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.\textsuperscript{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 this 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 British Convicts, Assisted Immigrants and Cootees

Before the Wakefield immigrants began to arrive in the 1830s, convicts and emancipists supplied the labour for colonial employers. By 1820, only 1,931 free immigrants had come. Some ineffective members of the English upper and middle classes had been sent fillers by their friends 'as the cheapest 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.\textsuperscript{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 immigrants; 'the line between the two ... was drawn as distinctly as between the white population and the black'.\textsuperscript{5}

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 shortage of labour in rural areas. By 1830 the Eastern Australian colonies comprised a small but growing class of property-owning employers, mainly convict labour and convict emancipates, favorably among themselves for the few free labourers who had immigrated.\textsuperscript{6}

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 dispatched 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 servile, and most of the latter made no social advance whatever. . . . Their social status was isolated from the whole of the community, 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.  

But the battles between landowners' 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 their 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. Prior to 1835 the emancipists were considered the dominant force in the Legislative Council, the Governor in turn had the ear of the Secretary of State. Their economic base was wool. By 1830, Australia had pushed Spain from second place as a supplier of wool to Britain and by 1840 it was clear that Australia would soon overtake the German States from first place, which it did by 1845.

With the transfer of British people and capital across the sea, particularly after assisted emigration began, metropolitan patterns of social relations were also transplanted. The marked division between employer and employee highlighted 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 concentration 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 shortage already exacerbated by the expanding pastoral industry. 

Until transportation ended in 1840, shepherding was done by convicts. This was a hard and exacting task. Neither emancipist nor free man was ever keen to work in this way: despite landowners' hopes of a regular labour supply under assisted immigration, the rural labour shortage continued. The dispossession of 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 coolies 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 Indian be imported for shepherding as well as for the production of sugar, cotton, coffee and tobacco in the north, no government action followed, not again when the Committee's recommendations were reconsidered in 1840.

After transportation ended, pastoralist agitation for cheap Asian labour began in 1847, 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 Indian residents for introducing Indian coolies as Government workers, 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.

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. 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 recruiting unemployed workers from Britain, some of the causes of Chartist agitation would disappear. The colonial workers opposed 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. Copland 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'. The workers were constantly watchful of competition from convicts,
cooies or assisted British immigrants, and the battles over convict transportation in the 1830s and its revival in the 1840s dominated 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 with the competing free labourer. There were other occupants for this niche, including cooies 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.'

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 sixth 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." 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.

But the arrival of many distressed persons in the colony, who were then unwilling to leave the towns for jobs in country areas, provided colonial employers to complain that England was not doing enough to dispose of 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 of immigration and the workhouse was fostered by female immigration, which included many domestics. Throughout the 1830s the Commissioners of Emigration were inundated with requests for assistance from London workhouses and workhouses.

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
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existing 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.

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 1845. In following years some thousands were landed at Sydney, Port Phillip and Moreton Bay, but not all proved successful shepherds.

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." 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 swollen, 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 situated in England in thousands every year at harvest time, and forced down the wages and standard of living of the English agricultural labourers." 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 Diemen'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. 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 goals.

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. In the 1840s, the squatters of the more populous Eastern colony were reoccupied with land as well as labour, and demonstrated their strength in battles with Governor Gipps. The landowners resisted 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.

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 "enclosed practically every point for which the squatters had been contending."

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."

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. 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 "ticket-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 debasing 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 Hamilton, the Spital of the Gnome."

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,' but Earl Grey needed only the employers' plea 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 argued 'out untrained labourers, our free immigrants' to 'the last drop of composition of life in society holders.'

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, audaciously, 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.' 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 sealed 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 Birriny's estimate of net immigration for the period is 317,000, as indicated in the table below.

