimed as an ally) and would have received little lay support even if he were. See also F.J., 23 August, 27 September 1879, for open appeals to Anglican support.

2 Vaughan to Dr Smith, op.cit.

3 F.J., 23, 30 August, 6 September 1879.

4 His speech was reported in F.J., 18 October 1879. The pamphlet version was entitled Sydney Platforms and European Cabinets - An Address to the Catholics of N.S.W. on the Education Question (Sydney, 1879). Bishop Lanigan immediately ordered 2,150 copies for the Goulburn Diocese (F.J., 1 November 1879).
been pleased with the Parliamentary debate on Parkes's Public Instruction Act. All nine Catholic members present spoke during the second reading debate, and although eight indicated their intention of opposing the Bill, only two had any criticism of public schools, and then only as places likely to endanger the Catholic faith. Most praised public schools, but thought that was no need to remove assistance from denominational schools. Two (Dillon, who supported the Act and would have made it more secular, and McElhone) deplored the pastoral and roundly criticised Vaughan. It was McElhone who first claimed that Vaughan, by provoking a strong public reaction against denominationalism, had brought about the abolition of aid to denominational schools. Several other members, mostly Catholic, could not resist the absurd claim that Parkes would never have brought in an

---

1 John Thomas Dillon was born in West Maitland in 1848. Educated at Maitland, Lyndhurst and Sydney University (M.A.), he was admitted to the bar in 1869 and elected to the Legislative Assembly for the Hunter in the same year. He served one term but was elected for Tenterfield in 1877. In 1882 he resigned to become a stipendiary magistrate in Sydney and after a time resigned that position because of ill-health. He acted as Crown Prosecutor until his death from tuberculosis in 1888.

Elected a fellow of St John's College in 1870 he mixed political liberalism with his Catholicism in a way that astounding most traditional Catholics. He was often denounced by the Freeman's Journal, first for remaining with his friend Robertson after that gentleman had formed an alliance with Martin; then for supporting Buchanan's divorce legislation (Dillon said that as a Catholic he could not practice it, but thought others whose beliefs did not prevent them should be enabled to); and finally for his support for the 1880 Public Instruction Act (he had supported the P.S.L. platform 1877). It was said by the Protestant Standard that he had married (in 1882) outside the church, but he was buried a Catholic and was good friends with a number of prominent Irish Catholic figures of the eighties, such as the Freehill brothers and John Toohey. (See N.B.R. file; F.J., 5 March, 9 July 1870, 10 November 1877, 8 November 1879; P.S., 9 August 1884.

2 N.S.W.P.D., 1 (1879-80), 355-65, 380-82.
education bill if Vaughan had not prepared the way.¹

Very few of the speakers at any stage of the debate indulged in sectarianism in any way matching that of Vaughan and other Catholic spokesmen outside. Buchanan and Hurley (Central Cumberland) were the main exceptions. Parkes became a little excited at some remark of Vaughan's and suggested he was inciting people to treason, but it was an expression of exasperation rather than bigotry. At the end of the debate, Fitzpatrick, the Catholic leader of the Opposition, admitted Parkes had said no more than the provocation he had received warranted.² The debate did indicate that several Catholics had changed their views on education during the previous decade. Joseph Leary had been fully committed to national schools in the 1862 debate on Cowper's educational proposals. By 1879 he was all for denominational schools. W.B. Dalley had come down firmly in favour of denominational schools and while Michael Fitzpatrick still favoured public schools he did not wish to see the 1866 Act, which he had originally attacked as a compromise, changed. They leave the impression that their changed views were not the result of any detached reassessment of the relative merits of public and denominational schools, but rather a product of the decade of sectarianism forcing them to side with their church leaders.

The extent of Catholic support for their bishops' views on education was demonstrated in the petitions organised

¹One of the other myths arising out of the controversy was that many otherwise favourably disposed to denominational education had changed their views from a desire to oppose Rome. This view was first put by Bishop Barker (Cowper, ed., op.cit., p.367) who seemed determined to paint the motives of those Anglicans who opposed him in the worst possible light. He did not comprehend the voluntaryist principles which underlay their disagreement with his view.

²N.S.W.P.D., II, 1879-80, 1288.
against the Bill. 31,416 people signed petitions opposing the Bill. Only 1,368 of these were Anglican. The rest, 30,048, were Catholic. This was 26 per cent of the Catholic population over 15 and, more impressively, 76 per cent of the average number of Catholics over 15 at church on a Sunday.¹ This compared to 10 per cent and 60 per cent respectively in 1866. It was not a spectacular increase but it was an increase nevertheless, and had taken place at a time when most colonists were coming to accept public schools unreservedly. The decade of sectarianism had done its work. The decision taken by the Catholic clergy over a decade before, to reject the non-sectarian vision of society embodied in the national education movement in favour of the formation of a distinct Catholic subcommunity had been confirmed. It was a decision that had been taken in other colonies at about the same time for the same reasons, and the consequences of that rejection were to exercise a significant influence on Australian history for the next century.

¹Figures for the total Catholic population and the percentage of the population over 15 are calculated from the 1881 census. It is assumed that the percentage of the Catholic population over 15 is the same as for the total population. It is presumed that those under 15 would not be signing petitions, whatever their views. Phillips, 'Christianity and its Defence', Appendix IVa, p.446, gives figures for the average Sunday attendance at Catholic churches in 1880 (69,363). The actual number of regular Sunday worshippers would presumably have been higher than this as, especially in country districts, a shortage of priests made monthly rather than weekly mass the more usual arrangement. Such figures are not very reliable anyway. Probably no more than 60 per cent of regular Catholic church goers signed petitions opposing the Public Instruction Bill. Probably few of those who did agreed with their bishops' full blooded condemnation of public schools, but merely wished to see aid retained for denominational schools.
CONCLUSION

The pattern of colonial sectarianism, established between 1865 and 1880, existed with only small alterations for another three decades. Within New South Wales a large sectarian Catholic subcommunity and a smaller subcommunity of Protestant sectarians viewed society with suspicion and each other with hostility. Together they generated enough ill-feeling to maintain their own existence, but they did not further polarise society. The majority of the population remained largely unaffected by them. During the eighties and nineties more important social and political changes were occurring. One of their consequences was to ensure the continuation of sectarianism for several more generations.

For the three decades after 1880, Catholic sectarianism was largely defensive: the Catholic subcommunity had cut itself off from society in a number of ways, but retained the delusion that it had been cut off (or forced to remove itself). It had its aggressive members, who wished to fight for Catholic rights, and whose paranoid posturings often attracted more attention than they deserved, but mostly, like their chief, Cardinal Moran, Catholics remained faintly regretful of their position, but unable, and unwilling to extricate themselves. They were essentially a conservative group - looking back to pre-liberal days when, so they imagined, the Church ran education and clergymen were respected among men. Yet, because of their self-adopted minority status and frequent protests about the prevailing state of affairs, an odd alliance developed between Catholics and more radical minority groups, such as the Labor movement.\(^1\) Catholic sectarians remained largely Irish in

---

\(^1\)In so far as a large number of Catholics were working men, their support for Labor was quite natural. What was odd was the support the Catholic clergy, so conservative on most social issues, gave it: almost the only large body of clergymen who did; grudging and qualified though some of it was. The reason, I suggest, is to be found in their sectarianism.
inspiration, both in its specifically Irish and in its specifically Catholic form. A high rate of Irish immigration, especially clergymen, continually renewed its sectarian springs.

Occasionally something occurred which attracted hostile public attention to the Catholic subcommunity. The Catholic authorities refusal to give a Catholic burial to Michael Fitzpatrick, apparently because of his opposition to their views on education, was one event which attracted controversy early in the eighties.¹ The visit of the Redmond brothers on behalf of the Irish Home Rule party in 1883 was another such occurrence.² The first event provoked indignation; the second apprehension: the two responses which had formed the public's response to the Catholic subcommunity since the 1860s.

Such occasions provided Protestant sectarians with opportunity to parade their theories of the Catholic threat and obtain reinforcement for their conviction that they alone understood the essential interests of society. The Orange Institution remained the centre of Protestant sectarianism during the eighteen-nineties. If the number of orangemen in the Legislative Assembly is any indication, the eighties saw it at the zenith of its power,³ but that power was weakened

¹ After an initial refusal to allow a Catholic burial the Catholic authorities 'discovered' that he had in fact been to confession not long before, and had the last rites performed over his grave. The timing of their actions suggested to contemporaries that they were bowing to the pressure of the strong public outcry which the original refusal occasioned. See P.J., 17, 24 December 1881; P.S., 17, 24 December 1881.
³ There were 26 orangemen in the Assembly elected in 1880. P.S., 12 February 1881). The extended size of the Assembly (from 72 to 107) following the 1880 electoral act partly accounts for the impressive increase on earlier years. A list of Ms L.A. in the 1880s who were orangemen, or at least orange sympathisers is in Appendix IIId.
by the emergence of political allegiances and parties in the Assembly that cut right across sectarian groupings. Orange and Catholic politicians both inside and outside the Assembly provided a continuous stream of sectarian invective but this was mainly accompaniment for more important social and political changes.

The sectarianism of the late sixties and seventies had seriously weakened the hegemony anti-sectarian strand of the liberal ideology. During the eighties a new generation of colonists and deep rooted social forces challenged and broke that liberal hegemony. The liberal ideal had been a harmonious unified society. During the eighties and nineties society became divided to a degree unknown since the 1840s. This division manifested itself in politics. At first the division was between the liberals and the younger generation of colonists, critical of the older men's shibboleths and assumptions. Then the division widened, and took on the disguise of economic theories: protection vs free trade. But a more fundamental division was manifesting itself: crudely a division between labour and capital; between working class and middle class. By the first decade of the twentieth century the Labor movement, in some ways the heirs of the protectionists confronted a Liberal party formed out of old liberal-free trade politicians, employer organisations and other middle-class associations with church, temperance or community service orientation.¹

The liberal ideology split. It had been an establishment ideology and most of its components, such as the belief in the importance of social harmony, took on reactionary implications and formed part of the ideology of a new more conservative establishment. Some components, such as its nativist pride, became part of the new radical ideology. Shorn of this belief, the new, conservative, liberals became imperialist in their outlook. Since the Free Trade-Liberal

party represented an establishment, it had a following of younger men, who, as a method of improving their status, preferred accommodation with their elders to revolt. This was particularly true of the orange leadership, who firmly supported the Free Trade and later the Liberal party. ¹

Some orangemen however, favoured Protection and, later, the Labor party. They were however a minority, and although this division of loyalties sometimes caused angry recriminations and weakened orangeism's electoral potency, it was more than compensated for by another product of the wider social polarisation - the noticeable preference of Catholics for the Protectionist and later the Labor party. Just as the psychological conditions producing his sectarianism predisposed orangemen towards establishment or 'right-wing' political groups, so their different psychopathology predisposed (within limits) Catholic sectarians towards the more radical party. The Catholic sense of being a persecuted minority fitted nicely with the minority-reformist outlook of the Protectionist, and more particularly, the Labor party, although there were extreme elements in Labor ideology that could conflict with Catholic doctrine. It became the task of some Catholics to try and lead Labor away from these. ² Labor however carried on the anti-sectarian tradition of the old liberals, and other Catholics (e.g. J.D. Fitzgerald) found in it sufficient cause to put aside any sectarian tendencies they may have possessed.

Both the Protectionist and the Labor parties received far more than simply Catholic support - indeed Catholics were probably underrepresented in the Labor leadership until 1917. This did not prevent the orangemen from representing each party in turn as being dominated by Romanists. Similarly,

¹Their long standing devotion to Henry Parkes played an important role in this as well.
but by no means to the same extent, Catholics were not unhappy to picture the conservative parties as partly motivated by anti-Catholic malice. Incorrect though these characterisations were, they were accurate enough to be believed by large numbers of the population. In this way the more fundamental social division, which could easily have cut right across the sectarian division, actually reinforced it, and in turn gained a certain bitter edge from it. The controversy aroused by the conscription campaigns in the first world war showed just how sharp and just how deep set that edge was.

