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This thesis attempts to determine the areas in which the United States had its greatest impact upon Australia between Federation in 1901 and the Washington Conference of 1922.

In the fields of defence and foreign policy it traces the growth of Anglo-Saxon sentiment in Australia which embraced the United States as a member of the same family of nations as the British Empire; the Australian disillusionment which greeted the late entry into World War I of the United States, and the reversion to dependence on Britain for defence after World War I at a time when Britain's naval, military and strategic capacity to defend her far-flung Empire had been challenged by the enormous growth of United States power.

In the field of commercial relations it investigates and analyses the growing quantity of imports into Australia from the United States. During World War I America became Australia's largest supplier after Great Britain. The main Australian exports to the United States were primary produce and metals. American investment in Australia was mostly in branch offices or assembly plants; very little was put into primary produce or heavy industry. The fascinating career of the three largest United States' life insurance firms in Australia which was part of a world-wide expansion of these firms' insurance business in the 1880's came to an abrupt halt due largely to circumstances in the U.S.A. after 1906.

In the cultural field the growth of American influence can be seen in the increasing number of American plays, books and films in Australia. Americans, such as J.C.
Williamson, Hugh Ward and J.D. Williams were largely responsible for the development of the managerial and organisational side of both cinema and theatre in Australia. The number of American plays grew especially after 1913 and by the 1920's American films dominated the Australian market. In the field of architecture the American Walter Burley Griffin was responsible for the prize-winning design for Canberra.

American influence, though not readily traceable in basic social structure can be seen at work in certain specific fields of social reform such as the institution of Children's Courts or the re-organisation of the hospital systems of N.S.W. and Victoria.

Finally, because of the deliberate basic similarities to the United States Constitution in the Australian Constitution drawn up in the 1890's, the first twenty years of the Commonwealth of Australia saw a heavy dependence upon United States legal precedents in the interpretation of the Australian Constitution.

In fact during these years Australia's growing independence of Britain in political, social and artistic fields was to some extent balanced by the growth of United States influence. To many Australians not only did Britain represent the past in the sense that many Australian institutions and traditions were British, but Britain represented the past also because she was old-fashioned; to them the United States represented Australia's possible golden future.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION
INTRODUCTION

This study originated from the fact that in my undergraduate (Glasgow) M.A. degree I had specialised in the history of the United States of America and in particular the period of the emergence of the United States to world power between the Spanish - American War of 1898 and the Washington Conference. The impact of this shift in the world balance of power on the British Empire as a whole, and the effect on thinking on defence and foreign policy is a particularly fascinating topic. The effect on Great Britain itself, and the relations between the United States of America and Canada have already been studied but in the case of Australia, the works dealing with American-Australian relations are either general studies of the whole period from 1789 until the present-day or else deal with the period of the gold rush in the 1850’s or earlier.

One peculiar problem about the relations between Australia and the United States of America is that as a series of colonies, and later as a


2. e.g. Werner Levi: American Australian Relations, Minneapolis, 1947; Harrold Grattan: The United States and the South West Pacific, Melbourne, 1961.

Dominion, foreign affairs were conducted for Australia through the British Colonial and Foreign Offices. Australia, unlike Canada, showed little desire to extend her autonomy in the field of foreign affairs, and did not in fact appoint a diplomatic representative to the United States of America until just before the Second World War, although she could have done so as early as 1918. Thus "foreign relations" as such between Australia and the United States of America have really been a part of the relations of each with Great Britain.

It therefore became apparent in the course of this study that other forms of American influence, such as commercial and cultural impact were at least as important as diplomatic relations, and that the latter was on the whole rather a matter of Australian attitudes to the United States of America, than of any concrete diplomatic interaction. The scope of the thesis has therefore been broadened to include certain other main fields of Australian life, commercial, cultural, social and constitutional as well as the questions of defence and foreign policy.

The subject has been dealt with from an Australian, rather than an American point of view. To the United States of America Australia was not in this period of very great importance. Commercially, most of America's trade with Pacific countries has been with the Northern Pacific, China and Japan, and only a small fraction of American experts and investments has found its way to Oceania, of which Australia forms a part. In the field of diplomatic relations the United States dealt with Britain, not Australia, while strategic thinking in the Pacific
took little account of Australia till after Pearl Harbour, when Australia became a useful American base against the Japanese. Culturally, it is doubtful whether Americans were aware of the existence of Australia before the days of Sydney Nolan and Patrick White. Finally Australian influence on the governmental and social structure of the United States has been non-existent.

To Australia on the other hand, the United States has bulked increasingly large in the twentieth century. Not only was the constitutional structure of the new Australian Commonwealth, established in 1901, deliberately modelled upon that of the United States of America, but the First World War so changed the basic balance of world power that the United States became of immense interest to Australia in other fields. By the end of the First World War the United States was the most important nation after Great Britain as a source of Australian imports, while American shipping in Australian ports was far greater than that of any other foreign nation. This was a radical switch from the pre-war period when German imports rivalled those from the United States, while the American mercantile marine was virtually non-existent. In the field of defence the Great War effectively destroyed British maritime supremacy; the period from the Peace Conference of 1919 to the Washington Conference shows some glimmering of realisation in Australia that a changed situation demanded some alternative defence, a realisation which appears less evident after 1923. Reliance was once again placed on Britain, this time on the Singapore base, partly out of miscalculation, partly also due to the distrust of the United States.
Culturally Australian creative artists and critics have looked towards European, and especially to British traditions. But the United States in the twentieth century has become the purveyor of mass culture in the form of the film and television for all the countries of the Western world. Thus while the creative arts in both the United States and Australia have looked towards a common source of tradition in Europe, modified by indigenous influences rather than impinging on each other, in the field of "middle-brow" culture, the United States has had an immense impact on Australia in the form of popular fiction, films, and more recently in television.

This study is in effect a pioneer survey of the field, which raises more problems than it solves. Each of its sections could have been expanded to make a thesis in itself; Raymond Esthus's book "From Enmity to Alliance" demonstrates that clearly enough. It deals with only a ten year period in United States-Australian relations, and with the fields of commercial and diplomatic relations, yet there is more than enough material for a complete book. One of the aims of this study has been to show which fields will best repay further intensive research.

It is obvious that much work can still be done on the question of the role of the United States in the defence and foreign policies of Australia, particularly, if as was recently suggested by the Prime Minister, Sir Robert Menzies, the fifty-year rule on archives is relaxed

to a forty-year rule. Japan until after 1945 has been the focus of twentieth century Australian thinking in the Pacific, and the main line of defence was seen until 1940 as the British navy. Nowadays the Japanese threat has been replaced by the Communist menace in Asia, with particular reference to the People's Republic of China, while a wary eye is kept on the activities of Indonesia, and Australia's main source of defence is now seen as the United States, not Great Britain. The recent dispatch of Australian troops to assist the Americans in Vietnam rather than the British forces in Malaysia is defended by many Australians, who might otherwise be doubtful about the ethics of this move, on the grounds that it places a moral obligation on the United States to defend Australia.

This attitude not only illustrates the basic transfer of strategic dependence, but also a lingering doubt as to whether Australia is in fact sufficiently important to the United States to be defended on strategic or political grounds. One point is striking; Australia is geographically an Asiatic country, but racially, socially and culturally a European outpost, together with New Zealand, the last large European settlement left in South East Asia. She has deliberately chosen to perpetuate her European character through her White Australia policy. Her defence must therefore rest upon Europe since her tiny population makes her unable to defend herself. The United States, the military leader of the Western world, is in a sense the closest substitute for vanished British supremacy which can be found by Australians. The ideas of liberty, equality and democracy on which the United States was founded are fundamentally part
of the Western European political tradition: industrially her growth was based upon the Western European industrial revolution, perfected in the United States of America. Culturally her heritage, modified though it has been by non-European elements, is basically European. Finally her origins as a series of British Colonies, and her retention of the English language, makes her readily understandable to Australians. Thus, even leaving geographical and strategic factors out of account, the United States, in the absence of British world power, is the country which logically can be seen to have most in common with Australia.

This fact, reinforced by the military might of the United States of America and by the changing and immensely expensive character of modern warfare, has made the twentieth century from the Australian point of view a period of transfer of dependence from Great Britain to the United States. The final shift took place in fact during the Second World War, but the First World War so changed the balance of power as to make it likely that sooner or later such a transfer would become inevitable; when Britain accepted naval parity with the United States of America at the Washington Conference, she was in effect accepting the United States of America on an equal footing as a Great Power, and acknowledging her own inability to police the world alone. On the other hand, Australians were reluctant to recognise this change; they accepted the enhancement of their own status brought about by participation in the First World War and in the Peace Conference of 1919 which ended it, but thought that an independent navy of their own in conjunction
with the great Singapore base, was sufficient substitute. In actual fact the Great War not only made Australia more conscious of herself as an independent nation, but reduced the sentimental leanings towards the United States of America so evident at the time of the visit of the United States fleet in 1908. The tardiness of American entry into the Great War, and the subsequent rejection by the United States of the League of Nations left Australians, previously convinced of an identity of interests with Americans, more than a little bewildered. The pre-war inclination to see the United States of America as a second line of defence against Japan was severely shaken.

Commercially also Australia, which has always relied upon Great Britain to provide her imports, buy her exports and supply her investment needs, found the position changed by the Great War. Tightness in the London money market after 1918 forced Australia to turn for the first time to New York for governmental loans. The imposition of a high tariff in Australia forced some American firms which found Australia a useful market to start manufacturing in Australia in the 1920's. As for trade, although the United States did not take an increasing amount of Australian exports, she supplied an increasing proportion of Australian imports, until the trade gap became such that in the 1930's a deliberate trade diversion policy was attempted in Australia. This was directed against both Japan and the United States. In yet another field the United States had become almost as important to Australia as Great Britain. Much work still remains to be done on
the activities of individual American firms in Australia, while full
and accurate details of United States investment in Australia before
1929 are still lacking. Research is still needed into the technological
effect of American export knowledge in agriculture, mining and industrial
upon the Australian economy. But in the absence of any history of such
developments in Australia, it is impossible to assess the significance
although one can demonstrate the existence of such American aid.

In the field of cultural development much obviously remains to
be done. Only one pamphlet has been published on the cinema in
Australia while the histories of the theatre are inadequate.

In the absence of such background the conclusions of this study
must in some fields remain tentative, since although the importance
of United States influence can be clearly demonstrated, as can some
of the reactions of Australians to this growing influence, the final
relative importance of British, American and indigenous influences
cannot yet be finally determined.

Most of the work for this thesis has been done from primary
sources, such as Parliamentary debates and papers, newspapers and
periodicals, and such relevant manuscript collections and business
records as are available. In a few areas, such as the study of the

5. Mervyn Wasson: The Beginnings of Australian Cinema; Australian
Film Institute: Papers on the Film in Australia No. 1, Melbourne,
1964.
constitution and of education, there is a considerable body of secondary works, but in many fields, even a basic survey is lacking.

This is particularly noticeable in the field of social history. There are many studies of social welfare legislation in Australia, but very little on the non-governmental bodies, individuals and groups which provided and still provide much of social work aid. George Nadel's book on Australia's Colonial Culture stops before the period with which we are dealing.

In the field of social structure, many observers have seen Australia as an "Americanised" country. The question of how much of this resemblance, which is seen in terms of lack of rigid social stratification, of similar taste in dress, culture or use of leisure, is due to direct influence, and how much to parallel development is a fascinating one. In this writer's opinion the latter theory is unhesitatingly to be chosen. Similarities between Australia and the United States exist in that both countries pursue goals of individual not collectivist endeavour. Australia under a Labor Government between 1945 and 1949 still failed to go as far as the Labour Government of Britain or even the right-wing governed Netherlands in the direction of a welfare state. In fact the pace of social reform in Australia has been remarkably slow since 1913. It is in some ways nowadays closely parallel with the United States where even a moderate reform

such as Medicare met such opposition that it almost failed to become law. Attempts have been made to explain the supposed similarities or dissimilarities of the social structures of Australia and the United States of America in terms of the applicability or otherwise of the moving frontier theory. But the frontier has not been in Australia a dynamic, moving, individualistic area as it was in the United States of America. Due to geographic and economic circumstances it has been a virtually static phenomenon controlled by squatters not small farmers. On the other hand the governmental structure of both Australia and the United States of America, which are both Federations with power over social and economic affairs reserved to the States, are remarkably similar. It has been noted that Federal governments with powers divided between central and provincial governments show a tendency towards conservatism in social reform; this is to be seen in Canada also where although the central government has the residual powers, instead of the States as in the United States of America and Australia, the States have power over health. 7 It may be suggested that certain resemblances between the social structures in the United States of America and Australia, where so much which is done by governments in other Western countries to aid the handicapped, is left to private agencies, is due rather to a similarity of governmental structure than to the role of a frontier in providing an outlet for protest. It is notable not only that social welfare reform virtually ceased in Australia after 1913 when the second Labor referendum for increased Federal powers over

commerce and industry, was defeated.

Other factors which the two Federations have in common which can be said to have a bearing on this question are the pragmatic nature of the labor movements in both countries. The United States of America is peculiar in that the trades union movement never became associated with a socialist-minded political party which obtained power. Even in Australia there was no union of doctrinaire socialists with trade unionists which developed in the majority of European countries. Thus the Australian Labor Party in Australia has been a more pragmatic body than, say, the Labour Party in Britain, more prone to pursue limited practical objectives than long-range plans.

The writer's contention that United States influence has been minimal on the Australian social structure in the period under review, is based on the fact that such United States influence as is to be found in this field has been peripheral. The introduction of children's courts and probation, the method of fund-raising for hospitals have been questions of detail, not principle, based on a search for practical answers to specific problems, not on admiration for the system which produced them. Children's courts were considered to be good, but the prison system in the South was abominable, the reformatory at Elmira was good, but the spoils system, or the election of judges was bad.

It is impossible to evaluate the response of groups or classes in Australia to increasing American influence until the type, amount
and area of this impact have been determined. It is the latter task which this thesis has attempted to fulfil, but there are certain groupings of people in Australia in whom one can detect varying responses to the "image" of the United States of America. This is of course a tricky and suspect field to investigate. There are no election or census results to be consulted, no one has ever been made to vote on what he or she thought about the United States of America. Even the referenda designed to modify the "American" design of the Australian constitution cannot be seen as a guide since to voters the matter was one of internal Labor versus anti-Labor politics. Therefore one has to rely on individual expressions of opinion, and induce from this certain group characteristics.

Even this can be dangerous; importers for example, may state that they prefer in principle to buy British goods, yet import goods from the United States of America.

One fairly fundamental division of opinion on the United States of America can be detected in the period under review. Firstly political conservatives were more likely to look to the example of the United States of America than were radicals, as was the case in the High Court where Sir Samuel Griffith, Sir Edmund Barton and R.E. O'Connor appealed to United States precedent in the interpretation of Federal powers on restrictive lines, while the more radical Higgins and Isaacs distrusted American precedents. It is also to be seen in the fact that attempts to introduce Federal machinery and agencies on United States lines in the first few years of the Commonwealth

8 See below Chapter 8.
Parliament were almost entirely made by non-Labor members.

It was Sir John Quick who first introduced the motion for a Federal Bureau of Agriculture on the lines of the United States one, an idea later sponsored repeatedly by (Sir) Ernest Littleton Groom, later Minister for External Affairs in Deakin's Government. Sir William Lyne supported the introduction of an Inter-State Commerce Commission on the grounds that if it worked in the United States it should work in Australia. Employers of Labor also showed a tendency to approve of employer-employee relationships in the United States and of the firm stand taken against labor by American employers. Labor men on the other hand saw the example of the United States as a bad one and to be avoided. The debates in the first Parliament reveal this very clearly. Racial relations in the United States were an example of what would happen if coloured immigration were allowed. Working conditions in the United States were far worse and pay lower than those in Australia and even than those in Britain, there were long hours, sweating, child labour and the like. One of the interesting

facts about these expressed views of the United States of America is that many of them relied for their information on British Labour views of the United States of America.\textsuperscript{15} Frank Tudor who had been in the United States stated that labour conditions in New England were in fact better than those in the United Kingdom.\textsuperscript{16} Other Labor members also relied on United States sources such as H.D. Lloyd's \textit{Wealth Against Capital}, Jacob Riis's \textit{How the Other Half Lives}.

It is clear that what most Australian Labor men knew of the United States they disliked. "Surely we are not asked to imitate America, a country which is seething with industrial strife, and where the police are called out to shoot down men who are fighting for their rights" inquired one Labor member of those who opposed the Conciliation and Arbitration Bill.\textsuperscript{17} W.M. Hughes summed up the main Labor view of the United States of America when he said: "America is a creation of yesterday. If you ask me America is a country where although democracy is based upon the broad basis of manhood suffrage, yet nevertheless it is tied by such rigid bonds constitutionally that we see there to-day the most extraordinary division between those who nominally are equal. We see there powers vested really in the hands of men who, although they are not distinguished by aristocratic titles have nevertheless very real and actual possession of that power. We see too that America has

\textsuperscript{16} H. Repr. Oct. 31, 1901, Tudor p6753.
\textsuperscript{17} H. Repr. Aug. 11, 1903, Wilks, p3357.
already known what it is to quail beneath a military despotism. We saw not long ago that a hired band of soldiers or detectives, no matter what you call them - were called out, hired by private individuals and permitted to shoot men down because of a difference of opinion as to what should be or should not be done in a question of industrial dispute. Such a thing would never be possible in this country - at least I hope not. Such a thing has never been done in Great Britain..."18

The nationalistic sections of the Press such as the Bulletin, and the labor newspapers, also display this type of view of the United States of America. They were, like those political members of the Australian Labor Party, particularly horrified by the measures taken against strikers in the United States. "Trades Unionism as we know it in English-speaking countries and in Australia does not exist in the United States ... The assassination of President McKinley might be traceable to the smashing up of Trades Unionism ... The workers were crushed from the cradle to the grave."19 wrote the Toosin. The Australian Worker took much the same line "They work longer in American workshops and have fewer holidays than in England. English workmen know that they are slaves and they stand together and trust one another. In America they do not know it or pretend not to and they do not trust one another - rather the ideal situation from an employer's point of view."20

19. Toosin Sept. 12, 1901.
20. A.W. May 4, 1901.
Andrew Carnegie in particular was seen as the symbol of a ruthless and triumphant capitalism. Of Carnegie's gifts of libraries to American towns the Worker wrote "Are these libraries to atone for the horrors of Homestead, the atrocious crimes of Carnegie in hiring three hundred Pinkerton mercenaries in 1892 to murder in cold blood the working men whose labor had enriched him?" Of the 1901 Steel Strike it wrote "The economic conditions in America have reached the stage where the class division is more strongly marked than anywhere else in the world. Nowhere has the ownership of industry concentrated so quickly and so inexorably into fewer hands and consequently nowhere else has there developed a wage working class so completely dependent upon the owners of industry for the opportunity to labour and live. And as this class division has become clearer so have the interests of the opposing classes of workers and capitalists come into sharper conflict. To-day these interests are represented by the Steel Trust on the one hand and the Amalgamated Association on the other." Another labor newspaper wrote "In Capitalism unchecked and in the Raw, such as they have in America, there is certainly no sentiment ... the fight between capital and Labor in the United States of America is more bitterly waged than in any other country in the world. Such a system, which treats human beings like machines and scraps them with as little compunction when their labor value begins to fall off, can only lead,

as Jack London points out in his "Iron Heel" to anarchy and chaos.\textsuperscript{23}

A few took the traditional socialist line that the development of trusts and combines, evil though its results were for the workers, was a step on the way to nationalisation of industry and the setting up of a socialist state.\textsuperscript{24}

The sources from which the Labor men drew their view of the United States were various. Some had been in the United States such as Tudor or Senator Charleston. Others relied strongly on the unfavourable views of the United States expressed by British socialist leaders. Tom Mann spent several years in Australia and New Zealand between 1902 and 1909, Ramsay MacDonald visited Australia in 1906, Keir Hardie in 1907, while Ben Tillett came both in 1896 and 1907.

But it is also clear that Australian Labor members were aware of the growing United States literature of protest.\textsuperscript{25} The Labor newspapers also received large quantities of American journals, not the main American Eastern newspapers, but trades union journals\textsuperscript{26} and some of the Western newspapers such as the Chicago\textsuperscript{27} the San Francisco\textsuperscript{28} San Francisco\textsuperscript{29} Clarion,\textsuperscript{30} the Chicago Chronicle.

\textsuperscript{23} The Alert Maryborough Oct. 10, 1913.
\textsuperscript{24} W.C. Spence: Presidential Address in Annual Conference of the Australia Workers' Union 1908, Report pp. W. July 12, 1902; A.W. May 16, 1901.
\textsuperscript{25} e.g. a quotation from Jane Addams W. Apr. 4, 1903; review of Upton Sinclair's "The Jungle", A.W. June 7, 1906; review of Jack London's "War of the Classes", A.W. Oct. 11, 1906; quotation from H.D. Lloyd's "Appeal to Reason", Tocsin, Mar. 14, 1901 etc. etc.
\textsuperscript{26} e.g. the Coast Seamen's Journal, see W. Mar. 9, 1901; A.W. Nov. 1, 1902; the Tobacco Worker, see W. Aug. 17, 1901; the Miner's Magazine published by the Western Federation of Miners, Denver, Colorado see A.W. Feb. 8, 1902; the Bricklayer and Mason, see A.W. Feb. 22, 1902; American Leather Workers Journal, see A.W. Nov. 1, 1902.
\textsuperscript{27} W. Jan. 5, 1901.
\textsuperscript{28} W. Mar. 30, 1901, Oct. 12, 1901; A.W. Feb. 8, 1902.
\textsuperscript{29} A.W. July 28, 1902.
\textsuperscript{30} A.W. June 7, 1906.
the Kansas City Journal, the Chicago Social-Democratic Herald and the like.

In other words, as well as the news cables on the United States, which came to the larger Australian newspapers via Reuter's in London, and were by no means favourable to the United States, Labor politicians and newspapers were getting much of their information on the United States from journals which by their very nature were inimical to the social structure of the United States.

It seems clear that to the Labor Party the United States represented a conservative, and thoroughly unadmirable society, a view reinforced by the Labor Party's hostility to the American form of the Australian Constitution both before 1901, and during the referenda of 1911 and 1913.

The image presented by the United States was more attractive to the conservative elements of society, to employers, or to the lawyers and pastoralists who drew up the Constitution. Hartley Grattan notes that the United States has usually had a conservative image for Australia but is dubious of this in view of the fact that the main American contribution to Australian political life was the extremist Industrial Workers of the World (I.W.W.).

Yet the introduction of the I.W.W. to Australia is not really a contradiction of the main contention above. The I.W.W. was a force

31. Tocsin Nov. 14, 1901.
32. Tocsin Dec. 31, 1903.
strongly opposed to the social structure of the United States, its
advocacy of direct industrial action rather than political action being
a reflection of this. The movement in fact had very little success in
Australia in the pre-1914 period, since political action by industrial
unions had already been adopted, and had been found to be successful.
An attempt in 1908 to have the I.W.W. preamble adopted by the Interstate
Labor Conference was defeated.

The first I.W.W. branches in Australia were formed in 1907, two
years after the formation of the I.W.W. in the United States. These
were not industrial locals but clubs devoted rather to debate and
propaganda, and supported by the Socialist Labor Party. The Melbourne
I.W.W. Club reported in March 1908 that they had about fifty members
and were holding monthly educational meetings as well as weekend
propaganda meetings on the Yarra. Broken Hill, that fertile ground
for labor propaganda proved unresponsive to I.W.W. ideas in 1908.
The 1908 split in the I.W.W. in the United States caused some confusion
in Australia; some wished to follow the line of the Detroit faction
led by De Leon, which favoured political as well as industrial action,

35. Ian Turner: Industrial Labor and Politics, Canberra, 1965; V.G.
36. Montaigne O'Dowd to J.F. Neill, Mar. 15, 1908 in I.W.W. papers
others to adhere to the St. John body at Chicago.

It was not till 1911 that a "Chicago" type local was founded in Australia, at Adelaide, and then in Sydney. Even then the movement pace Childe, cannot be said to have flourished. G.G. Reeve, the secretary of the Sydney branch resigned in December 1916 because he complained that at least five of the I.W.W.'s. Detroit members were officers or delegates to the Sydney Trades and Labor Council, which in view of the I.W.W.'s. scorn of the official Labor movement was unacceptable.

The influence of the I.W.W. during the First World War was greater than in the pre-1914 period, since the split in the Labor party and the industrial unrest caused by unemployment and the rising cost of living made their propaganda much more attractive to various sections of the Labor movement.

It played a considerable part in the formation of the One Big Union movement and contributed greatly towards the C.E.U. philosophy. Turner's recent book, moreover, shows that in the years preceding the formation of a Communist party in Australia, the I.W.W. provided the most coherent and influential political theory for the extreme left wing.

Yet neither the One Big Union nor the I.W.W. ever struck deep.

