

4

AUSTRALIAN IMMIGRANTS, 1788-1940: DESIRED AND UNWANTED

MARIE de LEPERVANCHE

THE FIRST IMMIGRANTS to Australia arrived over 32,000 years ago.¹ They were hunters and gatherers who spread over the continent and incorporated the landscape into their social and religious life.

A much later wave of settlers consisted of British undesirables and their gaolers who brought with them an alternative orientation to land and labour. The society they came from periodically produced financial crises, depressions, and a residue of unfortunate souls, the criminals and unemployed. And the settlement in New South Wales, first founded as a 'thief colony', also became in time the destination for many who could not find work at home.

One palliative for unemployment was Edward Gibbon Wakefield's systematic scheme for colonization, first published in 1829. This entailed using funds from land sales in the Australian colonies to finance the passages of British emigrants, who in turn would provide labour for the colonial landowners. The colonies had land, but their great want was labour. In Britain there was capital but also the unemployed.

Wakefield's scheme rested on the expediency of maintaining the British connection between land, labour and capital. Thus he advocated treating colonial land as if it had risen 'out of the sea close to Britain':² a purchaser need not live on his land, he could rent it out. Indeed, he argued, 'all these ends of colonization, the extension of markets, relief in several ways from excessive numbers, and new investments for capital, may now be brought under one head, namely, a progressive enlargement, partly domestic, and partly colonial, of the field for employing capital and labour'.³

Wakefield's ideas met with a cool reception from Marx who argued that this colonization plan was merely an attempt to manufacture wage-workers in the colonies, because 'property in money, means of subsistence, machines, and other means of production, does not as yet stamp

a man as a capitalist if there be wanting the correlative—the wage-worker, the other man who is compelled to sell himself of his own free-will'.⁴

Marx's criticism was written some decades after Wakefield's colonization scheme had been implemented. The first Australian scheme of mass immigration began in New South Wales in 1832 with government assistance towards the payment of passages for working-class immigrants. For the next hundred years, immigration, particularly assisted immigration, was a central issue in the struggle between capitalist and worker in the new land.

It is the general argument of this paper that conflicts arising from opposing class interests in the colonies produced, in turn, divisions within each class. More particularly, the question of immigration remained a contentious issue between employers and employees until World War II, and as a consequence of employers advocating a plentiful supply of cheap labour, a bitter division developed within the Australian working class between colonial worker and immigrant competitor.

The Early Period: Convicts, Assisted Immigrants and Coolies

Before the Wakefield immigrants began to arrive in the 1830s, convicts and emancipists supplied the labour for colonial employers. By 1820, only 1,941 free immigrants had come. Some ineffective members of the English upper and middle classes had been sent thither by their friends 'as the easiest and surest way of being rid of them', and those few enterprising souls further down the status system—carpenters, blacksmiths and small shopkeepers—'might have formed the basis of an industrious middle class had not the rigid caste system in Sydney forced them into the society of emancipists and convicts'.⁵

The lower half of this rigid system did not house a homogeneous body of workers. From earliest days there was competition between the 'good, hard-working convict' and the free labourer. Another aspect of status difference was infrequent intermarriage between convict and free immigrant: 'The line between the two . . . was drawn as distinctly as between the white population and the black'.⁶

The other half of the rigid system consisted mostly of landowners. Officially, power was vested in government officials and the military, but as the landowners' holdings increased, so did their political power. The pastoral expansion was well under way by the 1820s and was accompanied by an increasing labour shortage in rural areas: by 1830 the Eastern Australian colonies 'comprised a small but growing class of property owners employing mainly convict labour, and competing feverishly among themselves for the few free labourers who had immigrated'.⁷

Early colonial society thus demonstrated marked distinctions insofar as power, prestige and ownership or likely ownership of property was

concerned. The earliest immigrants to the continent, the Aborigines, were dispossessed of their land and were powerless, and amongst white settlers the convicts were deprived of their liberty—if only temporarily. As far as landowners and others were concerned, this division at first paralleled to a great extent that between free and bond, and most of the latter 'made no social advance whatever . . . [being] brutalized by their convict associations and by the inhuman punishments of the system until they were beyond redemption'.⁸ Yet some emancipists did become landowners, although their status always remained lower than that of those who arrived free. Usually they intermarried with each other, occasionally they married immigrants 'but it was a very exceptional occurrence for an emancipist to marry a member of one of the families long established in the colony'.⁹

But the battles between landowning 'exclusives' and emancipists, begun in Macquarie's day, did not preclude their joining forces as employers against the employees, and in supporting each other to further joint interests through the colonial courts and press. Their privileges were guarded in Masters' and Servants' Acts; indeed 'the great employers in the colony, the absorbers of abundant and cheap labour, were the real rulers of the country. From their ranks were chosen the members of the Legislative Council; they had the ear of the Governor, and the Governor in turn had the ear of the Secretary of State'.¹⁰ Their economic base was wool. By 1830, Australia had pushed Spain from second place as a supplier of wool to Britain;¹¹ and by 1840 it was clear that Australia would soon oust the German States from first place, which it did by 1845.¹²

With the transfer of British people and capital across the sea, particularly after assisted immigration began, metropolitan patterns of social relations were also transplanted. The marked division between employer and employee highlighted in the colony distinction between town and country: the workers, if they could choose, preferred the towns, and very early on helped establish the predominantly urban nature of Australian society and its working class. But concentrations in the towns, where public works and building were the most important industries, made workers vulnerable to slumps and unemployment. The urban preference also intensified the rural labour shortages already exacerbated by the expanding pastoral industry.

Until transportation ended in 1840, shepherding was done by convicts. This was a hard and lonely job, and one with very low status. Neither emancipist nor free man was ever keen to work in this way, so despite landowners' hopes of a regular labour supply under assisted immigration, the rural labour shortage persisted. In later years the dispossessed Aborigines were often recruited as cheap labour for the pastoralists. But in the 1830s, the landowners in desperation turned to another source of cheap labour to tend their flocks. They began importing coolies.

The switch to indentured coolies introduced a new note to colonial labour relations and a new phase in the battle between employers and workers—a phase in which workers were opposed to coolie as well as convict competitors in the course of the landowners' search for cheap labour.

In the 1830s the pastoralists imported their coolies from India, China and the South Sea Islands, and tried to persuade the government to fund this traffic. But despite a favourable response from a Select Committee of the NSW Legislative Council in 1837, which recommended that Indians be imported for shepherding as well as for the production of sugar, cotton, coffee and tobacco in the north, no government action followed, nor again when the Committee's recommendations were reconsidered in 1840.¹³

After transportation ended, pastoralist agitation for cheap Asian labour began in 1841, but a Select Committee of that year disapproved the idea, thus reversing the official opinion of the 1837 Committee. In 1842, W. C. Wentworth formed a Coolie Association to tap the labour reserves of Asia, and in 1843 there were further suggestions from landed proprietors for introducing Indian coolies at Government expense, but the Legislative Council abandoned the scheme. Private employers were still permitted to import Asians at their own expense, and some did, but the Indian Emigration Act of 1839 restricted the recruiting of coolies to other British possessions unless strictly controlled, and this virtually put an end to the Indian coolie traffic to Australia.¹⁴

British authorities at this time did not warm to the coolie idea, although Wakefield, in 1829, had recommended both India and China as sources of indentured labour.¹⁵ But in the 1830s opposition came in various guises: humanitarian voices were raised against such schemes, but the opposition of the Secretary of State for the Colonies rested on the need to remove to the colony, by assisted emigration, distressed members of the British working class. Authorities argued that traffic in coolies would then only prejudice plans for this free emigration because the free and the indentured did not mix well. The British also hoped that by removing unemployed workers from Britain, some of the causes of Chartist agitation would disappear. The colonial workers objected to coolies because they did not want competition from any cheap labour.

The growing labour shortages and higher wages of the 1830s gave the colonial workers some feeling of strength for collective action, which they took in 1833, for instance, in issuing a schedule of wages. Coghlan says the workers 'explained that their motive was to prevent false hopes being raised in the minds of intending immigrants, but doubtless they were actuated also by a desire to prevent the lowering of wages—an event which the limited scale of industry made most probable, if a large number of workmen were at any time introduced'.¹⁶

The workers were constantly watchful of competition from convicts,

coolies or assisted British immigrants, and the battles over convict transportation in the 1830s and its revival in the 1840s delineated with particular sharpness colonial class interests, with employers favouring transportation and the workers vigorously opposed. But this class conflict also generated status divisions among workers themselves, so that those who campaigned for better wages and conditions were permanently ranged against those who sold their labour cheaply. The 'good, hard-working convict' was only the first to fill this low status *vis-à-vis* the competing free labourer. There were other occupants for this niche, including coolies and assisted British immigrants, before and after the convicts disappeared from the colonial scene. In the 1830s, for example, assisted British immigrants arrived and the colonial workers began objecting to 'the periodical arrival of batches of trade competitors, and their objections were both to immigrants coming on the Government ships and to those claiming bounty'.¹⁷

For several decades thereafter, assisted immigrants were the bearers of low status amongst the working class as they brought with them, particularly in times of unemployment, the threat of competition and lowered wages. And it was in such class and status conflict that the peculiar brand of Australian xenophobia was nurtured.

Ironically, assisted immigration and transportation both swelled the ranks of the working class and gave it leaders. In the late 1830s, unemployment in England produced mass demonstrations and Chartist agitation, and one response to this was the steady transfer of working class leaders 'to gaols and convict transports; Australia harvested in the late 'thirties a richer crop of "political" exiles than had appeared during the whole of the forty-odd years since the "Scottish martyrs" were transported in 1794'.¹⁸ Thus there was the paradox of the workers' movement recruiting members from the ranks of those they opposed.