---

1 This view has become widely accepted. The proportion of Catholics in the non-Labor parties has always been low, but they have always been there, right from the beginning. The early liberal party in New South Wales received important support from John Garvan, son of J.P. Garvan, an I.N.L. activist in the 1860s, and from John and Thomas Hughes, sons of John Hughes, likewise an I.N.L.'er in the 1860s. Both Garvan and Hughes (seniors) were very successful financially, and by their later lives fully assimilated into the higher ranks of colonial society, which helps explain their children's conservatism.
APPENDIX Ia.

Proportions of Irish and Catholics in New South Wales
by electorates, 1861, 1871.

NOTE - The following table is constructed from figures given
in the New South Wales Censuses for 1861 and 1871. These
are unfortunately the only censuses that use the same units,
but while a consideration of the problem over a longer time
span would have been more valuable, these comparisons are
of some use.

Two sorts of calculations are made with the census
figures. In the first place the percentage of Irish and the
percentage of Catholics in each electorate are calculated.
If a random boundary of three per cent above and below the
average number of Irish and Catholics in the total population,
in 1861 and 1871 respectively is calculated, it can be seen
that the number of electorates with percentages of Irish
above and below this boundary is less in 1871 than 1861
(10 compared to 21). In no electorate is the variation of
the percentage of Irish above or below the mean greater in
1871 than in 1861. Thus, not only is the proportion of
Irish in the population decreasing overall, but they are
becoming more evenly distributed. The same is more or less
true for Catholics, although in a few electorates the
proportion of Catholics slightly increased. That is, there
were some areas of noticeably higher than normal Catholic
population in 1861, which retained this characteristic in
1871. In no sense however, could these areas be described
as 'ghettoes'. Catholics, as such, were far less visible
than Irish, anyway.

The second calculation was one suggested to me by a
statistician, who felt it was important to compensate for
the differences in the population of the various electorates.
This can be done by approximating the figures for the
percentage of Irish and the percentage of Catholics in each
electorate to a normal distribution. This figure, to be
called C.R. is calculated as follows:

\[
C.R. = \frac{P_o - P_e}{\sqrt{\frac{P_o (100-P_o)}{t}}}
\]

where \(P_o\) is the population observed (i.e. the proportion
of Irish in the population); \(P_e\) is the population expected
(i.e. the mean number of Irish in the total population); and
\(t\) is the total population in the district).

I subsequently noticed that the procedure was used by
Dr. Waldenser, 'Catholic Society', pp.138-40; and Appendix 2.
He called it 'critical ratio', a term which will be adopted here. If a .001 significance level is used, any critical ratio (C.R.) greater than $\pm 3.3$ is significantly different from the mean for the whole population. The nature of the critical ratio is such that sometimes quite spectacular differences occur, but their significance is not directly proportional to the extent of that difference. The point is that the number of electorates with critical ratios for the Irish greater than $\pm 3.3$ in 1871 is less (though not much less) than in 1861 (33 to 37). It is also slightly less (51 to 55) for Catholics.

I include this calculation to satisfy the statistically rigorous, but I have certain reservations about it. The meaning of its significance is a mathematical rather than a social one, and while it points to the same conclusion as my rougher methods, it does not illustrate it as clearly. As well, I am not entirely sure if it is necessary to compensate for differences in the population of the units (electorates), when those differences are not all that great and when the area in question also varies, a variation not taken into account by this method. A method which took into account some measure of social distance, or obversely, social concentration, would be more useful, but that would require figures for census districts within electorates and measurements of area, and would involve a thesis in itself.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Electoral District</th>
<th>No. of Persons 1861 Census</th>
<th>Irish Catholic %</th>
<th>CR Irish Catholic</th>
<th>No. of Persons 1871 Census</th>
<th>Irish Catholic %</th>
<th>CR Irish Catholic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argyle</td>
<td>6,583</td>
<td>1,170</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>4.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balranald</td>
<td>2,003</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathurst</td>
<td>4,042</td>
<td>693</td>
<td>1,333</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bogan</td>
<td>4,487</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>1,328</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>-1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braidwood</td>
<td>8,199</td>
<td>1,289</td>
<td>2,505</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden</td>
<td>10,305</td>
<td>1,433</td>
<td>3,148</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>-4.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td>17,740</td>
<td>1,642</td>
<td>2,637</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>-3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carcoar</td>
<td>4,995</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>1,287</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>-9.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarence</td>
<td>5,141</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>1,092</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>-12.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland</td>
<td>8,076</td>
<td>1,046</td>
<td>1,181</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>-6.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eden</td>
<td>4,307</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>1,576</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glebe</td>
<td>7,077</td>
<td>1,044</td>
<td>1,585</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>-1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goulburn</td>
<td>3,641</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>861</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>-1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwydir</td>
<td>3,010</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>-7.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartley</td>
<td>4,232</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>1,423</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>-3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hastings</td>
<td>6,697</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>1,299</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>-10.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkesbury</td>
<td>6,880</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>1,567</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>-22.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hume</td>
<td>3,771</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>1,248</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter</td>
<td>5,614</td>
<td>1,031</td>
<td>2,164</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Hunter</td>
<td>3,353</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>1,144</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Hunter</td>
<td>5,614</td>
<td>995</td>
<td>1,672</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>4.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illawarra</td>
<td>6,049</td>
<td>1,314</td>
<td>2,090</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>11.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiama</td>
<td>5,486</td>
<td>1,437</td>
<td>1,405</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>5.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lachlan</td>
<td>13,450</td>
<td>2,531</td>
<td>4,694</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>9.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liverpool Plains</td>
<td>5,309</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>1,173</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>5.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Macquarie</td>
<td>4,460</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>2,397</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>-15.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Macquarie</td>
<td>3,201</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>1,036</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>-0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Maitland</td>
<td>3,265</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>1,078</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>6.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Maitland</td>
<td>5,694</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>1,549</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monaro</td>
<td>5,888</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>2,144</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norpeth</td>
<td>3,874</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>1,260</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>5.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narbidge</td>
<td>6,376</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>1,454</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>-9.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray</td>
<td>2,395</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murrumbidgee</td>
<td>3,826</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>1,361</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued on next page)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Electoral District</th>
<th>1861 Census No. of Persons</th>
<th>Irish</th>
<th>Catholic</th>
<th>% Irish</th>
<th>Catholic</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>Irish</th>
<th>Catholic</th>
<th>% Irish</th>
<th>Catholic</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>Irish</th>
<th>Catholic</th>
<th>% Irish</th>
<th>Catholic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Narellan</td>
<td>3,834</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>1,388</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle</td>
<td>1,462</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New England</td>
<td>6,630</td>
<td>1,089</td>
<td>1,751</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newtown</td>
<td>6,090</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>1,081</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>7.84</td>
<td>21.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northumberland</td>
<td>6,460</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>863</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>-23.38</td>
<td>35.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>2,892</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>857</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>-4.15</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paddington</td>
<td>8,537</td>
<td>1,457</td>
<td>2,023</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>9.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parramatta</td>
<td>5,577</td>
<td>1,026</td>
<td>1,070</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>17.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paterson</td>
<td>2,440</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>-12.51</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricks Plains</td>
<td>5,584</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>1,838</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>7.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queenbeyyan</td>
<td>3,612</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>1,539</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>7.29</td>
<td>17.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Leonards</td>
<td>5,556</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>1,171</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>7.48</td>
<td>-13.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoalhaven</td>
<td>4,296</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>1,097</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>-4.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney (West &amp; East)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenterfield</td>
<td>3,046</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>-0.77</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tumut</td>
<td>4,617</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>1,097</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>-9.48</td>
<td>-7.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>5,124</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>1,204</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>-11.92</td>
<td>-8.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>4,323</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>1,019</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>-8.45</td>
<td>-7.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor</td>
<td>2,843</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>-11.76</td>
<td>-13.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wollombi</td>
<td>4,234</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>1,232</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>-8.59</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yass Plains</td>
<td>4,425</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>1,798</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>11.34</td>
<td>16.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Sydney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillip Ward</td>
<td>27,500</td>
<td>5,601</td>
<td>9,079</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>19.76</td>
<td>16.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bourke Ward</td>
<td>5,913</td>
<td>1,254</td>
<td>2,035</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>10.54</td>
<td>10.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denison Ward</td>
<td>6,301</td>
<td>1,174</td>
<td>1,924</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>7.37</td>
<td>17.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilps Ward</td>
<td>8,061</td>
<td>1,636</td>
<td>2,559</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>10.43</td>
<td>6.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Sydney (Total)</td>
<td>28,894</td>
<td>5,646</td>
<td>8,694</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>16.73</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macquarie Ward</td>
<td>4,513</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>1,239</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bourke Ward</td>
<td>5,154</td>
<td>1,067</td>
<td>1,583</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>9.04</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook Ward</td>
<td>8,268</td>
<td>1,560</td>
<td>2,406</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>7.66</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitzroy Ward</td>
<td>10,959</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>3,466</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>11.76</td>
<td>7.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAND TOTAL</td>
<td>348,655</td>
<td>54,561</td>
<td>98,785</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Excluding              |                               |       |          |        |          |     |       |                      |        |          |     |       |                      |        |          |
| Shipping and           |                               |       |          |        |          |     |       |                      |        |          |     |       |                      |        |          |
| Victoria Barracks      |                               |       |          |        |          |     |       |                      |        |          |     |       |                      |        |          |
| etc. for 1861)        |                               |       |          |        |          |     |       |                      |        |          |     |       |                      |        |          |
| (Excluding Shipping   |                               |       |          |        |          |     |       |                      |        |          |     |       |                      |        |          |
| for 1871)             |                               |       |          |        |          |     |       |                      |        |          |     |       |                      |        |          |
# APPENDIX lb.

## COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP OF IRISH ORGANISATIONS IN N.S.W. IN 1860s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>President</th>
<th>Vice Presidents</th>
<th>Secretary</th>
<th>Treasurer</th>
<th>Auditors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Celtic Association</strong></td>
<td>August 1859</td>
<td>J.H. Plunkett</td>
<td>D.H. Denihey, James Clinton, William Dolman</td>
<td>J.F. Dwyer</td>
<td>George Hurley</td>
<td>J.G. O'Connor, P. O'Dowd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Australasian Hibernian Association</strong></td>
<td>July 1863</td>
<td>John Hourigan</td>
<td>Richard Creagh, Joseph Carroll, Thomas McMahon, Patrick Cleary</td>
<td>John Robertson, M.L.A. - President</td>
<td>Owen Caraher - Vice President</td>
<td>J.J. Moore - Treasurer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Irish State Prisoners Fund</strong></td>
<td>April 1866</td>
<td>John Speerin - Chairman</td>
<td>W.M. Davis, John Caraher</td>
<td>J.J. Moore - Treasurer</td>
<td>William Dolman, R.H.M. Forster, M.L.A.</td>
<td>J.J. Moore - Treasurer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. F.J., 21 May 1862.
3. Empire, 21 July 1863.
   (Copy in M.L.)
5. F.J., 12 November 1865.
6. F.J., 28 April, 5 May, 1866.
APPENDIX Ic.

The 'Forties Generation' of Irish Catholics

(Most of these are mentioned in the table above (Appendix Ib); those who appear in the table and who are not mentioned below are those about whom there is little further information. Not quite all of them are Irish.)

James Butler. Active in Celtic Association and Irish National League. Born Ballinasloe, Ireland 1823 and emigrated to New South Wales in 1841. A tailor and draper, he unsuccessfully sought municipal honours in 1860 (Richard Creagh was his campaign director), but was successful in 1863 and remained on the council for most of the sixties and early seventies. A Catholic, he lent his support to Catholic charities. Edward Butler (no relation) refused to recommend him for a magistracy in 1872. He died in 1875. (N.B.R., F.J., 21 May 1862; 20 May 1865; 7 March 1868; Butler to Parkes, N.D. [1872] P.C., A919, p.604.)