**Australian Population Growth and Net Immigration 1788-1851**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Population at end of Period</th>
<th>Increase during Period</th>
<th>Net Immigration during Period</th>
<th>Percentage of IV as III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1788-1811</td>
<td>11,375</td>
<td>11,375</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1812-1821</td>
<td>35,492</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1822-1831</td>
<td>75,981</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1832-1841</td>
<td>220,965</td>
<td>145,000</td>
<td>116,000</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1842-1851</td>
<td>457,665</td>
<td>217,000</td>
<td>343,000</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>479,075</td>
<td></td>
<td>317,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of these 317,000, at least 128,356 were free assisted, and about 150,000 convicts came before transportation stopped. 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. In 1850, the total population of Australia was approximately 406,000, with three-quarters of it concentrated in the Eastern colonies. Until mid-century the only non-European that appeared in the colonies were infant 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. 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 inhabi...
removal of agitation workers, increasing the colonial population and thus providing markets for Australian goods.

But not all working-class immigrants came to Australia. Among the voluntary immigrants, many of whom came with capital, there were also some working-class newcomers who paid their own way. 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-assisted 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 83,396, or 7.2 per cent of the total population, a percentage which steadily declined thereafter. But the unsatisfactory treatment of the 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 rather than any protection once the Chinese threat appeared to wane: South Australia acted in 1865, 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 overworked districts 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 Times, noted that “the disorganisation of trade disputes as 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.”

Problems resulting from a failure to devote 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 this 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 1861.46

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 further of assisted immigration had begun to affect government policy. In 1858, only a small sum was granted for assistance.47

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 Chinese votes occurred, yet another manifestation of working-class discontent.48 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.’49

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 unpleasant surprise: 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 an exodus, and convicts as well as the free had trouble finding jobs. By the 1860s the land question was as acute as immigration in the Eastern states. The squatters still held a heavy hand over most of the best country and their stand for pre-eminent rights was inimical to the development of small-scale farming. Both the New South Wales and Victorian governments attempted to frame land policy to create a yeomanry, but so long as it was more easily available to the small man, it was so much easier for the big man to acquire, and thus begin a constant battle between the squatters and selectors. 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. 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. Despite belated attempts to unlock the land and create a yeomanry, the colonial governments on the whole failed to accomplish their aims, particularly in the eastern states: the result of most of the legislation of the period was the formation of large freehold estates established from England. As Fitzpatrick notes: "The Forbes Act of 1834, which encouraged the immigration of British capital; Worsthorne's 1843 Land on Wood Act, which facilitated the large freehold of such estates; 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.

Although the Australian economy remained one of primary production, manufacturing grew in the decades after 1850, and its scope 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
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.'** Aid was stopped in 1860, resumed in 1862, but not revoked again after 1867 until 1873.

Assistance in South Australia financially ended in 1866, but not before the Province had experienced with coölic immigration to work the Northern Territory. Some Chinese were brought to Palmerston but did not please the planters, so Indian labour was considered as a substitute. A Coölic Immigration Act was passed in 1862, but administrative problems arose concerning the Indian Government's requirements for coölic importation, and the plan was stillborn. Adelaide workers did not approve the coölic idea, nor did they take kindly to three shipsload of British assisted immigrants arriving in 1863 in the middle of a depression. Following a public outcry, the Government decided to end financial assistance to immigration altogether in 1886.**

Meetings of the unemployed were also held in Melbourne throughout the 1860s to government assisted immigration—on one occasion labelled as 'the most wicked thing imaginable.' In 1870, a 'Protection and Anti-State-Assisted 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.' 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.' 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 Immigration 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 cities. Recent immigration into Queensland, not subject to 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 suspended, but after gold discoveries in 1867 it was revived in 1868, and extended to German immigrants as well as British. But the immigration that characterized 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.**

The West Indian 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 coölics 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 Polyneesian 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. Opinions to cheap Island or Indian labour carried little weight at first, white 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 1868 public protest meetings were held, and in 1869 a petition 'expressed with dismay the introduction of an inferior and uneducated 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.' 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 labourers from Chinese and white labour. The Labour Party revoked this compromise but revocation 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.