It was the need to relieve unemployment at home that persuaded the British to end transportation in 1840: they considered the mitigation of working class distress a more pressing problem than emptying the prisons.¹⁹

But the arrival of many distressed persons in the colony, who were then unwilling to leave the towns for jobs in country areas, provoked colonial employers to complain that England was merely dumping its dispirited poor. To some extent these accusations reflected landowners' views, as they were not getting the agricultural labour they called for, but between 1832 and 1836 the association between immigration and the workhouse was fostered by female immigration, which included many destitute. Throughout the 1830s the Commissioners of Emigration were inundated with requests for assistance from London poorhouses and workhouses.²⁰

Given the source of immigrants, complaints about their unsuitability for pioneering agricultural work are not surprising. In the nineteenth century Britain was industrializing: what surplus population there was

existed in cities. Most agricultural labourers and farmers who wished to emigrate went to Canada or the United States of America, and the lack of suitable applicants for Australia meant that regulations were relaxed and many paupers sent.

Depression in the 1840s interrupted immigration aid for a number of years, but pastoralists still clamoured for labour, even though there was unemployment in Sydney, Port Phillip and Adelaide. Ruling class views were echoed in a Legislative Council Committee Report of 1845 to the effect that vast quantities of labourers and servants could be absorbed in the colony, but workers protested that this was nothing less than a scheme for flooding the colony with cheap labour in order to lower wages.²¹

The Government hesitated, mainly through lack of funds, and landowners turned again to procuring Asian labour. During this decade, Lord Stanley encouraged the importation of Chinese coolies to north Queensland, but none was Government assisted. Pastoralists made their own arrangements and coolies began to arrive in 1848. In following years some thousands were landed at Sydney, Port Phillip and Moreton Bay, but not all proved successful shepherds.²²

Worker agitation against the coolie traffic persisted, but it was not until after the Chinese flooded the goldfields that official moves were taken to end their importation by private employers. In 1854, a Select Committee appointed to consider Asiatic Labour heard submissions, and eventually recommended that as a number of experiments had proved disappointing, and with an increase in immigration from the United Kingdom, 'all ideas of a renewal of Asiatic immigration, at private expense, will be abandoned'.²³

Another division in the colonial work force at this time was between English and Irish. This also concerned wages and conditions of work. After the 1846 potato famine in Ireland, the numbers of the Australian bound traffic swelled, and the proportion of Irish was soon high enough to cause hostile comment in the colonial press. This antagonism originated in Britain where the wretched conditions of the British labourers were 'as nothing compared with that of the Irish peasant . . . who invaded England in thousands every year at harvest time, and forced down the wages and standard of living of the English agricultural labourers'.²⁴ Once in the colonies, grievances easily revived if given a chance, and they persisted in Australia in class and status differences, although the Irish never formed communities of the kind they did in America.

To the south, in Van Dieman's Land, free immigration was not a big enterprise. There was more than enough convict labour in the 1840s, for instance, for free labourers to protest at employers' taking advantage of the cheaper workers.²⁵ In Western Australia on the other hand, early hopes of avoiding convicts were not fulfilled. Labour became so short that colonists petitioned for convicts and some were sent from

1850, an arrangement that suited the British authorities who were having trouble with crowded gaols.

In South Australia the situation resembled more the Eastern colonies, although the Province had been settled without convicts and had witnessed a substantial German immigration, sponsored initially by a private capitalist, G. F. Angas in 1838. The Wakefield scheme was given full rein, but lack of Government funds marred the expectations of free arrivals in the 1840s, when they landed to find unemployment in the towns. But the land-grabbing of the East was not repeated, and the smaller farmer thrived in a sense he never did in New South Wales or Victoria.²⁶

In the 1840s, the squatters of the more populous Eastern colony were preoccupied with land as well as labour, and demonstrated their strength in battles with Governor Gipps. The landowners resented provisions introduced by the Imperial Land Act of 1842, including an increase in the minimum price per acre for Crown land. Select Committees appointed in 1843 and 1847 by the Legislative Council to investigate the land question favoured the squatters, and the eventual effect of the legislation was to give impetus to expansion as men moved beyond the limits of location.²⁷

Additional proposals for leasing colonial waste lands, introduced in 1845, again angered the pastoralists who petitioned the Colonial Secretary; they also gained support for their cause in England. When Earl Grey became Chief Secretary for the Colonies in the course of these wrangles, he gave a sympathetic ear to the squatters' cause and argued for concessions. A new Act of 1846 was then passed and the Orders in Council required to bring it into operation 'conceded practically every point for which the squatters had been contending'.²⁸

In favouring the squatters, Earl Grey was not neglecting interests closer to home. As Coghlan comments, 'It had been suggested that the granting of large concessions to the squatters would enable them to receive convicts as servants, thus relieving the Home Government of the great difficulty it was experiencing in disposing of its prison population'.²⁹

In short, the question of reviving transportation was in the air, and feelers were going out to test opinion. Employers welcomed the idea but the workers did not, and once again the battle lines were drawn between classes over convict labour.

At several public meetings, the mechanics of Melbourne protested against the exile scheme. In Sydney, the chief opposition came from representative men of the immigrant class who argued that 'in general, adoption of the new scheme would utterly destroy the value of free labour and annihilate wages'.³⁰ But the workers did not yet have the franchise and their views both in England and the colony carried little weight. The first lot of exiles were landed at Port Phillip in

November 1844. Over the next few years until 1848, 1,568 were introduced. The early arrivals went to rural areas; pastoralists took to hiring them direct from the ships, which infuriated the Melbourne workers. But the exiles were not altogether constant employees; many returned to the towns, so their status was quickly altered to ensure that their tickets-of-leave gave them freedom only on condition they stayed in assigned districts.

Because the first exiles got jobs quickly, Gladstone regarded the scheme as a success and issued proposals for sending more. When Gladstone's text was made public in the colony, renewed worker agitation broke out, especially from free immigrants who formed themselves into a large and compact body of opposition to transportation. Some members of the 1847 Legislative Council began to have second thoughts about the exile plan, and criticized the whole system of transportation and assignment. But labour was short again the following year and Gladstone's plan was reconsidered. Even the press favoured the prospect, the *Australian* of 7 April 1848, commenting:

In place, therefore, of the dribbling system of shipping small drafts at broken intervals, we say to England, Ship all your Crime and Poverty, which, whilst they reduce the remuneration of labour and lower the standard of comfort and subsistence at home, will produce a directly opposite effect if deported to a labour market where the demand may truly be described as unlimited . . . Let our boundless labour fields be made available in the fullest extent for those millions of our starving and criminal brethren for whom England has hitherto provided no other place of refuge than—The Union or the New Bastille, the Spital of the Gaol.³¹

In the course of Legislative Council deliberations on convicts in 1848 and 1849, an anti-transportation league was formed 'to oppose by every legal and constitutional means the revival of transportation',³² but Earl Grey heeded only the employers' pleas and sent more exiles. In 1849 a shipload of convicts arrived in Melbourne where it was greeted with protests, and it was clear that such arrivals in Sydney would meet the same fate. The press had changed its tune as well. This time the *Sydney Herald* of 27 February 1849, declared such shipments were unjust, and exposed 'our untainted labourers, our free immigrants' to 'the hateful competition of ticket-of-leave holders'.³³

A new Legislative Council met on 15 May, 1849, and did not accede to renewal of transportation. But convicts were already en route to Sydney, and upon the arrival of the ship, *Hashemy*, carrying 212 convicts, Sydney people 'were lashed into a fever of excitement, and a great public meeting was convened . . . The Governor . . . saw fit to forbid the landing of the convicts . . . not caring to face the obloquy and public indignation which the adoption of any other course would certainly have brought upon him'.³⁴ A compromise was eventually reached whereby the convicts were quietly removed from the ship and

dispersed in areas away from Sydney. But in 1850 there was more protest against convicts, and over 35,000 people petitioned against transportation, representing more than two-thirds of the population of the metropolis. With the weight of public opinion against it, transportation to New South Wales and its dependencies was absolutely and finally abolished from April 1851.

Working class protest had a powerful effect on this issue, as it was to have in later years against assisted British immigration, against the Chinese, and in the next century against southern European immigrants, all of whom were seen as threatening wages and working conditions.

Between 1788 and 1851 the bulk of those coming to the colony were convicts and assisted British immigrants. Authorities differ in their figures but Burton's estimate of net immigration for the period is 317,000, as indicated in the table below.

AUSTRALIAN POPULATION GROWTH AND NET IMMIGRATION 1788-1851⁸⁵

I Period	II Population at end of Period	III Increase during Period	IV Net Immi- gration during Period	Percentage of IV to III
1788-1811	11,875	11,875	10,000	84
1812-1821	35,492	24,000	18,000	75
1822-1831	75,981	40,000	30,000	75
1832-1841	220,968	145,000	116,000	80
1842-1851	437,665	217,000	143,000	66
	Total:	437,875	317,000	

Of these 317,000, at least 128,356 were free assisted, and about 130,000 convicts came before transportation stopped.⁸⁶ The total foreign-born in Eastern Australia in 1851 did not exceed 3,500, most of whom came between 1847 and 1851, but a larger concentration existed in South Australia where by mid-century there were about 10,000 Germans settled.⁸⁷ In 1850, the total population of Australia was approximately 406,000, with three-quarters of it concentrated in the Eastern colonies.⁸⁸ And until mid-century the only non-Europeans that appeared in the colonies were indentured workers who, like convicts, were the bearers of the lowest status.

The growing solidarity that appeared among workers in the 1830s gathered strength in the 1840s along with the fight against transportation and coolie labour. A petition signed by 2,856 Sydney workers in 1840 protested against the Masters' and Servants' Act.³⁹ And in 1843 a Trade Protection Society was formed in Sydney. That same year a Committee of the New South Wales Legislative Council was appointed 'to take into consideration a petition from upwards of 4,000 of the inhabitants

of Sydney, soliciting the attention of the Council to the distressed condition of the numerous unemployed artisans and labourers in the city of Sydney'.⁴⁰ Also in 1843, there was a petition from the working class to Governor Gipps denouncing the coolie importations.⁴¹

But the working class could not maintain a completely solid front against the employers. New immigrants posed a constant threat, and as pastoralists fought for land and tried to wrest control of immigration from the Imperial authorities, the colonial workers remained divided against themselves. The division within the working class over the question of cheap labour, first manifested in competition between two kinds of Englishmen, bond and free, characterized the colonial working class throughout the last century. And divisions between Australian and immigrant workers persisted after Federation until the second World War.