Owen Joseph Carahar. Active in Celtic Association and Irish National League. He was born in Balleboy in Northern Ireland in 1819 and kept a shop for a brief period before emigrating to Australia in 1842. Almost immediately after his arrival he and a Patrick Hogan set up a soap and candle manufacturing business in which they prospered. Carahar was a staunch Catholic: a member of the Australian Holy Catholic Guild since the 1840s, and of the St Patrick Christine Doctrine Confraternity. He later built his house 'Cardistown' near St Patrick Church in Gloucester Street. He was also active in Irish affairs and was vice-president of the Irish National League in 1865. He successfully represented Gipps ward in the City Council from 1860-71 (inclusive) when he retired. The wide contacts given him by his commercial success meant that, except for his first entry into politics, Carahar did not need to cultivate the Irish vote, and his membership of the I.N.L. was possibly more from Irish nostalgia than political need. He was rarely opposed when standing for re-election. He was a member of the conservatively inclined Constitutional Association in 1860, and steered clear of the more radically inclined I.N.L. Cowper-Robertson supporters such as Kearney and Hourigan. He was, nevertheless, made a J.P. by Robertson in 1869. After the fracas over the Royal toast at the 1868 St Patrick's Day committee he withdrew entirely from Irish affairs. In later life he was active in the affairs of benevolent and charitable institutions, such as St Vincent's Hospital, the Sydney Infirmary and the Randwick Asylum. He was one of Henry Parkes creditors in 1870. He had been almost blind for
Joseph Carroll. President of the Australasian Hibernian Association, and active in Irish National League. He appears to have arrived in the colony in late forties or early fifties. He was by the late fifties principal accountant to William Dean and Co., and then seems to have practiced on his own. He seems to have been involved in the 'Battle of York Street' in 1866. Late in 1865 he was elected to one of two positions as city auditor, and won considerable praise for uncovering a number of irregularities in the accounting procedures of the Corporation. He was re-elected auditor in fairly regular progression until the late 1880s. He seems to have largely retired from Irish affairs in 1868. (V & P (LA NSW), 1867-8 (3), 11-21; Empire, 21 July 1863; 14 December 1866; 1 December 1866; F.J., 15 February, 7 March 1868, S.M.H., 14 December 1868; 9 November 1886).

Richard Cleary. Active in Celtic Association, Australasian Hibernian Association and Irish National League. Born Wexford, 1809, the son of a maltster, he emigrated to N.S.W. in 1840, and set up business as a bootmaker. He died in 1876. (N.B.R.)

Richard Creagh. Active in Celtic Association, Australasian Hibernian Association and Irish National League. Born Co. Clare, 1827, son of Simon Creagh, a lawyer. Two elder brothers were both lawyers in Dublin. Creagh emigrated to N.S.W. in 1855 and at the time of his marriage in 1862, described himself as a civil engineer. At the same time however, he was conducting a school in Elizabeth Street, which he continued to do until 1867, when he was given a post as a clerk in the shipping masters office, by the Martin Government. He threw himself into politics soon after his arrival acting as secretary to Plunkett's election committee in 1856. He continued to assist Irish-Catholics like Plunkett and Faucett in elections of 1858 and '60, and sought for himself the post of city auditor in 1860. He was successful and held the position on and off until 1869. He was also active in church affairs, being president of the St Mary's Christian Doctrine Confraternity in 1862. He died in 1874. At his death his age was given as 59, meaning that he was born in 1815. This is contradicted by information on his marriage certificate, where in 1862, he described himself as 35. (N.B.R.; N.S.W. Government Gazette, 10 May 1867, p.1166; Empire; 23 November, 3 December 1860, 21 July 1861, 5 December 1863, 17 December 1864, 14 December 1865, 30 January 1869;
F.J., 21 May, 31 December 1862, 9 November 1867, 21 November 1868, 21 March 1874.

J.J. Curran. Active in the Irish National League, a wholesale grocer and importer by the mid 1860s, he was active on behalf of Cowper-Robertson candidates in elections during the mid to late 1860s. He was made a magistrate in 1869. He was involved in the Society for the Abolition of Capital Punishment and was a director of the Benevolent Society in the seventies. He remained moderately active in Irish affairs in the seventies. He was a Catholic. (F.J., 14 September 1864, 12 November 1865, 21 June 1866, 12 June 1869, 21 January 1871, 3, 10 February 1872, 19 December 1874.)

William M. Davis. Secretary to the Celtic Association in 1858, and of the Irish State Prisoners Fund in 1866. He arrived in the colony from Ireland in 1844. In 1858 he was secretary of the Donnegal Relief Fund. He remained active in Irish affairs in the seventies. He was one of the first fellows of St John's College. (V & P (LA NSW), 1858-9 (2) 79; F.J., 23 June 1858, 28 April 1866, 18 March 1874; R.A. Daly, 'Foundation of St John's College', Australasian Catholic Record, Vol. XXXV, No. 4, October 1958, p. 306.)

William Dolman. Vice-president of Celtic Association in 1859; active in Irish National League and Irish State Prisoner Fund. Born in Pocklington, Kent, in 1832 of an old English gentry family. Well educated, he was recruited by Polding to teach French and English at St Mary's Seminary and arrived in the colony in 1852. By the late fifties he was a bookseller and stationer, an occupation he sporadically continued during the sixties when he was proprietor and editor of the Freeman's Journal. After he sold his shares in that paper in 1870 he continued in the book trade until the eighties when he retired and devoted himself to municipal pursuits, being an alderman of Newtown municipal council for many years. During the sixties he was connected with several other newspaper ventures such as the Sydney Times and Punch. Dolman was one of those strange characters in whom Catholicism struck up an affinity for the Irish nation, causing them to devote themselves to the Irish cause. From an early date he was active in Irish affairs in the colony being secretary to the O'Connell monument fund in 1863. He was closely connected with St Patrick's Day organising during the sixties and seventies. He remained active in Catholic affairs throughout his life; a daughter became a Dominican nun, while a brother and seven nephews were priests. He died after being run over by a tram in 1902. (N.B.R., F.J., 21 December 1859; 5 May 1866, 2 March 1867, 18 January, 15 February 1868, 27 February, 17 April 1869, 6 January 1872, 7 February 1874,
Edward Francis Flanagan. Active in Celtic Association. Born Roscommon, Ireland 1830, son of a farmer he emigrated to N.S.W. in 1841. He joined the staff of the Sydney Morning Herald and later set up as a bookseller and stationer. He was active in the Catholic Church and in most Irish causes. For many years before his death in 1900 he was a director of the St Joseph's Building Society and the City Mutual Insurance Company. A brother, Roderick, was the author of A History of New South Wales (London, 1862). (N.B.R., F.J., 4 January 1868, 21 June 1879, 24 February 1883, 20 October 1900.)

Richard Henry Mariner Forster. Irish National League. Born in 1817 on board the ship 'Mariner', near Corfu. His father later (in 1847) became Governor of Goulburn Gaol. He emigrated to the colony in the late thirties and lived for some time during the fifties at Berrima. He began practising as a solicitor in the early 1860s. He was active in municipal affairs in Sydney during the sixties, and involved himself in St Patrick's Day committee work at the same time. He was elected to the Assembly for New England in 1862 and for Gold-fields North in 1870 and 1875. He supported John Robertson even after the latter formed an alliance with James Martin in 1871. During the seventies he involved himself in various land reform movements, and became a supporter of protection. A staunch Catholic he echoed his bishop's views on the education question, but once he supported a divorce bill on the grounds that he thought it a necessary thing although as a Catholic he could not approve of divorce itself. For this he was attacked by the Freeman's. He died in 1880. (N.B.R.; S.M.H., 27 February, 5 March 1850, 26 February, 27 May, 30 October 1868; Empire, 30 November 1860; F.J., 12 November 1864, 10 September 1870, 10, 24 December 1870, 21 January 1871; Sydney Mail, 7 February 1880. Karr 'Political Protest and General Development in Rural N.S.W.' p.69; V & P (LA NSW), 1862 (2) 508; V & P (LA NSW) 1863-4 (1) 466.)

Patrick Freehill. Active in the Irish National League and Irish State Prisoners Fund. Born Co. Cavan 1817. A baker and ships' chandler, he emigrated as an assisted immigrant in 1844, and worked in Sydney as a ships' provider. By the late sixties he was a master baker. He was active in Irish and Catholic affairs in the late fifties and sixties. He also involved himself in politics, organising for Martin supporters in 1864 and seeking municipal office himself several times,
unsuccessfully. Two of his sons, F.B. and B.A. Freehill were active in Irish and Catholic affairs during the seventies and eighties. (N.B.R.; F.J., 26 May 1858, 28 November 1862, 12 November 1864, 5 May 1866, 19 December 1874; S.M.H., 28 November 1862, 28 May 1868; Empire, 5 November 1864.)

Bernard Gaffney. Vice-president of Irish State Prisoners Fund. Born Ballyconnell Co. Cavan Ireland 1831, son of Bartholomew Gaffney, a baker, he emigrated to N.S.W. in 1853. After a start on the goldfields he set up in his father's profession at which he prospered. He supported James Martin in elections in 1864. During the late sixties and seventies he was active in other sectarian Irish causes, such as the plan to welcome the released Fenians in 1869, and he several times clashed violently with more conservative Irishmen. In 1871 he helped found the Australasian-Hibernian Benefit Society in Sydney, and became its first president. He visited Ireland several times in the 1900s and died a very old man in 1924. (N.B.R.; F.J., 19 November 1864, 5 May 1866, 12 October 1867, 12 June, 20 November 1869, 29 January, 5 February, 26 March, 2 April 1870, 29 July 1871, 6 November 1924; Catholic Press, 6 November 1924.)

James P. Garvan. Corresponding secretary Irish National League 1865-6. Born Ireland 1843, he emigrated with his parents in 1847. His father, Denis Bourke Garvan (1810-1860), also active in Irish affairs in late fifties, was a clerk in the civil service. After education in Sydney, including Richard Creagh's school in the late fifties, and Sydney Grammar (1858-60) he left school on the death of his father and began employment with the Sydney City Council as a clerk in the survey department. He lost this position in 1866, after being prominently involved in the disruption of McGibbon's York Street meeting. At that time he was active as an organiser in municipal and colonial politics on the side of James Martin. After his dismissal from the council he remained in Sydney for two years, and then, following the attempted assassination of the Duke of Edinburgh, he wandered around the country. He had returned to Sydney by 1869 and in 1870, was elected city auditor. His youthful Irish sectarianism was by this time curbed by increasing maturity, and although he continued to be involved in Irish affairs in the seventies, being one of the organising secretaries for the O'Connell celebrations in 1875, he involved himself more and more in commercial affairs, at which he was notably successful, and, later in politics. (N.B.R.; Empire, 27 November 1866, 9 February 1868, 20 March 1869; S.M.H., 14 June 1871, 2 August 1875, 18 March 1877; F.J., 27 February 1869, 25 February, 1871, 7 August 1875; 15 December 1877, 29 June, 2 August 1879, 22 March 1884; F.S., 24 December 1870, 22 March 1884;
13 March 1886. See A.D.E., Vol.4, forthcoming for article on Garvan by N.B. Nairn, which deals more fully with his later life.)

**John Hourigan.** Active in Celtic Association (Chairman in 1862) and the Irish National League. Born in Limerick in 1825 he emigrated to the colony in 1840 with his parents. He was apprenticed in the building trade. He succeeded in it and was appointed Inspector of Government Buildings in the 1850s, but did his own contracting as well and retired quite wealthy in the late 1870s. He unsuccessfully sought municipal office in the sixties. After his early involvement in sectarian Irish organisations he settled fully into colonial life. He was an early member of the A.J.C.; a magistrate and in later life was appointed government representative on the board of the Sydney Infirmary. He died in 1900. (N.B.R.; Empire, 4 December 1860, 19 February 1868; S.M.H., 17 March, 4 April, 3 December 1868; F.S., 21 May 1862, 7 September 1864, 7 March 1868; Catholic Press, 14 April 1900.)

**John Hughes.** Active in Celtic Association and Irish National League, although he never achieved office in either organisation. Born Co. Roscommon 1826, eldest son of a farmer. He reached Sydney, with his family, assisted immigrants, in 1840. His father set up business as a grocer. By the late 1850s, he was active on behalf of conservative candidates (such as Richard Tooth and Plunkett, and later, James Martin), who were receiving the blessing of the clergy. He was a devout Catholic and although he retired from Irish affairs after 1868, he remained strongly devoted to the Church, becoming one of its wealthiest benefactors as he prospered in commercial life. He died in 1885. Two sons, John and Thomas became prominent in politics on the conservative side in the 1900s. A great-grandson was Federal Attorney-General in the late 1960s. (Shultz, 'The Free Settlers of New South Wales', p.82, n.100; Australian Men of Mark, Vol.1, p.249; Empire, 8 January 1858, 19 February 1868; S.M.H., 12 March 1868; F.J., 19 November 1864, 15 February 1868, 25 November 1871, 4 July 1885.)