Queensland planters had also tried for Indian and Chinese coölics in the 1870s, but due to the government's unwillingness to accept responsibility for their introduction, the plan failed. In the 1890s, planters again renewed their efforts to get Asians where the Government opposed, to limit the employment of Kanakas. But when Carnegie became Premier in 1893, the whole question of importing coölics was abandoned and another alternative presented; the Immigration Act of 1892 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. Attempts to negotiate with Scandinavian countries met with no better success.**
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. 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-sold immigrants continued in New South Wales. In 1877, the Trades and Labor Council and the Working Men's Defense 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 by-election. 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 ceased assistance by 1887.

Like the mainland colonies, Tasmania's immigration history was one of fits and starts, with labour shortages one year and joblessness 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. This was the British immigrants who 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 pastoral 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 protest. The immigrants arrived in 1879 but engaged in pearling and timber getting, rather than pastoral employment, and the Governor expected 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 Asians, as authorities believed that whites could not work in hot areas. In 1882, the Import Labour Restriction Act of 1874 was amended to regulate the conditions under which private employers could introduce Asian labour under contract, and Chinese were brought in 'for the next six months to the 1882. But after gold was discovered in the Kimberley District in 1896, 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.

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 Kanakas, 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 fail employers' requirements to prevent abuses of the land labor 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 Mail 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.

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. The Premier immediately excluded 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 sparked the violent reaction, but public feeling ran high, undoubtedly precipitated by the arrival of thousands more Chinese that same year in Port Darwin.

This anti-Asian sentiment crystallized in legislation against others besides the Chinese; they included Afghan, 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: Abolitions of Assisted Immigration."39

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 competition between Capital and Labour began with the 1891 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 1890s, the 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.44 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Population at end of Period</th>
<th>Increase</th>
<th>Natural</th>
<th>Migration as % of Overall Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1852-1855</td>
<td>1,168,000</td>
<td>720,000</td>
<td>554,000</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1864-1870</td>
<td>1,647,756</td>
<td>502,170</td>
<td>355,610</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870-1880</td>
<td>2,233,531</td>
<td>583,770</td>
<td>391,970</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881-1890</td>
<td>3,151,355</td>
<td>919,820</td>
<td>537,080</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891-1900</td>
<td>3,765,359</td>
<td>613,960</td>
<td>589,110</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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, 2,890 Italians and 478 Greeks. In the decade 1891-1901 immigration declined; net immigration increased the population by only 25,000.45

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 desired status of "prosperity" and "cheap labour" were those from southern Europe who came to replace the Kansaks and whose numbers gradually began to increase.

1891-1940: 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 3,645 were assisted of a total net gain through immigration of 925,800.
POLITICAL ECONOMY OF AUSTRALIAN CAPITALISM

NOMINATED AND SELECTED MIGRATION 1901-1940

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Total Arrived</th>
<th>Total Net Immigration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1901-05</td>
<td>16,700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906-10</td>
<td>57,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911-15</td>
<td>130,554</td>
<td>186,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916-20</td>
<td>11,631</td>
<td>70,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921-25</td>
<td>115,468</td>
<td>183,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926-30</td>
<td>99,403</td>
<td>129,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931-35</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>-10,800 (0/00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936-40</td>
<td>3,828</td>
<td>43,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.1