In the second half of the nineteenth century, the power to legislate on immigration was transferred to the colonial parliaments, and these tried to replace the Wakefield dominated systems by schemes which would satisfy colonial demands rather than British opinion as to which of its population was dispensable. But employers remained the real advocates of assistance. As the century wore on, immigration became more and more an issue over which capitalist and worker clashed head on.

1851-1900: Whites, Chinese and Kanakas

Political agitation in the colonies during the 1840s culminated in The Australian Colonies Government Act, 1850, and within the next decade the colonies achieved responsible government and adult male franchise. The colonial economic base remained the pastoral industry. In 1850, there was as yet 'no strong middle class either of small landholders or of urban artisans, shopkeepers and merchants who could challenge the economic and political power of the pastoralists and large-scale farmers who were still the backbone of the colonial economy'.⁴² After the discovery of gold the socio-economic patterns became more complex as the economy diversified, yet the sharpness of the division between employer and employee remained.

After mid-century, voluntary immigration began to overshadow assisted immigration for the first time. In the 1850s the population increased to 1,168,000. The British accounted for 465,125 newcomers between 1850 and 1859, of whom 231,601 were assisted,⁴³ and until the 'eighties, assisted British immigration continued to supply over one-third of the total intake of immigrants: 'These assisted migrants, together with the majority of those who managed to pay their own passages, were men and women of limited capital who swelled the ranks of the labouring and artisan classes rather than of the owners of large properties'.⁴⁴ In addition, some charitable organizations 'helped' introduce the working classes to the colonies. These bodies saw their job as curing unemployment in Britain, providing a safety valve to

remove agitating workers, increasing the colonial population and thus providing markets for British goods.

But not all working class immigrants came assisted to Australia. Among the voluntary immigrants, many of whom came with capital, there were also some working class newcomers who paid their own fares. Most of the immigrant members of the Amalgamated Society of Engineers, for instance, including fitters, turners, smiths, patternmakers and other skilled craftsmen in the engineering trade, funded themselves. These men earned good money in England and were 'amongst the 10 to 15 per cent of the British working class who may be characterised as "labour aristocrats"'. Once in Australia, many of them adapted quickly to the colonial situation and identified with local workers who disapproved of State aided immigration. For example, an A.S.E. delegate to the Intercolonial Trades Union Congress in Adelaide in 1886 successfully moved 'that in the opinion of this Congress State-assisted immigration should be totally abolished throughout Australia'. In addition, warnings by colonial A.S.E. members, who were themselves subject to unemployment on occasions between 1851 and 1887, influenced the Home society's cautious attitude to emigration.⁴⁵

The foreigners in 1861 included 27,000 Germans and 39,000 Chinese in a total foreign-born population of 83,395, or 7.2 per cent of the total population, a percentage which steadily declined thereafter. But the unassisted Chinese created problems. By 1857, there were 40,000 in Victoria and this invasion provoked resentment and violence, as the Chinese were seen as competitors on the goldfields. The first Restriction Act against the Chinese was passed in Victoria in 1855, and similar legislation followed in South Australia in 1857 and New South Wales in 1861. But each of these colonies repealed its legislation once the Chinese threat appeared to wane: South Australia acted in 1861, Victoria in 1865 and New South Wales in 1867, and for ten years there were no restrictions against non-Europeans.

The decade 1851-61 saw a great dislocation of the population as men went after gold. When the fever abated, the problem was unemployment, as erstwhile miners looked for jobs in overcrowded cities—and ran into competition from new immigrants, many of them assisted. After the mid-1850s, when conditions deteriorated in the cities, workers became more vocal in their complaints against employers, against assisted immigrants whom they saw as competitors, against the Chinese who 'lowered the standard of living', and against the squatters who had taken up the land and left little suitable for the man returning from the diggings with some savings to start a small farm.

Growing unrest among workers also led to their increasing combination in New South Wales and Victoria in the 1850s and 1860s, and strikes were more common. In 1854, a Sydney newspaper, *The Operative*, appeared with its stated policy 'the dissemination of true

reports as to the wages actually paid in the colony, the direct representation of labour in the legislature, an altered immigration system, and the protection of the working class from the depreciation of the labour market by the introduction of inferior races'.⁴⁶

Problems resulting from a failure to dovetail assisted immigrants and labour shortages were recurrent in the Eastern colonies and in South Australia. In 1854, Victoria had too many immigrants so levied a tax on them and used the proceeds to relieve the destitute. In 1851 in Adelaide, the Government had to intervene with relief works for the unemployed, but by 1854 labour was so short employers were talking of introducing German, Indian and Chinese labour to ease the situation. Yet later the same year there was more unemployment when men returned from the diggings to Adelaide: there they opposed wage reductions and formed a Working Men's Association to pursue their objective. But they lost to employers as wages were reduced. In the following years more immigrants arrived to exacerbate the situation, and in 1859 a 'Political Association' was formed—one of its most important principles being that immigration at public expense should cease. In 1860 no money was appropriated for immigration in South Australia although some was made available in 1861.⁴⁷

In Melbourne, by 1855, there was growing feeling among workers and the unemployed that the land system was the root of their troubles. Then in 1857 unemployment swelled with the arrival of more assisted immigrants. Public meetings were held to petition for relief in the towns and to criticize continued aid for immigration. After 1857 it was clear that strong worker opposition to any form of assisted immigration had begun to affect government policy. In 1858, only a small sum was granted for assistance.⁴⁸

There were similar developments in Sydney. In 1858, a deputation of unemployed waited on the Premier and were offered relief work in the country. The men did not want to go bush any more than they did in Victoria, and as conditions worsened, the Legislative Assembly appointed a Committee to 'report on the condition of the working classes in Sydney'. The Report, presented in April, 1860, strengthened the case of the unemployed who again petitioned parliament to act. To alleviate the situation, the immigration vote was cut by half. The opening of the Snowy River goldfield in October 1860 caused a rush to the diggings, where anti-Chinese riots occurred, yet another manifestation of working class discontent.⁴⁹ Then in 1861 workers again petitioned the Legislative Assembly not to vote 'any sum during the present year, either by Estimate or Resolution, for assisted or any other kind of Immigration, as it is a direct interference with the labour market, and an unjust application of the public funds'.⁵⁰

In Western Australia, colonists supported assisted immigration, especially after men left for gold, because they disliked being associated

with convicts. But the first consignment of free settlers was an embarrassment: there was no demand for their services. In 1856, public works were opened for the destitute, many of whom were immigrant farm labourers employed only seasonally. In Tasmania there was a manpower shortage after men left for gold, then when wages rose employers called for more immigrants and convict labor. But by 1857 there was depression, and convicts as well as the free had trouble finding jobs.⁵¹

By the 1860s the land question was as crucial as immigration in the Eastern states. The squatters still had a hold over most of the best country and their stand for pre-emptive rights was inimical to the development of small-scale farming. Both the New South Wales and Victorian governments attempted to reframe land policy to create a yeomanry, but as land was made more easily available to the small man, it was so much easier for the big man to acquire, and thus began a constant battle between the squatters and selectors.⁵² Subsequently, agricultural settlement fared better in Victoria, as their squatters had less government support than in New South Wales, but both in quantity and quality, South Australia was ahead of other colonies in the agricultural field until late in the century.

New land regulations in Western Australia resulted in many small lots being sold to men of working class background. This development from hired hand to small landowner was unlike the picture in the east, where the selectors lacked capital and had 'to mortgage their land to provide necessary equipment, and in many cases pioneered the soil without gain to themselves'.⁵³ Tasmanian legislation aimed at making land more readily available to the small man also ended in contrary developments: 'the yeoman farmer was conspicuously absent, the only small farmers in the colony were tenants, and there was not any large number of these'.⁵⁴

Despite belated attempts to unlock the land and create a yeomanry, the colonial governments on the whole failed to accomplish their aim, particularly in the eastern states: the result of most of the legislation of the period was the formation of large freehold estates financed from England. As Fitzpatrick notes: 'The Forbes Act of 1834, which encouraged the importation of British capital; Wentworth's 1843 Liens on Wool Act, which facilitated the application of such capital; and the Selection Acts of the 'sixties, which indirectly had the effect of mortgaging the pastoralists still further to "finance capital", which provided them with the means of protecting their estates,' were all legislative steps towards subordinating the producers to the financiers.⁵⁵

Although the Australian economy remained one of primary production, manufacturing grew in the decades after 1850, and mining expanded, with major enterprises like BHP and Mt Morgan. Railway construction went ahead, financed with British capital, and there was development of shipping and telegraphic communications. Despite this diversification, the Land Acts of the 1860s helped perpetuate traditional

inequalities. With the end of transportation and the influx of immigrants looking for gold, free labour replaced bond, but the battle between worker and employer continued, as did working class antagonism towards assisted immigration. This opposition reached considerable proportions in the next three decades, coinciding with the largest yet influx of British immigrants. Between 1860 and 1889 a total of 732,952 arrived, of whom 392,358 were assisted.⁵⁶

Although many of these British immigrants eventually became absorbed into the Australian wage-earning fraternity, and protested in turn against arrivals more recent than themselves, there remained a continual cleavage in the working class at this time between colonial worker and British assisted immigrant. In short, the employers' search for cheaper and more abundant labour, and consequently their advocacy of assisted immigration, divided colonial worker from potential British competitor.