**Denis Kearney.** Active in Celtic Association and Irish National League. Born Co. Clare, Ireland in 1833, son of Timothy Kearney, surveyor, he arrived in Sydney in 1840. A publican during the late fifties, his hotels, first the Brougham Tavern and then the Collonade Hotel, were often used as meeting places for the city's Irish organisations and as committee rooms for Cowper-Robertson candidates in colonial elections. Kearney himself unsuccessfully sought municipal office several times during the 1860s. One of his daughters married James P. Garvan's elder brother. (N.B.R.; F.J., 23 June 1888, 20 July 1867, 27 February 1869; Empire, 23 March 1867.)
George Hurley. Auditor of Celtic Association. Probably born in England of Irish parents, but migrated to the colony with his brother during the gold rush. By the late 1850s he was a clothier draper and general outfitter. During the seventies he ran a fancy goods shop, then a toy bazaar and then, finally, a sports goods store. He was active in municipal politics in the late fifties, sixties and early seventies. After two defeats by orange candidates he was instrumental in starting the Lay Catholic Protection Association. (F.J., 21 April, 1858, 10 March 1884, 29 July, 25 November 1871, 1 November 1873, 26 November 1874; Empire, 3 December 1867; S.M.H., 28 November 1862.)

Jeremiah John Moore. Treasurer of Celtic Association and Irish National League. Born Dublin 1819, the son of a farmer, he arrived in Sydney in 1840. He soon set up business as a bookseller and in the sixties branched out into publishing and printing as well. He died in 1883. (N.B.R., V & P (LA NSW), 1858-9 (2) 71.)

J.G. O'Connor. Active in Celtic Association and Irish State Prisoners Fund. Born King Co. Ireland in 1839, he was brought by his parents to Australia in 1841. His father, a butcher, had him apprenticed in the printing trade and O'Connor remained connected with newspapers, as printer, proprietor and editor until near the end of his life. In the early 1860s he started a paper, the Sunbeam, devoted to the activities of the Catholic Young Men's Association, and was connected in time with the Sydney Times, the Catholic Association Reporter, the Balmain Reporter, the Catholic Times, the Express (which he edited for Archbishop Vaughan, and later bought) and the Nation. He was finally obtained a job by his friends on the Hunter District Water Board, and he died in Newcastle in 1913. As well as his newspaper ventures O'Connell had been a devoted son of the Church ever since his father enrolled him (aged six) as the tenth member of the Holy Catholic Guild in 1843. He was active in the Catholic Young Men's Association, the Catholic Association (he was lay secretary from 1869 to 1872), and co-operated closely with Archbishop Vaughan. From his father he also received a strong commitment to the Irish cause and was constantly active in this interest. After being associated with the sectarian State Prisoners Fund in 1866-7 he mellowed and was associated with the more conservative Irishmen during the seventies. In 1883 however, he was one of the few prominent Irishmen to welcome the Redmond brothers and became the first president of the newly formed Irish National League. He remained friendly with the Redmonds and other, later, Irish delegates for the rest of his life. He had been active in ward politics in the sixties and was elected city auditor and alderman several times in the 1870s. He represented Mudgee in the Legislative Assembly 1872-5. (J.G. O'Connor papers, in possession of Irish National Association, Sydney; Daily Telegraph.
13 November 1880; F.J., 28 April 1866, 27 February, 17 April, 1 May, 4 October, 27 November 1869, 24 December 1870, 18 February 1871, 13 September 1872, 15 July 1876, 22 March, 23 August, 15 November 1884, 24 July 1913; Empire, 11 December 1866; P.S., 24 December 1870; S.M.H., 8 May 1868.)

Thomas O'Neill. Active in Irish National League and a Treasurer of Irish State Prisoners Fund. Born in Ireland he was said to have arrived in the colony in the forties, with his brother Michael. Together they set up and prospered in a confectionary business. O'Neill retained his connection with the more sectarian Irish in the late sixties and early seventies, being involved in the welcome for the pardoned Fenians in 1869. He was occasionally involved in ward politics in the 1870s. Active in Church affairs, he was a member of the board of the Sisters of the Good Shepherd School in 1867, when it was taken out of the control of the Council of Education. By the late seventies he was a prominent Catholic businessman. He was, for example, chairman of the City Mutual Life Assurance Society (J.P. Garvan was managing director). (F.J., 19 January 1859, 7 September, 12 November 1864, 8 May 1866, 15 February 1868, 12 June, 24 July, 20, 27 November, 4 December 1869, 5 February, 2 July 1870, 16 May 1874, 2 August 1879.)

Michael Shalvey. Irish State Prisoners Fund. Born Co. Cavan, Ireland 1824, he emigrated to New South Wales in 1850. After some time he opened a hotel, the Globe Tavern, in the sixties. This prospered and in 1867 he built an imposing hostlery, the Royal Hyde Park Hotel. Both pubs were used as meeting places by Irish groups, particularly the more sectarian. He died in his hotel in 1894. (N.B.R.; F.J., 28 April, 5 May 1866, 16 November 1867, 7 March 1868; S.M.H., 24 April 1868.)
APPENDIX IIa.

Early History of Loyal Orange Institution
in New South Wales

There has been some dispute among orangemen concerning the actual details of the foundation of the Institution in New South Wales, but this has largely been in the interests of championing one or the other of the two claimants to the title of 'father of orangeism', Andrew Alexander or Richard McGuffin. As far as can be gathered the truth lies somewhere in a combination of these two versions.¹

According to orange tradition the first warrant to establish an orange lodge was brought into the colony by Andrew Alexander, a private in the 50th Regiment who arrived with his family on 9 April 1835 as part of a small detachment of his regiment on the convict transport Lady Nugent.² Alexander had been born on a farm in Co. Derry in 1798. He married in Glasgow in 1826 and a year later joined an Orange Lodge. This was probably his regimental lodge, for despite orders in 1813, 1822 and 1828 outlawing military lodges, they continued to flourish, particularly in those units which had seen service in Ireland.³ Nevertheless, these orders meant that lodges could only function secretly and were consequently confined to a small number of men, and tradition has it that Alexander carried the regimental warrant, newly issued by the Dublin Grand Lodge to replace the old warrant lost while the regiment was returning from the West Indies the year before, sewn into the lining of his jacket. In Sydney he and his comrades were stationed in the barracks where Wynyard Square now is, and would appear to have met above the printing shop of a Richard Barr, which was situated near the barracks. They continued to meet there, somewhat irregularly, after they had brought themselves out of the Regiment on its being posted to India in 1839. Even while they had met as soldiers a small number of civilians had attended their meetings, but no attempt was made to establish a proper colonial lodge.

In 1840 Richard McGuffin arrived from Newry in Ireland and set up business as a bootmaker. McGuffin was born in 1795 and had been an orangeman since his fifteenth birthday. Like many northern Irish Presbyterians he worshipped at the Church of the Rev. James Fullerton⁴ and there met, among the other recent immigrants, orangemen, who like himself had been initiated into the second, higher, arch-purple degree of orangeism. Some time in the early 1840s he collected them together at his residence to discuss the wisdom and propriety of founding their own orange lodge. This was agreed upon and several subsequent meetings were held at Robert Pattison's Crispin Arms Hotel, near the northern gate of the barracks. The first of these meetings instructed McGuffin to write to an acquaintance of his in Newry who was a member of the Grand
Lodge of Ulster for a proper warrant, but a little later it was discovered that there was in fact a warrant in the colony, in the possession of Alexander and his friends, and after some negotiations the two groups, 39 orangemen in all, met on 13 April 1845 and duly instituted the first colonial orange lodge. Numbers applying for membership rapidly increased and a month later a Grand Lodge was established, which soon issued warrants to establish a number of ordinary lodges. Within two years there were four lodges in the city, and others at Gladesville, the North Shore, Kiama, Parramatta and Windsor. By 1848 there were about 500-700 orangemen in the colony.

The rise of the order had been greatly assisted by the Sentinel newspaper, which was published between 1844 and 1848 and was devoted almost exclusively to the various forms, theological and paranoid-political, of no-popery. It was published by Richard Barr, whose printing shop had provided the first refuge for Alexander's military lodge. Barr, in fact, was the first Grand Master of the Institution, holding that position in 1845 and 1846 when he was succeeded by Alexander.

The Institution was probably more helped than hindered by the disturbances which marked its attempts to celebrate the Battle of the Boyne in Sydney and Melbourne in 1846. The rapid increase in colonial population during the 1840s had naturally given rise to a number of tensions which the first municipal and colonial elections in 1842 and 1843 had exacerbated rather than allayed. The Sentinel newspaper, as well as annoying Irish Catholics, had publicised the Orange Institution during 1845-46 and it was not surprising that a number of Irish Catholics should decide to give the 1846 twelfth of July celebration the sort of treatment it often received in some parts of Ireland. On 4 July a notice was inserted in the Herald advertising 'a great novelty: a hurling match to be held between the four counties of Ireland at the Hyde Park on 13 July for a purse of 100 sovereigns'. As this also happened to be the day of the orangemen's celebrations, the authorities were disturbed, and Dean McEncroe, the leading Irish priest in the colony preached the next day at St Mary's Cathedral on charity, urging Irishmen to postpone the match and assuring them that the authorities would prevent any party procession or displays of offensive banners on 13 July. Fortunately 13 July was cold and wet and the fears of the authorities that the hurling match would prove to be only an excuse to gather together a large number of Irishmen armed with staves to assault the orangemen, were never tested. The police and the military, who were kept under arms at the Barracks, were not required. The Sentinel, however, reported that a number of Irishmen had gathered outside Richard Driver's Three Tuns Hotel where the orangemen were conducting the evening's festivities, and claimed that only the intervention of Bishop Polding, Dr Gregory and Dean McEncroe prevented a clash. Even the Sentinel, however, did not suggest that the Irish were any but few in
number and it pin-pointed a certain tavern in the Rocks area as the gathering place of the rowdies.10

The situation in Melbourne was rather different. By far the majority of Melbourne's small but rapidly growing population were recent immigrants from Britain and society was far more unstable than Sydney. Sectarian animosities had been aroused in the 1842 municipal elections and exacerbated by the campaign for the Legislative Council the next year. The origins of Melbourne orangeism are at least as obscure as Sydney's, but orange-type organisations, if not formal orange lodges, were formed in 1842 and 1843 to fight the election on behalf of the Protestant champion J.D. Lang.11 A St Patrick's society, of Irish Catholics, was formed at about the same time.1: By late 1843 there was a fully fledged Orange Institution functioning in Melbourne, and though their celebrations of Boyne Day in 1844 and 1845 were marked by gatherings of Catholic Irishmen at hurling matches, there was little disturbance, possibly because the orangemen did not attempt to hold a march, but celebrated quietly in their favourite public house.13 In 1846 it appeared as if the same pattern would be repeated, but this time as they gathered for lunch the orangemen hung several banners from the upstairs window of their public house, and these attracted a crowd of Catholic Irishmen who would not be dispersed by the pleadings of Fr Geoghegan and their political hero, John O'Shannasy. The Mayor arrived and, intending to cool the situation, ordered the orangemen to withdraw their banners, which they refused to do. At this point several of the crowd, undoubtedly feeling that they now had the law on their side, attempted to storm the staircase to the upstairs room and simultaneously a number of orangemen fired from inside the building into the crowd, wounding several people. Some shots were returned and many stones were thrown, but the prompt arrival of the military prevented further bloodshed and several orangemen and Catholics were arrested. During the next day two armed mobs of orangemen and Irish-Catholics gathered in different parts of the town, but the authorities, with the backing of the military, were able to keep the situation in check.14

The discovery of gold, first of all in California and then three years later in New South Wales and Victoria, removed any threat a strong orange movement might have offered to the colony's peace. Both McGuffin and Hezlet agree that it was the Californian gold rush that 'took a great number of our best members away' and left the Institution struggling for three more years until discovery of gold in Australia destroyed it almost completely.15 This comment throws interesting light on the composition of the orange movement. On 6 November 1849 Governor Fitzroy pointed out to the Colonial office that emigration to California had been going on for some time past 'to a considerable extent among the working class of the community', many of whom had had their passage to New South Wales paid out of the Colonial Emigration Fund.16 A month later he wrote that not only were a number of recent immigrants going to California 'but also large numbers
of well conducted and industrious mechanics1 whom, Fitzroy argued, were being forced to emigrate to California under the pressure of competition in the various trades caused by an oversupply of skilled labour.17 During 1849 and 1850 3,135 colonists emigrated to California.18 If McGuffin and Hezlet are correct, between 200-400 of these were orangemen - a very high proportion, given their relatively low numbers in the colony, but not surprising if it is considered that orangeism was partly an expression of dissatisfaction with and alienation from the on-going life and values of society.