38. loc. cit. see also Christensen to Hawkins Apr. 25, 1911 in I.W.W. papers Al 333-4 M.L., Sydney.
roots in Australia. Bedford considers that the One Big Union was an American scheme, and that most of its leaders had come from Britain. It was regarded by most Labor men as a foreign body unsuited to the more sedate Australian scene, an attitude very similar to that adopted towards the I.W.W. 43

Even the partial acceptance of the I.W.W. in Australia does not invalidate the fact that the United States presented a basically conservative image to most Australian labor men. In fact since it was itself so utterly opposed to the existing social and economic structure of the United States, its publications tended to reinforce this belief by disseminating stories of the brutality of the American social scene.

The I.W.W. was not a true representation of American influence since it certainly was a minority movement even in the United States. In a sense it was itself a repudiation of all that the United States stood for in the social and economic field, and merely reinforced the distrust already felt by most left of centre Australians for the United States.

It is thus clear that the appearance of the I.W.W. in Australia does not invalidate the contention that the image of the United States in Australia was a conservative one, which was rejected as a model by the Labor Party. This is, of course, an oversimplification; some of the administrators, such as FrederickKeitenstein Comptroller-General 43. I. Bedford: op. cit. p37.
of Prisons in New South Wales, or Peter Board, Director of Education might look towards the United States, rather to certain progressive American States, for examples for specific reforms, but they were equally willing to take examples from any other country which might offer.

This is perhaps because the newness of the United States dazzled many European countries into believing a country so recently founded, so accomplished in modern industrial techniques, so devoted to democracy, must indeed be the image, however deplorable, of the modern world. But to Australia, the United States was an old-established country, whose democratic forms were less genuine than her own and whose example, except in the field of industrial growth, had nothing to offer Australia which Australia did not already possess.

It is therefore all the more fascinating to see the growth in the twentieth century of Australian strategic economic, and cultural dependence on the United States; ideological dependence/- Certainly no Labor politician of the period under review, would have suggested as did Mr. Calwell recently that Australia should follow more closely the constitutional form of the United States.
CHAPTER 2

DEFENCE AND FOREIGN POLICY
DEFENCE AND FOREIGN POLICY

It is impossible to evaluate Australian attitudes to America in this field except in terms of both Australia's position within the British Empire, and her attitudes towards the Pacific as a whole and to Japan, which, in the words of Hartley Grattan, has always been "the focus of all thinking about the Pacific."\(^1\) The connection between this anxiety over Japan and the White Australia policy is succinctly put by E.L. Piesse: "Although there has been scarcely any friction with foreign countries in consequence of the White Australia policy, the fear that this policy might lead to trouble has been always present to Australians; and the growing strength of Japan which became apparent about the time when the White Australia policy was first strictly enforced has led to this fear being constantly associated with that country ... It was the principal reason that led to compulsory military service in Australia, and to the building of the Australian navy; and it influences all of Australia's reactions to external events."\(^2\)

Australia's foreign and defence policies have been largely conditioned by two main factors, her geographical position, and the strength, or weakness, of the British Empire. Australia depended

1. C. Hartley Grattan: *Australia and the Pacific*; address to Institute of Public Affairs, University of Virginia, July 2, 1941 p6.
on Britain for her ultimate defence until the stark realities of World War II, the fall of Singapore and the Japanese advance southwards, forced her to switch her dependence to the United States. As MacMahon Ball wrote in 1951 "The most that a small nation can reasonably hope for is that she will have some freedom in choosing the great power on whom she will depend. For most of the last fifty years, Australia has depended mainly on Britain. The hard question now before us is whether we can in future depend mainly on the United States. Is this transfer of dependence possible, and, if so, will it secure and foster our distinctive Australian interests and ideals."3

Ball sees the basic aim of Australian foreign policy as security, a security best gained through dependence. In a sense the whole of Australia's defence and foreign policy history in the twentieth century has been concerned with this "transference of dependence," although its necessity was ignored either through lack of knowledge or deliberate self-deception during the later 1920's and the 1930's.4 Australia deliberately prolonged her military and naval dependence on Great Britain long beyond the dissolution of more formal constitutional ties: her Navy and Air Force for example were commanded by British officers at the outbreak of World War II and she looked largely to the great British base at Singapore for her defence. The

3. W. MacMahon Ball: Australian Foreign Policy pp11-17 in Australian Quarterly XXIII No. 2, June 1961 p11.
brief realisation of the changed position of the Pacific evident in public, parliamentary and Press concern over the Peace Treaties of 1919 and the Washington Conference, died down too soon into military complacency and even hostility to the United States of America.

This was in a sense an irresponsible attitude, as all Australian attitudes to foreign policy have tended to be. The Department of External Affairs set up in Australia in 1901 dealt largely with relations with the United Kingdom, and especially over Pacific questions (this largely came to mean Papua) and with immigration. Other foreign affairs, relations with countries other than Great Britain, were dealt with through the British Foreign Office. Even after the First World War when Australia could have appointed an Ambassador of her own in the United States of America she did not do so; it was not until 1940, when an Australian Minister was appointed to Washington, that Australia had any independent diplomatic or consular representative overseas, apart from her High Commissioner in London.

Relations with Great Britain improved steadily after Federation. No more republican separationist talk was to be heard. This was partially because successive Colonial Conferences from 1887 on did give the colonial governments at least an opportunity to air their views, while the consultation with the Dominions about the renewal of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance in 1911 caused Fisher, the Prime Minister, to state that for the first time the Imperial Government had seriously

6. H.V. Evatt: Australia in World Affairs; Angus and Robertson, 1946 p197.
consulted with the dominions on the problems of the British Empire. The nineteenth century resentment that Britain ignored Australian strategic interests in the Pacific for the purposes of her own good relations with other European powers was possibly well-founded, as in the case of the British Government's rejection of McIlwraith of Queensland's annexation of New Guinea in 1884. Even by 1899 relations were obviously better. The opposition to Australian soldiers participating in the Boer War, and to the War itself, though vocal, actually lost ground throughout 1899; the Labor group of Parliamentarians hostile to the move was much the same as that hostile to Federation, including Hughes, Holman, Darcy, Edden, Thomas and Griffith, but by 1900 many of them no longer opposed the war so strenuously. War conditions between 1914 and 1918, the constant consultation and close liaison necessary between Britain and her Dominions went far to remove this fear, born partly of parochial ignorance of British motives. By 1919 Sir William MacGregor could write that in the past Pacific problems had been unwelcome to Great Britain which had acted without forethought in that area, but that now the position was quite different. Even as early as 1911 the Round Table, whose correspondents in Australia were representative of the more informed but also more British-oriented section of Australians, felt that Australians now generally realised

that Great Britain's quarrels vitally affected Australia. 10

Concern was indubitably felt in Australia about the ownership
of the Pacific Islands closest to Australian shores. Innumerable
protests were sent to the British Government on the subject of French
misddeeds in the New Hebrides, jointly ruled by France and Great
Britain in a condominium; Latham wrote in 1908 that since 1901 more
than seventy had been made. 11

There was also a rather grandmotherly concern over British policy
in Fiji. 12 A section of Australian public opinion wanted Australia
to be in some way responsible for the running of the British
possessions in the Pacific. Suggestions were made by Deakin that
Australia's Governor-General rather than the Governor of Fiji should
supervise British interests in the Solomon Islands and in the New
Hebrides. 13 A local movement was founded in Australia in 1911 "with
the object of having the High Commissionership of the Western Pacific
transferred to Australia." 14

The British attitude to these manoeuvres was unenthusiastic, as
it was to any manifestation of an Australian "Monroe Doctrine" of
the Pacific. There is even evidence that the Colonial Office occasionally
deliberately tried to keep Australia in the dark about Pacific policy;

11. J.G. Latham : Australia and the Pacific pp95-8 in The Trident a
journal of modern languages and literature, Melbourne, Sept. 1908 p97.
12. Telegram from Lord Hopetoun to C.O. August 2, 1901 : memo by
Barton included in Hopetoun to C.O. Despatch No. 5 of Aug. 3, 1901
13. Memo by Deakin in Northcote to C.O. Confidential despatch of
Dudley to C.O.
a Colonial Office minute of 1901 recommended that Australia should not be told about a proposed special commission on the New Hebrides, "as it would be in the newspapers the next day and spoil everything."\(^15\)

According to D.C.S. Sissons, who has made a study of Australian attitudes to Japan, fear of Japan as a military threat did not develop until after the Russo-Japanese War of 1905; during the war in fact much of the Press was in favour of Japan as a gallant little nation attacking an out-of-date, illiberal, unwieldy giant.\(^16\)

Growing fear of Japan was behind the Labour Party's adoption of compulsory military training in 1906, after it had been twice defeated in 1902 and 1905.\(^17\) Earlier hostility to Japan was mainly concerned with the prevention of immigration and the preservation of the White Australia policy enacted in 1902. Australia in 1901 rejected the idea of an agreement between Japan and Australia, rather than the publication of an Immigration Act based on the so-called Natal dictation test.\(^18\) In fact, owing to the handling of Australian foreign affairs by London, Australia was able to act in a much more irresponsible manner than would ever have been possible if she had had to bear the consequences of her own actions. Australian actions endangered the embryonic Anglo-Japanese Alliance and imposed a strain on the relations between the British Foreign and Colonial Offices.\(^19\)

19. loc. cit.
Australians in fact attempted to end previously existing direct contact with Japan through Japanese consular officers in Australia and requested that in future Japan should communicate with Australia through Great Britain rather than attempt to use their consuls as diplomats.20 This attempt to shelter behind British skirts to escape the consequences of the hostility they had aroused was supported by the British for their own reasons, the main one being the desire to keep tabs on Australian foreign policy.21 In fact by 1905 Britain had become aware that the attitude of the Colonies of Australia, New Zealand and British Columbia might undermine the Anglo-Japanese Alliance.22

That this did not happen sooner was due to the ambivalent attitude adopted by the colonies. To Australia in fact the Treaty was an insurance policy against Japanese attack, and in 1911 there was little Australian opposition to renewal.23 It was not in fact until the next renewal was due in 1921 that anxiety about the growth of Japanese naval power, and the hostility between Japan and the United States forced some of the Dominions into arguing against the Alliance. As Hughes put it in 1921 before departing for the Imperial Conference "Now here is our dilemma. Our interests, our safety lies in a renewal of the Anglo-Japanese Treaty. Yet that Treaty is anathema to the

22. Ibid p8.
Americans ... What is the ideal at which we are to aim at this conference and elsewhere by every means at our disposal. It is, as I see it, a renewal of the Anglo-Japanese Treaty in such form-modified if that should be deemed proper - as will be acceptable to Britain, to America, to Japan and to ourselves.24 This appeared to have been accomplished by the abolition of the Anglo-Japanese Treaty, and by the substitution therefor of the Treaties concluded at the Washington Conference.

The role of the United States of America in Australian thinking on foreign affairs was of increasing importance during the first twenty years of the twentieth century. The universal recognition of the United States as a world, not just a continental power, as a result of the Spanish-American War of 1898 affected Australia also. Most daily newspapers carried daily cable accounts of the fighting. Many of them recognised the departure of the United States of America from isolationism, and her emergence as a world power. 25 Most of them however, such as the Bulletin and the Sydney Morning Herald, saw this emergence as an entry into the field of European politics and diplomacy not directly affecting Australia.26 The Australasian saw the future of the United States of America in the Pacific and

25. S.M.H. August 20, 1898, August 31, 1898, Sept. 27, 1898. B. Sept. 10, 1898; Australasian July 9, 1898, Oct. 8, 1898.
welcomed this. Virtually no alarm was aroused by the sudden rise to prominence of yet another Pacific power. There was in fact a great deal of talk about Anglo-American solidarity and friendship in Australia, as in the United Kingdom and the United States of America, after the prevention by Britain of German interference at the Battle of Manila.

Australian interest in the United States appears from 1901 on to have been associated with her growing apprehension of Japan. The invitation to the American Fleet in 1908 was seen, at least in part, as a demonstration of solidarity between Anglo-Saxon peoples in the Pacific. Growing pro-American feeling received a severe set-back during the First World War when considerable resentment was aroused by the United States neutrality until 1917. This resentment continued through the Peace Conference at Versailles when Wilson was accused widely of pressure tactics. Yet it was realised that the future of Australia was going to depend increasingly on the United States in the Pacific, in view of the growth of the American and Japanese navies, and the decline of British sea-power during the war.

**Anglo-Saxon Sentiment and the Visit of the Great White Fleet 1901-1914.**

The twentieth century opened thus with considerable friendly

28. S.M.H. Aug. 20, 1898; Australasian July 9, 1898.
feeling towards the United States of America on the part of both politicians and Press. This took the form largely of a feeling of vague Anglo-Saxon kinship and solidarity, based upon a similarity of race, language, and institutions. The Prime Minister Sir Edmund Barton in January 1901, visiting the American mail-ship the Sierra said that "like the Americans, Australians naturally thought first of their own, but next to them they thought of their kinship to America." 29 Alfred Deakin in 1905 said that "Next to our own nation we place our kindred in America." 30 King O'Malley, who had spent most of his life in the United States, speaking of the American invasion of Cuba, said "I knew the Americans would win because we belonged to the Anglo-Celtic people." 31 The Australasian in 1801 warned "that any European power that might think of attacking the United States of America "that would have to be a combination against Anglo-Saxondom - a rather large responsibility." 32

Dissent to this cozy view of Anglo-Saxon amity was displayed by three main elements, those strongly emotionally concerned with Ireland's fight for freedom from Great Britain, by the Bulletin, and by the left-wing Socialist press. The first and the third groups often coincided.

The Brisbane Worker wrote that "England has more to fear from America than from any other foreign State. Injustice to Ireland has

32. Australasian June 15, 1901.
peopled America with tens of millions who execrate England's name and curse her tyranny. The Anglo-Saxon kinship which British politicians prate about is a pious myth. Only a small proportion of the population is British or of British descent, and the bulk of the population are either out of sympathy with Britain, or bitterly hostile. The seeds of Irish enmity have been blown across the Atlantic like pollen on the wings of a gale to fertilise a continent with hatred of England."33

The Bulletin characteristically remarked that friendship between the United States of America and Great Britain would last only so long as the United Kingdom was America's largest customer,34 and backed down to United States demands as in the Alabama indemnity, or the disputed Oregon boundary,35 examples perhaps of the Bulletin's militant nationalism being extended in foreign affairs to include the whole British Empire.

Left-wing attitudes to the United States of America must be seen in the light of the labour movement's tendency to see the United States as the home not of democracy but of over-blown capitalism,36 a country of corrupt politicians and judges37 where the worker was a permanent underdog.38

33. W. March 14, 1903.
34. E. Feb. 22, 1902.
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As a result of this, American expansion overseas was seen as
imperialist in the worst traditions of the old world. "... America,
possibly aided by Great Britain, is about to extend her territory by
swooping down on some of the West India Islands in the name of religion
and for the extension of the Kingdom of Christ. Faugh!"39 wrote the
Worker over trouble in Haiti. The Tasmin, journal of the left-wing
Australian Socialist Party, published a parody of the Poet Laureate,
Alfred Austin, culled from a San Francisco labour journal which read:

"Should alien races dare to fight
Against our conquering banners,
Although they strive for home and right
We'll teach them better manners.
We'll scatter ruin in our track
And loose the war dog's tether
When Stars and Stripes and Union Jack
Spread Tyranny Together.

Now let us give one hearty grip
As tyrants e'er are doing
And pledge land pirates' fellowship
While trade and gold pursuing
And with our battle flags unfurled
Be fair or foul the weather
We'll shoot our way around the world
And share the swag together."40

The Tasmin, in fact, even stood out against the flood of popular
sympathy for the United States of America which followed the assassination
of President McKinley in September 1901, saying that "he has only got
a little dose of what the United States troops habitually meted out
to strikers,"41 defending anarchism42 and alleging that Czogolsz, the

40. Tasmin June 26, 1902.
41. Tasmin Sept. 12, 1901.
accused murderer, had been tortured. In this instance it was in a very small minority, for the sympathy of the Australian people was aroused. Hundreds of letters of condolence poured into the United States Consul's Office in Sydney, Parliament passed a resolution of sympathy to be sent to the United States of America, and the daily press unanimously condemned the murder.

Even the Worker reflected that the act was wrong although it proved that if you neglected the lower classes, you would simply produce anarchy.

Interest in the United States of America flagged somewhat in the years between 1901 and 1906; although there was continued interest in the domestic actions of Theodore Roosevelt, who, as Vice-President in 1901, became President on McKinley's death. He was regarded at first with a certain amount of suspicion - the Bulletin described him as "an amateur swash-buckler with a genius for self-advertisement"; the Age disliked his policy of spread-eagleism, as did the Sydney Morning Herald. Nevertheless Roosevelt, as a result of his anti-Trust legislation, was a much more sympathetic figure to the Labour Party than McKinley had been.

This period 1901-8 saw a great deal of discussion of the nature of Australian defence of Australia, discussion which barely mentioned

43. Toos in Oct. 10, 1901.
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49. Age June 18, 1901. 50. T.M.H. June 4, 1901.
the United States but which did see a crystallisation of the fear of Japan. It saw the adoption of the principle of compulsory military training by the Australian Labour Party and the Fusion party and a growing dissatisfaction with British naval defence of Australia. Probably all these factors influenced the invitation sent to Roosevelt's Great White Fleet to include Australia on its round the world cruise.

This move caused friction between Australia and Great Britain; Deakin, while Prime Minister, wrote what purported to be a private letter to the American Ambassador in Great Britain, Whitelaw Reid, asking him to help to persuade the United States Government to allow the American fleet to come to Australia. The Colonial Office was extremely indignant, since they argued such a letter could never be unofficial; that the arrangements should have been made in the normal way through the Colonial Office and the Foreign Office.52

The official letter from Deakin to the Colonial Office said "It has occurred to Ministers that it may be in harmony with the policy of the American Government which has inspired the visit if it could be made to extend to all important ports of the coasts of the Pacific, and they accordingly suggest that the leading Australian ports should be included as calling places for the Squadron on its homeward route."53

His unofficial letter to Whitelaw Reid was more expansive "The appearance in the Pacific of such an Armada is an event in the history

52. Northcote to C.O. Mar. 4, 1908 Despatch No. 61 C.O. 418 P.R.O.
53. Northcote to C.O. Despatch No. 60 enclosing Despatch Deakin to Northcote n.d. C.O. 418 P.R.O.
not only of the United States but of that Ocean. We are naturally deeply interested in its significant voyage and anxious to have some opportunity of expressing our sympathy with our kinsmen in their timely demonstration of naval power in what may be loosely termed an Oceanic neighbourhood. There are two sides to the Pacific and it would be a pity if only one of them were to be favoured with the presence of your Fleet ... No other Federation in the world possesses as many features of likeness to the United States as the Commonwealth of Australia and I doubt whether any two peoples are to be found who are in nearer touch with each other or likely to benefit more by anything that tends to knit their relations more closely ...”

Attlee Hunt, permanent head of the Department of External Affairs, denied in 1910 that the invitation to the American Fleet was a sort of international insurance policy against possible trouble.

“We are proud of our connection with the British Empire and are not at all likely to look to any country, even to the United States, for whom we naturally feel a high regard, for assistance in any time of trouble.

“M. Corbach says that since the visit of the American Fleet the people consider the United States as an elder brother, from whom it would be necessary to seek support if England had international difficulties. There may have been a few people who talked that way.

at the time that the Fleet was here, but I happen to know well the feelings that inspired the invitation for that Fleet to visit our shores, and the consideration which M. Corbach mentions certainly found no place among them. We regard the people of the United States just in the same way since the visit of their Fleet as before it. We were of course glad to see that magnificent exposition of Naval power; we were glad to meet the thousands of sailors who spoke our own language and who have interests in the Pacific largely similar to our own; but to say that we ever dreamed of transferring allegiance from our Mother-Country to the United States is to make an assertion that would not be supported by one person in a thousand of the Australian people."

If Attlee Hunt, who was in a position to know the motives behind the invitation, denied that any idea that the United States could replace Great Britain as defender of Australia, existed, this leaves two other main possibilities; that it was prompted by a growing fear of Japan, or that it was in fact basically a move in Australia's relations with Great Britain. If it was the latter it must be seen in the light of the withdrawal of the British Squadron from Australia after the conclusion of the Anglo-Japanese Treaty, of the agitation in Australia for national defence schemes independent of Britain, and of the nationalistic feeling that objected to payment of a subsidy to Britain's fleet, although realising that Australia's basic

defence lay in that fleet.

There is no direct evidence from those concerned in the issuing of the invitation of fear of Japan. Sissons, however, has shown that from 1907 fear of Japan in Australia, previously voiced only by a few, became acute and widespread, that professional naval opinion for the first time in 1907 showed fear of Japan as a possible aggressor, especially in combination with a European power. There was also a snowballing of Parliamentary support for compulsory military training from 1907 onwards, based on fear of Japan. Sissons also claims that Deakin had Japan in mind in inviting the United States fleet, since he wanted support for his own defence proposals.

This may well have been one factor behind the invitation, but it is possible that other reasons can be found in Deakin’s reports of the Fleet’s visit as anonymous Australian correspondent of the London Morning Post.

"We have never seen a single British battleship in these waters so that the prospect of beholding sixteen of them arrayed in Port Jackson between Government House and the Heads may well awaken fresh emotions. The Imperial Navy is represented among us principally by third-class cruisers; its men are extremely popular along the waterside and its officers sought after as guests during their stay in Sydney. There its relations with the public end. The "Admiralty" with no appreciation of the influence even its Squadron might wield here, or

57. ibid p62.
the impression it might make in other States, contemptuous about the spectacular and very little concerned about colonial opinion, does nothing. The Americans are not so blind, in their own country or out of it. Before they leave the Pacific, their sea-power will have been visibly demonstrated to every nation that borders on the Pacific in an unforgettable way."

A distinct note of disillusionment is apparent in Deakin's letter to Hume Cook at the time when a split was developing between him and the Labour party whose votes had kept him in office. "The United States Fleet has nothing to do with my troubles except to add to them by wasting my time," a comment which scarcely suggests an over-great enthusiasm for cementing Australian-United States relations.

The idea that the aim of the invitation was at least partly to provoke a demonstration of British naval strength in the Pacific gains strength from an invitation sent almost immediately after the American Fleet's departure. "Received from His Majesty's Ministers of the Commonwealth: Begins; Strong desire throughout Australia for visit British fleet calling each State capital. It would receive most patriotic welcome. Very desirable that fleet should be impressive as possible in size and quality. If no prospect such a fleet could squadron visiting Cape Colony come on here preliminarily though more striking demonstration of naval power would still be sought and exercise most beneficial influence upon public opinion. Ministers do not formally invite either fleet or Cape squadron until informed of wishes of His Majesty's Government and timeliness of request."
indignant Colonial office minute on this telegram commented "It appears that nothing could be less appropriate than to send a British fleet to Australia at once as a sort of counterblast to the visit of the United States fleet. If such action is necessary it should have been foreseen before the Americans were invited."61

Further overtures to the United States in the form of an invitation to Theodore Roosevelt to visit Australia on his proposed World tour in 1909 after the end of his Presidential term provoked intense annoyance at the Colonial Office.62 "This is really unworthy of the Australian Government. To play off United States against us is not only foolish (for United States will not fight Japan for Australia) but is intended to be used to induce us to break our Japanese alliance,"63 while the permanent head of the Colonial Office added "We must send it on but it is a most objectionable message and I cannot help thinking meant to be unpalatable to us."64

The idea that Deakin was using the United States as a lever against Britain to end the Anglo-Japanese alliance, or provoke a British show of naval strength against Japan in the Pacific is strengthened by a despatch from Deakin to the Governor-General in March 1906, about the same time as the issuing of invitations to the United States of America, recommending the termination of the

62. Telegram Dudley to C.O. received 5.25 a.m. Sept. 18, 1906.
63. ibid C.O. Minute thereon signed A.N.N. Sept. 18, 1906.
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Anglo-Japanese Treaty. Ian Nish points out that although Australia’s Labour Prime Minister Andrew Fisher in fact supported the renewal of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance in 1911, this did not mean that hostility to Japan had ended, but was an acquiescence in Grey’s view that termination of the Alliance would mean that a two-power Fleet would be necessary in the Pacific.

The Australian public was more interested in the visit as a spectacle than as a political event "Whatever the Prime Minister’s aims when he despatched the invitation," wrote Deakin "it is already clear that the general public is principally intent on satisfying its curiosity and enjoying a holiday in honour of the event." All the Australian states clamoured for an opportunity to see the Great White Fleet, which, in fact, confined its visit to Sydney and Melbourne.

Enthusiastic citizens suggested that a flock of eagles should be liberated when the Fleet entered the heads, or that rubber eagles holding United States flags in their beaks should be manufactured as souvenirs. Manufacturers and retailers rushed to advertise their products with reference to the Fleet. The Press as a whole devoted a great deal more space to reporting the parades, the dinners, the spectacle provided than to analysis of its significance for Australia.
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But there was analysis as well.

Some of it dwelt on the Japanese threat. "To Australia, the lone guardian of white civilisation in the Pacific, the message that comes cannon-tongued from the swift and stalwart messengers of the deep has but one import, an assurance of amity charged with power."  