New South Wales workers agitated against assisted immigration in 1865, 1866, and in 1870. Coghlan argues that in the 1870 dispute, employers, in supporting a Bill to promote immigration, 'were still hankering after a return to the rates of wages in the period anterior to the gold discoveries, and indulged the delusion, not uncommon amongst their class in all countries, that the rewards of capital directly correspond with the extent to which wages can be depressed'.⁵⁷ Trade union leaders advocated the abolition of assisted immigration, and in correspondence with English unionists complained that 'the Colony of New South Wales has been getting gradually worse these last seven years, chiefly owing to the great amount of immigration and the falling off in the goldfields, and more so through the great amount of importation of every article we left our own homes to come here to manufacture'.⁵⁸

The workers' plight at this time received a comment from Marx, who was finishing Volume One of *Capital*. He denounced the colonial governments' shameless 'lavishing of uncultivated colonial land on aristocrats and capitalists' as it had produced 'in conjunction with the stream of men that the gold-diggings attract, and with the competition that the importation of English commodities causes even to the smallest artisan, an ample "relative surplus labouring population", so that almost every mail brings the Job's news of a "glut of the Australian labour-market", and prostitution in some places there flourishes as wantonly as in the London Haymarket'.⁵⁹

Distress was not confined to New South Wales. In 1865, the South Australian government had to arrange housing for new arrivals, and by 1866 the excess of labour in Adelaide led to public protest and the formation of another 'Political Association' of working men whose object was 'the stoppage of immigration for the benefit of labouring men, and to place the whole question concerning labour fairly before the public . . .' Coghlan argues that although South Australian workers

did not take a prominent part in land and tariff legislation, like their fellows in the east 'the conduct of immigration was almost entirely decided by their action'.⁶⁰ Aid was stopped in 1860, resumed in 1862, but not revived again after 1867 until 1873.

Assistance in South Australia finally ended in 1886, but not before the Province had experimented with coolie immigration to work the Northern Territory. Some Chinese were brought to Palmerston but did not please the planners, so Indian labour was considered as a substitute. A Coolie Immigration Act was passed in 1882, but administrative problems arose concerning the Indian Government's requirements for coolie importation, and the plan was stillborn. Adelaide workers did not approve the coolie idea, nor did they take kindly to three shiploads of British assisted immigrants arriving in 1883 in the middle of a depression. Following a public outcry, the Government decided to end financial assistance to immigration altogether in 1886.⁶¹

Meetings of the unemployed were also held in Melbourne throughout the 1860s to denounce assisted immigration—on one occasion labelled as 'the most wicked thing imaginable'. In 1870, a 'Protection and Anti-State-Immigration League' was formed and spokesmen referred to the aims of assisted immigration as 'obtaining cheap labour for the squatters . . . and as procuring a large town population in order to advance the price of beef and mutton'.⁶² In 1872, the policy of assisted immigration was abandoned in Victoria. But not without a last plea from rural employers in 1874, who petitioned for renewal of aid. The Trades Council immediately condemned the move and claimed the petition was 'an endeavour to cause an influx of skilled as well as agricultural labour, to the detriment of the working classes of the Colony'.⁶³ The aid was not renewed.

In the 1860s, Western Australia was still receiving convicts, but that colony seems not to have been an attractive prospect for free immigrants; only about 200 a year came. Conditions were rather depressed in Tasmania as well, and the unemployed regularly protested at the arrival of assisted immigrants.

Queensland's first parliament had met in 1860, after separation from New South Wales in 1859, and immediately arranged with the Emigration and Land Commissioners in London to send immigrants. Land-order schemes were adopted to facilitate settlement of small farmers, but not all immigrants settled on the land, and in many cases squatters purchased the land orders and the new arrivals stayed in the city. Recent immigrants increased unemployment in 1866, when the colony was undergoing financial and credit crises, and workers then formed a Land and Emigration League, the principal object of which was to stop assisted immigration. Assistance was temporarily suspended, but after gold discoveries in 1867 it was revived in 1868, and extended to German immigrants as well as British.⁶⁴ But the immigration that coloured Queensland's history from the 1860s was the Kanaka experiment, begun

in 1863 with Pacific Island labour for the sugar plantations and first introduced by a private capitalist, Captain Towns.⁶⁵

The wish for convict labour had been one reason for Queensland's separation from New South Wales, and when this was not available the colony turned elsewhere. Without labour, the planters argued, capital would not be forthcoming to develop the new sugar and cotton industries. First, in 1862, legislation provided for the introduction of Indian coolies to help develop the hot north, but nothing eventuated because of stringent Indian governmental requirements, and Queensland looked to the South Seas for substitutes. Until 1868 and the passing of The Polynesian Labourers' Act, the Kanaka trade was conducted without any regulations, and the labourers had no protection from abuses.

In the 1860s and 1870s, the pastoralists and planters were all-powerful in parliament and only gradually was the working-class voice heard. Opposition to cheap Island or Indian labour carried little weight at first while labourers were so short, but Queensland workers objected to the traffic both on moral grounds and because of the effect on work and wages: in 1866 public protest meetings were held, and in 1868 a petition 'regarded with dismay the introduction of an inferior and uncivilized race into this colony to supplant the British and European labourers . . . who have been induced to emigrate here in large numbers in the hope of finding . . . an independent home and permanent employment'.⁶⁶

The Government legislated for protecting the Kanakas in 1868 but abuses continued, despite subsequent amendments and further legislation restricting their recruitment in 1877 and 1880. In 1885, a time limit was set concerning the introduction of Islanders, and a Bill was passed making their importation illegal after the end of 1890. Subsequent legislation in 1892 permitted a more gradual ending to this traffic in order to facilitate the transition in the sugar industry to smaller farms and white labour. The Labor Party opposed this compromise but recruiting was permitted again in 1892. Finally in 1901, legislation was introduced prohibiting the trade in Islanders after 1904 and providing for their repatriation by 1906.⁶⁷

Queensland planters had also tried for Indian and Chinese coolies in the 1870s, but due to the government's unwillingness to accept responsibility for their introduction, the plan failed. In the 1880s, planters again renewed their efforts to get Asiatics when the Government attempted to limit the employment of Kanakas. But when Griffith became Premier in 1883, the whole question of importing coolies was abandoned and another alternative presented: the Immigration Act of 1882 was amended to allow indentured labourers from Europe to be introduced in order to ease the planters' loss of Island labour. Colonists hoped Germans would come but the German Government refused to permit its subjects to indenture themselves to foreign masters. Attempted agreements with Scandinavian countries met with no better success.⁶⁸

Not all Queensland's efforts to obtain European labour for the sugar industry failed. In 1883, private employers imported Maltese to replace Kanakas, and in 1891 the Government assisted 335 agricultural labourers from Italy to work as cane-cutters on the northern plantations.⁶⁹ These southern Europeans became successors to the Kanakas and their low status, when they appeared willing to work for less than Australian workers. They also became the target for working class hostility as they became the source of cheap labour.

As in the other colonies, working class opposition to State-aided immigrants continued in New South Wales. In 1877, the Trades and Labor Council and the Working Men's Defence Association vigorously protested against assisted immigration, and at the elections of the same year, Parkes lost his seat in East Sydney when he supported immigration—although he was later successful in a country constituency. A slight increase in prosperity during 1882 induced the Government to ignore working class opposition and assist immigrants, but when conditions declined from 1885 the Government was more cautious, and eventually ended assistance by 1887.

Like the mainland colonies, Tasmania's immigration history was one of fits and starts, with labour shortages one year and jobless men the next. Then with the boost in mining after 1876, immigrants poured in, including the Chinese. While jobs were available there was peace, but by 1885 unemployment hit the towns and agitation against Chinese began. Restrictive legislation against them was passed in 1885, but British immigrants were also seen to be threatening working conditions and assistance to them stopped in 1891.

Western Australia, like South Australia, imported Asian labour as a solution to the rural labour shortage. Initially, employers in the west brought in coolies without Government assistance, but in 1878 the Legislative Council voted money for some Chinese, despite working class protests. The immigrants arrived in 1879 but engaged in pearling and timber getting, rather than agricultural employment, and the Governor objected and ended coolie importation for the time being. But in the 1880s, the development of the Kimberley District was accompanied by the introduction of more Asiatics, as authorities believed that whites could not work in hot areas. In 1882, the Imported Labour Registry Act of 1874 was amended to regulate the conditions under which private employers could introduce Asian labour under contract, and Chinese were brought to the west up until the 1890s. But after gold was discovered in the Kimberley District in 1886, the Government became alarmed at the increase in Chinese and instituted some restrictive measures against them. Those Chinese who left the north and settled in Perth took up market gardening and furniture making and, in the latter occupation particularly, incurred the wrath of white urban workers, as well as criticism from the Eastern states.⁷⁰

Queensland and Western Australia were the only two states to continue assistance to immigrants, mainly British, throughout the 19th century. Working class opposition to this, as well as to the Kanaka trade, continued, and at times the Government's response was to cut the immigration vote, or temporarily stop financial aid, which it did in 1893 in Queensland. But assistance revived again in 1896. As in the other colonies, Queensland's policy reflected immediate conditions in the colony, and adjustments were periodically made to immigration regulations to fulfil employers' requirements, to prevent abuses of the land order system, and to cope with the Chinese.