Orangeism in New South Wales did not entirely cease to exist after the gold rushes, and one or two lodges continued to meet sporadically during the 1850s.19 However, it was not until 1860 that a serious effort to revive the Institution was made, coinciding with the return to Sydney of Andrew Alexander from the Bendigo gold fields. By March 1861 the Grand Lodge had been reformed and the Grand Lodge of Ireland had been requested for a warrant and other necessary books.20 The Grand Lodge was reconstituted in 1864 after communication had been received from Ireland, and the Institution slowly built up its strength.
The most comprehensive account is that of W.A. Stewart, *Early History of the Loyal Orange Institution, N.S.W.*, published in 1926. This is of course a secondary account based on reminiscences, sporadic research into old newspapers and lodge records, which are, unfortunately unavailable to non-Orangemen. The most useful primary source is R. McGuffin, *The Rise and Progress of Orangeism in N.S.W. Vindicated*, a small pamphlet published in 1872 putting McGuffin's own side of the story in a reply to an earlier pamphlet by a 'G.H.S.', *The History of Orangeism: Its Rise and Progress*, published in 1871, after revision by the Rev. Zachary Barry. This pamphlet mainly concerns the British foundation of Orangeism, which the author, G.H. Sparke, optimistically discovers in the 1688 revolution. Neither Sparke nor Barry are reliable on the origins of colonial Orangeism, Barry arriving in New South Wales in 1865 (A.D.B., Vol.3, p.111) and Sparke early in 1870 (*V & P (LA NSW)*, 1885-6 (2) 127). During the 1870s and 1880s several different accounts of the foundation of Colonial Orangeism were given, in addresses at Orange functions and articles published in the *Protestant Standard*. The most important of these are an obituary for McGuffin, largely based on his own pamphlet (*P.S.*, 12 October 1878); William Hezlet's speech (*P.S.*, 28 July 1883); an article on Alexander (*P.S.*, 2 August 1884); and a speech by Rev. E.D. Madgwick (*P.S.*, 28 January 1888). Hezlet's account differs from all others in that it suggests that the initiative for the foundation of a lodge was taken by a Melbourne Orangeman called Carr in 1844. But Hezlet contradicted not only McGuffin's account, which makes no mention of Carr, but also some details which he himself offered 13 years earlier, when presumably his own memory was fresher, concerning his own initiation into Orangeism (see *P.S.*, 19 November 1870).

However, there could possibly be some truth in his account. One of the founders of Victorian Orangeism was a William Kerr, Town Clerk of Melbourne and a strong supporter of Dr Lang in the 1843 Port Philip elections, and it is possible that he visited Sydney following the apparently important role played by Orangemen in Lang's victory in that election. However his visit would probably have done no more than help Orangeism on its way. See 'Garryowen' (E. Finn), *Chronicles of Early Melbourne* (Melbourne, 1888), Vol.II, p.620; G. Serle, *The Golden Age* (Melbourne, 1963), p.18; A.D.B., Vol.2, pp.50-1.

The publication by William Freame in the *Watchman* in 1910 of Alexander's side of the story attracted mostly confirmatory reactions from descendants of McGuffin, Alexander and John Cadden, one of Alexander's regimental comrades. See W. Freame, *Press Contributions*, Vol.3, in *ML*. These sources form the basis of the following account of the beginnings of Orangeism in the colony.
There might well have been purely regimental lodges within earlier regiments stationed in the colony, but they would appear to have kept their meetings exclusive as no memory of Orange meetings earlier than 1836 remained in later years. H.W. Cleary, The Orange Society (Melbourne, 1907), p.5, quotes the Report of the Common's select committee on Orangeism (H.C. 1835 [377] XV) to the effect that there was a lodge functioning in the 17th Regiment in Sydney in 1833.


Empire, 15 July 1867; S.M.H., 16 July 1868.

Cameron, Centenary History of the Presbyterian Church in N.S.W., p.349, indicates that Fullerton was very popular amongst Ulstermen.

Roe, Quest for Authority, pp.137-8, has some examples of the style of that paper.

S.M.H., 4 July 1846.

Morning Chronicle, 8 July 1846. These assurances probably came from the Catholic Attorney-General, Plunkett.

S.M.H., 22 July 1846. The Sydney Chronicle (previously Morning Chronicle - a Catholic paper) did not carry any report of the day, but later waxed indignant when the Herald seemed to compare it to the Sentinel as a 'party paper', and argued that it had deliberately set out to discourage any confrontation. Sydney Chronicle, 25 July 1846.

W.A. Stewart, op.cit., p.20.


Ibid., p.675.

Ibid., p.677.

S.M.H., 22 July 1846 and Garryowen, op.cit., Vol.II, pp.677-84, both give extensive quotations from the three Melbourne papers, the Port Phillip Patriot, the Herald and the Argus, for 14 July 1846. Each paper gives a different account of the event, and Garryowen's story in his Chronicles is different again. However three of these: the Patriot, the Herald and Garryowen's are basically the same and the above is based on them. The Argus's report exempted the orangemen from any blame, but it was at the time edited by William Kerr, who was the town's most prominent orangeman. A recent account of these events, based largely on Garryowen, by F.D. Minogue, appeared in the Advocate (Melbourne), 22 August 1966.

R. McGuffin, op.cit., p.3; W. Hezlet in P.S., 23 July 1883.

Fitzroy to Grey, 6 November 1849. In H.R.A., MSS bundle 12, p.162 (MS 237, in National Library). This is a manuscript of a volume of H.R.A. for 1849 prepared but never published.
17 Fitzroy to Grey, 18 December 1849 in H.R.A., MSS bundle 15, p.45 (MS 237 in N.L.). The figures calculated by C. Bateson, Gold Fleet to California, p.127, indicate that contrary to gold field myth only about 12.1/2 per cent of emigrants were of convict origin. Most were former self- or government-assisted immigrants.


19 W.A. Stewart, op.cit., p.34.

20 Ibid., p.39.
### Grand Lodge Officers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1871</th>
<th>1881</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grand Master</td>
<td>S.S. Goold painter and glazier</td>
<td>Henry Hicks produce merchant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Grand Master</td>
<td>John Davies ironmonger</td>
<td>William Henson independent means</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Secretary</td>
<td>W.H. Davis commission agent</td>
<td>A.J.S. Gilchrist schoolmaster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Grand Secretary</td>
<td>A. McNeilly paper hanger, painter and glazier</td>
<td>S. Murphy schoolmaster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Treasurer</td>
<td>W. Coulter commission agent</td>
<td>N.J. Mackenzie draper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreman of Grand Committee</td>
<td>John Roseby monumental mason</td>
<td>W.W. Robson accountant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX IIb.
APPENDIX IIc.

Biographical details of Grand Lodge officers not mentioned in text, including all holding office in the 1880s.

William Coulter. Grand Master 1868-9; Grand Treasurer 1870-1.
Born in Ulster, he immigrated to the colony from Scotland in 1854. A produce agent, he quickly became influential in orange circles and in the P.A.F.S. He was occasionally active in politics, supporting orange and temperance candidates. (His evidence (q.2857, p.908), 'Assassination Committee'; Empire, 15 July 1867; S.M.H., 6 May, 24 October, 8 December 1868; A.P.B., 1 July 1868; P.S., 2 April 1870, 25 February 1871.)

William Holme Davis (or Davies). Grand Secretary 1870-74.
A member of Council of P.P.A. in 1870. At various times during the 1870s a produce agent, a mining agent and a commission agent. In 1879 he formed an unsuccessful partnership with James McFadyen (Grand Treasurer, L.O.I. N.S.W., 1879) as commission agents. In 1880 he described himself as a forest ranger (but does not seem to have been in the government's employ). (P.S., 22 January, 2 April, 25 February 1870; 22 November 1873; 23 May 1874. Sands, Sydney Directory, 1870-1888.)

Alexander John Stuart Gilchrist. Grand Secretary 1875-1878; 1888-1912. A member of Council of P.P.A. in 1872. Born Glasgow, 1837. He was said to have been educated at the English Academy, Glasgow, where he won a gold medal and a scholarship. His father, Alexander Gilchrist was a bank clerk, and migrated to Sydney in 1853, but Alexander jnr may not have accompanied his family. A younger brother, Archibald, born 1843, and later to become moderator of Presbyterian church and founder of Scots College, did. Alexander was in Sydney by 1859, when he married. He became a public school teacher in 1867 and was posted for most of his career at North Sydney School. He resided at Willoughby. A Presbyterian, he was an elder of St Leonard's North Presbyterian church (opened in 1888). He died in December 1916. (N.B.R. file; V & P (LA NSW), 1885-6 (4) 238; P.S., 3 January 1880; 26 February 1889; Cameron, Centenary History of Presbyterian Church, p.356; Stewart, Early History of Loyal Orange Institution, pp.47-8.)

William Henson. Deputy Grand Master 1879-81; Grand Treasurer 1888. Born Sydney 1826. Father a soldier who stayed behind in New South Wales. Educated St. Philips School, Church Hill. After leaving school at 13, he worked for an uncle with extensive business interests, including a sheep station. He took over the management of these interests when uncle died. He successfully worked for a short period on the goldfields at Ophir and Bendigo, and seems
to have left them a wealthy man. In 1852 he married and settled at Ashfield. A prominent Methodist layman, he was active in temperance circles and municipal politics. He was president of Local Option League for a long time, and a director of the Benevolent Society for many years. He represented Canterbury in the Legislative Assembly 1880–82; 1885–89. He died in March 1903. (T. & C.J., 2 April 1887, p.686; Empire, 29 November 1869; S.M.H., 2 March 1886; P.S., 17 December, 4 February 1888; Methodist, 11 April 1903.)

William Hezlet. Worshipful Master No.1 L.O.L. during 1860s. Born in Newry, Ireland in 1825. The son of a publican he emigrated to Sydney in 1843 and was the second person in New South Wales initiated into the Orange Institution, in 1845. Although he never achieved highest office in the Institution he was always a prominent figure in their celebrations, and was similarly active in the Protestant Political Association 1868–72. He was successful in his business as a commission agent, and during the seventies was involved in several companies, such as Sydney Permanent Freehold Land and Building Society, started by fellow orangemen. An Anglican of evangelical persuasion he was active in the Public Schools League in the mid 1870s and concerned himself with the affairs of the Sydney Infirmary and Randwick Asylum, being connected with what many observers described as the orange takeover of these organisations in the early 1870s. During the 1860s and 1870s he was active in municipal and colonial elections, usually supporting orange or orange sympathising candidates. In 1880 he was elected to the Legislative Assembly for Paddington, where he had resided for many years, in a by-election, and held his seat in a subsequent election. (N.B.R.; P.S., 3 September, 19 November 1870, 11 May 1872, 27 December 1873, 17 July 1875, 18 July 1884; A.P.B., 5 September 1868; P.J., 11 December 1869, 26 February 1870, 4 March 1871, 3, 17, 24 February 1872, 19 December 1874.)


Thomas Jessep. Grand Secretary 1883–85; 1911–12; 1915; Deputy Grand Master 1886–88; Grand Master 1889. Born Norfolk, England in 1848. When aged six he was orphaned while on the way to Australia and he and an elder brother were brought up in Tasmania. In 1866 he unsuccessfully tried mining at Ballarat and moved to Sydney, in mid–1869, where he became a fruitier. An active Methodist and
temperance advocate, he joined the L.O.I. in 1870 and was very active in the Grand Lodge for the next 45 years. For many years he was a director of the Protestant Hall Company. He was the founder and first chairman of directors of the New South Wales Fruit Exchange. A resident of Waverley he was an alderman on the Waverley Council for six years and represented the district in Legislative Assembly, 1896-1900. An alderman on Sydney Municipal Council for seven years. He was a founding member of Dill Macky's Australian Protestant Defence Association. He died November 1916. (Stewart, Early History of Loyal Orange Institution, pp.46-7; M.B. Marshall, 'Some Aspects of the Australian Protestant Defence Association 1901-04' (Government III (honour) Thesis, Sydney University, 1961), p.55; P.S., 25 August 1883; 15 August 1885; 11 February 1888; S.M.H., 8 May 1871; 8 November 1916.)