"The remoteness of Australia from the Great Powers, the comparative fewness of her population, and the feeling that their nearest neighbours are the teeming millions of Asia ... are cogent reasons why any large body of progressive whites would be treated with delight."  

"We are not concerned to deny that a special point of attachment (to the United States of America) does exist in the fact of a community of interests between America and Australia as regards the Oriental invasion which is ever threatening, and from which only a display of invulnerable force will preserve us."  

"The presence of the United States fleet gives the opportunity for the peaceful development of the interests of the white races in the Pacific which will inevitably be brought closer together for mutual protection."

There was still more emphasis on the theme of community of interests, language and institutions. Wade, the Premier of New South Wales said

"We look upon the visit of this fleet as a further step in the
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realisation of the brotherhood of the English-speaking nations." 77
Deakin spoke of "the strength of invisible ties drawing us together
as States united in affection." 78

The United States was by no means averse to such statements of
solidarity. Theodore Roosevelt was anxious to work along parallel
lines with British policy in the Pacific, and constantly stressed the
common problem of checking Japanese immigration faced by the United
States as well as by Australia and New Zealand. He was in fact
anxious to accept the invitation extended to the Fleet by the
Australian Government. 79 Admiral Sperry, Commander of the American
Fleet, in Sydney made such statements as "The Imperial interests of
both our great nations are one - From New Zealand at the lowest point
to the uttermost point of the Philippines, from New Zealand north-east
towards Hawaii and the coast of the United States there is an unbroken
chain of common interest ... Common interests will require common
protection." 80

Deakin wrote, with a touch of irony, "The prophetic are most of
them confident that all possible misunderstandings between the Empire
and the Republic will henceforth be impossible. The two peoples are
to walk hand in hand in paths of peace to which a sense of their
joint strength is to confine the unruly nations who have no such
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pleasant recollections. Of course both are to be sensible of the
kindness of the Australians in bringing about so happy a climax.31
Some weeks later he summed up "In the retrospect ... everyone seems
well content that we should thus have put our sense of a living
kinship between the Empire and the Republic beyond all question.
Both are British not only in a historic sense, but in many other ways
which ought to make a good understanding between them easier than
with other peoples. This has been the Imperial note struck insistently
and with emphasis by the Governor-General, the State Government,
the Prime Minister and all the Premiers with an unbroken harmony
rarely witnessed in Australia."32

A few newspapers, most notably the Sydney Morning Herald, attempted
to see the visit of the United States fleet in a wider perspective.
"So far as we are concerned this expression of the amity of nations -
of the brotherhood of the Anglo-Saxon race - must be held the supreme
motive of the visit ... But of course there are wider implications.
When the fleet entered the Pacific, we remarked that the centre of
gravity of sea power had changed. What the future of the Pacific is
to be only the future can disclose. It may not be an American lake.
It may not be a Japanese sea. But whatever its fate, the coming of
the fleet to Auckland is another noteworthy stride towards it, for
it points to the cementing of closer ties between America and Great
Britain ... It is likely enough that America may be the first line

of defence against Asia," while the following day it scouted the idea that friendship towards the United States implied disloyalty to Great Britain.

These words in a sense sum up the main themes visible in Australian thinking on the visit of the American fleet; the growing apprehension of Japan's strength, the desire for Anglo-American friendship since this would provide a second ally in the Pacific, yet a constant emphasis that Australia's first line of defence lay in fact with Great Britain. It emphasised at once the need for an independent defence policy in the form of the Australian navy, and the constant importance of the British tie.

Sissons states that only the Argus and the Mercury were unenthusiastic about the American Fleet's visit. This is not entirely accurate.

The Bulletin, for example, wrote that "... the fact that Uncle Sam will one day fire his guns at us - or at least at our relations - seems fairly certain. All the clatter about kinship - all the reunions and ententes on earth - are not likely to shift that fact one inch."

A split within Labour ranks on the question of the United States of America is by now discernible. Arthur Griffith probably expressed the general feeling of the majority of the Parliamentary Australian Labor:
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Party when he wrote "... an epoch-making event has occurred which goes a long way to neutralise the effect of Tsu-Shima (where the Russian fleet was destroyed by the Japanese). A great Anglo-Saxon democracy, Britain's eldest-born daughter and the wealthiest and most advanced nation in the world, the United States of America, has leapt full-armed into the gap, and by the transference of the Great White Fleet from the Atlantic to the Pacific, has flung down the gauntlet to the Mongol and challenged the naval supremacy of Japan, and by its visit to Australia has given notice to the yellow races that they will have to stop in Asia."\(^{88}\)

The Labour Press was unenthusiastic about the visit, feeling that for example fleets would soon be out of date because of the beginning of air flights.\(^{89}\) But only the most extreme sections actually condemned the visit; the Australian organ of the I.W.W., the American direct action labour organisation, called the Fleet "Uncle Sam's Blood Ships" and remarked that what true Socialists wanted was the abolition of an economic system which made such ships possible.\(^{90}\)

Press enthusiasm, naturally enough, waned after the departure of the Fleet, but there is evidence that sections of the Australian public were still interested in the American position in the Pacific
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especially in view of the projected opening of the Panama Canal.

"Atlantic traffic will have an easy and direct ingress into the Pacific. This will plainly strengthen America's preponderance in our ocean, and render more unlikely than ever her withdrawal from Hawaii and the Philippines. In fact we may expect that the opening of the Canal will give to the United States preponderance for years to come." 91

J.G. Latham commented that the United States had entered the Pacific to stay and that "The new importance of the Pacific is the product of two factors - the rise of Japan, and the prospective completion of the Panama Canal." 92 Colonel Foster, director of Military Studies at Sydney University, and one of the most vocal supporters in Australia of the "Blue Water" or Imperial view of Australian naval defence, commented that the only result of the Panama Canal would be to shorten routes between Australia and the East Coast of America. "In this region the only foreign navy is that of the United States, based on their Eastern ports, and they can hardly be considered a possible enemy." 93

By no means all Australians would have disagreed with Winston Churchill's view that "If Great Britain's power were shattered, the only course open to the whites in the Pacific would be to seek the protection of the United States." despite the outcry that such a
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statement caused in Australia. Such a course had in fact been suggested in the Lone Hand, the magazine offshoot of the Bulletin, in 1913. "To lose the protection of the British Navy, even temporarily would be a catastrophe for Australia. But to gain the moral and material support of the United States, our nearest white neighbour would be, at least, some compensation. Apart altogether from sentiment the national interests of the United States would imperatively prevent that nation from acquiescing in the establishing of an Asiatic power on this island continent, which lies within a fortnight's steaming from its own outpost at Hawaii," and "No-one can doubt that if Australia is attacked by sea in the coming years, and if Britain is embarrassed by a simultaneous attack elsewhere, and only able to send a small part of her naval strength to these waters, the United States flag will be seen flying off our coast, and American ships will be seen lying in the line with the British and the Australian ships to hold this country for the white race that first colonised it."

Evidence of a growing interest in the United States of America can also be seen from the increasing amount of newspaper space devoted to American internal affairs between 1908 and 1914: most of the Eastern daily newspapers began in this period to publish regular accounts from correspondents in the United States of America on American domestic affairs, while increasing interest is evident in
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the coverage of the 1912 elections in the United States when Woodrow Wilson was first elected President.

To sum up, it would probably be fair to say that interest in the United States grew as growing fear of Japan forced Australia into an examination of her position in the Pacific. Australians saw the United States of America as a new country with British language, traditions and institutions like themselves; a country moreover which faced the same problems in regard to Japanese immigration as themselves, and which was an industrial giant with a growing military potential. The distrust felt by much of the Labour party for certain aspects of the United States policy tended to die down after 1908 except in the minority anti-conscription groups; it had been overcome by fear of Japan. On the whole, however, friendly relations with the United States were seen as a supplement to, not a substitute for, British protection: a sort of vast Anglo-Saxon union was envisaged. Relations with America were in a sense a part of a better and closer relationship with the Mother Country.

Affection for the United States in Australia probably reached its peak in the years between 1908 and 1914 but it was an emotional feeling of friendship. No attempt was made to translate it into anything more practical as can be seen from the development of Australian defence policy in this period.

Sisson has shown the development of Australian defence policy

in relation to the growing fear of Japan, while a useful summary plus documents of the development of an Australian navy is given in G.L. Macandie "The Genesis of the Australian Navy" (Sydney Government Printer 1949) and it is not proposed to do more than offer a summary of the main trends of defence policy.

Two main impulses are obvious behind a growing concern in Australia with the problems of defence. The first is the growing realisation of the end of Australia's isolation in the Pacific, as a result of European expansion there in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, reinforced by apprehensions created by Pacific Wars and the emergence of Japan in the 1890's. A conference of Commonwealth naval officers in 1899 wrote that "Within the last half-dozen years the keen attention of the political world has been concentrated on the Pacific."

"There is every indication that it will play the part of the Mediterranean in the past century as the arena of national contending forces."

"France, Russia and Japan have established naval bases and possess powerful fleets in the north of the Pacific. Nearly every other European power has effected a lodgment in the seas to our north." 99

Yet despite a general agreement that the defence of Australia

98. D.C.S. Sissons op. cit.
must, by reason of geography, be primarily naval, agreement was not reached on the form this naval protection should take. In 1903, despite recommendations from the report of the conference of Commonwealth Naval Officers and of Commander Creswell, despite Press support of an Australian navy, the Naval Agreement by which Australia subsidised the British Navy, was renewed by the Barton Government. Sir John Forrest, Minister for Defence, wrote to Barton "I am not prepared to recommend under existing conditions the establishment of an Australian navy. Even if it were established, I am afraid it would not be very efficient, for besides the enormous cost of replacing the Fleet from time to time with more modern ships, there would be no change for the crew." There was considerable hostility to renewal both in Parliament and the Press, but there was a reluctance to spend money on defence, especially among the Labour party. Creswell reported bitterly in 1906 that "Immediately after Federation, however, it seemed the intention to abolish the naval forces. Reductions were made with the end in view only of reducing the numbers to be dealt with. The flow outwards from the Service, particularly of the Naval Militia was made easy, and no enrolments were permitted."

Deakin's Government was much more vigorous about defence matters,
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and Australian feeling in favour of a fleet of their own gained steadily in strength, reinforced by a growing doubt of Britain's ability to defend Australia from Japanese attack in the Pacific, as well as her own territory from Germany. The controversy between the school of thought which argued for continued subsidy and reliance on the strength of the British Navy, and that which desired to set up an Australian Fleet, is epitomised in Col. H. Foster The Defence of Australia together with remarks thereon by Captain Creswell.

Foster argued that Japan was in fact further away from Australia than Turkey from the United States and that there were virtually no military or naval forces in the French New Hebrides or German New Guinea, and that no sizeable naval force could reach Australia without being intercepted. The main danger was from isolated cruiser raids, and Australian defence should concentrate on land forces capable of coping with small parties of invaders, and harbour defences.

Creswell, however, pointed out that British naval superiority was by no means immutable and that "we have been reminded by English writers on defence that the time is fast approaching when the existence of Australia "will depend on the goodwill of America and the politeness of Japan," a comment based on a simple calculation of the growth of the world's navies.
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He argued further that an Australian fleet would in fact strengthen the British position by relieving the Admiralty of the need to worry about Australia, thus enabling her to concentrate her forces. "We see now — that naval power alone can tell in the Pacific. Unfortunately other counsels prevailed and Australia is a naval cypher as a result. In our present condition of helplessness we are more or less dependent upon the kindness of an Asiatic power for our security. It is, I think, the first time in our history that any section or branch of our race has depended for its safety on any other people than its own." Creswell made no reference to any possibility of defence by the United States of America in case of attack from Japan; in fact such a conception appears to have been entirely lacking among Governments or military or naval advisers in Australia, who unlike the Press or the public were concerned with hard facts of ALLIANCES and naval strength, not sentiment.

It was paradoxically enough in the field of military defence, which was less controversial than that of naval protection, that some faint traces of American influence can be found. On March 1, 1901 the States' militia forces were taken over by the Commonwealth, but little was done to implement the principal of universal military service so early agreed on in 1902. In March 1901 the permanent
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military forces of the Commonwealth numbered 240, by June 30, 1906 they were only 171. 112

American precedents were used to buttress the idea that a nation could survive without a standing army, but the true precedent for a citizen militia was really Switzerland. Militia training was at first voluntary, but as fear of Japan grew, the advocates of compulsory training were strengthened. In 1908 the Labour party adopted this policy which it had rejected in 1902 and 1905. Deakin also came around to supporting it, and the 1909 Defence Act introduced universal military training for males between the ages of twelve and twenty-two years.

The Royal Australian Military College at Duntroon, established to provide the officers to lead and train this citizen army, was in fact modelled upon America's West Point Military Academy. This was first recommended by Major-General Hutton in 1903114 and had also been advocated by Lord Kitchener in 1911 when he reported on Australian defence. 115 Major-General Hoad had been sent to the United States, as well as Europe, in 1909 where he reported extensively on American military education, including that at West Point. 116 The Imperial Defence Conference on 1909 gave further impetus to the setting up of an officers' training school by its recommendation of the establishment
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of an Imperial General Staff.

Another minor example of American influence is to be found in the selection of a tender for plant and machinery for the Commonwealth Small Arms factory at Lithgow from the American firm of Pratt and Whitney, rather than from three important British firms. But since the grounds for the choice were economy and speed of erection, this decision was rather economic than military.

The Great War 1914-18

This period saw both a growth in sympathy for the United Kingdom caused by the close co-operation of the war, and a growing independence due to the increase in consultation. In the Pacific question it sharpened Australia's anxiety about the ownership of Pacific possessions, and increased hostility to Japan as it appeared that Japan would take possession of some of the captured German islands there.

Sissons, despite the difficulty that war censorship stifled criticism of Japan, finds that hostility to Japan was particularly strong in the conscriptionist wing of the Labour party. There is also evidence that Hughes in particular feared Japanese long-term designs and even that Japan might join with Germany against Australia.

From 1916, by which time Japan and Britain had conquered all the
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German possessions in the Pacific, there was in fact a greater fear of Japan than before 1914. 120

The fact that the United States remained neutral in a war which Australians saw as fully justified aroused a hostility the more bitter for the friendly feelings which had been built up before 1914, but it also forced a more realistic appraisal of the situation and policies of the United States of America than had been common in the pre-war period.

The nationalistic press such as the Bulletin and the Lone Hand were probably the most hostile to the United States of America. An editorial in the Bulletin proclaimed that the United States was in fact unable to support the Monroe Doctrine with ships or men. "In fact Britain has been the Monroe Doctrine and the United States has been the Monroe bluff. Now the Republic has proved a mighty poor present friend in disagreement. It has even explained that a German invasion of Canada would not necessarily be regarded at Washington as a hostile act, and it has refused to strengthen its emaciated army of ninety thousand men lest Germany should be annoyed thereby. In these circumstances BULL may possibly decide, when the smoke of battle has blown away, that he will take a line of strict neutrality ... Then UNCLE SAMUEL will be like a pyramid upside down with a great deal of assertion on top and very little solid assurance below." 121
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sinking of the *Lusitania* provoked the comment that a powerful navy would be of more use to the United States than would the dollars they were making out of the war.122

Even the difficulties of the United States of America were turned into sins by this section of the Press. Of the racial problems caused by the large minority of German-Americans; "The United States of America is a discordant multitude pursuing one objective - four and tuppence."123 and 'Our American cousins' is a false phrase, and the silly expression 'Anglo-Saxon' as applied to an American is mere slobber - He is Celtic, Slav, Scandinavian, Latin, Semitic, Mongolian, Teuton. He is chiefly an Anglophobe during childhood ..."124 declared the Bulletin. Even an assessment of the constitutional difficulties faced by the United States said of Wilson, "His sole protection is the British fleet. His hesitation is not his fault. It is not optional but imperative. He is the victim of circumstances over which he has no control, and with the genesis of which he had nothing to do - Abuse of him is beside the point. It is like abusing a man for failing to fight well with a wooden sword. As an ally the United States would be useless to the Empire, but as an example of all that this country must avoid it is of inestimable value to

122. *B. May 13, 1915.*
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Australia. 

Even the Sydney Morning Herald, which was less vituperative, was critical of United States policy. It was quite convinced that the 1914 elections for the House of Representatives in the United States of America would see a Republican victory. "While the power of Japan in the Pacific is growing week by week there is little hope for a party which calls Mr. Bryan its Secretary of State. Americans in the present war will remain neutral and sell all they can to Germany careless of whether they prolong the war or not. But they like to have at their head a man who is not committed to the independence of the Philippines, who will magnify the influence of America all over the world, and who, whether his services are wanted or not, will not show any of that reluctance to obtrude himself which distinguishes President Wilson from ex-President Roosevelt." 

Wilson's Notes to Germany were greeted with scorn in Australia. Even as the United States President moved reluctantly but inevitably towards war early in 1917 little sympathy or admiration was expressed. The Argus wrote "The ordinary citizen of the United States is not thin-skinned. He presses strenuously onward in pursuit of his business interests, and allows no sensitiveness to rebuffs to deflect him from his purpose. This characteristic of the individual
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naturally expresses itself in the nation as a whole, although it may be obscured somewhat by diplomatic formulas. There has been nothing in the Republic's attitude to the war that can by any stretch of courtesy be described as chivalrous; but the business instincts of the people have been very keenly alive, and no chance for turning an honest dollar has been missed. "129 About six weeks before war was declared the _Argus_ thought the prospect of America's fighting Germany was more remote than ever. 130

The _Age_ did not believe that the declaration of war by the United States would mean physical hostilities because the United States Government was spineless and undignified, 131 and saw the main value as being not to the British Empire but to the United States of America in restoring her self-respect. 132

The Labor Press paid little attention to the role of the United States in the war; it believed that the war was a product of the capitalist system. 133 The leader pages of the _Worker_ gave no indication that a war was in progress; there was no editorial comment on the United States drift into war in 1917, or on her part in the war thereafter.

It is thus clear that the difficulties of the United States of America were not fully recognised in Australia, and that bewilderment at her neutrality after the high hopes for Anglo-Saxon unity led to
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a swing to contempt, hostility and an underplaying of her military
and naval power.

There were still a few Parliamentarians who echoed the earlier
sentiments. A backbench Senator named Bakhap in 1915, speaking on
the Appropriation Bill, claimed that Australia by conquering German
island possessions in the Pacific was now in a similar position to
the United States of America: "If we were an independent country and
had the power to negotiate these, one of the first things that we
ought to do in the field of diplomacy would be to enter into an
alliance with the United States whose interests are absolutely
identical with our own. I hope that the might of these two great
units of democracy will be associated for decades to come in insuring
that peace shall prevail both above the Equator and below it, in
territories which are vital to the interests of America and specially
vital to the interests of Australia and important in no mean measure
to the whole British Empire ... I hope that we shall keep on extending
to the Old Country our left hand, which is nearest to the heart,
and which is the hand of affection, but that at the same time we shall
offer the United States of America the right hand of friendship and
that by our joint efforts in the cause of peace we shall enable our
interests in the Pacific Ocean to be so maintained as to secure the
influence of the two great Democracies of the world for centuries
to come." 134 Another backbencher, Senator Lynch, agreed with Bakhap
that although in many points of social and economic development Australia could teach the United States a lesson, yet the preservation of Australian standards in the Pacific against Japan demanded close friendship with the United States of America.  

The Australian Government, however, appears to have been unenthusiastic about the United States of America in this period. 

This type of anti-United States reaction, if complete reliance could not in future be placed in British protection, yet Japan was becoming ever more powerful in the Pacific, meant not increased reliance on the United States but the development of a type of Australian Monroe Doctrine. 

This was no new phenomenon; it had been advocated early in the nineteenth century and Federation gave it new impetus. In 1897 it was stated "Australia should be the supreme power in the Southern Pacific." In 1901 the French were alarmed by the development of Australian jingoism in the form of a Monroe Doctrine. In 1903 it was claimed "Australia is developing a foreign policy of her own. There is a British, and a Monroe doctrine, and an Australian doctrine (the Service - Moilwraith doctrine) is springing up in Australasia to safeguard Anglo-Australian rights in the Austral-Pacific, theirs by naval-tradition, trade, energy and geographical position. Australia must have no foreign and hostile ports or naval bases within striking distance of Sydney, Melbourne, Auckland, Christchurch, Brisbane, Albany, Hobart, Adelaide or even Fiji. Our policy is hands...

137. Reported in Henry L. Hall: Australia and England: A study in Imperial Relations: London 1894 p231: for statements of such a view see e.g. H. Repr. May 21, 1901 Crouch p87.
off the Austral-Pacific towards Germany, France or Russia.\textsuperscript{138} In 1902 \textsuperscript{138} Major General Hutton wrote "Mr. Watson and the Labor members present quite agreed with me that there had recently sprung up in Australia a phase of the American Monroe Doctrine, and further that there were unmistakable signs of Australian 'spread-eagle-ism' gradually making itself apparent."\textsuperscript{139}

This doctrine was never precisely defined, but was largely a sort of exclusivism: compounded of the White Australia doctrine, and of a feeling that Australia was vitally interested in the ownership of any territory near enough to Australia to serve as a base for attack. It was crystallised by the conquest in 1914-15 of the German Pacific possessions by Australia and Japan. This had a two-fold result; firstly, although they had not in fact been used as bases against Australia, Australia was determined that they should be so disposed of as to offer no possible future threat and secondly it brought Japan much nearer to the Australian northern coast.

Andrew Fisher and probably Hughes knew of the secret agreements of 1915 by which Britain agreed to cede the islands North of the Equator, the Carolines, Marshall and Ladrane Islands to Japan.\textsuperscript{140} It may have been the apprehension prompted by such private knowledge\textsuperscript{141} which prompted the setting up within his department of a special information


\textsuperscript{140} D.C.S. Sissons op. cit. pp86-7.

\textsuperscript{141} Not only was this knowledge private to the Government, but the press was prevented by war time censorship from discussing the future of the Pacific islands.
service on Japan; and his declaration in the United States of America in 1918 of an Australian Monroe Doctrine of a say in the South Pacific.

But although there was support for the idea of Australian predominance in the Southern Pacific, there was disagreement as to whether this should involve annexation or not. As early as 1917 a resolution was passed in the Senate that the captured German possessions should not be returned to Germany, although some Labor members expressed themselves as being opposed to annexation. On a motion of Hughes in April 1918 to record pride in Australian forces and an intention to fight for a victorious peace, Higgs of the Labor party declared himself in favour of Woodrow Wilson's peace proposals and asked how the demand for annexations could be reconciled with Lloyd George's assertion that the war must be a holy one; there was no satisfactory reason, he said, for keeping the German Pacific islands which would, like New Guinea, merely be an unrewarding expense. This point of view was once more expressed by Labor members on November 14, 1918 when Government-sponsored motions that the former German Pacific possessions should not be returned to Germany were passed in both the House of Representatives and the Senate. One member even attempted to reconcile annexation with former American policy, if not with Woodrow Wilson's aims, by comparing it with the United States.
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acquisitions in the Spanish-American War. 148

There was thus by no means unanimity in Australia on the subject of the German possessions.

The Peace Conference

The part played by W.M. Hughes at the Peace Conference of Versailles was large considering the smallness of his country and its recent emergence to an independent voice in world affairs. 149

There were two main points on which Australia's interests, as seen by Hughes, conflicted with American policy. These were the disposition of the former German possessions in the Pacific, and the declaration of racial equality demanded by the Japanese. On both of these collision was violent.

The reasons behind this collision are in a way obscure. Hughes displayed no vestige of the pre-1914 Australian idea that the United States might be a potential defender of Australia against the Japanese menace, a view never really shared by Hughes who saw little to admire in the United States of America. 150 There appears from the start to have been considerable personal animosity between Hughes and Woodrow Wilson, the American President. This probably dated from 1916 when Hughes first visited the American President and attempted

to put forward his ideas on the Pacific Islands. Hughes described the encounter graphically and unfavourably. "At the White House President Wilson received me courteously and when after a few non-committal words I ventured to set out the views of the Government of the Commonwealth on the future of the Islands of the Pacific, he heard me in silence, listening intently to all I said, but remaining as unresponsive as the Sphinx in the Desert ... The President's silence had so depressing an effect upon me that my powers of speech withered and died. Although as a professor in a great University he must have had at least a nodding acquaintance with the Islands in the South-West Pacific, and must have heard about New Guinea, he sat there like a stuffed image, never betraying by word or gesture the slightest interest in what I was saying. If he had even said 'Pooh', or 'Bah' or even 'Ah' I could have struggled on, but as it was I gave it up, and thanking him for according me the honour of a personal interview, I tottered down into the outside world where thank God, ordinary human beings were going about their lawful occasions."