SOUTHERN EUROPEAN MALE SETTLERS IN AUSTRALIA 1890-1940

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>1921-25</td>
<td>152,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1926-30</td>
<td>100,889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1931-35</td>
<td>-10,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1936-40</td>
<td>14,665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.A.</td>
<td>1921-25</td>
<td>2,732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1926-30</td>
<td>491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1931-35</td>
<td>-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1936-40</td>
<td>492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>1921-25</td>
<td>419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1926-30</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1931-35</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1936-40</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>1921-25</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1926-30</td>
<td>1,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1931-35</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1936-40</td>
<td>7,902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>1921-25</td>
<td>3,391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1926-30</td>
<td>1,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1931-35</td>
<td>-194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1936-40</td>
<td>3,478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>1921-25</td>
<td>11,587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1926-30</td>
<td>10,466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1931-35</td>
<td>1,223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1936-40</td>
<td>7,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslav</td>
<td>1921-25</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1926-30</td>
<td>2,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1931-35</td>
<td>-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1936-40</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other European</td>
<td>1921-25</td>
<td>7,816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1926-30</td>
<td>8,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1931-35</td>
<td>-47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1936-40</td>
<td>7,039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total European</td>
<td>1921-25</td>
<td>188,636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1926-30</td>
<td>125,447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1931-35</td>
<td>-9,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1936-40</td>
<td>42,228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-European</td>
<td>1921-25</td>
<td>-968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1926-30</td>
<td>-797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1931-35</td>
<td>-1,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1936-40</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1921-25</td>
<td>179,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1926-30</td>
<td>124,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1931-35</td>
<td>-10,866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1936-40</td>
<td>42,128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From 1788 to 1940, according to Geyl, the total net immigration into Australia was 2,230,240. And for that period, Bercie estimates that 1,068,311 immigrants were assisted.4

Not for a moment can one deny the great variety in the lives and experiences of immigrants to this country,4 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 in occupations where they did not compete with Australian labour, little overt hostility was directed against them.5 By contrast Italians who settled in Western Australia early in this century and in Queensland
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 unemploy-ment threatened. This Italian competition eventually gave rise to three official enquiries, two in Western Australia in 1902 and 1903, and one in Queensland in 1925. These investigations, like their nine-
tenth century predecessors into transportail, coolie immigration, the Chinese, and the Germans, 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 one-fifth of the Australian total. 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 1903 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.

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 regula-
tions. The Reports also showed that Italians were not inspected as contract labour but had immigrated with financial help from relatives and friends already established in Australia.

These immigrants were mostly men, unaccompanied 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 1901 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.' 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 1905, Victoria in 1907, in South Australia in 1911, and in Tasmania in 1912.

Between 1850 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. The largest immigration from the United Kingdom had occurred from 1850 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 publically 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. In South Australia, despite insistence 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 authentically supported land reservation for closer settlement. Yet State governments made no concerted efforts to implement such plans and the result was that new-
comers 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 Queens-
land, South Australia and Tasmanina was actually settled by immigrants.

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.\textsuperscript{96} Distress of the employee's 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.\textsuperscript{97}

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 district groups 'closely representative of the respective views of employers and wage-earners'.\textsuperscript{98}

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 areas 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 loan spent on development'.\textsuperscript{99}

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 1926 and 1928, 15,999 settlers were placed on land in Victoria under the closer settlement schemes, and between 1922 and 1927, a total of 16,000 left these rural areas for jobs in the towns and cities.\textsuperscript{100} 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 breadwinner engaged in industrial enterprises was 33.2 per cent and those in primary production only 22.6 per cent.\textsuperscript{101}

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 Australia closed. Some Yugoslavs, Malteese, 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 8,380 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.\textsuperscript{102} 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' organisations. 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'.\textsuperscript{103}

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 beside 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'.\textsuperscript{104}

By pouring into the sugar districts the Italians became a threat to the workers and farmers alike. 'Australia's own tended to assume that southern Europeans would be prepared to accept sub-Australian standards, and were therefore anxious to control the inflow and to compel those already in the cane fields to cooperate with 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'.\textsuperscript{105}
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 Australian's 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.206 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'.

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'.207 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 irrigated areas. The P earling 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 1923 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 excluded widespread application of these Acts, they were manifestations of an overriding intention to protect Australian working and living conditions.

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 principal reasons for 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'. He added that no country had felt the effect of the Australian trade unions is given to any scheme of immigration'. Dr. Evatt declared that migration was at best only a palliative, and that population and unemployment in Europe could only be cured by raising

The standard of living'. In taking this line, Evatt stated the opinion of a minority group at the Conference who opposed the majority view, which supported a 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.208 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 shipsloads 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.209 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.