Samuel Edward (Sammy) Lees. Foreman Grand Committee 1876. He held other positions in orange order in 1870s and early eighties. Born Sydney 1843. A printer by trade, he soon owned his own works and gradually widened his business interests. He was a director of the Protestant Hall Company and, during the 1880s, president of the Protestant Alliance Friendly Society (original branch). He was provisional secretary of the Sydney Coffee Palace Company when it was founded in 1879, and was a director of several building companies during the 1880s. A Mason, he was a member of the board of the Sydney Infirmary for 20 years and a member of the Royal Agricultural Association. He was a prominent lay member of the Methodist Church and a temperance advocate. He represented Macquarie ward on the Sydney Council from 1879-1906. He was a mayor in 1895 and Lord Mayor in 1903-4. He represented the Nepean electorate from 1887-95 and 1898-1900. He was an M.L.C. from 1895 to 1898. He died in June 1916. (Cyclopedia of N.S.W., p.475; V & P (LA NSW), 1889 (2) 1015; S.M.H., 6 August 1879; P.S., 27 May 1871, 3 June 1876, 5 May 1877, 21 January 1880, 9 August 1884, 26 February 1885, 6 February, 17 July, 25 September 1886; F.J., 20 March 1880; Methodist, 24 June 1916.)

Peter D. McCormick (or McCormack). Grand Treasurer 1890-2. Born Glasgow 1833. Served apprenticeship as a joiner and emigrated to Sydney in 1855. He first followed his trade and then, in 1863, became a school teacher, first at St Mary's, South Creek, non-vested national school and then at the denominational school connected with McGibbon's Woolloomooloo church. He later taught in public schools at Bourke Street and Crown Street and in the mid-eighties retired to devote himself to music and church work. He was well known as a choirmaster, not only at orange ceremonies and at the Scots church where he worshipped, but on public occasions. He conducted a choir of 15,000 school children at the opening of the Queen

Nicholas James Mackenzie. Grand Treasurer 1880-87; Vice President of Loyal Orange Institution of Australia in 1885. Born Parramatta 1835, he carried on business as a draper and outfitter, and specialised in orange regalia. After a bad turn in his business affairs in 1892 he committed suicide by swallowing carbolic acid. An Anglican. (S.M.H., 12 August 1892; P.S., 4 December 1880, 17 February 1883, 28 March 1885.)


Edward David Madgwick. Grand Chaplain 1883, 1898; Grand Secretary 1886; Grand Master 1887-8. Born Portsea, England, 1841. Aged 8 he immigrated to the colony with his parents who settled in the Hunter Valley. As a young man he joined the Wesleyan ministry and spent four years in Queensland before being stationed in the Hunter Valley. In 1877 he severed his connection with the Wesleyan Conference and was admitted to Moore Theological College and ordained an Anglican minister in 1881. He was stationed in Sydney parishes until his death in January 1899. As Grand Master he suggested the formation of women's lodges, but the idea was rejected. He also suggested that all Protestant churches might unite under the Orange Institution. (Daily Telegraph, 21 January 1899; W.A., 5 May 1877; P.S., 20 March 1886, 12 July 1887, 2 January 1888.)

John Cash Neild. Grand Master, 1891-3. Born Bristol 1846. In 1860 after seven years in New Zealand, he arrived with his father, a surgeon, in Sydney. Beginning work as an insurance agent in 1865 he built up an extensive business. As a young man in the 1860s he was active in the Free Church of England, and married the daughter of its colonial founder the Rev. P.P. Agnew. He was active in municipal politics in the 1870s and eighties, becoming Mayor of Woollahra in 1885. He represented Paddington in the Assembly from 1885-1900, excepting 1893-5. In 1901 he was elected Senator for N.S.W. a position he held till 1910. He was particularly interested in old age pensions and travelled in Europe in 1896 as a Royal Commissioner enquiring into pensions. He was the author of two child protection acts. E.W. O'Sullivan, a Catholic, described him as a witty, good hearted, amiable
man, who, while Grand Master had the courage to pray publicly for the Pope, who was very ill. For this the orangemen had him defeated when he next stood for election in 1893. He died in 1911. (E.W. O'Sullivan, 'From Colony to Commonwealth' (MSS in M.L.), pp.188-9; N.B.R. file; C.P.I., May 1866; Empire, 24 August 1866.)

James Pedlow. Grand Master 1864(?) 1867. Born Armagh, Ireland, 1841, son of a farmer. Arrived in New South Wales in 1861 and became a grocer. Stewart (Early History of the Orange Institution, p.45) claims he was Grand Master in 1864, just after his arrival from Ireland. 1864 was the year the Grand Lodge was reconstructed and it is possible that Pedlow arrived from Ireland with the requisite instructions. However his youth and background (he was a Baptist) make this unlikely. He died in 1873 of heart failure induced by delirium tremens. (N.B.R.)

William Thomas Poole. Deputy Grand Master 1882. Born London 1828. After working on the railways he immigrated to Victoria in 1851 seeking gold. He later bought an estate in the Macleay district where he pioneered sugar growing. He retained his interests in the area but moved to Sydney in Redfern. He became mayor of Redfern, and represented South Sydney on an orange ticket in 1880 and 1882. He died in 1902. (P.S., 25 March 1882; Daily Telegraph, 25 June 1884.)


John Roseby. Deputy Grand Master 1870, Foreman Grand Committee 1871. Active in P.P.A. 1868-72. Born Durham, England 1836. With family immigrated to Australia in 1841. His father, Thomas Roseby was a monumental mason and sometime itinerant preacher. A younger brother, Thomas, joined the Congregational Ministry. John followed his father's trade, sometimes describing himself as a sculptor. He was a methodist and a leading temperance worker. Active in a number of charities such as the Benevolent Asylum (a director 1876-98) and the Sydney Night Refuge and Soup Kitchen he represented New South Wales at the International Conference on Charities in 1890. He was active in municipal and colonial politics: an alderman from 1870-72; M.L.A. (Shoalhaven) 1871-82. He was made a magistrate in 1871. A close friend of S.S. Goold and John Davies he was immensely popular with
orangemen. He died in 1898. (S.M.H., 18 June, 18 September 1868, 13 January 1869, 16 April 1878, 21 April 1898; P.S., 12 June 1869, 22 April, 2 December 1870, 24 February 1877, 18 December 1880, 6 May 1882; F.J., 12 August 1871, 6 July 1872, 17 July 1880; Daily Telegraph, 14 November 1890.)


William Stephen. Foreman of Grand Committee 1885-89; Grand Master 1890. Born Northern Ireland 1828. Arrived in Australia in 1848. Tried mining in New South Wales and Victoria, then fruit growing near Sydney. Formed woolscouring and fellmongering business. A prominent resident of Botany for a number of years, he represented Redfern in 1887-91 and Botany 1894-5. A mason, he was a director of one of the orange building companies in the mid-eighties. (P.S., 26 September 1885, 6 February 1886, 8 February 1890. Martin and Wardell, Members of the Legislative Assembly of New South Wales, p.202.)

Arthur Walker. Grand Treasurer 1889; Deputy Grand Master 1890. President of Protestant Alliance Friendly Society (original branch) in 1882.

John Wheeler. Foreman Grand Committee 1883-4; Deputy Grand Master 1885; Grand Master 1886, 1894-1909, 1912. Born Sydney 1853. His father, Aaron Wheeler, a timber merchant, was active in municipal politics. A Congregationalist, Wheeler joined the L.O.I. in 1870, aged 17. Beginning as an accountant in the Newcastle-Wallsend Coal Company he rose to become General Manager. He was a director of several land and building companies in the eighties, but his main interest, apart from the L.O.I. was municipal politics. He was mayor of Petersham from 1886-90, a senior vice president of the Municipal Associations in 1894 and chairman of the Local Government Conference in the 1900s. He was Grand Master of the E.O. Protestant Alliance Friendly Society 1885-1890. He was M.L.A. for Canterbury from 1889-91. (Cyclopedia of N.S.W. (1907), p.491; Stewart, Early History of the Loyal Orange Institution, pp.44-6; V & P (LA NSW), 1889 (4) 916; P.S., 26 September 1885, 30 April 1887, 3 August 1890.)
NOTE: Biographies of other orangemen appear in the text at the following places:

Rev. Zachary Barry p.65, n.3.
G.L. Carter p.251, n.4.
Henry Clarke p.231, n.3.
John Davies p.183.
Henry Hicks p.287.
I.J. Josephson p.307, n.2.
Samuel Kippax p.181.
William Kippax p.287.
J.S. McCoy p.286, n.2.
Richard McCoy p.286.
Rev. George Sutherland p.374, n.2.
G.L. Wilson p.185, n.4.
APPENDIX IIId.

Orange M.P.s in the 1880s

(Those marked with an asterisk are known sympathisers, whose actual membership is doubtful.)

F. Abigail; Alfred Allen.
E.J. Ball; W. Barbour; A. Bowman; C.J. Byrnes.
A. Cameron; G.L. Carter; G. Cass; M. Chapman;
W. Clarke; J. Clubb; H.H. Cooke; J. Creer.
J. Davies.
F. Farnell; C.H. Fawcett; J. Fletcher; W.J. Foster;
A.R. Freemlin; J. Fullford.
Jacob Garrard; T. Garrett,
J. Haynes; W. Henson; W. Hezlet; W.H. Holborow;
B.O. Holterman; A. Hutchinson.
J. Kidd; R. King.
S.E. Lees; R.C. Luscombe.
J. McFarlane.
W.F. Martin; N. Melville; Joseph Mitchell;
R.L. Murray.
J.C. Neild.
W.H. Paul; J. Perry; W.H. Pigott; W.T. Poole;
W.C. Proctor.
J.C. Roberts; J. Roseby.
W.F. Schey; John Shepherd; T.R. Smith; W. Stephens.
J.B. Thompson; R.W. Thompson.
C. Withers.
### APPENDIX III

**NAME AND OCCUPATION OF COUNCIL OF PROTESTANT POLITICAL ASSOCIATION, 1868, 1870, 1872.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>1868</th>
<th>1870</th>
<th>1872</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>John Davies, ironmonger</td>
<td>John Davies</td>
<td>John Davies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. President</td>
<td>W. M'Cuire, solicitor</td>
<td>J.G. Wilson, manager of Robertson's Baths</td>
<td>J.G. Wilson, James Partridge, galvanised ironworker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>Robert Hughes, furniture broker</td>
<td>Robert Hughes</td>
<td>Robert Hughes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>G.L. Wilson, conveyancer</td>
<td>G.L. Carter, tailor T. Armstrong, joiner(?)</td>
<td>G.L. Carter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Secretaries</td>
<td>G. Balmer, clothier(?) J. Dole, ironmonger</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rev. W.Beg, Free Presbyterian minister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaplain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examiner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>George Garton, bootmaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>James Harris,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council</td>
<td>T. Greenway,</td>
<td>Henry,</td>
<td>John Fraser fruiterer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List of council members continued...
### APPENDIX III Contd.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>1868</th>
<th>1870</th>
<th>1872</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council</td>
<td>S. Kippax, poulterer</td>
<td>A. Alexander, retired tailor</td>
<td>A. Alexander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J. West, -</td>
<td>J. Carruthers, clerk</td>
<td>J. Carruthers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R. Beavis, fruiterer</td>
<td>R. Beavis</td>
<td>Elias Bethall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Field, produce agent</td>
<td>Somerville, -</td>
<td>Thomas Warr, wheelwright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G. Coulter, commission agent</td>
<td>J. Kennedy, -</td>
<td>Richard Pyerson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Reynolds, publican(?)</td>
<td>Greenup, -</td>
<td>James Dive, greengrocer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E. Gordon, coal merchant</td>
<td>W. Davis, produce merchant</td>
<td>James Graham, builder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J. Fyfe, engineer</td>
<td>McCulloch, -</td>
<td>George Shaw, -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A. McFarlane, blacksmith</td>
<td>John Maxwell, -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A. Gilchrist, schoolteacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas Dodds, moulder</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 (previous page) For list of names see S.M.H., 18 July 1868; P.S., 22 January 1870; manifesto rules and by-laws of Protestant Political Association (Sydney, 1872) in M.L. Occupations are largely from Sands, Sydney Directory, for 1868, 1869, 1870, 1871, 1872, 1873; and from advertisements and other information in A.P.R., or P.S.  