He rushed straight off to the more congenial company of ex-President Theodore Roosevelt. 151

James Shotwell, a member of the Inquiry, later recorded of this visit that Hughes "gave us a foretaste of his diplomatic technique at the Peace Conference by laying his electric ear-Trumpet on the table when he didn't want to hear any objections to his point of view." 152

Major-General J.E.B. Seely, then British Under-Secretary for Air, commented on the Peace Conference that "Among the many misadventures that befell President Wilson, not the least disconcerting was the presence of Mr. Hughes, Prime Minister of Australia, at the Conference. This strange man had the knack, possessed by none other, of knocking the President completely off his balance. As a natural consequence the President tended more and more to view any proposal from Australia with a somewhat unfriendly eye." 153

It is thus obvious that there was considerable personal dislike between Woodrow Wilson and Hughes. Hughes' view of Wilson is epitomised in the following comment, "When asked if he had seen the President, Hughes replied 'Only his back. No man can look on the face of the Almighty and live'." 154 But personal dislike is not enough to account for Hughes's stand against the mandate principle, even in the case of a politician with so little experience in diplomacy. Borden, Prime Minister of Canada, who had been favourably impressed by Hughes in 1916 155 recorded that he was already in belligerent mood in November 1918, two months before the Conference opened; he got on Lloyd George's nerves, 156 and was "cranky and unworkable." 157 Lloyd George described his attitude as pugnacious. 158 He objected
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not only to Wilson’s actions, but to actions by the British Government which appeared to disregard the newly-won Dominion voice in British foreign policy. On November 7th 1918, he protested in a speech in London that the British Government had not consulted the Dominions before signing the Armistice on the basis of Woodrow Wilson’s Fourteen Points, while he demanded separate Dominion representation at the Peace Conference. Despite Scott’s claim that public opinion showed no opposition in Australia to the latter point, a cable from the acting Prime Minister in Australia stated that the Government would not support such a demand, and criticism was expressed by some Nationalist members of Hughes’ demand for independent representation in the debate on the Treaty of Versailles. Hughes’ criticism of the British Government’s acceptance of the Fourteen Points was condemned by some newspapers. It is thus clear that Hughes did not completely represent the views either of his own party or of the country as a whole in his attitude to the Peace Conference.

His actions can, however, be interpreted as consistent in furthering what he supposed to be Australian national interests, which involved resisting not only foreign powers, however potentially friendly, but also if necessary the British Government.
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161. Ibid p752.
163. Argus Nov. 16, 1918; Register Nov. 11, 1918.
Hughes' demand for annexation of the German Pacific islands and consequent opposition to Wilson's proposed mandate system, was backed by Smuts's and Botha's desire to annex German South-West Africa to South Africa, by the Japanese demand for the former German Islands North of the Equator, and by French hostility. Lloyd George said that by the time the Conference opened only he himself and Woodrow Wilson were in favour of mandates. The problem was finally solved by a compromise proposal of the British Empire delegation which divided mandates into three classes, the third of which provided for virtual annexation; the problem brought the Conference nearer to a breakdown than any other issue since Wilson threatened at one stage to withdraw and return to the United States of America if annexation rather than a mandate system was adopted.

Hughes, at first bitter about the settlement, as was the Australian Government, later pointed out that it was in fact satisfactory, especially since no other power (presumably he was thinking of Japan) could fortify its own mandated islands.

The question of the disposal of the German Pacific Islands was followed with close interest in the Australian Press. Most newspapers recognised that it was the most important question for Australia at the Peace Conference even if it were a minor problem to the
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Conference as a whole. 167

But though they were agreed that the islands should not be returned to Germany, few of them were in favour of annexation, and most of them would have been willing to accept internationalisation, as they named the Mandate system.

The Adelaide Register opposed annexation since, if Australia got the islands South of the Equator, Japan would be entitled to those to the North and this would bring her half-way towards Australia: 168 a trusteeship system which forbade fortification of mandated territory would, however, solve this problem. 169 It also chided Hughes for making so much fuss over annexation, 170 and considered that he should apologise to the United Kingdom and to the United States of America. 171

The West Australian considered that Hughes was running counter to Australian public opinion in demanding annexation, and would have been content to internationalise the Islands; 172 especially since it also recognised that annexation by Australia would have its corollary in annexation by Japan. 173

The Age declared that the defence of the German islands would cost too much if they were annexed, and although anti internationalisation,
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had the brilliant idea that the Royal Navy could defend them, and Australia administer them. It did, however, stress that Australia’s interest was purely strategic and rebuked Hughes for giving the impression that Australia wanted to grab territory for herself.

The Argus supported Hughes on the retention of the German Islands in December 1918, but condemned him for his behaviour towards Wilson at the Peace Conference. It would have been happy to give the Islands to the United States of America, but recognised the impossibility of this. Therefore, since it felt that international control had failed in Egypt and the New Hebrides, the only alternative was reluctant annexation by Australia and New Zealand to protect their strategic interests.

The Sydney Morning Herald recognised the strategic importance of German New Guinea, but felt that a mandate system would be adequate, since Australia had no desire to fortify the Islands. Hughes’ clash with Wilson upset the Herald “If some grave wrong were about to be inflicted, such an appeal would be justified and necessary. If Australia’s destinies are safe, as we believe them to be, in the hands of her own spokesmen and of the statesmen of the Allied nations, Great Britain, France and the United States, it would be unwise and
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discourteous. The interview will be interpreted in the United States as a protest against the objection to the dominions being treated as separate States which is attributed to President Wilson. Mr. Hughes, however, knows that the interests of Australia and the United States are too closely identified to maintain such a quarrel [the reference was to the threat from Japan] ... The supremacy of the British Navy will be greater after this war than it has even been. But the second Naval Power will be the United States and it will be by the cooperation of the two fleets that the peace of the world, the freedom of the seas and incidentally the Australian coast line will be preserved. 181

The Herald and the Bulletin 182 were the only papers at this period to speak up in favour of Australian-American friendship in the sense it had been envisaged in the pre-war period, but more typically the Bulletin thought little of either Wilson, or of his proposals 183 or of the United States contribution to the war. 184 In a later summation it thought that the demand for annexation was a mistake because it brought Japan closer to Australia. 185 The Lone Hand favoured annexation, showing no fear of the possible Japanese retention of the Marshall and Caroline Islands. 186

The Worker, consistent to its war-time policy, had little comment

to offer on the peace; except that the Great Powers had, as usual, parcelled out territory to suit themselves and that Woodrow Wilson had been the only statesman at Versailles with any pretensions to righteousness.

Labor party members were also against the idea of annexation. It is thus clear that on this question few except the Australian Government were behind Hughes in his demand for annexation rather than international control and that in fact the greater body of Australian public opinion was perfectly content to accept a mandate system.

On the other important point, the Japanese demand that a clause recognising racial equality be included in the Covenant of the League of Nations, there was less division of opinion. Hughes considered that the terms in which it was concerned constituted a threat to the White Australia immigration policy, and resisted it strenuously. In the end the motion, carried by eleven votes to six, was prevented by Wilson's ruling that all amendments to the League Covenant must be unanimous.

According to Colonel House, Wilson was in fact prepared to accept the clause, but for the sake of preventing another outburst from Hughes,
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he decided to support the British position of opposition to its inclusion in the Covenant.

It was difficult at such a distance for the Australian Press to grasp the issues involved. The *Argus* said that it could not understand what the Japanese wanted, since they were already one of the Great Powers; but it opposed anything which would force Australia to accept Japanese immigration. The *Age* expressed its admiration for Japan and her loyal conduct during the war, felt that Japan was interested not in Australian territory but in China; it had been fair enough that Japan should raise the racial equality issue even although she must have known it would not be accepted. The *Register* also opposed the idea of the racial equality clause if it would affect the White Australia policy, and felt sure the other Great Powers would reject it because of fear of Japanese economic and social rivalry. The *Sydney Morning Herald* did not think the Japanese would press the point: a few weeks later it thought that if the clause had been a mere statement of equality, Hughes had made a great deal too much fuss. The *Bulletin* claimed that in fact Japan had more respect for Australia's direct opposition to the clause, than for

Wilson's hypocritical attitude to the question of peace. The Worker dissented from the prevailing chorus by claiming that racial hatred merely helped the ruling classes, not the workers.

One point of view which is notably absent from these comments is any idea of the United States as Australia's protector in the Pacific against Japan.

There were those who considered that on this question Australia had in fact fought the battles of the United States, since there was strong feeling about Japanese immigration in the Western States of the United States of America, and the possible danger that if such a clause were included the American Senate would refuse to ratify the Treaty. "On that occasion the President had, by the skin of his teeth, been rescued by Mr. Hughes of Australia." The Sydney Morning Herald also commented to this effect in 1919; while the Bulletin argued that Hughes' belligerent attitude had antagonised other nations such as South Africa or the United States of America, which were also interested in racial exclusion and "His hostility to the American delegation was such that amicable co-operation between the two countries will be difficult for some time." Some Parliamentarians also thought that Wilson had left it to Hughes to fight his battles.

Hughes returned to Australia still convinced that his country
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had not been well treated at the Versailles Conference, as is evident from his speech in the House of Representatives introducing a resolution for the acceptance of the Peace Treaty. He recapitulated his grievances over the acceptance of Wilson's Fourteen Points as the basis of the German surrender and of the subsequent peace negotiations, he complained that the peace had not been harsh enough on Germany, that Australia had had to fight to gain the captured German Islands and to prevent an "open door" in the mandated territories, and that Australia under the reparations agreement would receive no compensation for her war-time expenditure. He also indicated that he had little faith in the efficacy of the League of Nations, and that since America had reserved the Monroe Doctrine from the League's domain, Australia would have her own Monroe Doctrine in that she would allow nothing concerning her interests in the Pacific to be submitted to the League. "This Peace, whatever may be said, is not a harsh peace for Germany and it is not a just peace to us."202

Other more forceful expressions of opinion were made in the same vein. Senator Bakhap called the Treaty an American peace.203 Most of them were aimed specifically at President Wilson, personally, and did however express some hope for future Anglo-American friendship. Sir Robert Best said "I cannot extend unqualified admiration to President Wilson. No doubt his task was an arduous and difficult one; but until he was taught the lessons of diplomacy at the Conference itself..."

brought face to face with actualities, he and his fourteen points furnished one of the biggest amongst many great problems with which the delegates to the Conference had to contend," but hoped for a future Anglo-Saxon alliance for peace.

Dr. Maloney said "One cannot always admire President Wilson, although one might do so if it were a matter of choosing a great letter-writer. He is a man of literary instincts, and a great literary capacity, but the deep regret that I have in my heart is that Roosevelt was not President of the United States of America, ... It seems to me that this war has made an alliance between English-speaking races."

Objections to Hughes' point of view were varied. Points made were that the Fourteen Points were a just basis for the Peace, or that Australia had no use for more territory even in the form of mandates. Tudor, as official Labor party spokesman, supported the Fourteen Points as similar to terms suggested by the Australian Labor Party in June 1917, but felt that people were more interested in the cost of living. J.H. Catts attacked the Treaty fiercely on the grounds that it brought Japan closer to Australia, but passed no judgment on United States actions.
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On the subject of Woodrow Wilson and of the League of Nations the Australian Press was divided. Some, like the Sydney Morning Herald\(^1\) and the West Australian\(^2\) were on the whole favourable, but the Herald felt that peace should have been made before the League was set up.\(^2\) The Adelaide Register expressed the same opinion.\(^2\)

The Age, although recognising Wilson's sincerity and the desirability of a League of Nations with practical machinery, yet felt that Wilson was trying to foist the League on the Allies, without solving the problems of the war.\(^2\) It also finally decided that the League would be unable to guarantee peace because of basic war-like impulses in human nature.\(^2\) The Argus thought the League would be useless without United States membership, but that if it meant the end of American isolationism it would be a good thing.\(^2\)

But a sense of puzzlement, of an inability to judge any longer what were United States attitudes, a realisation that the United States of Theodore Roosevelt for which Australia had felt such admiration before the war was not the real United States is perhaps visible in the obituary notices of Theodore Roosevelt who died just after the New Year in 1919.

---

\(^2\) S.M.E. Mar. 6, 1919.
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The Argus felt that he was one of the truly great men of his day who had represented all that was true and honourable in the United States of America during World War I. The Register ranked him with Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, Grant and (possibly) Wilson as one of the greatest Presidents of the United States of America. The Sydney Morning Herald also praised him highly, especially for his cementing of Anglo-American friendship.

The Bulletin was less restrained in its opinion of Wilson than the rest of the Press; it was distinctly hostile, as it was also to the idea of a League of Nations. In a characteristic outburst it declared "Even an honest Pecksniff may be a serious nuisance, and President Wilson, assuming his honesty, fills the bill more and more every day. Most of the troubles at the Peace Conference have arisen through the moral precepts of the least practical among the delegates, and the least important save in the fact that he is the figurehead of a very great Republic. Wilson appears at the Conference as a self-appointed member and as the discredited leader of a defeated party. ... The Fourteen Points are so beautiful and vague and philanthropic that the Hun clamoured for them and claims that the Allies are bound to them, and is anxious to join Wilson's country in fighting for them against the Allies. Of course a peace based on
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them may be rejected as insufficient by an anti-Wilson Senate, but meantime the points are an unmitigated nuisance ... He stands for the country which entered the war last among the important states, and which in its haste to send its men home promises to be out first. It refuses the drudgery of police duty, and cleaning up in Russia, Poland and elsewhere." The Bulletin's obituary of Roosevelt claimed, however, that it was he and not Wilson who was truly characteristic of the American character.

It is thus clear that, while changing Australia's international position, as well as the relative strengths of the Great Powers, the war had an effect on Australian attitudes to the United States of America. Australia had emerged as a nation with more say in Imperial policy than ever before, and, due to the close co-operation of the war years, with a greater attachment to the idea of the British Empire. Yet the power of Great Britain, especially her naval and financial supremacy, had been severely damaged by World War I, and Australia could no longer rely securely on British protection, a fact barely recognised in Australia in 1919. The pre-war view of America as a possible alternative protector of Australia, or the more widespread feeling of Anglo-Saxon solidarity, had, however, been severely damaged by the American neutrality for two and a half years, and by the clash at the Peace Conference between Australian and United States attitudes. Despite a few isolated expressions of confidence in identical interests, and a still continuing conviction that the United States' power could

never be a direct threat to Australia, there was little confidence 
remaining that the Americans would necessarily protect Australia 
against any Japanese threat.

Hughes in particular appears to have considered the only possible 
course to be the building up of Australian naval defence, and the 
formulation of an Imperial defence policy. Others clung to the belief 
that the British Navy was still supreme; the Labor party, with a few 
exceptions such as Catts, was too pre-occupied with internal strife 
to worry about international affairs. As Japanese and American naval 
building programmes continued in the post-war period, however, 
apprehension grew that Australia might unwillingly be involved in a 
Pacific conflict, and an increasing desire to find some sort of 
solution to this problem became apparent.

Sissons states that there is no record of any Naval Board reaction 
to the Jellicoe Report but believes it unlikely that there was any 
disagreement with its major premise that Japan was the only potential 
enemy. Government interest in Japan was shown by the visit of 
Piesse, Director of Military Intelligence, to Japan in January 1919, 
and by the establishment in May 1919 of a Pacific branch of the 
Prime Minister's Department.

That Hughes was still pre-occupied by the need for defence is 
shown by his unsuccessful attempt to get military training for
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eighteen-year olds accepted by his Cabinet. In an important statement in 1920 on defence expenditure he declared that preparation for war was the best guarantee of peace; that Australia could no longer shelter behind the British navy, or the League of Nations. The League, he said, was useless so long as the will to war existed, and in any case some interests such as the Monroe Doctrine or the White Australia policy could not be submitted to it. The Pacific was now the centre of the Empire's naval policy, and because of Britain's huge burden of debt, the British Navy could no longer be expected to bear the whole burden of defence. Distasteful though a large army or navy must be to a democratic State, Australia must have sufficient trained staff, munitions and equipment for future defence.

Yet there was also a demand for economy in the country, as well as a strong pacifist element which opposed war preparations. Tudor, Leader of the Australian Labor Party said in 1921 that he would rather spend more money on the League of Nations than on a fleet. In 1919 the Interstate Labor Conference voted against peace-time training. The Ninth Commonwealth Australian Labor Party Conference in 1921 thought that the Pacific would be the centre of the next war, but preferred the idea of international arbitration to that of defence spending. One writer in the Worker saw the next war as being between

the United States and Great Britain with Japan as Britain's ally, although this writer appears to have been very much in a minority.

Also in a minority was the idea expressed by a Nationalist back-bencher, Cunningham, that since the United States in two years would have the most powerful navy in the world, there was no need for naval expenditure in Australia.

The Bulletin held the opposite view from this, believing not only that the Japanese were better sailors than the Americans, but that the United States of America was most unlikely to be able to defend Australia in the case of war with Japan. "It is plain that to stake our national existence of the certainty of the United States dominating the Pacific would be criminal insanity."

But the growth of navies in the Pacific definitely alarmed Australians, even if it were generally felt that the United States Navy would never be hostile to Australia. The fear that there would be a Japanese-American war in which Australia, due to her geographical situation, was bound to become involved, was very real.

In this context of increasing tension in the Pacific and
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Australian uncertainty as to what should be her safest course, the question of the renewal of the Anglo-Japanese Treaty, due to come up for review in 1921, came to assume a central importance. Was it in fact a guarantee of Australia's safety against Japanese attack, or did it threaten British, and therefore, Australian, involvement in a Pacific conflict between Japan and the United States of America?

Hughes, in a ministerial statement to the House of Representatives on April 7, 1921, on the Imperial Conference of 1921 which was to discuss the matter outlined his policy as one of renewal on terms unobjectionable to the United States of America.

"The attitude of the Australian people towards foreign policy before the war was one of indifference partly begotten from our geographical circumstances and our remoteness from those centres of population which were, in the very nature of things, regarded by us as being most potent in directing the affairs of the world, and our indifference arose, too, from other causes. We had lain so securely sheltered under the wing of the British navy from the very day of the foundation of this country that not only did wars which devastated and destroyed other parts of the world pass us by unscathed, but even rumours of war left us unaffected. The very completeness of the protection which the British navy gave us was responsible for the fact that the Australian people took no heed of those things which vitally concerned other nations, bringing to them war, turmoil and destruction, and those upheavals which have made history during the last hundred years. But the recent great war changed these
conditions; circumstances, to which I shall allude later, have made it necessary that we shall take a keener interest in foreign policy ...

What is the hope of the world? As I see it it is an alliance, an understanding, call it what you will, between those two great nations, the United States of America and Japan. America has said that she must have the greatest navy in the world; that she must have a navy strong enough to defend herself. To defend herself against whom? She has left the world in no doubt or very little on this point ... What is the ideal at which we are to aim at this conference and elsewhere by every means at our disposal. It is, as I see it, a renewal of the Anglo-Japanese Treaty in such form-modified if that should be deemed proper, as will be acceptable to Britain to America, to Japan and to ourselves."245

The official Labor party line was similar to that of Hughes. 244 and Fenton 245 for example agreed with his view, but the All-Australian Trades Union Conference in June 1921 opposed renewal of the Treaty, not because it offended the United States, but because it was an instrument of capitalism. 246 J.H. Catts, who had previously attacked the Peace of Versailles as bringing Japan too close to Australia, attacked renewal of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance in the Worker. 247

Catts clearly stated his opinion that United States friendship was more important to Australia than was that of Japan, and that the
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Alliance might embroil Australia in Asiatic quarrels on the opposing side to the United States. He also felt it necessary to defend America's late entry into the war and her refusal in April 1920 to join the League of Nations, points which still rankled bitterly with most Australians. 248

Much of the Press was pro-renewal, some of it even without the qualifications made by Hughes. The Argus agreed with Hughes that non-renewal would entail too heavy a defence expenditure. 249 It felt that there was in fact no inconsistency between the Alliance and friendship with the United States of America; 250 The Age surprisingly enough denied that Australians wanted any voice in United Kingdom foreign policy since this might embroil Australia in European troubles, and said that all that was desired was friendly consultation. 251 It also expressed itself in favour of a renewal of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance and said that the White Australia policy was not inconsistent with this. 252 It went so far as to say, as it had said in 1919, that Japan was no threat to Australia or the United States, since her future field of expansion lay in China. 253

In June it wrote "Despite the loose and foolish talk of scare-mongers

248. e.g. Argus Apr. 16, 1921; Age Apr. 26, 1919.
249. Argus Apr. 8, 1921.
250. Ibid June 21, 1921.
251. Age Apr. 8, 1921, Apr. 20, 1921.
252. Age Apr. 8, 1921.
253. Age Apr. 16, 1921.
the outlook has never been brighter than it is at the moment for
the establishment on the firm basis of 'international understandings'
of amicable relationships between Britain, America and Japan. The
future peace of the world practically rests in the hands of these
three nations. Britain is the dominant power in Europe, America is
the dominant power in the western world, and in the future Japan must
largely control the policy of the Orient"; it was confident that they
would all work together for peace. 254

The West Australian felt that Hughes had understated some of the
problems, and asked why, if the Anglo-Japanese Treaty would safeguard
Australia, and there was no fear of an Anglo-American War, the United
Kingdom, the United States of America and Japan were still engaged
on large shipbuilding programmes. 255 In a thorough and reasoned
analysis of the Pacific situation, it recognised that, "To Australia,
as to America, foreign policy pivots in the Pacific; and as, in existing
circumstances, only three powers, the Empire, the United States and
Japan, are in a position to exercise any potent influence upon
international affairs in this part of the globe, foreign policy must
concern itself with the relations between the three." 256 This is
the most succinct and realistic press comment on the Pacific found
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in research on this period. It decided that the Anglo-Japanese
treaty could be directed against no-one but the United States in the
Pacific, pointed out that the reasons for strain between the United
States and Japan were similar to those behind the White Australia
policy. It concluded that White Australia was more important than
the Anglo-Japanese Alliance, and if the latter were any threat to it,
the Alliance could not remain. Yet it had no illusions that common
interests in the prevention of Japanese immigration would mean that
the United States would protect Australia, as it would be forced to
protect Canada because of geographical contiguity, against Japanese
invasion.257

Even before Harding's invitation to a conference to discuss Pacific
problems it declared "If the Pacific questions are determined without
the expressed approval of America, and if no arrangement is made for
cooperation with the United States or for the adjustment of difficulties
with this kindred power, any Britannic alliance with a third country
appears to be Imperial business at the wrong shop. America is a
Pacific Power. She has interests in China. We would gladly see the
Anglo-Japanese Treaty and naval programmes go by the board if in their
stead were substituted a general arbitration agreement between the
257. West Australian June 16, 1921.
nations bordering the Pacific, or with interests therein - an agreement which necessarily would exclude the 'axiomatic' principles of the Monroe doctrine and the White Australia policy."

The Register considered that the best defence of the White Australia policy was the British Navy, but that Australia must contribute to her own defence and also suggested that some international agreement between Japan, the United States and the United Kingdom on trade policy and armaments would be the best solution; it felt that the Treaty should be renewed only if it served justice in the Far East but that Britain should not be swayed by United States dislike of the Treaty, since the United States of America had not even chosen to join the League of Nations. Non-renewal would weaken Britain in the East and strengthen United States commercial interests there.

The Sydney Morning Herald also felt that some sort of Pacific Triple Agreement, either as well as or instead of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance would be the best policy.

The Bulletin, long anti-Japanese, yet felt that renewal of the Alliance might be the best way to protect the White Australia policy. It felt, however, that war between the United States of America and Japan was unlikely since neither would really gain from it, but that Japan might very well choose Australia as a field for future expansion; the best protection against such an eventuality was co-operation
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within the British Empire. It had still, as in the pre-1914 period, no confidence that the United States would intervene. "There is an idea abroad that even if Britain failed us the Yankees would readily dash into the breach and help to uphold the white man's burden. Its basis is probably nothing more stable than the immemorial tendency of man to believe that which he wants to believe. Apart from the difficulties the United States of America has to meet as a sea-power by reason of the passive resistance of the bulk of its citizens to navalism, there are the facts that a large proportion have no cause to sympathise with us (Uncle Sam's Germans, Austrians, Hungarians, Turks, Bulgars and other late enemies of the Empire number about 20 million) that about 12 million look on our attitude towards the coloured races as an outrage; and that as regards the rest, the occupation of this country by Japan would help to solve their nation's most pressing foreign problem." 264

Concern over United States - Australian relations in this period was a continuation of the reactions at the Paris Peace Conference in that it was still primarily concerned with the position in the Pacific, and even more particularly with relations with Japan. The United States, however, due to the naval building programmes, was now seen as a potential source of danger to Australia in that Japanese-United States conflict might involve Australia. A growing realisation in the 1919-21 period of the weakening effect that the war had had on the international position of Great Britain and on her capacity to maintain
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a navy of pre-war standard (the Two-Power Standard was abandoned in 1920) made it necessary that some other means of protection for Australia must be thought of. Japan was still regarded as the main potential enemy, although elements of the Australian Labour Party did not entirely agree with this view; with scarcely any exception, however, the United States was not regarded as a potential enemy. On the other hand there was very little confidence that Australia would get material protection from the United States of America, although the world situation had changed so that United States protection would have been of more value to Australia in the post-war than in the pre-war period. Interest in foreign policy, from 1918 on higher than it had ever been before in Australia, centred on the establishment of some sort of balance of power in the Pacific between the United States, Japan and the British Empire.