Between 1875 and 1877 the increase of Chinese on the Palmer goldfields from 1,800 to 17,000 alarmed the colony, especially as there were only 1,400 whites there. And in 1877 the Chinese Immigration Restriction Act was passed. The Queensland experience and the introduction of coolies into the Kimberley District revived anti-Chinese feeling in other states, and by 1888 all colonies had agreed on legislation excluding them. One event that precipitated this action was the employment in 1878, of Chinese seamen at less than union rates on some of the Australasian Steam Navigation Company's vessels. This was the oldest, richest and most powerful shipping company in Australia: white seamen went on strike and gained the sympathy of other workers, 15,000 of whom signed a petition in New South Wales after a meeting held under the auspices of the Trades and Labor Council. The strike ended in a compromise, but 'the strength of the feeling aroused in all the self-governing Colonies by this Australian Company's attempt to employ cheap Chinese labour, ensured the indirect success of the strikers'.⁷¹

Another incident in 1888 that hastened the general restrictive measures against the Chinese was the arrival in Melbourne of the *Afghan*, carrying Chinese, some of whose naturalization papers were fraudulent. They were not allowed to land, and the ship sailed for Sydney where it was met by public fury and insistence that the Premier immediately exclude the immigrants. Parkes refused them permission to land and tried to push restrictive legislation through parliament. He did not succeed, and after legal action some of the Chinese were permitted to remain in Sydney. Nevertheless Parkes' move had partly quelled the violent reaction, but public feeling ran high, undoubtedly precipitated by the arrival of thousands more Chinese that same year in Port Darwin.⁷²

This anti-Asian sentiment crystallized in legislation against others besides the Chinese; they included Afghans, Japanese and Punjabi Indians who began to wander into the continent in the 1880s and 1890s. At the Intercolonial Conference in 1896, the State Premiers decided that restrictions imposed against Chinese should be extended 'to all coloured races' and, with modifications to accommodate Treaty interests and Japanese objections, they were. Then Federal legislation

in the form of the Immigration Restriction Act, 1901, effectively closed the door to Asiatic labour.

The late nineteenth century restrictive measures against coloured labour coincided with similar restrictions in North America, and with fears of Japanese power in the Pacific. But in addition they also followed the winding up of most assisted British immigration into Australia, and accompanied a period of colonial depression with increasing working-class unrest in the 1890s.

Many scholars have emphasized connections between the development of the 'White Australia' policy, the growth of the Labour movement and the impetus towards Federation at the end of the century, but it is important to stress, as well, the extent to which decades of protest against assisted British immigrants contributed to the end-of-century movements. As Manning Clark has recorded: 'Working class opposition to assisted immigration was often written into the platforms or resolutions of the early trade unions. Item number 8, for example, on the agenda of the Second Intercolonial Trades Union Congress [in 1884] was: Abolition of Assisted Immigration'.⁷³

The intensified class conflict of the 1890s and the 'White Australia' movement can thus be seen as a culmination of earlier battles in which the working class had fought against employers' efforts to keep wages low by introducing an abundant supply of *all kinds of labour* through immigration.

The last decade of the nineteenth century was profoundly distressing. Although Queensland and Western Australia still encouraged and assisted immigration, Australia as a whole started to lose people by emigration. Depression and financial crises affected all colonies, and bitter confrontation between Capital and Labour began with the 1890 Maritime Strike. The chief disputes thereafter included the Queensland shearers' strikes in 1891 and 1894, and the Broken Hill miners' strike of 1892. Despite increasing unionization, particularly in the 1880s, Labour eventually lost, in that workers' demands were often ignored, wages were reduced in many industries, and the trade unions exhausted their funds.

The socio-economic life of Australia had undergone some changes in the half century since 1850 but these were not radical. Mining, shipping and industry had expanded but the manufactories of the continent were still domestic industries, and inter-colonial tariff discrimination restricted the Australian market. In 1891 the percentage of breadwinners engaged in primary production was 30.7 per cent and the percentages engaged in the commercial and industrial categories were 12.2 per cent and 30.7 per cent respectively.⁷⁴ But the men of property and privilege had not disappeared: 'The truth is that the century [ended] with neither their economic nor their political power seriously threatened'. Economic expansion had provided the setting in which some political and social

reforms could be made but 'without sacrifice by or danger to the existing order'.⁷⁵

Many of the workers who took part in the prolonged industrial action of the 1890s and in the anti-Asian protests were immigrants themselves. And of the total net immigration of 1,320,000 between 1851 and 1900, 575,000 of the total arrivals were assisted.⁷⁶ From 1873 onward new members were still entering the Australian trade unions fresh from those of Great Britain, but these British workers did not form a permanent, physically differentiated minority group; they became in time indistinguishable from those white Australians born locally.

AUSTRALIAN POPULATION GROWTH AND NET IMMIGRATION 1852-1900⁷⁷

Period	Population at end of Period	Increase		Migration as % of Overall Increase	
		Overall	Natural	Net	
1852-1861	1,168,000	730,000		554,000	76
1861-1870	1,647,756	502,170	335,610	166,560	33
1871-1880	2,231,531	583,770	391,970	191,800	37
1881-1890	3,151,355	919,820	537,080	382,740	42
1891-1900	3,765,339	613,980	589,110	24,870	4

The 1891 population of the continent was 3,174,392 of which 5 per cent were foreign-born: these included 45,570 Germans, 32,525 Chinese, 16,512 Scandinavians, 3,890 Italians and 878 Greeks. In the decade 1891-1901 immigration declined; net immigration increased the population by only 25,000.⁷⁸

As the twentieth century progressed and the proportions of German, Scandinavian and Chinese declined, and as coloured labour was excluded, the immigrants who came to occupy the despised status of 'competitor' and 'cheap labourer' were those from southern Europe who came to replace the Kanakas and whose numbers gradually began to increase.

1901-1940: British and Southern Europeans

Immigration into Australia from Federation until the second World War was predominantly British and assisted: and assistance was confined almost solely to the British. Between 1901 and 1940 a total of 381,645 were assisted of a total net gain through immigration of 626,800.

NOMINATED AND SELECTED MIGRATION 1901-1940⁷⁹

Period	Total Assisted	Total Net Immigration
1901-05		16,700
1906-10		57,300
1911-15	150,554	136,900
1916-20	11,631	70,700
1921-25	115,448	183,200
1926-30	99,403	129,700
1931-35	781	-10,800 (minus)
1936-40	3,828	43,100

There was also a trickle of non-British, although the foreign-born in 1921 amounted to 157,407, or only 2.9 per cent of the total population, compared with 5 per cent foreign-born in 1891. The numbers of Germans, Scandinavians and Chinese steadily declined after 1891 and the foreigners whose numbers increased were Italians and Greeks, who by the 1920s, through a process of chain migration, had already formed the nuclei around which later southern European settlement developed.⁸⁰

SOUTHERN EUROPEAN MALE SETTLERS IN AUSTRALIA 1890-1940⁸¹

Italians	25,680
Greeks	10,260
South Slavs	6,010
Albanians	1,280
Maltese	2,600
Spanish, Portuguese and French	1,900
<i>Total</i>	<u>47,730</u>

From 1788 to 1940, according to Geyl, the total net immigration into Australia was 2,230,240. And for that period, Borrie estimates that 1,068,311 immigrants were assisted.⁸³

Not for a moment can one deny the great variety in the lives and experiences of immigrants to this country,⁸⁴ but at the same time there remain certain persistent structural relations in Australian social life which have influenced the introduction and reception of immigrants, and have shaped the immigrants' endeavours in their new land and the Australians' attitude to them. Not least is the relation between employer and employee.

Provided foreigners conformed to economic standards and remained

NET IMMIGRATION BY NATIONALITY 1921-40⁸²

Nationality	Period	Numbers	Per cent of Total Gain or Loss
British	1921-25	152,290	84.8
	1926-30	100,889	80.9
	1931-35	-10,390	-95.4
	1936-40	14,665	34.0
U.S.A.	1921-25	2,732	1.5
	1926-30	691	0.5
	1931-35	-54	-0.5
	1936-40	492	1.14
French	1921-25	419	0.2
	1926-30	53	0.0
	1931-35	87	0.8
	1936-40	2	0.0
German	1921-25	194	0.1
	1926-30	1,184	1.0
	1931-35	152	1.4
	1936-40	7,302	16.9
Greek	1921-25	3,391	1.9
	1926-30	1,774	1.4
	1931-35	-194	-1.8
	1936-40	3,478	8.1
Italian	1921-25	13,582	7.6
	1926-30	10,446	8.4
	1931-35	1,523	14.0
	1936-40	7,650	17.7
Yugoslav	1921-25	412	0.2
	1926-30	2,116	1.7
	1931-35	-39	-0.4
	1936-40	1,600	3.7
Other European	1921-25	7,616	4.2
	1926-30	8,294	6.7
	1931-35	-43	-3.9
	1936-40	7,039	16.3
Total European	1921-25	180,636	100.5
	1926-30	125,447	100.6
	1931-35	-9,346	-85.8
	1936-40	42,228	97.9
Non-European	1921-25	-968	-0.5
	1926-30	-797	-0.7
	1931-35	-1,540	-14.15
	1936-40	900	2.1
Total	1921-25	179,668	100
	1926-30	124,650	100
	1931-35	-10,886	100
	1936-40	43,128	100

in occupations where they did not compete with Australian labour, little overt hostility was directed against them. By contrast Italians who settled in Western Australia early in this century and in Queensland in

the 'twenties showed little tendency to conform to accepted Australian social standards and also competed with Australian wage-earners by working as labourers in lower-paid occupations at times when unemployment threatened'.⁸⁵ This Italian competition eventually gave rise to three official enquiries, two in Western Australia in 1902 and 1904, and one in Queensland in 1925. These investigations, like their nineteenth century predecessors into transportation, coolie immigration, the Chinese, and the Kanakas, focused on the role of immigrant and alien labour, and revealed again the persistent conflict between employer and employee, which also manifested itself in bitter competition between workers.

Most Italian immigrants first worked as unskilled labourers after they arrived, although many reached independent status later by buying small farms or shops, despite the fact that in 1933 over 40 per cent of the Italians in the country could not read or write English. In the eastern states, Italians largely concentrated in catering occupations in cities, fruit and vegetable vending in suburbs, market gardening in outer metropolitan areas and farming in rural areas. But in Queensland where they worked as cane-cutters, they competed with Australian labour. In Western Australia, many were engaged in timber cutting, fishing and mining, and as miners they also competed with Australians. In the West, Italians numbered 1,354 in 1901, and in 1911 there were almost 2,400 Italian-born, which constituted over one-third of the Australian total.⁸⁶

In Western Australia, employers sometimes used agents to recruit Italian labourers for the mines and for timber cutting, a practice Australian unions resented, especially during unemployment periods. A Commonwealth Royal Commission investigated this matter in 1902 and in its Report noted that most Italians worked for the same money as Australians, but in bad times accepted lower wages and living standards.