(?) means that there is doubt about the occupation; - means it is not known, either because it is not listed, or because there are several of that name listed.
Other details of Council members not already mentioned in the text (alphabetically)


G. Coulter: Grand master No.1 L.O.L. (P.S., 9 July 1870).

J. Dole: Orangeman in 1882 (P.S., 3 March 1882).


C. Field: Member circuit committee, Wesleyan Missionary Society (S.M.H., 4 August 1868).

A. Gilchrist: Born Scotland, Grand Secretary L.O.I. N.S.W. 1875-1883; 1888-1912 (Stewart, Early History L.O.I., p.47).

James Graham: Secretary, Protestant Alliance Friendly Society 1864-69 (P.S., 22 May 1869).

J. Kennedy: Orangeman (P.S., 31 July 1869); Office holder, Grand Black Chapter of N.S.W. (P.S., 27 February 1871).

A. McFarlane: Office holder, Grand Black Chapter of N.S.W. (P.S., 27 February 1871).

James Partridge: Assistant Grand Secretary, L.O.I. N.S.W., 1869 (P.S., 12 July 1869).
APPENDIX IV

A Summary of the Contents of Two Issues of the
Australian Protestant Banner

A brief summary of the main articles appearing in the second and third issues of the Banner will serve to illustrate the way the anti-Catholic ideology was presented. Even the first page, devoted as it was to advertisements, carried reminders of the Banner's purpose. Included among the advertisements for tailors, grocers, ironmongers and the like were advertisements for the classic American anti-Catholic text The Awful Disclosures of Maria Monk; for a second edition of William McIntyre's pamphlet version of his riot-provoking lecture (in Maitland, 1860), the Heathenism of Popery, Proved and Illustrated and for Peter Den's Theology. The latter consisted of translations from the Latin of extracts from a moral theology text sometimes used in Catholic seminaries. The extracts were from that portion of the book devoted to giving young seminarians a notional familiarity with some of the possible variations of human sexual behaviour and the Protestant assumption was that as priests they were encouraged to practice, and seduce others to practice, these terrible things. The advertisement carried the assurance that in making up this pamphlet, Den's has by no means been exhausted. . . . Foul and filthy as this sample of Popish theology is, I have left some more foul and filthy behind me. Should anyone doubt the accuracy of the extracts, the authenticated copy, in Latin, can be seen at the (Christian Pleader) office.

The second page of the Banner carried letters, several of which were usually contributed by the staff. In the second issue the main letter was a long piece denouncing the Romish practice of indulgences, written by the Rev. Wazir Beg, who signed himself 'Alter Ego'. In his typical style, overwritten and full of emphases, Beg described it as superstitious and, worse, as encouraging immorality: 'abortion, seduction, incest, concubinage, etc., etc., can all be paid for...' Another letter dealt with the imagined habit of papal 'cursing', and quoted passages from the Old Testament condemning it. The letter contained a version of what was said to be a papal curse, long, and full of convoluted invocations of saints and devils. A third page reprinted several articles from British and Tasmanian Protestant papers: on 'the Prince of Wales in Ireland'; on 'the Road to Rome via Oxford'; and on 'Abyssinia'. The fourth and fifth pages were devoted to editorial comment. The first leader in the journal was often devoted to comment on popery's
involvement in local affairs. On this occasion it concerned itself with Fr Dwyer's defence of his actions with respect to O'Farrell's final statement. It was written in an ironic style, probably by Barry who excelled at that, and made much of Dwyer's claim that making public the statement was part of the sacrament of O'Farrell's confession. The second leader also concerned the confessional, but in a much more serious fashion:

The Confessional involves the whole question of the validity of the Romish Church...[there] the priest extracts all secrets from the penitent, and he being himself in bondage to his superiors [thus] the whole church is bound together....That an unmarried priest should have such imperative power of conversation with wives and daughters of the people is shocking to all sense of decency...a monstrous effrontery against all reason, Scripture, decency....What instrument is more fit for treasonable and criminal purpose....No state ought to allow its existence.

A third editorial was devoted to the argument adduced by some Catholics that since they comprised one third of the colony's population they should have one third of the seats in Parliament of the education revenue and the like. The Banner, which exaggerated the Catholic position, then proceeded to answer it, pointing out that well over one third of the criminals in gaol and of the paupers dependant on public charity were Romanists, and asking whether the Catholic church was prepared to contribute a proportional share of the revenue to their maintenance. This provided an opportunity to point to some of the social implications of popery and to praise Protestant and British virtues:

It is in that country, as it is in England, in Scotland, in Ireland, and emphatically in some of the continental countries that Popery and poverty, Romanism and rags, splendid Cathedrals and a wealthy priesthood, and squalor and want go together. Industry languishes, self reliance sinks into beggary and indigence under the blight of Popery.

A fourth editorial dealt with the question of the Pope's curse, already raised by a correspondent, and also, during the previous week, in the daily press and the Freeman's Journal. The leader adopted an amused tone at such superstitious goings on, but contained a reminder that it was Protestants whom the Pope was fondest of cursing as heretics and infidels. The leader writers had apparently exhausted themselves by this effort, for the last half of page five contained only snippets of news culled from the daily press; for example, 'a dual between a laughing jackass and a snake'. Page six contained a long article under the
general title of 'Rome and Civil Liberty', and dealt with the
Reformation. This spelt out an important aspect of the
anti-Catholic version of British history. The first dawning
of the Reformation took place in England in 1380, the year
that Wycliffe published his translation of the Bible, but the
real Reformation began in 1516 when Erasmus published his New
Testament in England and ended in 1688 'when the ecclesiastical
and political basis of our constitution was settled on a
Protestant basis under William of Orange'. It surveyed the
period in between, particularly the bloody Marian persecution,
in some detail. The last two pages contained snippets of news
culled from the English papers relating to religious and
political events in England and Ireland. One longish piece,
continued from the previous issue, and sarcastically entitled
'Ireland for the Irish' presented a British loyalist version
of Irish history, specifically directed at the nationalist
version of the Young Irelanders.

Two letters in the third issue dealt with a so called
Fenian oath, full of bloodthirsty expressions of intentions
of exterminating Protestants, which had been published in the
first issue. Another letter deprecated the standards of
conduct in the colonial legislature while a fourth criticised
the supineness of Protestants who refused to buy the Banner.
Page three was devoted to an obscure allegory by Beg,
apparently about Fr Dwyer, the Catholic ex-chaplain of
Darlinghurst (a 'gaol-dog') and O'Farrell (a 'gaol bird').
The leading editorial began by fearfully bewailing the progress
of Rome in England ('they are filling England with mass houses
and monkery') and then attempted to console by pointing out
that none of the perverts (converts) to Rome had been true
Protestants and that although Rome was just then adopting a
mild facade, and achieving some success in the British Empire,
in Spain and Italy Protestantism was making important gains.
The second editorial noticed an attack on the Banner by the
Empire, which accused it of advocating extreme Protestantism.
The Banner professed not to know what this description could
mean, for true Protestantism had to stand in complete
opposition to Popery, and in this opposition there could be no
extremes. There could however be compromises: 'milk and water
Protestantism'; 'commercial Protestantism'; and 'political
Protestantism', all of which involved some truckling to Popery
from fear of suffering social, economic or political set backs.
A third editorial condemned the siting of Prince Alfred
Hospital at the Grose farm. This was a non-sectarian piece,
but served to introduce a more substantial piece regretting
the way 'a number of our leading Protestants had ensnared
themselves with Rome...[having] pledged themselves to support
the Ball to be given in aid of St Vincent's Hospital'. The
remaining three feature pieces consisted of a long filler on
the annexation of New Zealand; a short story concerning an
attempt by a priest and a Catholic gentleman to convert a
young Irish Protestant serving girl (the girl out argued the
priest and converted the gentleman); and a long article on
the Jesuits, quoting Macauley and other historians on their
past evil designs on England.
APPENDIX IV

Footnotes

1 A.P.B., 20, 27 July 1868.

2 These advertisements illustrate the social composition of the paper support. They also provided one-fifth of the revenue. When it first began its sales (mainly from subscriptions) were less than 1,000. This would have contributed about £25 per issue. The page of paid advertisements (4 columns x 13" at 2/- per column inch) contributed about £5. By the end of the year, when it was selling about 2,000 copies per week it had doubled in size, and approximately two and a half pages were devoted to advertisements. This would have provided £10-£12 out of a total income of £60. It had, at this stage, more advertisements than the Freeman's Journal.

3 See Best, Popular Protestantism, p.133.
APPENDIX V

Henry James O'Farrell: A Short Biography.

Henry James O'Farrell was born in Aarons Quay, Dublin, in 1835. He was among the youngest of several children. His father, William O'Farrell, was a butcher. The family moved to Liverpool soon after Henry was born, and in late 1840 emigrated from there to Melbourne, which they reached early in 1841. By 1845, William O'Farrell, a gregarious man, had deserted butchering for the less demanding work as a city rate collector. Utilising contacts and knowledge gained in this profession he eventually, in early 1851-2 became a full time land agent, and achieved notable success, although a rash piece of speculation just before his death in 1854 meant that his estate was eventually found insolvent. He had ensured his children a good education, and one son, Peter Andrew Charles (born 1828) became, in the fifties, one of Melbourne's most successful solicitors. Earlier in the decade P.A.C. had engaged in controversy with the Rev. Anthony Trollope in defense of Catholicism, and was a close confidant and legal adviser of Bishop Goold.

H.J. O'Farrell originally thought of studying law like his older brother. At ten he left home to board at David Boyd's school and then, in about 1848, at St Francis school. At about this time he determined to become a priest and in 1850 passed from the school to St Francis's seminary. Two years later he received Deacon's orders. In 1853 he left for Europe for further study, returning to the colony in 1855. He was then ready for ordination, but after a dispute with Bishop Goold over some point of doctrine, he abandoned his clerical vocation, and went up country, first as a sheep farmer near Clunes, and then, a little later, as a hay and corn merchant at Ballarat. He was partnered in the venture by a cousin, Joseph Kennedy. At first the venture prospered, and O'Farrell acquired other property as well. Then in 1864, his brother P.A.C. O'Farrell, after an unsuccessful libel suit had destroyed his reputation and lost him his clientele, left Melbourne hurriedly to escape his creditors. Within a year of this scandal, Kennedy died of the D.T.'s. These two events, particularly the former, seemed to unchief O'Farrell. Possibly from a desire to clear the family name by repaying his brother's debts, he began to speculate on the Ballarat exchange. He was unsuccessful and fell into debt. He began to drink heavily, and to brood about his failure to become a priest. Early in January 1867 he collapsed completely and became totally paranoid, talking of plots to poison him, and wildly brandishing pistols, and threatening to kill people. Two of his sisters went to Ballarat to care for him, and eventually took him away with them to Melbourne. After a short sojourn there he appeared to recover and returned to Ballarat. A little after his return he collapsed again, and suffered several epileptic fits. He was admitted to the Ballarat hospital for a few days. On
his discharge he returned to his sister's house and claimed to have no memory of his previous illness. He stayed there a short time, mostly calm, but sometimes agitated about the losses he had sustained because of the flight of his brother. He had pistols, swords and daggers in his possession. A few days after his discharge from hospital he wrote to Bishop Sheil, whom he had known in Ballarat, mentioning the trying time he had had, and desiring to prepare himself for ordination. In September 1867 he left Melbourne for Sydney where he took up residence in Tierney's Hotel. After three months of solitary, but orderly existence, he became agitated and intemperate, frequently talking of his financial losses. In December, Tierney asked him to leave, and he took up residence in Powell's Clarendon Hotel. He was being sustained at this time by his sister, who sent money to him via St John's College. During his stay at the Clarendon he remained quiet, but became agitated whenever the conversation turned to Fenianism. On 11 March he went out to Waverley and practised shooting with a pistol. The next day he shot the Duke of Edinburgh at Clontarf. After his capture he claimed to have several times previously attempted to shoot the Prince, and to have been acting on instructions from the Fenian movement, of which he was a member. A little before his execution he retracted the latter story.