The Imperial Conference and the Washington Conference

It has been argued that at the Imperial Conference of 1921 Hughes was in fact willing to sacrifice the Anglo-Japanese Alliance in favour of American friendship; but the fact that Hughes was cited in State Department files as being in favour of harmonious Anglo-American relationships or even the words quoted as his opening words to the Conference "It is vital in the interests of civilisation that a good understanding should exist between America and ourselves" are
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not sufficient to support this belief in face of other evidence. Hughes saw it as more important to restrain Japan than to conciliate the United States of America. 268 He also questioned the view of Meighen, Prime Minister of Canada, that United States opinion was in fact hostile to renewal of the treaty. 269

In the event there was such disagreement at the Imperial Conference on the question of renewal of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance - the Canadians steadfastly opposed it and South Africa was also unhappy - that the proposal for a conference on Pacific problems first introduced in the American Senate by Borah, and later formally extended by President Harding, was welcomed. The problem of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance was temporarily shelved and the Imperial Conference went on to consider other matters.

Britain was anxious that the proposed Conference on Pacific problems should be held as soon as possible, and preferably in London to facilitate attendance of the Dominion Prime Ministers; "... Prime Ministers Massey and Hughes last evening at Chequers implored me to ask my Government to so arrange the programme that they would not be prevented from attending, especially as their interests were in all essential respects identical with ours" 270 wrote the United States Ambassador in London. This was refused by the United States Government as was the proposal that Lloyd George, Curzon, Meighen, Hughes and Massey should sail to America for consultations with the United
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States Government, to arrive on August 18. There also ensued what has been described as a comedy of errors on the question of dominion representation, whereby the United States indicated its willingness to accept delegates from the Dominions at the Conference, but the British Government stated that they expected Lord Curzon, the British Foreign Secretary, to represent the Dominions. Later, because of pressure from the Dominions for representation, the British had to ask for a larger delegation than they had previously envisaged: this was readily granted. Hughes, however, with memories of Woodrow Wilson's opposition to separate dominion representation at the Peace Conference, assumed that it was the United States of America which had once again attempted to block Australian participation in yet another international conference. It was even suggested that no representative should be sent, but in the end Senator Pearce, the Minister for Defence was appointed.

The Australian press welcomed the American initiative but
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278. *West Australian* July 4, 1921; Register July 14, 1921; *Argus* July 16, 1921; *Age* July 5, 1921; *S.M.H.* July 19, 1921.
some pointed out that a desire for peace and disarmament did not ensure the success of such a policy. As the *West Australian* put it "It is not enough to say that war between the two great English Speaking countries is unthinkable. Common prudence demands that everything that is humanly attainable shall be done to make it impossible. A complete understanding between Great Britain, America and Japan is desirable to ensure proper respect for the integrity and sovereign independence of China. The Anglo-Japanese treaty in the past has not always proved an effective bulwark against a dictatorial attitude by Japan, an attitude which has aroused hostility in China and distrust in America. On the other hand Japan's territorial ambitions within her legitimate sphere must be viewed by Britain and America in the light of a full understanding of her economic needs. Given a satisfactory settlement of Pacific problems the stage will be set for the larger Conference which will aim at a universal limitation of armaments as one, and the most important means of preserving world peace. Though America has cut herself adrift from the League of Nations the latest action of the President is a definite acknowledgement that she cannot continue to maintain an attitude of aloofness from the affairs of Europe and Asia."\(^280\) Some Labour members, including the Acting Leader of the Opposition, refused to believe that disarmament could be achieved by a Conference of capitalist governments.\(^281\)

279. *B. July 21, 1921.*
280. *West Australian July 14, 1921.*
As the time drew near for the conference at Washington in November 1921, there were indignant denials of Lord Northcliffe’s allegations that Australia was unaware of its importance. As the Sydney Morning Herald put it: "We are in fact keenly conscious of the bearing of the Washington Conference upon our own future; we are as intimately concerned in its success as any other country; we have, indeed, by reason of our geographical position and national circumstances, more to gain by its success than any part of the British Empire, not even excluding Britain herself." It also expressed pleasure at the extension of American influence in the Pacific: "The rivalry between European and Asiatic in the Pacific is steadily increasing, and it may be felt at Rabaul as elsewhere. Whether America aspirers to be the leader of the white races, or of the Anglo-Saxon race at any rate, in the conference which will have to be held, and the settlement which will have to be made with Japan on behalf of the Asiatic races is not yet clear. One part which is clear is that the Anglo-Saxon peoples must pull together, because if they do so they are strong enough to ensure peace. If Japan is reaching out for wider interests in the Pacific, so also is America."

From this press reaction and from the debate on Hughes’ report on the Imperial Conference in September 1921, it is clear that hopes

282. S.M.H. Sept. 16, 1921.
283. S.M.H. Sept. 27, 1921.
were high that Australia's foreign policy and defence problems might be solved by the forthcoming Washington Conference.

The desire to believe that a solution would be found may account for a certain lack of critical analysis in the discussion of the proceedings of the Conference, although it was very fully covered in the news pages. The arrangements reached in effect divided the Pacific into two regions, the Japanese being supreme in the Western Pacific, the United States of America in the Eastern. The Anglo-Japanese Treaty was formally renounced by Article 4 of the Four-Power Treaty between the United States, Britain, France and Japan. A naval ratio for capital ships was established of 5 each for the United States and Great Britain as against 3 for Japan.

As already indicated these arrangements were on the whole welcomed in Australia. The *Age* considered the Conference highly successful, although it did point out that since the 5 : 5 : 3 ratio applied only to capital ships, a nation could build up unchecked its submarines and aeroplanes. The *Argus* was also convinced that the omens were good for a safe and lasting peace in the Pacific.

The *Sydney Morning Herald* had no doubts about the good done by the Conference. Of the Anglo-Japanese Treaty it wrote "The record of that Alliance is unsullied, yet nevertheless, if the present proposals

284. *Age* Nov. 14, 1921; Nov. 28, 1921; Dec. 6, 1921; Dec. 20, 1921; Feb. 3, 1922.
285. *Age* Dec. 27, 1921.
286. *Argus* Nov. 14, 1921; Nov. 15, 1921.
become reality, it may be agreed by all shades of opinion that nothing in its life so became it as the leaving of it. The Anglo-Japanese Alliance will pass unmourned because it becomes merged in a nobler and better alliance. Nowhere will the new treaty be welcomed more gladly than in Australia, the largest island in the Pacific and as defenceless as any." 287 Its main concern was whether the United States Senate would accept the Treaty since "The hopes of the entire British people had been sobered by the experience of American non-co-operation in the League of Nations." 288

Even the Bulletin, after expressing some doubts as to the sincerity of the nations concerned in desiring disarmament, 289 decided that the Conference had been a success. "The world faces the New Year with at least such a measure of hope as it never knew before in history. It has been denied disarmament, but armaments will be limited sufficiently to avert wholesale and immediate bankruptcy. It is possible - in fact human nature being what it is, extremely probable - that some of the nations merely regard limitation of armaments as an arrangement similar to the recuperative rest which boxers are allowed between rounds under the Queensberry Rules. But the idealist nations, and the nations like Britain and the United States of America which are in the agreeable dilemma of the ancient

287. S.M.H. Dec. 6, 1921.
288. Loc. cit.
289. N. Dec. 1, 1921.
imperialist who found himself with no more worlds to conquer, may reasonably hope that once civilisation gets a taste of small navies it may like the dish well enough to demand small armies also." \(^{290}\)

Sissons records immense optimism in Australia about the Treaty of Washington, \(^{291}\) and the end of the close study of Japanese affairs carried out in the Prime Minister's department from 1918. \(^{292}\) The Royal Australian Navy was reduced from 23 to 13 ships, and the army from 113,000 to 30,000. \(^{293}\) Major Piesse decided that "our policy of defence against Japan is inadequately supported by the facts." \(^{294}\)

Nevertheless it is clear that interest in foreign affairs had been aroused in Australia after many years of indifference, and although it became channelled into new lines it still existed.

Some of the old fears still existed. The Worker, for example, considered that despite the Treaties Japan could do as she wished in the Far East. \(^{295}\)

Hughes himself in moving the adoption of the Washington Conference Treaties had some reservations. "The Washington Conference has achieved great things. Its decisions are very material to us. They guarantee peace in the Pacific, so far as any effort of man can guarantee it.

---

\(^{290}\) B. Jan. 5, 1922.
\(^{291}\) D.C.S. Sissons: op. cit. pp120-121.
\(^{292}\) Ibid p123.
\(^{293}\) Defence Department Estimates for 1922-3 P.P. 1922 No. 60.
\(^{294}\) Letter Piesse to Pearce Nov. 13, 1920, quoted in Sissons: op. cit. p123.
\(^{295}\) W. May 22, 1922.
while human nature remains unregenerate. We may rely on the moral support of the signatories, but there is no force behind the Treaties and I should do wrong if I did not point out to honourable members and to the people of Australia, that these Treaties are not in the nature of an alliance. They do not guarantee to us material support if we are attacked. They insure merely moral support and the public opinion of the contracting countries. The policy of the United States of America Government is opposed to interference in the differences of other States, and that, in itself, has precluded any attempt to establish anything in the nature of an alliance. In any case no promise of material support by any nation that did not possess a naval base within striking distance would be of service and no nation is in that position except England herself. It follows, therefore, that so far as material support is concerned, we are as dependent as ever on the Navy of the Empire. We welcome these Treaties and will loyally abide by them, but we must not overlook the fact to which I have directed attention." 296 The few objections made in Parliament were mostly of detail : that submarines and aircraft had not been limited as well as capital ships. 297

Although Pearce, who had attended the Conference for Australia, spoke in the Senate of the great friendship between the British and the Americans, 298 the net result on the defence policy of Australia was a falling back on Britain for defence, and particularly on the

projected base at Singapore.

One comment on the Conference virtually summed up the post-war Australian attitude to the United States; Americans were personally disliked in Australia, and American post-war policy was very unpopular, yet Australians, because of certain common Pacific interests, favoured a better understanding with the United States of America.

Not only did discussion of the desirability and possibility of an independent foreign policy for Australia become more widespread in Parliament in the years 1919-22, 300 but non-Parliamentary bodies dealing not only with international relations, but with such subjects as science or education on international lines began to spring up.

Some of these were British-inspired, such as the overseas branch of Chatham House founded in 1925, which in 1929 became the Australian Institute for International Affairs. Others, such as the Institute of Pacific Relations, were American sponsored. This latter grew out of a proposal by Honolulu businessmen for a Y.M.C.A. conference on the Pacific, and became in 1926 a self-governing body to promote friendship and co-operation between Pacific countries. 301 Australian members of this organisation centred on the Universities primarily


on that of Sydney and included G.V. Portus, F.A. Bland, H.A. Nicholas, Brunsdon. Fletcher and Persia Campbell; in Melbourne public figures such as F.W. Eggleston (then Minister for Railways), Mr. Justice Beeby and Sir Harrison Moore.

Another body, founded earlier, began in a gathering of delegates in Honolulu before the First World War at about the same time as the Bureau of American Republics was being organised into the Pan-American Union. Percy Hunter, the delegate for Australia, was employed by the New South Wales Intelligence Bureau, whose primary interest was to promote tourism and Australian exports: he formed in Sydney a "Hands around the Pacific Club". In 1917 the Pan Pacific Union got a formal charter from the United States Government. In 1921 the Australian Government even voted money for the support of a Pan-Pacific Commercial and Educational Congress. The aim of the body was to be eventually "the official body of the governments of the Pacific;" this was never achieved.

There was, despite Australian participation in the Conferences called by the Pan-Pacific Union on Science, Education the Press and the like, a feeling that it was too American, and it never achieved official status.

Nevertheless, it, like the Institute of Pacific Relations indicated

303. ibid p4.
305. e.g. Melbourne Herald Aug. 17, 1923.
growing Australian interest in the Pacific and in the position of the United States therein.

Another indication of interest can be found in the publication of a growing number of books and pamphlets on the Pacific; the only substantial book published in Australia before the war dealt mainly with missionary efforts in the Pacific. 306

Some of these writings indicate that Australia's fears of Japan were allayed after the Washington Conference. E.L. Piesse wrote that "... there have been many signs that this view of Japan is not so widely held as it was ten years ago. Leaders of the Labour party, in opposition for many years now in the Federal Parliament, influenced no doubt by international affiliations with parties in other countries that are determined to oppose future wars, have often in recent years declared that the prevalent Australian view of Japan is not well-founded ... In the universities and in movements associated with them there are now large numbers of students of foreign affairs who give much attention to this principal problem of our foreign relations and there is justification for saying that more intimate acquaintance with the facts has led many to think that there is no need for Australia to make preparations for defence against Japan. 307

One of the penalties of being a world power is that other nations

feel free to criticise the actions, motives and results of one's foreign policy. This has been particularly true of the United States since 1945, it is also true to a more limited extent of the earlier period. American proclaimed idealism in foreign policy has made this attack more pointed, since actual policy seldom squares entirely with stated ideals.

Perhaps some of the bitterness against the United States in Australia in the immediate post-war period stemmed from the fact that Australians, while desiring American intervention in the Great War, had yet expected the United States ideals of righteousness, open covenants, democracy and the like, not only to remain unblemished by contact with European diplomats, but to be compatible with British aims and interests. In other words Australians over-estimated the degree of Anglophilia in the United States. Paradoxically Australians complained not only when the United States followed her own supposed interests rather than the supposed good of world peace in rejecting the Peace Treaty, but also when United States idealism over mandates clashed with very practical Australian interests. A feeling of disillusionment is evident over United States aims. One writer complained of the Washington Conference that it was largely the American naval building policy which had made disarmament necessary.  

In other words the very factors which had previously drawn Australia to the United States - the sense of community of race, language and political tradition, of common Pacific interests - now contributed to the Australian disappointment that American actions had not been as Australians had wished or expected.

The old days of diplomatic innocence had gone. Australia herself had by 1923 participated in the councils of the British Empire and of the world. She had become both more independent more conscious of her role within the British Empire. The United States could never be an enemy, yet she was not, as it were, one of the family; her interests had been shown to be dissimilar, her policies unpredictable.

Thus ironically the war which elevated the United States to the front rank as a world power, and, by reducing the power of the British Navy, made her support of greater potential value to Australia in the Pacific than ever before, caused Australia to turn from her rosy pre-war dream of Anglo-American-Australian solidarity back to reliance on Britain, and to a lesser extent on collective security in the form of the League of Nations.

She turned, in effect, from her strategic future as a dependent of the United States of America to her traditional past as a satellite of Great Britain.
CHAPTER 3

COMMERCIAL RELATIONS 1
COMMERCIAL RELATIONS I

One fact which must be firmly borne in mind in the consideration of commercial relations between Australia and the United States of America is that although the United States was of increasing importance to Australia in the fields of trade and investment, Australia was only of very minor interest to the United States of America. That this should be so is not surprising. Exports from the United States to Oceania accounted for only between 2% and 3% of total American exports before the First World War,¹ of which Australia is unlikely to have taken more than about three quarters. In 1917 United States exports to Oceania were down to 1.74%,² although in 1918-19 Australia took over one quarter of her total imports from the United States of America, which by then had become her largest trading partner after Great Britain.³ This would indicate that although the United States was supplying an ever greater proportion of Australia's imports, trade with Australia was of decreasing importance to the United States itself owing to the enormous expansion of American overseas trade, particularly that with Europe, brought about by war conditions. The same trend appears in the matter of United States investment in Australia. Even as late as 1929 after there had been considerable Australian Government borrowing in the United States, and American industry had begun to set up manufacturing plants in Australia in the course of the 1920's, United States direct investment in Australia

2. loc. cit.
3. see Table 3
and New Zealand was still less than $150,000,000 or about 2% of total United States overseas direct investments. Only Africa ranked behind Australia and New Zealand in the regions of the world as to the amount of American capital invested there.

This period was a vitally important one for the trade of the United States. From the mid-1890’s until the First World War her overseas trade changed in character. From being an exporter of raw materials and an importer of finished goods, she began to export manufactures and consequently to import an increasing amount of raw materials. 5 In 1900 60% of United States exports were agricultural products, by 1913 exports of manufactured commodities were almost 49%, the same virtually as those of agricultural produce. 6 This change met considerable opposition from European manufacturing nations in every Continent including Australia, 7 but the magnitude of the switch was not fully realised in Australia until during the First World War; up to 1913 German competition was regarded in Australia as the main threat to British domination of the Australian import market. The first edition of the Commonwealth Year-Book, published in 1908, while recognising the growth in manufactured imports from the United States, displayed a lingering tendency to regard America as a source of kerosene, timber and breadstuffs. 8

6. ibid p56.
7. ibid p54.
This switch in the pattern of United States trade ought logically to have encouraged trade between Australia and the United States of America, since Australia was, as the United States of America had formerly been, an exporter of raw materials and an importer of manufactured goods: in 1901 her export of manufactured goods amounted to about 0.4% of total Australian exports, while animal substances alone, mainly wool and hides, provided over a third of all exports. Nevertheless the proportion of American goods to total Australian imports while increasing in absolute quantity remained at about 13% until the disruption of world trade caused by the Great War led to a spectacular increase.

There were in fact powerful reasons militating against an increase in American trade with Australia. The first was that there was very little except wool that Australia had to export which was required in the United States of America, herself so rich in agricultural and mineral resources; this was a hindrance to United States exports to Australia as well as to imports from Australia because of the lack of return trade.

Another powerful handicap was the lack of regular shipping lines between the manufacturing Eastern areas of the United States and Australia. The American merchant marine carried only a small and declining fraction of United States foreign commerce before 1913. The only direct regular steam-ship line from the United States to

11. ibid p244.
Australia, the Oceanic S.S. Company, operated from Sydney to San Francisco, on the West Coast, and was primarily a passenger and mail service. American consular officers in Australia felt the lack of more adequate shipping connections hampered the growth of their country's trade in Australia.  

Other handicaps to the expansion of United States exports to Australia frequently complained of were the conservatism of Australian merchants and their preference for buying goods of British rather than foreign origin. Another, and more substantial handicap was the preference awarded to British goods in the revised, and higher tariff of 1908. That in fact, despite American fears, the preferential tariff did not increase Britain's share of the Australian market in the preferential sector seems clear, but it probably did act as a handicap to certain foreign goods.

There were other handicaps; there were indeed cable and letter services between Australia and the United States via Canada; but parcels had to go through Great Britain. Moreover since there was no American bank established in Australia, nor any Australian bank

12. e.g. United States Department of Commerce and Labor: Bureau of Manufactures: Special Consular Report No. 47, Australia, Its Resources, Industries and Trade, with some suggestions as to its development as a market for American merchandise by H.D. Baker, Vice-Consul-General at Sydney and other consular officers: Washington 1911 p10.


14. ibid (a) p10; ibid (b) pp10, 19.

15. See Commonwealth Year Book Vol. 7 1901-14 pp554, 559.
in the United States, payment to the United States merchants had to be made through London, or by special arrangements between Australian and American banks. The Commonwealth Government did have a chance to have a branch of the enormous and powerful National City Bank of New York, one of the largest in America, set up in Australia in 1916 but it refused the idea. In 1922 there were only two foreign banks other than British in Australia - one was the Comptoir National d'Escompte de Paris, the other the Yokohama Specie Bank of Japan. Even by 1922 direct exchange between Australian and American banks was rare, although three Australian banks had recently begun carrying balances in New York. In 1921 direct exchange was done through wool brokers who had sold wool to America. There were also in America Export Commission houses which would, for a fee of 2½% on large transactions or 5% on small ones, cope with the problems of shipment and payment. It was not in fact until 1928 that arrangements were made to open a branch of the Australian Commonwealth Bank in New York.

The natural conflict of interests between American merchants who wanted their money as soon as the goods were shipped, and the Australian purchasers who wanted a chance to see the goods before they paid for them caused some difficulty, especially since the Australians had become used to generous terms from English and German houses.

17. Ibid p139.
trouble could be caused by the reluctance to quote price c.i.f.
(cost, insurance and freight) rather than f.o.b. (free on board)
especially since sometimes in f.o.b. quotations the goods were not
placed on board the ship but merely delivered to the port. 20

There was also the problem as to how to conduct one's business
in Australia. At such a distance it was difficult to ascertain the
financial standing of an Australian agent, 21 but there was a preference
in Australia for Australian rather than American agents. 22 Australian
importers naturally preferred exclusive agencies (on the goods they
imported), 23 and there was sometimes considerable avarice when
the agencies turned out not to be exclusive after all. 24 All these
technicalities of trading overseas were obviously nothing new to
British exporters nor to giant corporations such as Ford, but they
could prove a headache to smaller American firms who moved into the
export business as American overseas trade expanded.

There were also less tangible difficulties. It certainly seems
that there was a considerable pro-British sentiment amongst Australian

20. Guaranty Trust of New York: Trading with Australia: New York,

(note 16) p139: see also for example letter from Roger H.
Williams, Estabrook Co. New York to Prof. Henry Barraclough
Aug. 30, 1927 in the Barraclough Papers in S.U.A.


23. ibid pp7-8.

24. See for example letters from Johns and Waygood Ltd. to Henry L.
Jones, Sydney, agent for the United Steel Corporation, July 12,
1905, July 27, 1905 in Johns and Waygood Papers 33/2 in the
A.N.U. Business Archives.
importers, although sentiment was never so strong as to interfere
with profitable business. As the American Consul in Sydney reported
in 1905 "There are no discriminating taxes levied on American trade
in New South Wales, but there is a strong sentiment favouring British
goods without regard to quality or price." Another American reported
in 1926 "While not ultraconservative the people of Australia are less
ready to adopt new habits than are the people of the United States ..."
Moreover business men and methods in Australia were different from
the United States. "Business methods are somewhat different from our
own. The Australian takes life more easily. He will import almost
anything we have except nervous hurry and tenseness." One Royal
Commission in Australia spoke of American travelling salesmen
"sweeping through the Commonwealth like a plague of grasshoppers,
devouring for one foreign company alone no less than £80,000 in one
year" although the Sydney Morning Herald thought Australian
business could learn from such American methods.

Thus the Americans did not have everything their own way in
increasing the share of the Australian market. But both the interest
in and the dislike of the United States felt by Australian traders,

25. See Dominion Royal Commission: Minutes of Evidence Taken in
Australia in 1913 Part I Cst. No. 7171, Part II Cst. No. 7172. London 1914
26. United States Department of Commerce & Labor : Bureau of
Manufactures: Monthly Consular and Trade Reports No. 292 Jan.
1905 p294.
27. United States Department of Commerce : Bureau of Foreign and
Domestic Commerce : Trade Information Bulletin No. 441: Central
Light and Power Plants in Australia and New Zealand by Howard
E. Way, Washington 1928 pl.
29. Royal Commission on Customs and Excise Tariffs : Progress Report
No. 5 : Agricultural Machinery and Implements P.P. 1906 No. 56 p62
30. S.M.H. June 7, 1919.
and also the fact that interest was stronger on the American side
can be seen in the publication of the Millions Club. At this time
(1920) several advertisements a month were appearing for trade
connections "Adelaide firm wants touch with American and Canadian
exporters of furnishings etc." 31, "Sydney firm importing hog casings,
butchers' supplies and exporting mutton and bullock casings wants
United States connections with sausage casing dealers' ", "Sydney
firm already agent for one well known American typewriter wants
contact with American manufacturers of office supplies."
32 Yet
Australian business men who had visited the United States complained
of the clap-trap talked there about the Americans having won the
war; Americans meantime declared "Woe betide that man whom from
this day, will attempt to drive a wedge between Australia and our
Australian cousins." 34

British reports, unlike the American ones, tended to stress
the superiority of the United States of America in such matters as
better and more up-to-date methods of manufacture, greater interest
in, and adaptability, to Australian conditions. 35

It was not in fact until the First World War cut Australia off
from her traditional European suppliers of manufactured goods, thus
enabling the United States of America and Japan as well to fill the

Seattle Vol. 3 No. 4 August, 1920 p24.
32. ibid Vol. 3 No. 1, May 1, 1920.
34. ibid Sept. 1, 1919 p19.
35. e.g. United Kingdom: Report on the Conditions and Prospects
of British Trade in Australia by the Advisory Committee of the
Board of Trade, based upon information collected by their
Commissioner, Mr. R.J. Jeffray Cd. No. 5639, London, 1907 p22.
gap, that United States exports to Australia increased greatly. The relative peacefulness of the Pacific and the high shipping freights even made it economically possible to send goods by rail to San Francisco from the Eastern United States of America and ship them onward from there. And the opening of the Panama Canal in 1915 shortened the sea-route from the Eastern sea-board of the United States of America to Australia. United States imports increasingly invaded Australia, and although they fell back in the 1920's from the huge proportion of over a quarter of the total imports to about a fifth, this was still well above the pre-war figure. This was due largely to the elimination of German competition.

In the field of investment, very little was borrowed from the United States of America till the 1920's. Although the traditional London money-market on which Australia had for so long relied, had dried up during the war, Australia had, despite British suggestions that she borrow from New York,\(^36\) financed the war by domestic loans. But after 1920, because of the tightness of the London market, Australians did in fact turn to the United States.

One thing is, however, clear. However unimportant trade with, and investment in Australia were in the overall perspective of United States foreign commercial relations, they were of immense and growing importance to Australia. By the end of the war not only was United States trade with Australia second only to that of Great Britain, but her shipping entering and clearing Australia was also the largest of any foreign nation; in investment too, no non-British nation except the United States showed any tendency to invest in Australia.