Similar questions were investigated in 1904 by a Western Australian Royal Commission, again precipitated by workers' agitation over Italians working for wages lower than those paid to Australians. This Report made clear that employers often preferred Italians because they were less militant, and there was also 'evidence that some employers tended to use Italian labour to split the solidarity of the Australian unions'.⁸⁷

Both Commissions established that some cases of wage undercutting were due to the Italians' ignorance of Australian working conditions, and that when they understood them, Italians worked to union regulations. The Reports also showed that Italians were not imported as contract labour but had immigrated with financial help from relatives and friends already established in Australia.

These immigrants were mostly men, unencumbered by wives and families and they formed 'a highly mobile labour force, turning their hands to almost any unskilled work as opportunity offered. To some extent southern Europeans who have arrived in Australia since 1947

have acted in the same way: they provide . . . in their first few years a labour force that is more willing to undertake hard jobs in hard conditions, and that moves much more easily in response to changes in the employment situation, than the native Australian population'.⁸⁸

Although the southern Europeans, particularly the Italians, occupied the low status of 'competitor' in the work force, the tensions produced by conflict between employers and employees were also kept alive by assisted British immigration, which revived again in New South Wales in 1906, in Victoria in 1907, in South Australia in 1911, and in Tasmania in 1912.

Between 1860 and 1914, Britain encouraged pauper emigration through its Boards of Guardians in England and Wales. This was supplemented by the work of various distress committees appointed in the United Kingdom under the Unemployed Workmen Act in 1905. Before the first World War, about 8,000 immigrants were helped to Australia by these committees, and the Australians were not very happy about these newcomers. The paupers came in addition to those arriving under the systems of Government immigration.⁸⁹

The largest immigration from the United Kingdom had occurred from 1860 to 1889, but another spurt between 1906 and 1914 brought 393,943 souls from Britain, of whom 184,605 were assisted. Most of these arrivals went to the Eastern states, and the official emphasis was on land settlement. In Victoria, for instance, the 'reintroduction of assistance in 1907 was publicly allied with the new rural policy . . . but the greater number of immigrants did not arrive with the intention of taking up land. They came mainly to work as farm labourers, domestic servants or skilled labourers'.⁹⁰ In South Australia, despite assistance after 1911, not many settlers arrived. More went to the West; and Tasmania, like South Australia, received few.

Until 1920, immigration from Britain was mainly an individual or family business; most immigrants came from working class and many were from depressed areas. Like their brethren in the last century, they were not very likely candidates for developing the pastoral and agricultural nation down south, although the Australian authorities supported land resumption for closer settlement. Yet State governments made no concerted efforts to implement such plans and the result was that newcomers found difficulties and delays in taking up land: 'few immigrants who began without capital managed to succeed, and fewer still did so without first acquiring some experience. At least several hundred pounds were necessary to take up even a small block of virgin land, in addition to the purchase money, which was rarely less than £1 per acre for Crown Lands. Very few of the immigrants had as much money, and very little of the land dispersed under the land order systems in Queensland, South Australia and Tasmania was actually settled by immigration'.⁹¹

In addition to an absence of government planning, neither employers

nor unions had any overall policy for absorbing new arrivals, most of whom stayed in the towns and cities. The Australian workers remained deeply concerned about the effects of immigration on their wages: 'on the other hand, no matter what form their arguments took and no matter what general principles they adduced to support their cause, the advocates of immigration were above all concerned to use immigration as a means of increasing the supply of labour'.⁹² Distrust of the employers' position fostered suspicion among workers. In 1916, for instance, rumours swept the country that 'interested parties' in Australia were importing Maltese as cheap labour to replace soldiers at the war. When a ship carrying Maltese arrived in Fremantle, W. M. Hughes refused it permission to land the immigrants. The ship eventually ended its voyage in Sydney where the Maltese were finally admitted only after guarantees of employment were made.⁹³

The war put an end to assisted immigration for some years, but at its conclusion the question of the need to develop and populate the continent, to be ready to repel external aggression, and to keep Australia white, continued to divide opinion into two distinct groups 'closely representative of the respective views of employers and wage-earners'.⁹⁴

After the war, the Federal Government for the first time took charge of immigration which was resumed in 1920, although assistance ended by the 1930s when depression hit the country. From 1920 onwards, developments were affected by two lots of governmental decisions. First, there was the grand plan of the Imperial and Dominion governments to resettle the whites of the Empire. Secondly, the American Government, by Acts of 1921 and 1924, restricted entry to the United States so the immigrant flow from southern Europe thereafter was diverted to Australia.

With the Empire Settlement Act of 1922, the loan agreements of 1925, and the Development and Migration Act of 1926, Britain and Australia planned to assist the overcrowded and oppressed British and settle them down in the open spaces of Australia. After the war Britain had over-population problems, and as Australian employers wanted labour the time was ripe for co-operation. The stress on land settlement was linked to hopes that 'the demand for British manufactured goods could be stimulated, while increased primary production in the Dominions would not only pay for these, but would also liquidate the loans spent on development'.⁹⁵

The rosy plans for this British immigration, subsidized by enormous borrowing, ended in failure. Between 1921 and 1925 although 183,000 British immigrants arrived, this was less than planned. Many of the land schemes were not an economic proposition: land settlement meant costly subdivision, which placed a burden on both government and settler. Many newcomers walked off the land in search of work, only to join the depression queues in the cities. For example, between 1904 and 1928, 15,999 settlers were placed on land in Victoria under the

closer settlement schemes, and between 1922 and 1927, a total of 14,000 left these rural areas for jobs in the towns and cities.⁹⁶ In the period 1921 to 1929, despite the high hopes for establishing thousands of small British farmers, the proportion of Australian population engaged in primary production declined and the proportion of industrial workers increased. By 1928-29, the proportion of total breadwinners engaged in industrial enterprises was 33.2 per cent and those in primary production only 22.6 per cent.⁹⁷

The non-British immigration of the 1920s was marked by a decline in northern Europeans and an increase in southern Europeans as the doors to America closed. Some Yugoslavs, Maltese, and Albanians, who came from places 'hardly heard of' arrived as often as not destitute, and became a burden on the government. But those who caused alarm were the Greeks and Italians. Greeks increased their numbers in the population from 3,650 in 1921 to 8,300 in 1933. Italians were more numerous: in 1921 they numbered 8,135 and in 1933 there were 26,756, making them the largest European group in Australia, and a third of them had settled in the sugar areas of Queensland.

This immigration was predominantly male and peasant in origin.⁹⁸ But the Greeks settled mainly in urban areas, entered catering businesses and did not become a main target for worker hostility: 'the Greeks have never entered occupations which have been keenly sought after by Australians, and hence they have seldom had to face opposition from either trade unions or employers' organizations. In this regard they were in a different position from the Italians who from their first settlement entered occupations, usually as employees, in direct competition with Australian labour'.⁹⁹

Italians had been encouraged to immigrate to the Queensland cane-fields, particularly after the Kanakas left in 1906: but from a minority who supplemented the labour force after the Islanders went, they became a torrent which threatened to create a surplus by the mid-1920s. They were willing to take other labouring jobs besides cane-cutting, and willing to accept any rate offered, and by living frugally many saved enough to pool their resources and buy farms. Some were landowners by 1925 but the main expansion into farming was after this date when 'their competition for land was one factor inflating the value of cane farms'.¹⁰⁰

By pouring into the sugar districts the Italians became a threat to workers and farmers alike: 'Australians now tended to assume that southern Europeans would be prepared to accept sub-Australian standards, and were therefore anxious to control the influx and to compel those already in the cane fields to accept union conditions. The employers, on the other hand, tended to see in the Italians and other southern Europeans a source of cheap and efficient labour which could replace coloured workers'.¹⁰¹

So great was the concern in Queensland in 1924 that the government appointed a Commissioner to investigate alien settlement in the north. The Ferry Report was published in 1925 and recorded the Australians' fear and suspicion of southern Europeans who accepted low wages too eagerly, worked too long hours, especially in the sugar plantations, and put their relatives to work for bed and board and not a proper wage.¹⁰² Ferry also echoed a preference for northern rather than southern Italians but 'failed to see that the Mediterranean immigrants he so criticized were nearly all in the first and most impoverished stage of settlement, whereas the North Italians he so praised were amongst the oldest established of Queensland's southern Europeans . . . and relatively far advanced along the road of prosperity'.¹⁰³

The Ferry Report clearly exposed Labor's attitude to southern European immigration. According to Phillips and Wood, the relative power of employers and wage-earners in Australia was 'shown by the fact that the immediate effect of the Ferry Report was a Federal Bill for the Restriction of Immigration, which was passed in 1925'.¹⁰⁴ Also contributing to this legislation was concern about unemployment in 1923 and 1924 amongst recently arrived southern European immigrants in the cities. The result was that quotas, already imposed on Maltese, were extended to Yugoslavs, Greeks and Albanians, and an arrangement with the Italian Government restricted entry of their nationals.