It is by no means certain that he was not a Fenian, but inconsistencies in his story suggest he was not. Although insanity does not preclude membership of the Fenians. A possible explanation of his actions might be constructed as follows. O'Farrell's father had high expectations for his children. To become a priest, as Henry intended, was to achieve very considerable success, for the priesthood was held in very high regard by Irish families. That he did not achieve ordination could only have been seen as a failure, but one that could be borne while successful in alternative occupations. His brother's ignominious flight, and the consequent disgrace to the family, together with his own financial failure consequent upon that disgrace, raised for O'Farrell the spectre of his own failure. He began to drink heavily and to think seriously about renewing his clerical vocation; a course of action which had not been entirely absent from his thoughts previously. His 'tests' of his chastity were partly attempts to prove himself capable not only of becoming a priest, but also an endeavour to prove himself superior to other men, in the way priests were - for in Irish-Catholic religious folklore the chastity of the clergy was an indication of their superiority to ordinary men. He began at this stage to display other external traits of insanity. To judge from his 'diary', he also, sometime in 1867 when the press was full of news of the Fenians, began to construct a fantasy world, wherein he eschewed the church for a more 'noble' cause: the liberation of Ireland. After his second bout of madness he wrote to Sheil expressing what seemed a genuine desire to become a priest, but not long after that he took himself to Sydney where his fantasy came to exert increasing control over his
actions, so that he eventually began to act out the role of a Fenian assassin, and finally, on the 12 March, carried his fantasy through to its fulfilment. After continuing the fantasy in prison and enjoying the fame that it had given him, with death approaching, he returned to some form of sanity and admitted that it had all been an elaborate hoax.

Insanity seemed to run in the family. His brother, P.A.C. O'Farrell, after his hurried departure from Melbourne settled in America. There in 1879, he communicated to his sister, a nun in a New Orleans convent, that he intended to assassinate the Catholic Archbishop of New Orleans. Convinced of his seriousness, she handed the letter to the police. When O'Farrell arrived at the Archbishop's residence he was arrested. In 1882 he returned to Melbourne, convinced that Bishop Goold had swindled him out of a large sum of money. He attempted to shoot the Bishop, and was gaol. A little after his release he was bound over for threatening to kill his brother-in-law. In 1885, and again in 1888, he published vicious, scurrilous attacks on Goold - repeating not only the swindling charge, but listing a number of other vices central to the anti-Catholic canon. An attempt by friends to raise enough money to enable him to return to America failed, and he finally died in Melbourne, a Catholic, in 1898.
APPENDIX V.

Footnotes

1 The exact date of his birth is uncertain, but 1835 fits general clues, such as his stated age in 1868. He had at least two elder brothers and one elder sister. There were at least two other sisters.

2 I am grateful to Miss Patricia Reynolds, the Latrobe librarian for information re William O'Farrell gleaned from Melbourne Directories. See also Garry Owen Chronicles of early Melbourne, pp.236, 243, 278, 288, 319, 439, 646, 653-4, 668.

3 P.A.C. O'Farrell. A Reply to the pamphlet of the Rev. William Trollope entitled "Are the Catholics of Port Phillip Tridentine Romanists? (Melbourne, 1850); An answer to the pamphlet of the Rev. William Trollope entitled "A parting word on Tridentine Romanism" (Melbourne, 1850).

4 For these details of early life of H.J. O'Farrell see the evidence of his sister Mrs Allen, at his trial, S.M.H., 31 March 1868; letter by D.H.S., Tribune, 1 December 1906; Bishop Hynes to Bishop Goold 10 July 1853, in Hynes letters in Melbourne Archdiocese Historical Commission. (I am indebted to Fr J. Keaney, of the Commission for the last two references); letter from John Carfrae, S.M.H., 19 March 1868; evidence of Patricus Walshe in trial of O'Farrell, S.M.H., 1868; Ballarat Rate Books, 1862-1868 (I am indebted to Mrs Weston Bate, of the University of Melbourne for this reference). On P.A.C. O'Farrell's departure see Argus, 29 November, 16 December 1862; 27, 28 February, 2, 3, March 1863; 29 June 1864; Australasian, 21 March 1868.

5 See evidence of sister, S.M.H., 31 March 1868.

6 Deacon's orders which O'Farrell had received, involved a promise of chastity. O'Farrell seemed determined to test this. According to the Ballarat Star, which carried the most reliable reports of his life (on other counts), after the attempted assassination "...he frequently made arrangements for three young neighbours, as frail as fair, to spend evenings in his house, taking a sort of martyr's pride in conquering whatever feelings he might possess, 'though his visitors were allowed perhaps greater liberties than were compatible either with the strict propriety or with being mentioned in the columns of a newspaper'. (Ballarat Star, 27 March 1868.) See also his letter to Sheil, 26 April 1867 (S.M.H., 5 May 1868).

7 Evidence of his sister, op.cit.; Ballarat Star, 27 March 1868.

8 H.J. O'Farrell to Bishop Sheil, 26 April 1867, published in S.M.H., 5 May 1868.
His sister said he left Melbourne in September (her evidence op. cit.). Tierney said he arrived in his hotel in September (letter to Empire, 19 March 1868). His sister and Ballarat Star, op. cit. both claimed that he went to Rockhampton before Sydney, which, if true means that either the sister or Tierney's timing is inaccurate.

See for example, evidence of Dr Colville at O'Farrell's trial (S.M.H., 31 March 1868).

10 As well, it is hard to know just when he might have had any direct contact with the Fenian movement, which had not been formed at the time of his visit to Europe.

11 Bishop Goold, who presumably knew something of O'Farrell's history was overseas in 1868. He was in Paris when he heard of the attempted assassination and immediately called on the British Ambassador with a request that his sympathy be conveyed to the British Government and the information that he had 'known for some time that O'Farrell was suffering from insanity'. (F.J., 15 August 1868.)

12 F.J., 30 August 1879.

APPENDIX VI.

Archbishop Whately and the Irish National School System.

The publication by E. Jane Whately of the Life and Correspondence of Richard Whately D.D. (2 Vols. London, 1866) provided ammunition for the Catholic opponents of the Irish national school system. In it they claimed to find irrefutable evidence that the Irish national school books, which Whately had helped prepare, had been designed to weaken the faith of Catholic children. In Australia frequent reference was made to 'Whately's confession' by Catholic controversialists from 1867 onwards. Catholic historians have merely repeated their claims. Even Donald Akenson, the impartial historian of the Irish national system, shows that he has not completely freed himself from the Catholic version. A short quotation from Fogarty illustrates the way Whately has been used:

In this book [Life and Correspondence of Richard Whately D.D.] it was revealed that the Archbishop, who was a member of the first Irish National Board, was a party to certain ulterior designs in the drawing up of the National school text books. His Grace confessed that his support had been given to the project primarily because he saw in it means of "undermining...the vast fabric of the Irish Catholic Church".

There are several reasons why this interpretation will not do.

For a start, there is the dubious nature of the source. Whately's Catholic critics are referring to conversations between Whately and his friend Nassau Senior. These were recorded by Senior in his journal at some time (at least some hours) after the conversations had taken place. This alone renders their accuracy doubtful. Not surprisingly, some Catholics, who had probably not even read the sections they were citing, referred to Whately's 'confessions' as being contained in letters to Senior.

More damaging to the Catholic interpretation is the context and content of Whately's remarks. On one occasion Senior referred to the number of conversions from Catholicism to Protestantism which were said to be taking place in Ireland, and asked Whately their cause. Whately listed several reasons, the most important of which, in his opinion, being 'the diffusion of Scriptural education' by means of the Irish national system. He noted that in preparing the national school books both he and Archbishop Murray agreed in desiring large portions of the Bible to be read in our National Schools; but we agreed in this because disagreed as to its probable results. He believed that they would
be favourable to Romanism. I believed that they would be favourable to Protestantism; and I feel confident that I was right.7

This is hardly a confession of an intention to proselytise. Along with a lot of other Protestants, Whately believed that the bible was inimical to Roman Catholicism. He went further and believed that even the books of scriptural extracts which he and Murray helped to prepare 'contain so much that is inconsistent with the whole spirit of Romanism, that it is difficult to suppose that a person well acquainted with them can be a thorough-going Roman Catholic.'8 He concluded that the large number of Irish conversions to Protestantism was evidence of the truth of his belief. It was strange that Catholics should have accepted his conclusion so eagerly, when they so frequently denied his premise.9

On another occasion Whately and Senior were discussing the likelihood of the British government making changes to the Irish education system, in order to placate the system's Presbyterian critics in the north of Ireland. Whately referred to his previous remarks, and regretted that he could not use the argument that the present system was an instrument of conversion, for such an argument would carry a lot of weight with those Protestants. His previous and subsequent remarks make it clear that that argument did not contain his own reasons for continuing to favour the system: he favoured it because it lessened sectarianism, and he feared a rise in both Protestant and Catholic bigotry should it be changed.10

It must also be remembered that Whately was speaking these views in 1858, twenty-seven years after he had helped design the system. He was on the point of resigning from the Irish National Board in protest against Catholic efforts to weaken the non-sectarian aspects of the system. Exasperation at these Catholic efforts must have lent an edge to his comments.

The Catholic interpretation becomes weaker still when one turns to Senior's Journals, Conversations and Essays relating to Ireland, (2 Vols., London, 1868), the source of the extracts published by Miss Whately. This book of Senior's was published posthumously (Senior died in 1864, a year after Whately) from a manuscript prepared by Senior in 1862. It would seem from some editorial remarks that Whately looked over the record of the conversation at some time before his death.11 The differences between Senior's text and the one published by Miss Whately are interesting. The two passages in the latter which contain the strongest expressions of belief in the proselytising effect of the Irish school books are omitted from the former — which would have to be accepted as the more definitive account of Whately's views.12 No indication that they were ever present is given in Senior's publication, although in another place an editorial remark indicates that Whately added three words
to the text of his reputed conversation. These words are not included in Miss Whately's edition. The three words work to cast doubt on the extent of the conversions from Irish Catholicism to Protestantism which Senior is enthusiastically questioning Whately about. The two passages which Whately apparently deleted both served to summarise what he had said previously, but were crudely stated and contained an anti-Catholic animus not present in the rest of his 'conversation'. It seems reasonable to suppose that they contained more of Senior than the Archbishop. Whately was a tolerant man, while Senior was prone to display that rather common prejudice of educated, nineteenth century Englishmen: anti-Catholicism.

It would appear that E. Jane Whately used an uncorrected version of Senior's journals for her edition of her father's Life and Letters. From what one can discover of her, she would have been only too happy to present her father in more fundamentalist colours.
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Footnotes

1 For example, by Plunkett, in July 1867 (Empire, 26 June 1867); by the Catholic Association in its second report (F.J., 6 November 1869); by Bishop Murray in his 1879 pastoral (F.J., 6 September 1879); by Daniel O'Conn or in the Assembly in 1879 (N.S.W.P.D., 1, (1879-80) 375).

2 e.g., for example, Fogarty, Catholic Education in Australia, Vol. I, p.177.

3 Akenson, Irish Education Experiment, pp.260-1. Akenson does not argue that Whately designed the Irish text books for proselytising, but does claim that Whately was determined, in 1858, to retain their use for this reason.

4 Fogarty, op.cit.

5 Senior recorded conversations with large numbers of prominent people, most of which he published at various stages.

6 For example, Murray and O'Connor, cited above.

7 Whately, op.cit., p.243.

8 Ibid., p.214.

9 That is, they frequently denied that the bible was inimical to Catholicism and that Catholics were forbidden to read the bible - two common Protestant criticisms.


12 The two passages in question on page 244-5 (paragraph "Such I believe...Roman Catholic Church") and p.246 (I believe, as I said the other day...tied behind me) in Whately, op.cit. The pages from which they are omitted in Senior, op.cit. are p.64 and p.67.

13 Senior, op.cit., p.59.


15 She would seem to have been a rather fundamentalist sectarian sort of Protestant, a disposition she may have received from her mother. See F. Boas, Modern English Biography, Vol. IV, (London, 1965 [First, limited, edition published 1921]) p.837. Boas mentions a book by her sister Reminiscences of the Life and Work of E.J. Whately, but I have not been able to trace a copy.
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