As Kerr 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 one day re-create the problem of a minority which would undermine economic standards and be culturally unassimilable'.210 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'.211 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 ...'. 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. In Griffith a single sequence took place; the early northern Italian sharefarmers for Australians in the 1920s and 1930s and then later bought their own farms. There was antimony between Italians and Australians for a while, and this flared up again in Griffith in 1947 when returned soldiers became alarmed at the assimilation of the area. But by 1960 relations between these groups had greatly improved.117

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 flowered 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 late 19th 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 extensive 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 Bertie 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 forces. The post-war change was thus closely connected with the fact that immigrants coming after the war had not so far threatened unemployment amongst Australian labour.118 Hence, 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 relations of the proponents and opponents of immigration to the factors of production, without deplying the legal status and social prestige of successive arrivals, and without recounting who held the power to introduce immigrants and to deport them.

NOTES
1 M. Bebbert & A. H. Allen, "Prohagic 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 Peter and Karlie Osbome for their helpful comments and criticisms.
3 E. Rapp, p. 125.
7 A. A. Gough, op. cit., p. 55.
9 Ibid., p. 178.
10 Ibid., p. 311.
AUSTRALIAN IMMIGRANTS, 1788-1940

103

102 POLITICAL ECONOMY OF AUSTRALIAN CAPITALISM

17 Ibid., p. 83.
19 Ibid., p. 203.
21 Ibid., p. 199.
22 A. T. Yarrow, op. cit., pp. 89-90.
26 Ibid., p. 371; B. Fitzpatrick, op. cit., pp. 35-54.
28 Ibid., p. 594.
29 Ibid., p. 396.
30 Ibid., p. 355.
31 Ibid., p. 142.
32 Ibid., p. 143.
33 Ibid., p. 347.
34 Ibid., p. 348.
37 W. D. Bourke, Italians and Germans in Australia (Cheshar, Melbourne, 1954), p. 14. Bourke 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. 22).
38 Ibid., p. 14. In 1850 Western Australia had only 5,000 inhabitants, South Australia had 64,000 (drawn largely from the lower middle and labouring classes of Great Britain and Ireland); New South Wales had 201,000, and Tasmania had 69,000.
39 B. Fitzpatrick, op. cit., p. 64.
42 W. D. Bourke, Italians and Germans in Australia, p. 15.
44 Ibid., p. 18.
48 Ibid., pp. 610, 627, 743-8.
49 Ibid., p. 673.
50 Ibid., pp. 700, 703-4.
53 B. Fitzpatrick, op. cit., pp. 138-146. In Victoria, "About 1600, the half million inhabitants of this island found themselves in this turlous situation, that while half of their territory, including most of the usable land, "on the horns of a thousand gravers, the rest could not grow half their own food requirements" (p. 128).
54 Ibid., p. 126.
56 B. Fitzpatrick, op. cit., p. 143.
57 B. K. Crowley, loc. cit., p. 63.


98 C. A. Price, The Peopling of Australia, p. 124. Price says that one-third of the southern European population in Australia between 1850 and 1860 came from small coastal or island towns and villages inhabited by peasant families.

99 W. D. Burt, Italians and Germans in Australia, p. 46.

100 Ibid., p. 103.

101 Ibid., p. 109.

102 Queensland Parliamentary Papers, Report of the Select Committee to Investigate the Social and Economic Effect of a Large Increase of Numbers of Immigrants in North Queensland, vol. 3 (1921), Paper 228.


106 Ibid., p. 71. The Congress was convened in London by the International Commission on Trade Unions and the Labour and Socialist International.

107 D. Phillips, The Peopling of Australia, pp. 143, 185. Price says that the 1920s was the most populous of the fourteen years of immigration for which he has figures, and that the population increased from 3.7 million in 1921 to 5.2 million in 1930.

110 W. D. Burt, Italians and Germans in Australia, p. 112.

111 Ibid., p. 149.


114 Ibid., p. 70.