Other restrictions imposed on non-Britishers after Federation concerned property and occupational rights. In South Australia, Asiatic aliens could not acquire land after 1914 in irrigation areas. The Pearling Act of Western Australia, 1911, virtually excluded aliens from the pearling industry. But Queensland was the most exclusive of all. The Leases to Aliens Restrictions Act, 1912, prevented European aliens from acquiring leases of more than five acres unless the lessee passed a dictation test. And between 1913 and 1921 Queensland passed several Acts excluding foreigners from employment in the banana and sugar industries, in diary produce premises, in the construction or working of tramway and omnibus services, unless they had passed the dictation test. Although subsequent treaty rights and regulations precluded widespread application of these Acts, they were manifestations of an overriding intention to protect Australian working and living conditions.¹⁰⁵

A clear, outspoken Labor view on immigration was expressed at a World Migration Congress in 1926 when H. V. Evatt argued that there were two cardinal points in Australia's immigration policy. First, there was the 'White Australia' policy; secondly, 'opposition to "any immigration until and unless the existing land monopoly is broken up, work is made available to Australian unemployed, and the consent of the Australian trade unions is given to any scheme of migration"'. Dr. Evatt declared that migration was at best only a palliative, and that over-population and unemployment in Europe could only be cured by raising

the standard of living'.¹⁰⁶ In taking this line, Evatt stated the opinion of a minority group at the Conference who opposed the majority view, which supported freedom of migration subject only to temporary restrictions on economic grounds.

Between the wars, public antagonism against non-British in Australia occurred on several occasions. In September, 1919, for instance, fruit-growers on the Northern Rivers joined with the Murwillumbah RSL and Chamber of Commerce to request Federal and State legislation to prevent Chinese from acquiring land for banana growing. The NSW government noted the grievances but after an investigation declined to introduce legislation against the Chinese.¹⁰⁷ Other hostile reactions were directed against Italians. When they were used as strike breakers on Melbourne wharves, bomb outrages against Italians followed. In 1930, two shiploads of Italians were refused permission to land because of Australia's depressed economic conditions, and in 1934 ugly riots, reminiscent of the anti-Chinese riots on the gold diggings, broke out at Kalgoorlie, which indicated how readily 'the tense situation created by economic depression could be fanned into racial hatred'.¹⁰⁸ The fact that in the late 1920s Italians bought up and cultivated land which British immigrants, introduced under the Empire Settlement Scheme, had failed to farm profitably, increased hostility and envy of Italians during the depression years. Of the pre-1940 immigration, one-third of the southern Europeans eventually engaged in some form of farming activity. Of those naturalized, 25 per cent were farmers by 1946 and 11 per cent agricultural labourers. Not all had stayed in Queensland. Some migrated south to the Riverina district and to Victoria.¹⁰⁹

As Borrie has noted: 'The reactions revealed in the Ferry Report to the Italians and to other southern Europeans brought out the same attitudes as those which had moulded the "White Australia" policy. Now that the non-whites had been excluded by operation of that policy, the question was whether the admission of southern Europeans would not re-create the problem of a minority which would undermine economic standards and be culturally unassimilable'.¹¹⁰

These 'same attitudes' emerged because the southern Europeans, especially the Italians, were, like the Chinese, culturally distinct from Australians, predominantly male and, more importantly, filled the low status occupational niches associated with cheap labour and competition for jobs. Indeed, in their early days of settlement the Italians' simple living requirements and their penchant for long hours and hard work helped them the nickname 'the Chinese of Europe'.¹¹¹ Then, when they became independent, southern Europeans 'took up the mantle of the Chinese settlers of the nineteenth century, who, after the gold-rushes petered out, adopted market-gardening and catering as the most profitable fields for economic endeavour . . .'.¹¹² They also engaged in other types of farming. For example, there were Chinese farmers growing tobacco in the Ovens Valley late last century, and in the 1930s Italians

moved into this area where they first engaged in sharefarming. Then as the Italians moved into farm ownership, immigrants from Spain, Yugoslavia and Greece moved into sharefarming.¹¹³ In Griffith a similar sequence took place; the early northern Italians sharefarmed for Australians in the 1920s and 1930s and then later bought their own farms. There was animosity between Italians and Australians for a while, and this flared up again in Griffith in 1947 when returned soldiers became alarmed at the Italianization of the area. But by 1960 relations between these groups had greatly improved.¹¹⁴

In the Queensland sugar cane and banana areas, competition between Australian and Italian workers was repeated between Australian and Italian farmers, as it had been with the Chinese. In both cases, status conflict flourished where there was first competition for jobs and later competition for a living between small, and sometimes struggling, landowners. By contrast the German farming communities of South Australia, established away from Australian competition in the last century, and already declining by the first World War, did not reap such a harvest of hostility.

Before the second World War, Australian Labour was determined to avoid any policy which would allow into the country immigrants who might infringe the hard-won wage and living standards of Australian workers. Even the refugees of the late 1930s were suspect for a while. After the war the situation was considerably changed. There was an acute manpower shortage which not only induced acceptance of immigrants but brought forth active support for intensive post-war immigration from the Australian Labor Party and the unions.

Immigration apparently ceased to be a contentious issue between employers and employees. A survey of conditions up to 1954 inclined Borrie to comment on how quickly public opinion could change with regard to immigrants, and he argued that the strength of opposition in Australia to any European immigrant group at selected points of time was primarily a function of economic factors. The post-war change was thus closely connected with the fact that immigrants coming after the war had not seriously threatened unemployment amongst Australian labour.¹¹⁵ Instead, the post-war manpower shortage had elevated the Australian worker to 'an aristocracy of labour', and the immigrants poured in to occupy the lower status working class positions.

Conclusion

It is clear that since first white settlement Australian society has been markedly stratified. The history of immigration illuminates the forms of stratification: it cannot be told in full without considering the relation of the proponents and opponents of immigration to the factors of production, without depicting the legal status and social prestige of successive arrivals, and without recounting who held the power to introduce immigrants and to deport them.

In the Australian social system it has always been possible and sometimes common for men to move upwards. Some early emancipists became pastoralists and merchants; some later Chinese, Indians, and Italian cane-cutters bought their own farms. But a distinction between employers and wage-earners persisted throughout. Immigration and the opposition to it fall into a field where these two parties pursued opposing interests.

The controversies over immigration were all the sharper when immigrants were assisted by governments, employers, relatives and friends. British arrivals did not escape criticism, but foreign arrivals who brought with them clearly perceptible cultural and ethnic attributes provided Australians with ready targets for xenophobic rhetoric. The immigrants' threat to work opportunities or living conditions, or their willingness to undertake tasks others were reluctant to perform, triggered the hostility.

As suppliers of added labour, immigrants played a critical part in the relations between landowners, manufacturers and existing wage earners. From early times to 1940, convicts, coolies, assisted British immigrants, Chinese, Kanakas and southern Europeans variously occupied low status positions. Accordingly, the working class was divided and employers had at their disposal, or continued to campaign for, cheap, competitive labour.

NOTES

- 1 M. Barbetti & H. Allen: 'Prehistoric Man at Lake Mungo, Australia, by 32,000 years B.P.', *Nature* (1972), pp. 46-48. My thanks are due to Dr. Peter White for drawing my attention to this article. I also wish to thank Gretchen Poiner and Karlie Oakley for their helpful comments and criticisms.
- 2 Edward Gibbon Wakefield, *A Letter from Sydney . . . And Other Writings on Colonization* (J. M. Dent, London, 1929), p. 104.
- 3 *ibid.*, p. 125.
- 4 Karl Marx, *Capital* (Allen and Unwin, London, 1938), p. 791.
- 5 R. B. Madgwick, *Immigration into Eastern Australia 1788-1851* (Sydney University Press, 1937), pp. 30, 34.
- 6 T. A. Coghlan, *Labour and Industry in Australia* (Macmillan, Melbourne, 1969), vol. I, p. 562. This work, first published in 1918, is an invaluable reference for the relation between immigration, land, labour and capital in Australia during the nineteenth century.
- 7 R. B. Madgwick, *op. cit.*, p. 65.
- 8 T. A. Coghlan, *op. cit.*, vol. I, p. 22.
- 9 *ibid.*, p. 198.
- 10 *ibid.*, p. 334.
- 11 Herbert Burton, 'Historical survey of immigration and immigration policy, 1788-1932', in F. W. Eggleston & P. D. Phillips *et al.* (edd.), *The Peopling of Australia—Further Studies*. (Dawson, London, 1968), p. 48. First published 1933.
- 12 Brian Fitzpatrick, *The British Empire in Australia* (Macmillan, Melbourne, 1969), p. 32. First published 1941.
- 13 M. Willard, *History of the White Australia Policy to 1920* (Melbourne University Press, 1967), pp. 3-7; A. T. Yarwood (ed.), *Attitudes to Non-European Immigration* (Cassell, Australia, 1968), p. 11. The word 'coolie' is used in this essay to refer to an Indian or Chinese hired labourer.
- 14 A. T. Yarwood, *op. cit.*, pp. 8, 12-15; M. Willard, *op. cit.*, p. 7.
- 15 E. G. Wakefield, *op. cit.*, p. 202.