36. E. Scott: *Australia During the War* Sydney 1938, p493.
In the field of commercial relations, as in most others, the twentieth century has seen the growth in importance of the United States of America to Australia, making her after Britain the most important overseas power for Australia.

Trade

Australian overseas trade increased steadily during the period under review from some £75,754,000 in 1891 to £92,150,000 in 1901, £146,450,000 in 1911 and £230,913,000 in 1921-2. There were occasional set-backs such as that in the early 1890's after the financial crash of 1893, and a slight diminution in 1902-3 because of drought conditions: the First World War also brought about a slight drop in trade, which was mostly made up for by increased prices. From 1892 onwards exports usually considerably exceeded imports except in 1913 because of exceptionally high capital imports in the shape of Governmental loans raised in London, in 1914-6 because of the war, and in 1920-21 because of very high imports. Since Australia was a debtor nation which had to pay not only for such services as shipping but also for interest on large Governmental and private loans raised overseas, the average annual pre-war excess of exports over imports of £16,000,000 was barely enough to cover her obligations in this direction before 1914. The large additional

37. See Table 1.
38. Commonwealth Year Book Vol. 6, 1901-14, p547.
39. loc. cit.
amount of debt incurred during the war years worsened this position, so that an additional annual excess of £6,000,000, making a total of £22,000,000, was reckoned to be necessary. 40

Trade with the United States was scarcely calculated to fill this gap. In this trade Australia invariably imported about twice as much from the United States, as she exported to them 41 while in 1920-21 the position reached its worst - United States imports to Australia were about three and a half times as great as the return traffic; even in 1921-2 when the position looked superficially better over £3,000,000 of the £8,314,386 of Australian exports to the United States of America was accounted for by gold bullion and specie. The growth of imports of goods of United States origin more than kept pace with the general expansion of Australian trade, expanding not merely in bulk but in proportion from some 13.05% in 1905 to a peak of 26.57% in 1917-18, and falling back thereafter to a more normal 18% of total imports; meanwhile the total foreign i.e. non-British trade of Australia grew from 33.44% in 1905 to a peak of 45.69% in 1919-20, and thereafter in the early nineteen twenties to about 36%; thus United States trade increased by some 5% while total foreign trade increased by a lesser percentage, about 3%; the remaining 2% would appear to have been made up by a fall in imports not from the United Kingdom but from other British possessions.

41. See Table 2.
Imports

For greater convenience the growth of imports of United States origin into Australia may be divided into three main chronological periods, pre-war 1901-1913, war-time 1914-1919 and post war.

Imperial Preference and German Competition 1901-13.

During the pre-war period it can be seen from table 3 that American trade, although advancing steadily in volume still remained steady at around 18%, while total foreign trade grew from 33% in 1905 to 39% in 1909 and about 37% in 1913. Germany's share of Australia's trade was increasing from under 8% in 1905 to over 9% in 1909, while the United Kingdom share declined slightly from 52.99% in 1905 to 48.88% in 1911, and 51.82% in 1913. Thus the actual threat, if any, to British imports in Australia appears to have been coming rather from Germany than from the United States.

Yet some concern was felt at the growth of American trade. The Commonwealth Year-Book right from its very first number in 1908 carried a section on The Diversion of British Trade with Australia. It considered the greatest threats to British domination of Australian imports were the United States of America and Germany, although Germany, being an industrialised country, was the more immediate danger. The United States imports were considered non-competitive with British trade since they included such items as kerosene and

42. Commonwealth Year Book Vol. I 1901-7 pp499-528, 1908; one of the odd things about the Commonwealth Year Book is the fact that although the Commonwealth Statistician, G.W. Knibbs was employed by the Department of Home Affairs, not the Treasurer, his reputation was such that not only were his statistics never queried but even when he ventured into commentary on economic affairs, his views seem never to have been challenged.
breadstuffs which Britain could not supply, a conclusion which ignored the already perceptible growth in such fields as machinery and manufactures of metal. Another explanation offered for the growth of foreign imports to Australia was the institution of direct shipping lines from such countries as Germany and France which meant that many foreign goods previously recorded as coming from the United Kingdom, now came direct. This argument does not apply however to the United States of America, since the two steamer lines operating between Australia and the Western coast of North America were mainly passenger and mail ships; and in any case few industrial goods were manufactured on the Pacific coast of the United States with which these ships communicated.

The British were more concerned about their future share of the Australian market than were the Australians. In 1905 they sent R.J. Jeffray to Australia to report on the conditions of trade. He also discounted the apparent growth of Australian imports from the United States of America, pointing out that foreign imports as a whole declined between 1901 and 1905, despite increases from the United States of America and the Argentine 1901-3 because of the need to import grain, that many Canadian goods were credited as of United States origin, and that prior to 1905 the purchase of steam-ships

44. Prior to 1905 imports were recorded only by countries of shipment, not of origin.
45. United Kingdom Report on the Conditions and Prospects of British Trade in Australia; by the Advisory Committee of Board of Trade based upon information collected by their Commissioner Mr. R.J. Jeffray Cd. No. 36-39 London 1907 p2.
46. ibid p4.
from Britain was not entered in the import statistics. In other words British imports were healthier than the figures showed.\textsuperscript{47} In a more detailed survey he found little United States competition in textiles except perhaps denims. There were, however, many fields in which the United States was competing successfully, such as certain types of iron and steel, in tools and hardware, agricultural and horticultural machinery and in paper and stationery. The reasons were sometimes, as with tools, the fact that similarity of Australian conditions to those of Western America made them more suitable, if less durable, than comparable British manufactures,\textsuperscript{48} at other times the conservatism and lack of adaptability of the British manufacturer played a part. Another factor was the high freights from Britain due to the existence of a shipping combine. On the subject of paper and stationery he quoted a Melbourne firm "Up to fifteen years ago we imported from the United States of America a comparatively small quantity of paper for printing or writing, our supplies being nearly all drawn from Great Britain. Since then, however, our trade with the United States has steadily increased until now the bulk of our printing papers come from there; the reason being that wood pulp is cheaper there than in England; and that the Americans use very much wider paper making machines than are used in Britain. So that although wages are higher the output per machine is so much greater that they can easily undersell the British."\textsuperscript{49}

\textsuperscript{47} United Kingdom Report on the Conditions and Prospects of British Trade in Australia, loc. cit.

\textsuperscript{48} Ibid p22.

\textsuperscript{49} Ibid p33.
Jeffray was followed in 1908 by Ben H. Morgan of the Manufacturers' Association of Great Britain, who came to investigate Australian markets. His conclusions were similar to those of Jeffray,\(^50\) that foreigners such as Germans or Americans charged less than British manufacturers for goods of equal value, because they had the advantages of protection and of lower transport and raw material costs.\(^51\)

This was the period in Britain when her nineteenth-century commercial supremacy was being challenged and rethought: the period of the questioning of the value of Free Trade in Britain and of the advocacy of Imperial Preference. Australia, which had had a tariff since Federation, was sufficiently influenced by this movement to institute Imperial Preference in the form of lower tariff duties for certain classes of British goods in 1908.

It is very hard to assess the results of this preference. The Commonwealth Statistician G.W. Knibbs did not believe that it aided British imports but the Americans clearly thought of it as a handicap.\(^52\) The mere prospect that the United Kingdom would have free entry for sewing machines, while foreign countries would pay 10% duty was enough

to persuade the largest American manufacturer to switch from the
United States to Britain; even when the clause was deleted, the firm
retained its factory in Britain. 53

In the 1914 Year Book Knibbs, the Commonwealth Statistician,
produced figures to show that United Kingdom trade was declining
slowly in the preferential section from about 64% in 1905 to 66.8%
in 1909, the first year after the introduction of preference, and
then to 63% in 1912 : meanwhile the British share of comparable
imports in a non-preferential field, on corrected figures, rose from
48% in 1905 to 50% in 1909 and just over 50% in 1912. 54 He also drew
up a table to show that in metal manufactures, the same thing had
happened; the United Kingdom share of preferential imports had
scarcely risen while her share of the non-preferential sector had
increased. 55 Knibbs wrote much the same to Hume Cook. 56 The British
Trade Commissioner in Australia, confronted with contradictory data,
concluded that preference was of definite benefit to the United
Kingdom, but that it was difficult to determine how far it was useful. 57
It is of course possible that British trade might have declined more
disastrously in the items covered by the preferential treatment, if
preference had been withdrawn, but the overall impression is that
preference did not increase, and indeed scarcely managed to maintain,

55. ibid p659.
56. Letter from G.W. Knibbs to Hume Cook : June 12, 1914 in Hume
Cook Papers Ms 601 series 1 A.N.L., Canberra.
57. Trade of Australia 1913 : Report to the Board of Trade by
p10.
the volume of British imports.

The Australian government manifested little interest in official trade links with the United States of America. There was no Commonwealth trade representative in the United States of America till post-1918: some of the States had representatives, but that of Victoria, for example was a series of special delegations concerned mostly with specialised affairs, such as the obtaining of experienced settlers for the irrigation areas of Victoria, while the New South Wales representative, Niel Nielsen, was appointed in 1911 by a Labour Government primarily as a political move to dispose of a troublesome Minister for Lands whose ideas were not those of his colleagues. His appointment was bitterly opposed, a motion of censure being moved (unsuccessfully) against the Government on the subject. Nielsen was not of course a commercial expert, or even a businessman, which gave the objections to him more weight. His reports from the United States proved to be of little lasting value; that on bulk-handling of grain was really a reduplication of that by the Burrell Construction Co. of Chicago, while his reports on dry-farming and irrigation and

60. See e.g. N.S.W.H. Ass. Sept. 4, 1912 Perry pp867-8.
ostrich-farming were not put to any practical use, despite hopes that dry-farming might prove valuable in Western New South Wales.

His suggestion as to political matters were coldly received. When he suggested to the Federal Prime Minister, Andrew Fisher, that a reciprocity treaty should be negotiated with Canada, he was told that the Government had no intention of using his services in this matter, while his attempts to establish banking links between Australia and the United States of America, to which the New South Wales Government was lukewarm, was turned down flat by the Federal Government.

Even his commercial enterprises were ill-fated; government purchases of such things as hay in San Francisco were made without consulting him, and his protests ignored, while when he despatched Oregon from San Francisco for the New South Wales State timber yards, the crew of the ship in which it was despatched claimed it was unseaworthy, and twice put into Honolulu in distress. In the end the New South Wales Government had to buy the ship and have her repaired before the timber could reach Australia.

At the end of 1915 Nielsen's assistant Quinn was deputed to open an office in New York, but in 1917, on the recommendation of Wade, who had become New South Wales Agent General in London, both his

and Nielsen's offices were abolished. The claims of Labour members that an increase in trade with San Francisco was due to Nielsen were countered by the contention that the increase was due to other causes such as the war.

It was unfortunate that a move which could have helped cement efficient trade relations with the United States of America was so closely tied up with politics that in a sense it never had a chance to succeed. Nielsen was not qualified for the post at first, and when after a few years' experience, he had got to know the situation, the Opposition had so bitterly opposed him that when they returned to office they were bound to abolish his post.

The United States Government on the other hand did have diplomatic representatives in Australia, not merely in the larger cities such as Sydney and Melbourne but in other important ports such as Hobart and Newcastle. It appears, however, that in the pre-war period little direct Government aid was given to the promotion of United States trade in Australia. There are only two United States Department of Commerce publications dealing with Australia in the pre-1914 period, while there were several during the war and post-war years.

It was, for example, only on the urging of the New South Wales Government that the United States Consul in Sydney telegraphed to the United States inviting tenders for the proposed Sydney Harbour

71. N.S.W.H /Ass. Fuller p847. Aug 29, 1917
Bridge, a request which appears to have received no answer. It is also clear from the records kept by the United States consul in Sydney and the vice-consul in Newcastle that their duties were very little concerned with the promotion of trade. In 1900 the American community in Sydney was tiny - not more than twenty-eight to thirty-five. Even in 1911 Baker, the American consul in Sydney, was very gloomy about the progress and prospects of United States trade in Australia. "It is the desire of all officers of the consular service to assist, if only in the capacity of 'look-outs' in developing American trade, but it must be admitted that in some instances and Australia is one of them, the problem is at present more one of maintaining what trade influence the United States is already fortunate enough to possess, rather than of expanding trade beyond the present limits. In some branches of trade the United States is evidently able with more or less difficulty to gain some ground, here, but in other branches falls behind, so that such losses tend to offset gains elsewhere along the line." Baker felt that the United States suffered from special handicaps, not only in the form of the preferential tariff, but also in the lack of a large American mercantile marine, and in the natural conservatism of the Australian in preferring British goods.

72. Telegram from G.W. Bell to Secretary of State June 28, 1900 and despatch No. 196 of June 29, 1900 : United States Department of State : Consular Reports of Sydney Post : on microfilm in the M.L. Sydney.
75. ibid p10.
It is doubtful whether much weight should be given to these worries; after all the trade of France and Germany, which also faced the same difficulties, apart from the lack of direct shipping services, found little difficulty in increasing their imports; and in actual fact American trade was not decreasing except in the fields of certain primary products such as grain where they could scarcely expect to sell much to Australia except under exceptional circumstances.

The absence of a large merchant marine did, however, have certain effects. For example many American goods were shipped from the United Kingdom. In 1905 and 1906 the amount was about £1,000,000 worth of goods, or about 20% of all American exports to Australia. 76 This was not merely a peculiarity of United States trade with Australia; in 1900-1904 only 6.5% of American exports sent by sea went in American vessels, the corresponding figures for 1905-9 and 1910-14 were 8.5% and 8.1%. 77 Although exports to Oceania as a whole were only a small amount (usually between 2% and 3% before 1914) 78 of total United States exports there is no reason to suppose that any greater proportion of this trade was carried by American shipping.

There was, after all, very little in the way of return cargoes. Australian exports to Europe were not sufficient until the early twentieth century to refill the ships which had brought cargoes.

78. Ibid Table 292, p362.
mostly of compact manufactured goods to Australia.\textsuperscript{79} Since the bulk cargoes of coal, wheat and wool which ultimately took up the tonnage of European ships, were of little use to the United States, rich in agricultural and mineral products, there were few return cargoes to tempt American ships.\textsuperscript{80}

Thus the position in the pre-war period in regard to American imports was that they remained fairly stable, while British imports slowly declined and German ones rose slightly. There was little active Governmental concern in the United States of America to promote trade with Australia, and most official opinion was not very hopeful about the future of America in the Australian market. British and Australian authorities although worried about the decline in the British share of the market, were not unduly pessimistic, and were more worried about German than American competition.

**The Great War and the Panama Canal 1914-19.**

This was the period when American imports into Australia grew rapidly, reaching a peak of over twenty-five per cent of all imports in 1918-19. German imports vanished completely, being prohibited by the Trading With the Enemy Act. British trade also declined because the demands of war channelled manufacturing capacity into war goods, and even more because of the heavy demands on shipping.


\textsuperscript{80} See Table 5 for exports of coal from Australia to the United States of America.
especially when the German U-boat campaign began to make serious inroads on British shipping. This meant that Australia found herself without many manufactured goods she had previously imported from Britain and Germany, and the gap was filled by the United States and Japan. The Japanese share of the Australian import trade though never so large as the American grew much faster, from 1.24% in 1909-13 to 5.60% in 1914-19.81

The war, and the shortage of shipping, which also affected Australia's export trade,82 since the nearness of North America and Argentina as suppliers of meat or wheat as compared to the distance from Australia, meant difficulty in getting shipping to lift cargoes from Australia.

On the other hand the fact that the Pacific was practically free from the submarine menace naturally encouraged trade between the countries bordering on it and thus between Australia and Japan and America. Another factor probably favouring an increase in imports from the United States was the opening in 1915 of the Panama Canal, thus bringing the manufacturing Eastern areas of the United States of America within easier reach of the Pacific and the Far East.

In 1914 the United States established a Commercial attaché in Melbourne; so did the Japanese, and the Swedes, who were neutral like

82. See section on Exports infra.
the United States considered doing so; obviously they already anticipated an increase in trade.

It is frequently argued that the war affected British exports to Australia only temporarily; but during the war-years they fell from 51.82% of total Australian imports in 1913 to a minimum of 33.80% in 1918-9, the year in which United States imports reached their maximum of 26.57% from 1913. The rest of the decline in British goods can be accounted for largely by an increase of imports from British possessions and there was also the wiping out of the 9% of the Australian import market held by Germany before the war. It is thus obvious that during the war-years the United States did take over some part of British trade with Australia, since the increase of over 15% in imports from America cannot be wholly accounted for by the disappearance of German goods.

This remarkable increase did not pass unnoticed by the Australians, but the Commonwealth Year-Book was unalarmed, since it considered it due to abnormal war conditions. The United Kingdom Trade Commissioner was less convinced of this; he considered the elimination of German trade to have been of more value to Japan than to the United Kingdom or the United States and warned "The strong position achieved by the United States in the Australian market has, of course, been rapidly

84. Commonwealth Year Book Vol. 9 1914-5 p585.
Commonwealth Year Book Vol. 10 1901-15 p548.
Commonwealth Year Book Vol. 11 1901-17 p609.
enhanced by the war situation, but it would be altogether a mistake to disregard the fact that previous to the war that position was year by year becoming more assured. As has been pointed out in previous reports the branch of trade in which the effect of United States competition is most severely felt is in that of machinery and to dismiss reference to this aspect of the question with the remark that it is largely agricultural machinery is to display ignorance of the facts as revealed by official records. Less than 15% of the machinery imported in 1913 from the United States was of an agricultural kind; the remainder of the United States total was made up of all kinds of machinery, the most important groups being electrical machinery and sewing machines.\textsuperscript{86}

The increase took place largely in the section of Australian imports in which the United Kingdom could compete\textsuperscript{86} and it was reckoned that future competition would be fiercest from the United States in the fields of hardware and machinery, while by 1918 the Trade Commissioner reported querulously that there was a prejudice in favour of American goods in certain fields.\textsuperscript{87}

From the greater incidence of United States Department of Commerce publications on Australia, as well as from the appointment of a


\textsuperscript{87} ibid (b) p55.
Commercial attaché, it is clear that greater official interest was being taken by the Americans in the potential Australian market. The war gave an over-all impetus to American trade, and turned the United States from a debtor to a creditor nation. A publication was issued in 1916 to help American manufacturers and agents to anticipate and cope with the conditions, economic, social and legal, they would meet in Australia: while 1918 saw two publications on fields in which the Americans were proving particularly successful in Australia—electrical goods and agricultural machinery.

In Australia, too, some dawning realisation of the position of the United States in the Australian market was beginning to appear. So far it was not unfavourable. A backbencher, Senator Lynch, said in 1915 "If any evidence is needed of the growing friendship between this country (Australia) and that (the United States) it is shown in the development of trade. The statistics of imports and exports for the last five quinquennial periods prove clearly that the United States of America has shown an increasing interest in this country so far as trade is concerned ... We buy more goods from them than


from any country except Great Britain."\(^{90}\)

Even so, the United States Department of Commerce reports were by no means altogether optimistic about the prospects of success for United States trade in Australia. "It may be observed that the new tariff put into effect in Australia in January 1915, has a tendency to keep out or reduce the quantity of some lines of American goods for the advantage of English manufacturers. This condition may be overcome later, when freight rates from America are normal."\(^{91}\); while the natural conservatism and Britishness of the Australians were also seen as barriers to trade development.

There are one or two interesting points about United States trade with Australia in this period. One is that by 1916-7 United States exports to Australia are approximately the same whether recorded by country of shipment or of origin.\(^{92}\) This would indicate that Britain had ceased to be a distributor to any large extent of American goods. It also probably suggests that an increasing proportion of American exports to Australia were carried in American ships. In the period 1915-9 18.2% of American exports by sea went in American ships, an increase of over 100% on the pre-war period.\(^{93}\) The other fact is that the increased trade with Australia was part of a world-wide increase in American exports; the proportion of exports

---

91. United States Department of Commerce; William C. Davis op. cit. (note 13b) p10.
92. See Table 3.
to Oceania from the United States actually fell as low as 1.74% in 1917,\textsuperscript{94} despite the great increase to Australia, thus indicating an overall increase in American trade.

\textbf{The Panama Canal}

It is exceedingly difficult to determine the effect of the opening of the Panama Canal on Australian-American trade relations, since its start in 1915 was in the middle of World War I which in itself disrupted traditional trade and financial patterns, destroying British naval supremacy and establishing the United States of America temporarily as the greatest world power.

The actual number of ships through Panama was not great during the war years - some 1,088 of 3,849,135 tons in 1915, 787 of 2,479,762 tons in 1916, 1,876 of 6,009,258 tons in 1917.\textsuperscript{95} The tendency was certainly upwards. By 1919 there were four lines established between Australia and America using the Panama Canal of which at least three were regular services: the United States and Australia line and the Commonwealth and Dominion lines, used the Panama Canal once a month while the American-Australian line operated once every sixty days: the other line, Ellerman Lines, was irregular.\textsuperscript{96} Doubtless other ships went from the United States to Australia and back via the Canal, but the proportion does not seem enormously high.

\textsuperscript{94} United States Department of Commerce : Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce : Statistical Abstract of the United States of America 1922 No. 45, Washington, 1923 Table 292 p352.
\textsuperscript{96} loc. cit.
in view of the fact that the Canal shortened the route from the
Eastern United States of America to Australia so that New York was
2,400 miles nearer Sydney than was London. It should logically have
helped the growth of American exports to Australia, since it brought
the manufacturing areas of the Eastern United States of America much
nearer to Australia: the West Coast, which was much nearer and with
which there had been for some time direct shipping links was not the
outlet for any manufacturing region. The saving of 2,400 miles
could save a 10-knot ship ten days voyage, and since, even with Canal
toll charges this could mean lower freight rates, it appears probable
that the Canal must have assisted the growth of United States exports
to Australia. 97

Australians, however, were not greatly interested in this aspect
of the United States of America. They were interested in the idea
of the Canal, but had little hope of material advantage to themselves.
In 1912 the Australian merchants were still uncertain as to how the
opening of the Canal would affect their country 98 while by 1913 they
had concluded that it would greatly assist United States trade in the
East but might prove detrimental to British trade. 99 American
consular reports in 1911 indicate that the general opinion in

97. United States Department of Commerce: William C. Davis op. cit.
   (note 13b) p16.
98. Associated Chambers of Commerce of Australia: Report of the
99. Associated Chambers of Commerce of Australia: Report of the
   Tenth Annual Meeting: Sydney, 1913 pp17-21; see also J.
   Calwell (ed.) A Century in the Pacific: 1815-1915, Sydney
   1915 Part V Ch. 1 p605.
commercial circles was that the only way in which Australia was likely to be directly affected was in a possible increase in competition from the Western States of Canada and the United States of America in supplying agricultural produce to Britain.\textsuperscript{100} It was Elwood Mead, an American who was in charge of Victoria's Department of Agriculture, who thought that the Panama Canal might be of use to Australia by putting Australian fruit-growers in closer contact with the markets of North America.\textsuperscript{101}

Some newspapers saw the political importance of the Panama Canal. The \textit{Argus} wrote "For Australia the greatest interest in the Panama Canal is not in its immediate opening of new routes, excepting that to Eastern America (for it does not bring us any nearer to Europe) but in the world importance which is added to the Pacific Ocean and in the subsequent developments of trade around the world. Fast lines of steamers circumnavigating the globe as their regular run are likely to be the outcome of this new highway ... The whole sea will be one and indivisible at last, the Pacific being no longer cut off on its eastern side by the barrier of a huge continent, and with this unity of the sea all the most remote countries will be bound more closely than ever with the globe's great system of international trade"\textsuperscript{102} and also suggested that the Canal might help revive the New South Wales

\textsuperscript{100} United States Department of Commerce and Labor : H.D. Baker \textit{op. cit.} (note 12) p83.
\textsuperscript{101} \underline{United Kingdom Dominions Royal Commission : Minutes of Evidence taken in Australia in 1913 Part I} Cd. 7171 Q2699.
\textsuperscript{102} \underline{Argus Aug. 12, 1911 edit.}
coal trade with South America, hampered for lack of suitable return
cargo. 103

Some dissatisfaction was voiced in the Commonwealth Parliament
over the preference in tolls which the United States Government
proposed to give to American shipping using the Canal, and Australia
was associated with the British Government's protest to the United
States on this subject, but interest died down after Woodrow Wilson
abandoned this idea in order to preserve amicable relations with the
British Empire, and to respect the spirit of the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty
of 1901 which had provided that the Canal should be free to the
shipping of all nations. 104 Only one member, Kelly, expressed much
interest in the Canal "Australia, on the opening of the Panama Canal,
will no longer be at the end, as it were, of shipping; she will be
midway in a trade-route round the world connecting its most important
centres. At present few tourists comparatively speaking visit Australia, ...
what this would mean to our producers is this. A big tourist traffic
would mean the employment of more steamers which in addition to
carrying passengers would provide accommodation for frozen produce,
and their competition for freight would give our produce cheaper
rates." 105

103. Argus May 23, 1912.
    H. Repr. July 16, 1912 Question by Bruce Smith to the P.M.
    H. Repr. Aug. 13, 1912 " Alfred Deakin to the P.M.
105. H. Repr. July 18, 1912 Motion by Kelly on the Panama Canal dues
Australia took part in the Panama-Pacific Exposition at San Francisco in 1915 to celebrate the opening of the Canal, although Great Britain had withdrawn because of the outbreak of war. Alfred Deakin was the Chief Commissioner, and it was his recommendation which persuaded the Commonwealth Government not to discontinue their representation there. The decision was subsequently regretted and there was a great deal of acrimonious correspondence between Deakin and Mahon of the Department of External Affairs, which was reprinted as a Parliamentary paper.

