

KING

CABINET

nothing to add to the statement I have made at the present moment".
(Evening Journal, Dec. 3rd)

Dec. 3rd. Col. Josiah Wedgwood, Independent M.P., told the British Press Association "the King is beloved. The thing we have got to fight more than anything else is abdication. Any change will tear this country in two. If a general election comes, the outcome will be on the side of the King The vast bulk of the people hate seeing a man bullied when he thinks he is right, and they respect a man who will stand up for his rights. Obviously the question is not one for the Cabinet to decide, but for Parliament as a whole, as in the case of Richard II."

Colonel Wedgwood formally entered for debate the motion "That in the opinion of this House the Oath of Allegiance which they have already taken to King Edward VIII is unaffected by any form of Coronation ceremony or by the presence thereof, or absence therefrom, of any dignitary or personage whatsoever, nor will they substitute any other for the King of England."

The following day Colonel Wedgwood said he had received more than fifty messages of congratulation for his action.
(Evening Journal Dec. 3rd)

News Chronicle, Dec. 3rd - although expressing its preference for an English woman as Queen or Consort, said, "The predominant feeling, however, would undoubtedly be that the King should marry a woman of his choice". (A.P. Dispatch)

Dec. 3rd, (A.P. Dispatch) - "Wave upon wave of cheering was sent up after a crowd of 7,000 sang 'God Save the King' at conclusion of a peace meeting in Albert Hall". (Journal Dec. 4th)

Yorkshire Observer -

"The Bishop was right in his assertion, and the issues now raised extend far beyond definition of Coronation formalities. They directly concern the public and the private lives of not only the King but of all British subjects whether or not they be communicants in the Church. ... Representatives of all churches will desire that in considering the Coronation, as in all else affecting the King, nothing shall be done that will affront the conscience of the nation or undermine moral authority, which the churches, collectively, represent.

Dec. 2nd - Leeds Mercury - expresses the hope that, if the King needs guidance in any problem of conscience, as may appear from certain reports in circulation, he will seek it from our leaders of Church and State, who have at heart the greatness of our country.

Dec. 2nd - Birmingham Post - called the Bishop's words "such a reproof as nobody, whether cleric or layman, has thought proper to address to the King of England for many a long day. They are not necessarily to be deemed on that account as mere impertinence". The paper added that the Bishop spoke the truth in giving "warning" that "in the eyes of the people" the private and public lives of the King are inseparable.

Dec. 2nd - New York Times, in a dispatch from London, said "that with the press and Parliament, the Church and the Cabinet against him, he (the King) refused to budge".

Dec. 3rd - London Times - conceded that the King was "entitled to his

W.L.M. King Papers, Memoranda and Notes, 1933-1939
(M.G. 26, J 4, Volume 161, pages C114723-C115560)

PUBLIC ARCHIVES
ARCHIVES PUBLIQUES
CANADA