- 16 T. A. Coghlan, *op. cit.*, vol. I, p. 212.
 17 *ibid.*, p. 227.
 18 B. Fitzpatrick, *op. cit.*, p. 12.
 19 T. A. Coghlan, *op. cit.*, vol. I, p. 189.
 20 R. B. Madgwick, *op. cit.*, pp. 90-99, 196-9.
 21 T. A. Coghlan, *op. cit.*, vol. I, p. 362.
 22 M. Willard, *op. cit.*, p. 12; A. T. Yarwood, *op. cit.*, pp. 8-9.
 23 A. T. Yarwood, *op. cit.*, p. 18.
 24 R. B. Madgwick, *op. cit.*, p. 235. Between 1848 and 1850 there were 15,409 assisted immigrants from England and Wales to Eastern Australia. In the same years, 3,825 came from Scotland, and 10,194 from Ireland.
 25 T. A. Coghlan, *op. cit.*, vol. I, p. 449.
 26 *ibid.*, p. 373; B. Fitzpatrick, *op. cit.*, pp. 35, 54.
 27 T. A. Coghlan, *op. cit.*, vol. I, pp. 382, 385.
 28 *ibid.*, p. 394.
 29 *ibid.*, p. 396.
 30 *ibid.*, p. 335.
 31 *ibid.*, p. 342.
 32 *ibid.*, p. 343.
 33 *ibid.*, p. 347.
 34 *ibid.*, p. 348.
 35 H. Burton, *loc. cit.*, p. 39. Writing 30 years later, Geyl uses these same figures for net immigration 1788-1851. W. F. Geyl, 'A Brief History of Australian Immigration', *International Migration*, 1, 3 (1963), p. 158.
 36 T. A. Coghlan, *op. cit.*, vol. I, pp. 216, 368-369, 374-375; W. D. Borrie, *Population Trends and Policies* (Australasian Publishing Company, Sydney, 1948), pp. 33-34.
 37 W. D. Borrie, *Italians and Germans in Australia*. (Cheshire, Melbourne, 1954), p. 14. Borrie notes that 'it is difficult to assess the precise extent of annual net migration of non-British before the establishment of the Commonwealth because of the inadequacies of the migration records of the colonies' (p. 32).
 38 *ibid.*, p. 14. In 1850 Western Australia had only 5,900 inhabitants, South Australia had 64,000 'drawn largely from the lower middle and labouring classes of Great Britain and Ireland'; New South Wales had 267,000, and Tasmania had 69,000.
 39 B. Fitzpatrick, *op. cit.*, p. 64.
 40 *ibid.*, p. 75.
 41 C. A. Price, *The Great White Walls Are Built* (A.N.U. Press, Canberra, 1974), p. 41.
 42 W. D. Borrie, *Italians and Germans in Australia*, p. 15.
 43 F. K. Crowley, 'The British Contribution to the Australian Population 1860-1919'. *University Studies in History and Economics* 2, 2(1954), p. 56.
 44 W. D. Borrie, *Italians and Germans in Australia*, p. 16.
 45 K. D. Buckley, *The Amalgamated Engineers in Australia, 1852-1920* (A.N.U., Canberra, 1970), pp. 7, 9; Ken Buckley, 'Emigration and the Engineers, 1851-87', *Labour History*, no. 15, November 1968, pp. 34-35.
 46 T. A. Coghlan, *op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 708.
 47 *ibid.*, pp. 610, 627, 743-8.
 48 *ibid.*, pp. 612, 724, 734.
 49 *ibid.*, pp. 700, 703-4.
 50 C. M. H. Clark, *Select Documents in Australian History, 1851-1900* (Angus & Robertson, Sydney, 1955), p. 250.
 51 T. A. Coghlan, *op. cit.*, vol. II, pp. 761, 767.
 52 B. Fitzpatrick, *op. cit.*, pp. 138-140. In Victoria, 'About 1860, the half million inhabitants of this inelegant Eden found themselves in this curious situation, that while half of their territory, including most of the usable land, was in the hands of a thousand graziers, the rest could not grow half their own bread requirements' (p. 128).
 53 *ibid.*, p. 150.
 54 T. A. Coghlan, *op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 671.
 55 B. Fitzpatrick, *op. cit.*, p. 143.
 56 F. K. Crowley, *loc. cit.*, p. 63.
 57 T. A. Coghlan, *op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 1029.

- 58 *ibid.*, p. 1024.
 59 Karl Marx, *op. cit.*, pp. 799-800.
 60 T. A. Coghlan, *op. cit.*, vol. II, pp. 1069, 1077.
 61 T. A. Coghlan, *op. cit.*, vol. III, pp. 1310-1315.
 62 T. A. Coghlan, *op. cit.*, vol. II, pp. 924, 1041.
 63 T. A. Coghlan, *op. cit.*, vol. III, p. 1291.
 64 T. A. Coghlan, *op. cit.*, vol. II, pp. 928-31, 938-41.
 65 A. T. Yarwood, *op. cit.*, p. 49. The term Kanaka refers to a South Sea Islander formerly employed in the Queensland sugar plantations.
 66 T. A. Coghlan, *op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 1092.
 67 A. T. Yarwood, *op. cit.*, p. 58. Yarwood estimates that up to the end of 1894 approximately 50,000 Kanakas had been imported into Queensland. Of these about 10,000 or 11,000 had died (p. 68).
 68 T. A. Coghlan, *op. cit.*, vol. III, p. 1297.
 69 C. A. Price, *Southern Europeans in Australia* (O.U.P., Melbourne, 1963), p. 98. W. D. Borrie, *Italians and Germans in Australia*, p. 50.
 70 T. A. Coghlan, *op. cit.*, vol. III, pp. 1320-22.
 71 M. Willard, *op. cit.*, p. 56.
 72 T. A. Coghlan, *op. cit.*, vol. III, p. 1341; M. Willard, *op. cit.*, p. 84; A. T. Yarwood, *op. cit.*, pp. 91-96.
 73 C. M. H. Clark, *op. cit.*, p. 249. A clear statement about working class opposition to immigration appears in K. M. Dallas, 'The Origins of "White Australia"', *Australian Quarterly*, March 1955, p. 43: 'Australian history shows a common factor which applies to immigration of all sorts the world over and which cuts across the Racialism argument . . . That common factor is opposition to the competition of 'sub-standard' labour in any form.'
 74 B. Fitzpatrick, *op. cit.*, p. 197.
 75 C. M. H. Clark, *op. cit.*, pp. xii, xiii.
 76 H. Burton, *loc. cit.*, pp. 57-58.
 77 W. F. Geyl, *loc. cit.*, p. 158.
 78 W. D. Borrie, *Italians and Germans in Australia*, pp. 33-51.
 79 W. D. Borrie, *Immigration: Australia's Problems and Prospects* (Angus & Robertson, Sydney, 1949), p. 95.
 80 C. A. Price, *Southern Europeans in Australia*, p. 109. Based on a study of naturalization records, Price estimates that in the period 1890-1940 only 7 per cent of southern Europeans came to Australia outside the chain migration process.
 81 *ibid.*, p. 18-23. According to Price, between 1921 and 1940 approximately one-third of the southern Europeans who migrated to Australia left again and did not return.
 82 W. D. Borrie, *Immigration: Australia's Problems and Prospects*, p. 96.
 83 *ibid.*, p. 95. Borrie reminds us that figures for the total net assisted immigrants are not available.
 84 For studies that emphasize these aspects, see C. A. Price, *op. cit.*, J. Martin, *Refugee Settlers* (Canberra, 1965); R. Huber Changing Institutions Among Italian Immigrants—A Study of Trevisani in Sydney and Griffith, N.S.W. (M.A. Hons. thesis, University of Sydney, 1972); G. Bottomley, Community and Continuity among Greeks in Sydney (Ph.D. thesis, Macquarie University, 1973).
 85 W. D. Borrie, *Italians and Germans in Australia*, p. 21.
 86 *ibid.*, pp. 61, 143.
 87 *ibid.*, p. 147.
 88 C. A. Price, *Southern Europeans in Australia*, p. 172. Price says that before 1921 about two-thirds of southern European men first entering Australia were single men under twenty-five years, and by World War II, about 50 per cent were (p. 104).
 89 F. K. Crowley, *loc. cit.*, p. 60.
 90 *ibid.*, p. 65.
 91 *ibid.*, p. 78.
 92 *ibid.*, p. 82.
 93 J. Lyng, *Non-Britishers in Australia* (Macmillan, Melbourne, 1927), p. 144.
 94 F. K. Crowley, *loc. cit.*, p. 81.
 95 H. Burton, *loc. cit.*, p. 62.

- 96 P. D. Phillips & G. L. Wood, 'The Australian Population Problem', P. D. Phillips & G. L. Wood (edd.), *The Peopling of Australia* (Dawson, London, 1968), p. 21. First published 1928.
- 97 J. B. Brigden, 'Secondary Industry in Relation to Population Absorption', in *The Peopling of Australia—Further Studies*, pp. 107, 110.
- 98 C. A. Price, *Southern Europeans in Australia*, p. 141. Price says that over three-quarters of the southern European population in Australia between 1890 and 1940 came from small coastal or inland towns and villages inhabited by peasant families.
- 99 W. D. Borrie, *Italians and Germans in Australia*, p. 46.
- 100 *ibid.*, p. 105.
- 101 *ibid.*, p. 108.
- 102 Queensland Parliamentary Papers, *Report of the Royal Commission to Investigate the Social and Economic Effect of Increase of Numbers of Aliens in North Queensland*, vol. 3 (1925), Paper A28.
- 103 C. A. Price, *Southern Europeans in Australia*, p. 205.
- 104 P. D. Phillips & G. L. Wood, *loc. cit.*, p. 38.
- 105 K. H. Bailey, 'Public Opinion and Population Problems', in *The Peopling of Australia—Further Studies*, p. 102.
- 106 *ibid.*, p. 71. The Congress was convened in London by the International Federation of Trade Unions and the Labour and Socialist International.
- 107 C. F. Yong, 'The Banana Trade and the Chinese in New South Wales and Victoria, 1901-1921', *A.N.U. Historical Journal*, 1, 2 (1965/6), p. 32.
- 108 W. D. Borrie, *Italians and Germans in Australia*, p. 149.
- 109 C. A. Price, *Southern Europeans in Australia*, pp. 145, 185. Price says that in the 1920s less than one-tenth of the Venetian farming groups at Griffith, for example, controlled farms on which they worked. But of the same generation of immigration, two-thirds or more controlled their own farms in the 1930s and 1940s.
- 110 W. D. Borrie, *Italians and Germans in Australia*, p. 112.
- 111 *ibid.*, p. 144.
- 112 C. A. Price, *Southern Europeans in Australia*, p. 217.
- 113 D. Phillips, 'Italians and Australians in the Ovens Valley', D. E. Edgar (ed.), *Social Change in Australia* (Cheshire, Melbourne, 1974), pp. 121-123.
- 114 R. Huber, *op. cit.*, p. 4, 70, 128.
- 115 W. D. Borrie, *Italians and Germans in Australia*, p. 19.