Thus the picture for the war years is one of increase in American imports, decline in the British share and elimination of German competition. The reasons for this were the abnormal war conditions as well as increasing United States interest in overseas exports, and possibly the Panama Canal.

The Return to Peace 1919-23.

In this period, although the proportion of American imports dropped somewhat with the return of more normal peace-time conditions, paradoxically more notice and concern was felt in Australia about this increase than when it was at its peak.

Although the American proportion of Australian imports fell back to about 18%, it still remained significantly higher than in the pre-war period. Moreover part at least of this apparent drop was due to the adverse conditions for the exchange of money which reigned immediately after the war, when the dollar was so strong in relation to sterling that it was really unprofitable to buy United States goods.
United States exports to Australia in 1919-20 were probably undervalued by about 25% due to the adverse exchange rate, and to deliberate undervaluing by the shippers in order to avoid paying heavy duties. In 1919-20 the American share of the competitive sector was probably about 27.4% of the total imports, about half the size of the British share, and four times the size of the Japanese. Yet in 1922 the Commonwealth Year-Book concluded "... it will be seen that the more prominent position held by the United States of America and by Japan in the Commonwealth import market in 1920-1 was not to any great extent at the expense of the United Kingdom, but rather represented a substitution of the trade formerly supplied by Germany."

But the new commercial importance of the United States to Australia was recognised: it became the first non-British country to which Australia in 1916 appointed a permanent Commercial Attaché, Mr. (later Sir) Henry Yule Braddon. There was even talk of appointing an ambassador to Washington (Braddon was stationed in New York). The United States of course had long had consular and commercial representation in Australia. Soon after his arrival Braddon made a speech in New York calling for the further development of trade relations between two countries whose interests in the Pacific were so similar; an attitude warmly commended by the Sydney Morning Herald.

107. loc. cit.
110. S.M.H. Mar. 11, 1919.
The trend towards American domination of the supply of machinery continued. "The weakness of the United Kingdom's position appears to be in machinery, engineering and allied materials. In these cases competition has to be faced from local manufacturers as well as severe competition from the United States and possibly from Germany in the near future." Other fields where United States competition was severe, said the same report, were metals, manufactures of metals, motor cars and steel plates, sheets and sections. British hopes that Australian merchants would become dissatisfied with the new and inexperienced American firms which had entered the Australian market, proved unfounded, or at least had no significant adverse effect on American trade. In this type of field there were indeed factors to tell against the British. As the members of the French Commercial Mission commented in 1919, the United States of America and Japan not only had the advantage of proximity, but also enjoyed prestige because of their ability as manufacturers and the thoroughness and ability of their advertising.

The British on the other hand were regarded as less efficient and more conservative a complaint which had been voiced even in the pre-war days when evidence given to the Dominions Royal Commission

suggested that Americans were more ready to adapt goods to Australian conditions than were the British,\(^\text{116}\) that their commercial representatives were more numerous and better organised,\(^\text{117}\) and that the quality of American goods was often better value for the money asked.\(^\text{118}\) One hardware importer declared that he would welcome better British goods since "I am an Englishman", and that he preferred dealing with the United Kingdom; but the British share of the hardware market had dropped sharply.\(^\text{119}\)

Thus the reasons why the United States retained a greater share of Australian trade are several. Some are general; such as the world-wide expansion of United States exports and the growth in American shipping. Others are the growing interest of Americans, both officials and merchants, in promoting trade with Australia. There was also the relative proximity of the United States of America to Australia, especially after the opening of the Panama Canal, and the elimination of German competition. Finally there were the shortcomings of the British and the vigour and inventiveness of United States manufacturers and merchants.

In yet another field, the United States had become the most important overseas power for Australia, after the Mother Country. In yet another field the New World was increasingly counter-balancing the influence of the old.

116. United Kingdom: Dominions Royal Commission: Minutes of Evidence Taken in Australia in 1913 Part II Cd. 7172 Q. 12,447, Q.12,545.
118. Ibid Q. 12,665.
119. Ibid Q. 12,483-4.
Types of Imports

So far this chapter has dealt with imports from the United States of America en bloc; but analysis of the types of goods imported is not only useful but significant.

It has been mentioned in the previous section that the areas of trade in which the United States imports were most prominent were machinery, and other metal manufactures, such as tools and hardware, as well as some other fields such as paper and stationery.

In fact two things are obvious from Table 4; that the vast majority of imports from the United States were increasingly the products of secondary industry, and that the fields in which America dominated the import market were in the newer industries, the novelties such as electrical machinery, motor cars, gramophones, films, typewriters, sewing-machines and the like. In the older-established industries, such as textiles, glassware and the like, the lead of Great Britain was so firmly established that although the Americans could, and did make inroads in such fields as boots and shoes, denims, or corsets, they could not oust the British. This position was aggravated, though not created by the war. Even before the war the United States provided about a third of Australia's imports of machinery and about half the American imports were machinery, and metal manufactures. The United States supplied about 90% of mining

machinery and 80% of coal-cutting machinery and percussive drills
while other fields in which United States competition was fierce
were agricultural machinery, electrical machinery, machine tools,
printing presses and sewing machines. Other fields in which the
United States were gaining were hardware, fencing wire, telephones
and motor cars 122 (the United States and Canada quadrupled their
exports of cars in the three years 1911-13).

The British trade commissioner felt this was due not to the
superior quality of American goods but to certain special advantages
such as lower freights and dumping prices: The other main factor
was that American business methods were better: their advertising
was more vigorous, 123 while in their dealings with their agents they
were more ready to supply samples and literature, and were more liberal
with expenses. 124

The war removed German competition in certain types of machinery,
such as electrical, and despite attempts by Japan to take over this
market 125 the American trade advanced enormously, 126 but the Americans
still worried about Japanese competition and about a possible renewal

122. As in note 120 loc. cit.
123. Trade of Australia 1913 : Report to Board of Trade by H.M. Trade
124. External Trade of Australia 1914 : Report to Board of Trade by
H.M. Trade Commissioner in Australia Cd. No. 8090, London,
125. ibid p17.
126. United States Department of Commerce : Bureau of Foreign and
Domestic Commerce : Special Agents Series No. 155 : Electrical
Goods in Australia by R.A. Lundquist, Commercial Agent,
of German competition after the war, although the British gloomily reported a strong Australian prejudice in favour of American electrical goods. There was only one Australian manufacturer of electrical goods in Australia in 1918, but his prices were too high. By 1926 United States imports were very firmly established in this field, providing the largest proportion of the import of fans (41%), vacuum cleaners (66%), washing machines etc. (57%), following the United and Kingdom (43%) closely on heating/cooking appliances (40%), and providing a high proportion of other appliances of which the United States supplied about 36% while the United Kingdom supplied about 54%.

The fact that the United States excelled in newer products can be illustrated by, for example, musical instruments. Over 50% of pianos, "the first essential of married life," were supplied by Germany, because American pianos were too expensive; on the other hand pianolas from New York dominated their own market. The Americans had only 5% of musical instrument imports, yet most gramophones came from the United States.

The Americans also made inroads into older established machinery fields; they invaded the field of mining machinery, where their

128. Trade of Australia for 1918 : Report to the Board of Trade by H.M. Trade Commissioner in Australia : S.W.B. McGregor, London 1918, Cd. 351 p35. (See note 126).
products were better and cheaper than the British ones—\textsuperscript{133} and by 1913 supplied 90\% of this field.\textsuperscript{134} Part of the explanation for this may lie also in the number of American mining engineers working in Australia at this period, and in the similarity between Australian and American mining conditions which led gradually to the replacement of the Cornish trained engineers in Australia by American trained men.

Even in such fields as railway material the Americans were able to make headway. Australians were often anxious to buy British, but found it impossible to get guaranteed delivery dates, as happened when Western Australia bought twenty Baldwin Compound Locomotives in 1900;\textsuperscript{135} while in 1913 the New South Wales Commissioner for Railways T.R. Johnson complained that he often could not get quotations from British firms, which did not care about colonial markets;\textsuperscript{136} while A.H. Ashbolt of Tasmania said the United Kingdom never got tenders for rails because they were so much dearer than American or Belgian or German goods. There were, apart from the disadvantages of dealing with the United Kingdom, certain positive advantages of some American railway material. Henry Deane, engineer in chief to the New South Wales Department of Railways, and later Engineer in Chief for Commonwealth Railways, was an advocate of the rapid and economical

\textsuperscript{133} United States Department of Commerce and Labor : Bureau of Manufactures : Monthly Consular and Trade Reports Feb. 1905 No. 293, p195.

\textsuperscript{134} United Kingdom Trade of Australia 1913 : Report to the Board of Trade by H.M. Trade Commissioner in Australia Cd. No. 7533, London,1914 p19.


\textsuperscript{136} Dominions Royal Commission : Minutes of Evidence Taken in Australia in 1913, Part II Cd. 7172, London,1913 Q.12,556, 12,566.

\textsuperscript{137} Ibid Q. 13,191.

construction of railways; for this he believed that sharp curves and steep grades in initial construction on routes which would not carry heavy traffic, could cut costs considerably; if traffic increased greatly later, sections of the railroad could easily be reconstructed. This was a principle which had already been successfully used in the great nineteenth century expansion of American railways; but on such railroads British-type locomotives were unsatisfactory because they were too rigid, and American ones were much better. When Deane built a railway to the Commonwealth Oil Corporation’s mines in the Wolgan Valley in 1906 he had to import locomotives from the Lima Locomotion Company of Ohio, United States of America. When contracts were let for the Kalgoorlie-Port Augusta railway, some 36,000 tons of rails were ordered from the United States and two American tracklaying plants were imported.

Other "novelties" also sold well. One Hobart agency sold 30 American sewing machines a week, while in 1909 the United States supplied 88% of typewriter imports, leaving the United Kingdom to dominate the more conservative field of ink supply.

144. Ibid Daily Apr. 15, 1911 No. 88 p219.
Two of the more spectacular successes of the Americans were achieved in the fields of motor vehicles, and agricultural machinery.

The reasons for United States gradual growth in the field of motor vehicles were once again twofold. There was firstly the inability of British manufacturers to fill orders, and there was also the fact that American cars were cheaper, and made for rougher roads than were European cars.

By 1911 the Consul-General in Sydney was informed that there were 2,100 cars registered in Australia, of which 870 were British, 572 French, 402 American, 123 Italian, 102 Belgian. By 1912 he could claim that cars were being registered at the rate of fifty a week, and that there were 5,225 cars, 3,600 motor-cycles and 200 motor trucks registered while the Americans now had fifty percent of the market. There was a great increase in the import of Canadian and American cars between 1911 and 1913. Advertisements for American cars blossomed throughout Australian newspapers. In 1913 it was possible to buy a 20 horse-power Ford two-seater in Australia for £210, while a five-seater car cost £225, a 30 horse-power American car cost £365, the cheapest English 10 horse-power car, however,
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148. ibid No. 276 Nov. 22, 1912, p967.

149. ibid Q.12,664.

150. ibid Q.12,684.

151. ibid Q.12,580.
cost £425;\textsuperscript{152} so that even if American cars were less durable than European vehicles they were still better value;\textsuperscript{153} and it was difficult to get enough of certain American makes to fill the Australian demand.\textsuperscript{154} In actual fact the Ford vehicles were imported, not from the United States, but from Ford's subsidiary company in Canada, which assembled parts manufactured in the United States of America; the Canadian company had sole rights of export to Australia.\textsuperscript{155} Other American makes of car such as Willy's Overlander, De Dion, Pontiac, were also imported. In December 1910 some 142 makes of cars were to be found in New South Wales of which a British car, the Talbot, had the highest number of registrations, while the number of registrations of British cars in New South Wales was four times the number of American.\textsuperscript{156} Even in 1911 the number of American cars still trailed not only the British but the French makes; out of 2,100 cars registered, 870 were British, 572 French, 402 American, 123 Italian and 102 Belgian.\textsuperscript{157} Dr. Colin Forster estimates that the import of motor vehicles accounted for some 2.1% of total imports in the period from 1909-13.\textsuperscript{158}
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\textsuperscript{156} United States Department of Commerce and Labor : Bureau of Manufactures : Daily Consular and Trade Reports No. 151 Dec. 6, 1910 p861.
\textsuperscript{157} Ibid No. 42 Feb. 20, 1911.
The war naturally decreased exports of British and European cars, and left the Americans a clearer field. There was moreover, except in the field of body-building, no local competition. The first motor vehicle to be built in Australia was probably constructed in 1885 by David Shearer, an agricultural mechanic who later founded a firm of agricultural machinery manufacturers. Later between 1899 and 1907 Tarrant manufactured some twelve cars of which five had imported engines; but he discovered that it was cheaper to import than build cars, and in 1900 got the agency for the importing of American De Dion cars. Most people building cars in Australia before 1913 were amateurs; and in 1913 the Dominions Royal Commission was told that only a few heavy vehicles such as motor tractors were manufactured in Australia.

It was, however, in the 1920's that the real expansion of motor-car ownership in Australia took place. Figures show that registration of motor vehicles increased in Australia from 99,270 in 1921-2 (the first year in which Commonwealth figures are available) to 571,471 in 1929-30, while the ratio increased from one vehicle to every fifty-five persons in 1921-2 to one vehicle to every eleven in 1929-30. Doctor Forster attributes this to various factors; the suitability of motor transport to Australian conditions, the high
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level of incomes in Australia, the extension of hire purchase, and
the introduction of technical improvements such as balloon tyres and
self-starters. 164 Self-starters were in use in American vehicles but
not on British before 1913 but their use became more widespread in
the 1920's. 165

In the 1920's Australia entered an era of high protection of
those nascent industries which had been fostered by war conditions;
by 1921 for the first time more Australians were engaged in manufacturing
than in primary industry. 166 The tariff of 1921 was a deliberately
designed protective measure and one of the industries it attempted to
protect was motor-car body building. Previous attempts to exclude
motor car body-imports, such as the luxury embargo in August 1917,
were not primarily protective in intent; but the modification of the
embargo to permit the import of only one motor-car body for every
three chassis performed the purpose not only of saving valuable
shipping space, but of protecting a new Australian industry. 167

From a few hundred bodies in 1918 the Australian manufacturers
by 1926-7 were producing 88,676. 168 A few of these were custom built,
but most were standardised products of a few large firms such as
Holden's and T.J. Richards of South Australia, Allied Motor Interests,
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Melbourne and Garratt's Ltd., Sydney. But even in this section of
the trade American influence was apparent: Holden's, a most efficient
firm, used American labour-saving machinery and adopted the moving line
system of production. Even so the incursion into the manufacturing
field of the Canadian Ford company in 1925 created great difficulties
for the local manufacturers; and even Holden's might have suffered
heavy losses if they had not in 1924 formed an association with the
American General Motors Corporation. In 1924 half Holden's motor
body output was for General Motors and the proportion later increased
to about two-thirds.

But whatever the body might be, the proportion of "American"
cars was reckoned at about 60% in Western Australia by 1929; and
the American Department of Commerce reckoned that about three-quarters
of new car registrations were of American makes. "Competition
between American and English cars in Australia can be reduced to
two opposing elements; on the one hand the tariff preference and
national sentiment, enjoyed by the British car, on the other the
reputation for serviceability and efficient performance under
conditions to which European cars are undoubtedly not suited ... The
development of adequate servicing facilities for American cars has,
in itself, had a decisive influence. Many European cars, with less
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developed distribution facilities have lost ground in the market because of the inability to provide service to owners." \(^{175}\) It was not, for example until the late 1920's that Morris, the British car manufacturers, set up their own distribution network in New South Wales instead of relying on agents.

Imports of other products were also affected by the growth in the use of motor vehicles. The two main products were petrol and oil, in the supply of which the United States of America could and did compete while Britain could not: the other was tyres. Tyres also were protected under the 1920's tariff, for there were three firms, including an Australian subsidiary of the British Dunlop Rubber, manufacturing them in Australia by then. \(^{176}\) The American firm of Goodyear Tyre and Rubber Company had opened in 1915 a subsidiary company in Australia to import and distribute their products. \(^{177}\) War difficulties forced them to postpone the idea of establishing a subsidiary manufacturing company. \(^{178}\) The proposed increase in duty in 1926 to 150\% made them decide to manufacture in Australia, \(^{179}\) in order to protect their claimed sales there of £750,000 a year, even though their prices were 20\% above those of locally produced tyres. \(^{180}\)

Their competition was fierce enough to force an amalgamation in 1929.

---

177. ibid p55.
179. ibid p398; also The Goodyear Tyre and Rubber Company (Australia) Ltd., Prospectus, Nov. 30, 1926.
between the two Australian firms.\textsuperscript{181}

Forster estimates that while imports of motor-cars, manufactures of rubber, which were largely tyres, and oils amounted to $0.3\%$ in 1909-13 of total imports, while by 1919-20 to 1923-4 they were $10.8\%$.\textsuperscript{182} Since the competitive position of Great Britain in these industries was so weak this meant in actual fact a decline in British imports, since the greater part of these imports came from other countries, particularly the United States of America.

The study of motor vehicles has been taken slightly beyond the period of this study in order to follow the development of factors already evident in the period up to 1923; namely the strong position of the United States of America in the Australian market in the "new" industry of motor car production and the gradual weakening of the British position, accentuated by the war. The motor vehicle industry offers a good example of the replacement of United Kingdom imports by United States imports as a result of the increase in imports of newer industries in which the United States was more highly developed and more efficient than the British.

\textbf{Agricultural Implements and Machinery}

This industry was also established in Australia but it was in existence long before the first World War; and in consequence of the

\textsuperscript{181} Colin Forster \textit{op.cit.} (note 158) p54.
\textsuperscript{182} ibid p24.
resentment of American competition, specifically protective duties were imposed on certain agricultural implements manufactured in Australia as early as 1906, long before protection of local manufactures became a wide-spread policy. Not only were American imports in direct competition with a local industry, but some of the implements such as the stump-jump plough or the disc-cultivator were actually Australian inventions. A Royal Commission on Customs and Excise Tariffs reported in 1906 that the local manufacturers of agricultural implements, who were mostly in Victoria, had suffered a loss of trade because of American and Canadian competition from the International Harvester Company and the Massey-Harris Company, and that local output had decreased as a result; and that the Americans were pirating Australian agricultural inventions. Local manufacturers hotly attacked long American working hours (even the Massey-Harris representative admitted that the hours in America and Canada were 57 hours a week as compared with the Australian total of 48 hours), and complained of deliberate price-fixing and dumping. One example instance was that the price of American reapers and binders had been dropped to £28 to oust English competition; when the English had been forced out the price was raised again, to £38.

The Massey-Harris representative claimed that their advantage stemmed from the lack of Australian labour-saving machinery in

183. Australian Royal Commission on Customs and Excise Tariffs Progress Report No. 5 : Agricultural Machinery and Implements P.P. 1906 No. 50 p35.
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factories, and from better marketing methods. They had established agencies, and sold on three years credit.

One of the reasons for lack of British competition in this field was the overwhelmingly obvious one that conditions for farming in Australia were much more similar to those in the United States than they were to those of an intensive farming economy in Britain. Agricultural machinery was and is an essential in Australia and the United States of America: in Britain it has always been rather a luxury. On the other hand by 1918 the United States Department of Commerce was warning that only a large manufacturer with considerable capital should attempt to enter this trade in Australia. This was due partly to the emergence of a few large Australian firms, but also to the immensely strong position held by the Canadian firm of Massey-Harris. In fact the Australian firm of W. McKay, the Canadian Massey-Harris and the American International Harvester Company between them held 65% of this trade in Australia, but the majority of this 65% must have gone to McKay, for local products accounted for 63.63% of all agricultural machinery sold in Australia. Massey-Harris was in the field before International Harvester Company: by 1903 it had taken over its own distribution and by 1918
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it had branches in all Australian capitals: International Harvester Co. came in a little later, but it also developed an efficient sales and service organisation in Australia. The competition was so intense that not only were the smaller Australian firms forced out of business, but some of the smaller American ones were also forced out of the market. Between 1909 and 1914 the Australian industry had mechanised itself, its plant increasing by some 90%, and McKay’s factory had adopted mass production by the 1920’s.

Tariff protection was given to local manufacturers; the opposition of the farmers who wanted cheap machinery was countered by the argument that if overseas firms killed local manufacture, they would then have a monopoly and demand monopoly prices. It seems however that the threat was never so great as was feared; the foreign imports of agricultural machinery in the post-war period were seldom more than a third of those used, the reaction is however interesting in that it shows Australian readiness to protect Australian industries against overseas competition even in the days before a high tariff policy became general.

Exports

A glance at Table 5 will show that Australian exports to the

190. United States Department of Commerce: Juan Homs op. cit. (note 89a) p88.
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United States were chiefly in the field of raw materials. The most important items were coal, wool, skins, pearls, and shell and various metals. Some of these exports show a sharp decline in the period under review. The fall in exports of copper to the United States from £710,086 worth in 1913 to Nil in 1916-7 is accounted for by the need of Great Britain for copper during World War I. The British Government purchased outright through the newly formed Copper Producers' Association the whole of the Australian exportable surplus of copper, amounting to £3,850,000 in 1916. The equally sudden appearance of exports of zinc to the United States of America in 1914-5 was also due to war conditions. Before the war the bulk of Australia's zinc ores and concentrates were processed abroad and the bulk of it was refined in Belgium, only a tiny fraction being distilled in Great Britain. When Belgium was occupied by Germany, Australia was forced to sell her zinc ores and concentrates to the United States of America just as Britain had to buy her pure zinc from the United States for the enormous price of £115 per ton in 1915. The subsequent decline in zinc exports to the United States was caused by the formation in 1916 of the Zink Producers Association Pty. of Australia to handle all zinc concentrates in the Commonwealth; they negotiated a contract with the British Government by which the latter was to take a minimum of 100,000 tons a year of processed zinc at prices between £30 and £40 a ton for the period of the war and ten years thereafter. This

contract assured the success of the Electrolytic Zinc Company of
Australia Pty. Ltd. which had been formed to process zinc concentrates
by a new American method being developed at the Anaconda Copper Mining
Co. in the United States of America. No zinc was produced in metallic
form until 1918, when the contract was signed and the process was
not in fact perfected on a commercial basis until 1921.\textsuperscript{197} When zinc
exports to the United States began to fall away.

Likewise the large export of £1,728,720 worth of wheat to the
United States was due to war conditions. Hughes in 1916 persuaded
the British Government which, owing to a shortage of shipping tonnage,
would have preferred to deal with North America, to which a ship could
make three voyages in the time it took to travel to Australia and
back, to buy the Australian wheat surplus for 1916. The British did
this because of a threatened crop failure in North America. The
American crop did not fail, and the shipping situation became even
more serious because of the intensification of submarine warfare,
so the wheat was left to rot in Australia. In 1917 the Australian
Government suggested that some of its unbought surplus could be
shipped to the United States of America's Western shipboard to free
an equal amount on the Eastern coast for shipping to England. This
was eventually done: the United States Grain Corporation imported
7,760,000 bushels below local prices and selling them at market
price, thus making a handsome profit.\textsuperscript{198}

\textsuperscript{197} Geoffrey Blainey: \textit{The Rush That Never Ended}: Melbourne,
1965 pp280-281.
\textsuperscript{198} E. Scott \textit{op. cit.} (note 194) pp537-9.
In actual fact the war, apart from these special incidents, had little permanent effect on the course of Australian exports to the United States of America, and certainly did little to alter them in character. The main effect was to channel more of Australia's exports to Great Britain, because of wholesale British purchases of local wheat, metals, frozen meat and the like.

