ON HER MAJESTY'S SERVICE.

The Hon. A. J. CLAIR,

U.P.

Chamber,

Hobart

Tasmania

FEDERAL CONVENTION.
PARLIAMENT HOUSE, MELBOURNE.
My dear Clarke,

The paper will have told you that your note, was laid before us on the table of the Convention, and ordered to be printed. The paper is regarded as a very valuable one, and if it can have added to your many services to the cause of Federation. There is not a set of Blackford's reports to be had in Melbourne, and the case you cited, therein reported, of the Holycroft Water Company, or the Connecticut Water Company, is not
mentioned in the Digest or by the text writers, so that all we can find out about the case is contained in your notes. This ought to be decisive of the question. I think (probably a Judge of a State Court involved with federal jurisdiction; see comment) is good law, but so far as I am, O'Connor I feel a good deal of doubt about it, if it means that the waiving of the federal jurisdiction confers on a citizen of a State a legal right, against a citizen of another State, which right was, previously non-existent. Your paper came at an opportune moment, respected towards the settlement of the Riva's
question on the time's it has been suggested - i.e. simple reliance on the 'Trade & Commerce' power of legislation.

I have to thank you further for your telegram as to the striking out of the power from the High Court to deal with cases of mandamus & prohibition against officers of the Commonwealth. None of us, here, had yesterday understood the case mentioned by you, or if seen if had been forgotten. It seems however to be a leading case. I have given notice to refer the minds on the reconsideration of the clause.
Our work here will occupy two or three
weeks. Time, I think. Things are going very
well so far, and there is a difficulty on the
part of delegate, so far to realise the
difficulties of colleagues, who come from other
Colonies.

Yours very truly,

Edward Barton
Clark's contribution to Federalism

C4/C15 E. Barton to A.L. Clark

Federal Convention
Victoria

Parliament House
Melbourne
14th February 1898

My dear Clark

The Papers will have told you that your notes were laid by me on the table of the convention & ordered to be printed. The paper is regarded as a very valuable one, & by it you have added to your many services to the cause of Federation. There is not a set of Blatchfords’ reports to be had in Melbourne, and the case you cited, therein reported, of the Holgate* Water Company v. the Connecticut Water Company, is not mentioned in the Digests or by the text writers, so that all we can find out about the case is contained in your notes. Wise thinks the decision of Shipman J (probably a Judge of a State Court invested with federal jurisdiction on circuit) is good law, but so far Isaacs, O’Connor & I feel a good deal of doubt about it, if it means that the creation of the federal jurisdiction confers on a citizen of a state a legal right as against a citizen of another state, which right was previously non-existent. Your paper came at an opportune moment, & assisted towards the settlement of the Rivers question on the lines I had been suggesting - i.e. simple reliance on the "trade & commerce" power of legislation;

I have to thank you further for your telegram as to the striking out of the power given to the High Court to deal with cases of mandamus & prohibition against officers of the Commonwealth. None of us here had read the case mentioned by you of Marbury v. Madison or if seen it had been forgotten - It seems however to be a leading case. I have given notice to restore the words on the reconsideration of the clause.

Our work here will occupy two or three weeks more, I think. Things are going very well so far, & there is a disposition on the part of delegates to realise the difficulties of colleagues who come from other Colonies.

Yours very truly

Edmund Barton

* It might be Holyoke