Two commodities deserve a closer look. The export trade in coal was on the decline with the United States although it was still healthy with other Pacific countries such as Peru, Chile and the Philippines. Even the 1902 figure of £100,734 was only 12% of total New South Wales exports of coal as compared with 30% in 1881, and 30.5% in 1891 and the importance of the United States of America as a market for coal was by then less than that of the Pacific Islands or South America. Even the peak export of £265,993 in 1907 was ephemeral and exports once again began to dwindle. This was part of an overall decline in the coal trade; the Sydney Morning Herald attributed this to industrial troubles such as the 1911 coal strike, and deplored the fact that unreasonable unionists were destroying Australia's chances of exporting coal to the Philippines and North America's West Coast. K.H. Burley agreed in part with this but also suggested that competition from overseas coal such as the British played a part, while the increase in wheat exports from Australia helped to fill up

the tonnage returning from Australia, whereas in the days when return
 cargoes were scarce coal had been used for this. 201 In the San
 Francisco market Australia had a powerful competitor in the form of
 British Columbia, which between 1900 and 1905 supplied 57% of all
 coal imports there. By 1911-14 the proportion from British Columbia
 was 80% of coal imports, from 1915 it exceeded 90%. Meanwhile the
 proportion of coal imports supplied by New South Wales to San Francisco
 dropped from 26% 1901-5 to 14% by 1914. 202 Trade fell away once again
 because of war conditions. Severe restrictions and even embargoes
 were placed on the export of coal to Pacific ports in order to prevent
 Australian coal being used by German vessels. Export to San
 Francisco was refused in October 1914 until a guarantee was given
 against re-export; 203 but from January 1915 the policy became rather
 one of withholding coal supplies from black-listed dealers than from
 countries as a whole. 204 By 1921 coal exports to the United States
 were back to their pre-war figure, but high freight charges and
 renewed competition from the Welsh collieries once again made conditions
difficult. 205

But wool was the staple export of Australia. Hartley Grattan
wrote in 1961 "Since the Australians and New Zealanders have for
almost a century been anxiously concerned with the vagaries of the
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wool trade with the United States, a few observations on it are perhaps in order, prefaced by the observation that it appears never to have been intensively studied on an historical basis. Ordinarily the failure of the Americans to take as much wool as the Australians and New Zealanders would like is attributed to the American wool tariff. This is a simplistic thesis which often has overtones of the extraordinary Australian implication that the world has a moral obligation to buy Australian exports. It is hard to accept even in the light of the facts to be found on the surface of the record. From the record it appears that when Australian wools were wanted in the United States they were imported over the current tariff. Conversely, when there was no tariff, as was occasionally the case during the nineteenth century, this did not markedly increase imports from the South-West Pacific. The key to the enigma seems to be (a) in the kinds of wool wanted by the American mills, (b) the influence of the fairly constant imports of fine woolen (sic) cloth from England on the foregoing, (c) the state of the domestic supply of wool, (d) the fact that the basic demand for imported wools was fairly constantly for carpet wools not produced in Australia nor New Zealand and finally (e) the ups and downs of the wool manufacturing trade. In support of Grattan's contention that the American tariff on wool had little effect on the imports from Australia it may be mentioned that while the tariff was still high in 1891 exports

to the United States suddenly jumped by £325,314 to £514,551, 2.1% of total wool exports and thereafter fell again to £228,040 worth in 1894. However, the placing of wool on the free list in 1894 was followed by a rise in exports, which reached £441,049 in 1896; while the reimposition of high tariffs in 1897 was once again followed by a fall in wool exports, which in 1901 were only £273,933. The tariff controversy of 1912-3 was followed with considerable interest in Australia, especially since the American purchases of Australian wool were down 50% on 1911. The eventual placing of wool on the free list in 1913 was followed by a jump in Australian exports to the United States from three-quarter of a million pounds worth in 1913 to over three million pounds worth in 1914-5 and well over eight million pounds worth in 1915-6; part of this increase is, of course, due to the greatly increased wool prices as a result of the war which although increasing only by 30c. a lb. from 27c. a lb. to 30c. a lb. between January 1914 and January 1916, thereafter rose to about 46c. a lb. in 1916. But it was also an overall increase from about 6% of the Australasian clip pre-1914 to 15% 1914-5 and 31% in 1915-6.

Too much emphasis cannot be placed on this increase after the freeing of wool from tariff restrictions in the United States, since

208. loc. cit.  
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it was undoubtedly influenced by abnormal war-time conditions which stimulated manufacturing activity in the United States. It is however evident that the United States tariff could influence the type of wool imported from Australia.

Alan Barnard points out the tendency after the 1867 tariff to import greasy wool into the United States, since the duty on it was only half that on washed wool, and one-third that on scoured wool, he also believes wool exports to the United States would have been higher if it had not been for the high American tariff.

From Table 5 it is apparent that wool exports to the United States did, in the period under review, gradually increase. There are some major economic reasons for this. One was the gradual decline in woollen-manufacturing countries of domestic wool production, hastened by the growing bulk and cheapness of wool supplies from new countries such as Australia, the Argentine, New Zealand and South Africa. This applied with most force to Europe of course, but also affected the United States.

The United States of America in 1875 produced 86% of her consumption of wool, by 1900 the figure was only 60%.

The other was the growing importance of the local Australian wool auctions: previously most wool had been sold through London, but from the early 1870's this began to change, a development in which Barnard believes American buyers were extremely influential. In 1909-10

214. ibid pp59-41.
215. ibid p39.
216. Ibid pl73.
137,481 bales were sold in Sydney as compared with 69,500 in London.\textsuperscript{217} Americans preferred buying in Sydney rather than in London.\textsuperscript{218}

War naturally affected not only the export but the production of wool in Australia; the clip declined from 720,000,000 lbs. in 1909 to 650,000,000 lbs. in 1921, partly because of the concentration on crossbred sheep, and on mutton, both of which were in demand by the Imperial Government during the war.\textsuperscript{219} An embargo was placed on the export from Australia of crossbred wool which was useful for army uniforms; but owing to the plight of Australian wool-growers, 70\% of whose product was merino, not crossbred, an agreement was reached by the British Government with the United States Textile Alliance, which comprised 90\% of American manufacturers, that all wool exported to the United States would be used there and not re-exported. Thereupon huge quantities of merino wool were exported to the United States, until in February 1916 an embargo was placed on all wool exports, and the United Kingdom bought the entire Australian wool clip for 1916, thus cutting off supplies to the United States.\textsuperscript{220}

After the war with the decline in wool production, and the imposition in 1921 of a high tariff, wool exports to the United States of America once again fell.

No other section of the Australian export trade was of any great
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significance: attempts were made to establish trade in fruit and
frozen meat particularly with San Francisco, but with little success.

**The Philippines**

A fair amount of trade was done by Australia with the Philippine
Islands, which were owned by the United States after the war with
Spain in 1898. As can be seen from Table 6, the pattern of this
trade was the reverse of that with the United States of America in
that Australia exported about four times as much to the Philippines
as she imported from there.

New South Wales maintained a Trade Commissioner for the Far East,
J.B. Sutor, and he made several reports on the Philippines in the
pre-war years. Australia in the Philippines controlled the market
in horses, coal, fodder, fresh and salt beef, mutton and butter. 221
Australian flour replaced American flour in the market. 222 In 1904
Australia sold only £2,030 of flour to the Philippines; between 1905
and 1906 its value rose from £55,000 to £76,741 out of a total of
Australian exports to the Philippines of about £400,000, 223 while by
1907 the imports were £108,038 or 58% of total flour imports.

Before 1909 little of the Philippines trade was done in
United States of America ships, and British vessels carried 50% of
the total imports to the Islands and 76% of the exports while only
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6.8% of Philippines exports to the United States and 16.6% of the imports went in American ships.

Horses were also important to the American army in the Philippines, and Australian exports of horses there went up 37% in 1906-7. Coal was on the decline because of strikes at Newcastle and consequent uncertainty of supply.

In 1909 the American navigation laws and a new tariff were applied to the Philippines, and trade temporarily decreased as a result, but Australian imports were still fourth on the Philippines list following Britain, the United States and the French East Indies. The new duties gave a heavy preference for example to American flour, and Australian exports of flour dropped below 50% of the total Philippines import of that commodity.

The war of course disrupted the Australian export trade to the Philippines in much the same way as that with the United States of America. Guarantees had to be given that commodities such as coal, meat etc. would not reach the enemy's ships, but in actual fact Australian trade continued to grow.

Conclusions

The growth of United States trade in this period is enormous.

Before the war imports of American goods into Australia kept at a steady proportion of about 15%, although they increased in volume. They did not damage particularly British trade, which found Germany a stronger competitor. The war, however, gave the United States a chance greatly to increase her exports to Australia, because of the elimination of Germany as a competitor, and the pre-occupation of other European nations including Great Britain. During this period inroads were made not only into the German sector of the market, but into the British. Although things returned after the war to a position where Great Britain held roughly the same proportion of the Australian market as she had before the war, America had taken over most of the German share, and was in a much stronger position than in 1913, a position which she was to improve on during the 1920's.

Imports from the United States were, with a few exceptions, goods products of newer industries such as electrical, modern machinery, films, motor cars, in which Great Britain was lagging behind the United States of America even before the war. Tariff preference did little to redress the balance in favour of the British, and war conditions, and the impoverished condition of Britain post 1918 gave her little chance to regain lost ground which the Americans had won during the war.

Little concern was felt by the Australians until about 1921 about the volume of American imports, although some about the adverse balance of trade. The 1920's saw the establishment of manufacturing industry in Australia on a considerable scale, and a consequent
attempt to erect tariff barriers to protect them. But before 1921 it was only really in the field of agricultural machinery, which was manufactured in Australia that attempts were made to exclude American goods.

Australian exports to the United States were mostly primary products and changed little in character between 1901 and 1923. Exports of wool grew, those of coal declined; the export metals changed somewhat due to the war.

And despite handicaps to American trade, the Americans were established by 1923 in trade as in many other fields as the most important foreign influence on Australia after the basic British tradition, an influence representing in this field as in many others the new, the changing, possibly, the ephemeral and the mercenary, the New World leavening in the Old World tradition.
CHAPTER 4

COMMERCIAL RELATIONS II
Shipping

Shipping between Australia and the United States of America was only a small fraction of the total shipping entering and leaving Australian ports. During the pre-war period, it was actually on the decline, although American trade with Australia was gradually increasing in value, but like American trade, shipping from the United States became more prominent in Australia during the First World War, reaching 19.1% of all shipping entering and leaving Australia in 1918-19 compared with 6.2% in 1913. Yet though it was more prominent, in proportion to the total shipping in Australian ports, the total tonnage from and to Australia fell from 10,601,948 tons in 1913 to 6,180,486 tons in 1918-19.1

In other words what the percentage figures reveal is not an absolute increase in shipping connections between the United States and Australia, but a decrease in the shipping from Europe due to war conditions. The war caused the diversion of British shipping from the Australian trade to the shorter routes to North or South America for badly needed food supplies, and reduced the total amount of British shipping through the inroads of the U-boat campaign. United Kingdom shipping actually increased in proportion during the war years from 1. See Table 7.
52.74% in 1913 to a maximum of 63.43% in 1916-17 and, except for 1917-18 remained above the pre-war level for the rest of the period under review. But the German shipping was eliminated, and French and Norwegian damaged, by the war.

It is also obvious that except for the year 1918-1919 shipping from the United States represented a slightly smaller proportion of the total shipping entered, than the proportion of imports of United States origin formed in total Australian imports. This is accounted for by two factors. Firstly the fact that cargoes from America were usually of compact manufactured goods; and the other is the role of the United Kingdom as a distributor of United States goods in the pre-1914 years.² The United States in the pre-1914 period depended almost entirely on foreign, especially British, shipping to distribute her world trade.

Another fact which becomes noticeable from the statistics is that ships of United States nationality played only a minor part even in the small traffic between Australia and the United States. The proportion of shipping of American nationality trading with Australia fell steadily in the pre-war years, from 4.19% of the total in 1904, to 0.52% in 1910; a slow climb is evident thereafter to 1913 when the proportion rose to 2.11%: in 1914-15 the proportion more

² See Chapter 3 above.
than doubled, to 4.58%, and thereafter, except for 1921-2 remained between 4% and 6%.\textsuperscript{3}

In the pre-war years American vessels were only a small proportion of the shipping entering Australia from the United States, 24.9% in 1906, 4.5% in 1908, 6.2% in 1910 and a slightly larger 12.8% in 1913. In fact between 1906 and 1911 there was about ten times as much British shipping entering Australia from the United States as there was American while between 1909 and 1912 far more German than American shipping entered from the United States.\textsuperscript{4}

This all points to the fact that the trade of the United States with Australia was, like most American trade of the period, mostly carried in non-American ships. An American writer pointed out in 1915 that American exports to the Pacific countries had grown between 1897 and 1911 despite the lack of regular steamship services between the United States and the Pacific, while those of Britain and Germany had fallen, although they did operate such services.\textsuperscript{5} His conclusion from this was that regular shipping services would not necessarily benefit United States trade. This seems a dubious argument; it would at the very least have been to the advantage of the United States balance of payments if 92% of her foreign trade had not been carried in foreign vessels.

3. See Table 7.
4. See Table 8.
The proportion of American vessels in the trade between the United States and Australia grew during the war years to 31.5% in 1915-16, 45.3% in 1917-18 and fell back to 31.6% in 1918-19. This was in line with an overall increase in the United States merchant marine which grew from 5,797,902 tons registered in 1901, to 7,928,688 tons in 1913, to 9,924,518 in 1915 and thence with a spurt to 12,907,300 tons in 1916 and 18,462,968 tons in 1922. The percentage of total American exports carried in American vessels grew from 6.9% 1900-4 to 8.5% 1905-9, fell from 1910-14 to 8.1%, but became 18.2% 1915-19, and was still high in the post-war years: 43.6% in 1920, 36.1% in 1921 and 28.4% in 1922.

There were in fact direct regular shipping lines between the Western coast of the United States of America and Australia. In 1901 there was a break between the Union Steamship Company of New Zealand and the Oceanic Steamship Company of the United States, which from 1885 to 1900 had acted in collaboration to run shipping services between Eastern Australia and San Francisco. This was due to the extension of United States navigation laws to the recently acquired island of Hawaii: foreign ships were excluded from the United States' coastal trade, including that between American possessions in the Pacific and San

7. ibid p287.
Francisco. The United States government subsidy to the mail service which had previously been granted was now confined to ships of United States nationality. The Union Steamship Company shifted its North American terminus to Vancouver in 1901 thus providing an "All Red" mail route from Australia to Britain; and the American Oceanic Steamship Company put a third boat on the Australian-San Francisco run.

The disruption caused by the San Francisco earthquake of 1906 caused the suspension of Oceanic's service to Australia in 1907; but communication was still possible since Union operated from Australia to Tahiti, and Oceanic from Tahiti to San Francisco. "Then in 1909 both Union and Oceanic returned to the North American-South West Pacific Service." This statement is not entirely accurate. Union never suspended its service to Vancouver and although there were rumours that Oceanic would resume its service in 1909 these came to nothing. "There can be no doubting," wrote an Australian publication, "the immense value the service would be to New Zealand and Australia as well as the Pacific Coast, but the trade relations are not yet sound enough to run it at a profit without assistance in the form of a subsidy; and as that is not forthcoming - not a substantial one at any rate - the prospects of its resumption are almost as remote now as was the case a month after the three sister ships Sierra, Sonoma and Ventura were withdrawn."  

10. Shipping and Commerce of Australia : No. 1 Sydney, 1910 p23.
But the Union Company was expanding: in 1911 it announced its intention of entering the San Francisco–Sydney route, and by 1912 its ships were on this run. This was made possible in part by a New Zealand Government subsidy. From July 1912 the Oceanic Steamship Company also re-entered the Sydney–San Francisco route.

It would in fact have been impossible from the shipping figures between the United States & Australia between 1909 and 1911 for the Oceanic ships to have been sailing regularly between Sydney and San Francisco. American shipping figures between Australia and the United States, which had fallen after 1907, did not increase substantially from 1909 when Oceanic is supposed to have resumed services according to Grattan. Regular monthly services of two of Oceanic's three boats the Sonoma and the Ventura would have meant some 46,974 tons per annum entering Australia and leaving from Australia for the United States of America for Oceanic's boats alone. In fact in 1910 the total United States tonnage entering Australia from the United States of America was 22,176, in 1911 36,637. It is not until 1912, when Oceanic resumed its Sydney–San Francisco service that the figures started to rise again. By 1913 when the service was running regularly the American tonnage entering Australia from the United States of America was 74,143.

A proposal in 1912 to set up a third line of steamers plying regularly between Sydney and the United States of America, this

11. S.M.H. Feb. 9, 1912 ed.
13. See also W.S.W. Maritime Services Board: Overseas and Interstate Register Inwards 1912–14 in the W.S.W. State Archives, M.L. Sydney.
15. See Table 12.
time to Seattle, was welcomed in 1912 by the *Sydney Morning Herald* which wrote, "These doings betoken vigour of enterprise. They are welcome for that reason alone. But they also betoken — and in that regard are doubly welcome — recognition of Australian trade as worth having, and of Australian direct services as likely to grow to dimensions that make them worthy of the active interest of business enterprise." In 1914 this enterprise got under way and a British line, owned by James Burrell of Glasgow, began running a service between Seattle, on the Puget Sound, and Sydney at the rate of about one vessel every five weeks; this business was interrupted by the war for no ships of this line are recorded as entering Sydney from Seattle after March 1915. Many of them were later purchased by the Australian Government for its Commonwealth line.

The Oceanic boats accounted for a large proportion of the United States shipping sailing between Australia and the United States of America. For instance the tonnage the boats of the Oceanic Co. recorded as entering Sydney in the period January – April 1902 was 22,250 tons. Multiplied by three to give the year's total this would be 66,750 tons, or over three-quarters of the total amount of United States shipping entering Australia from American ports in 1906. In 1914–5 Maritime Services Board records show the tonnage of boats belonging to the

Oceanic Steamship Company which entered Sydney as 46,974 or over half the total of 77,721 tons of United States shipping entering from the United States in this year. In 1912 the corresponding figures were 17,576 tons Oceanic Steamship boats out of 56,637 tons total United States shipping entering from the United States of America; in 1913 46,974 tons out of 74,145 tons total, in 1915-16 59,224 tons out of 180,140 tons total American shipping entering from the United States. These ships were not primarily cargo ships, although they did carry some cargo as well as passengers. But the West Coast was not a natural outlet for the manufacturing areas of the United States, which were concentrated in the Eastern section of the country, and it seems unlikely that they carried any great proportion of American exports to Australia. The Maritime Services Board's records are not very informative but the Sonoma for example docked on January 17, 1902 only partly laden; while the Ventura on April 14, 1902 discharged some 1,900 tons of cargo.

Between 1912 and 1915-16 the Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics distinguished between the Western and the Eastern coasts of the United States of America and Canada. In these years, as can be seen from Table 9 the greater part of United States shipping came to Australia from the West Coast, only a small proportion coming from the East Coast, until 1915-16 when the war conditions and the opening of the Panama Canal combined to increase the amount coming from the East Coast. Australian and other non-United Kingdom British ships plying between the two countries, however, also traded mostly with the West Coast; the only exceptions are one Australian ship of

3,535 tons from the East Coast in 1914-15 and a few others in 1915-16. United Kingdom tonnage, however, was about equally divided between East and West. Norwegian tonnage came mainly from the West Coast, while German ships came almost entirely from the East Coast. A few small French sailing ships also took the New York-Sydney route. Thus the ships entering Australia from the manufacturing Eastern areas of the United States were almost entirely British or German. In 1913 all but one of the 14 German ships of 45,664 tons entering Sydney from New York belonged to one single line, the Deutsche Dampfahrtsgesellschaft, Bremen. The British ships entering from New York were more diverse, but many of them belonged to the Commonwealth and Dominions line. It was not however until 1915-16 that American ships were recorded as entering Australia from the Eastern Coast, from New York: they were four in number and their combined tonnage was 9,590 tons. Even when United States ships began to carry goods between New York and Sydney, they did not return direct. They tended to return via Europe, and thus carried no return cargo from Australia to the United States.

This was in fact typical of all shipping between the United States and Australia. As can be seen from Table 8, in general about twice as much shipping entered Australia from the United States of America as cleared from Australia to return there. In general about as much American shipping entered from American ports as returned

there, a result in part of the regular shipping between Sydney and San Francisco. But the shipping of the "carrier" nations, the United Kingdom, Germany and Norway, made more voyages from America to Australia than they did in the other direction, a reflection of the fact that more trade goods were flowing into Australia from the United States of America than were going in the other direction. 21

A study of Tables 10 and 9 will show that the greater part of American shipping which was recorded in Australia came from and departed for the United States; a few vessels came from Canada or New Zealand or the Pacific Islands, and even a few from Africa, but the vast majority came from and left for American ports. Most American shipping entered with cargo from the United States of America or Canada; but from New Zealand and Africa it frequently entered in ballast, presumably to seek return cargo for the trip home. This was in line with the shipping of most foreign nations trading with Australia: with the exception of the British and the Norwegians, and before 1914, the Germans, who were "carrier" nations, the shipping of most countries traded between Australia and either its own home country or its overseas possessions. 22

But the war altered the pattern of United States shipping. As already mentioned, and as can be seen from Table 7, United States shipping increased more in proportion to the total overseas shipping of Australia than it did absolutely. The amount of United States

21. See Chapter 3.
shipping with Australia in the peak year of 1915-16 was rather less than three times that of 1913; but its proportion to the whole overseas shipping of Australia was 5.52% in 1916-17 or about four times as great as that of 1913. In fact the total overseas shipping of Australia dropped sharply during the war and immediate post-war years. As already mentioned this was due to war conditions, to the elimination of European shipping from Australia and to the great shortage of British ships. The U-boat danger in the Atlantic made the sea-routes of the Pacific seem attractively peaceful to the United States during the period up till March 1917 when she was a neutral country. Thus her shipping in 1915-16 became for the first time in Australia the greatest amount from any foreign nation: up till then American tonnage had always been outnumbered by that from France, Germany and Norway. The shortage of shipping tonnage made it for the first time profitable to ship Australian goods from San Francisco to New York and then send them by boat to the United Kingdom.

The conditions which favoured the increase in shipping between Australia and the United States of America also favoured that between Australia and Japan and, as can be seen from Table 7, it was an opportunity seized by Japan. It is evident that shipping between Australia and Japan was increasing before 1914, faster than that with the United States of America, especially from 1911 on, and

in the war years Japanese shipping was little behind that of the United States of America, while in 1919-20 and 1920-21 it actually exceeded the American tonnage visiting Australia.

Mention has already been made in Chapter 3, of the difficulties of assessing the importance of the Panama Canal in United States-Australian trade. These difficulties obviously apply to its influence on shipping too, but lines were set up to sail between New York and Australia. American interest in the potentialities of Pacific trade certainly quickened towards the end of the war. In 1918 a monthly magazine called Pacific Ports began to appear in Seattle to deal with the problems and prospects of United States trade in the Pacific. In 1920 an American businessman, President of the Pacific Steamship Company, declared at the seventh annual convention of the Foreign Trade Council in San Francisco, "To-day it is generally recognised that in Asia, Australasia and the west coast of South America are the greatest undeveloped markets of the world. Even of more importance these markets are responding in a healthy manner to the pioneering efforts of American ship-owners and American salesmen."

Realisation was slowly growing in Australia too of the importance of shipping to trade. As early as 1915 the New South Wales trade representatives in the United States, Nielsen and Quinn, were pressing United States authorities for a direct shipping line between Sydney and New York. This particular scheme fell through despite Nielsen's optimism but by 1919 there were lines sailing regularly between New

York and Australia via the Panama Canal.

To sum up it can be said that shipping between the United States of America and Australia was before 1914 only a small proportion of Australia's overseas shipping; a smaller proportion than the amount of goods Australia imported from the United States was to her total imports. United States shipping moreover formed only a small proportion of the shipping plying between Australia and the United States of America, although this proportion grew during the war years to about half.

Before 1915-16 most United States shipping entered Australia from the West Coast of the United States of America and returned thereto; a very large proportion of this shipping is accounted for by the regular service of the Oceanic Steamship Company's boats between Sydney and San Francisco. Most of the shipping engaged in the carrying trade between the Eastern coast of the United States of America and Australia, was not American, but British or German. United States shipping plied mostly direct between the United States of America or her Pacific possessions and Australia and did not engage in the "carrying" trade. It became increasingly important in the overseas shipping of Australia during the war years due to abnormal conditions and the growth of the United States merchant marine.
Finance

Most governmental loan finance from overseas in Australia came from Great Britain; although it has been pointed out that although British investment in Australia was increasing between 1870 and 1890 it thereafter fell up till 1914. This is attributed to a decline in Australian demand for capital after 1890 due to lesser investment activity, most of which could be met by the growing amount of local savings, and to the more intensive demands from Canada, the United States and South America for development capital between 1890-1914. The fact nevertheless remained - that before 1914 no Australian Government, State or Commonwealth, had raised a loan in the United States of America.

The war of 1914-18 virtually closed the London capital market to Australian Government loans. That the British Government was worried about the possible effect that this might have on Australia is evident from their proposal in July 1915 to guarantee principal and interest on local loans raised entirely for war purposes; but although the Commonwealth raised such loans they took no advantage of British offers to guarantee them. In 1917 the British Treasury suggested that Australia might raise money in New York, although Britain felt unable to let the Treasury act as agent in their transaction.

28. ibid p148.
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But despite the feelings of one non-Labour backbencher that this would be a good thing, the Hughes Government did nothing about it, since they considered that if the State Governments could raise money freely in New York they would not curb expenditure at home, and because it would tend to divert trade from British channels.

After the end of the war, however, when Britain was less able to provide money for overseas investment, and Commonwealth control over the States' borrowing was slightly eased, the Government of Queensland decided in 1921 to raise a loan on the New York market. The loan was a twenty-year one $12,000,000 at 7%; this loan was followed in 1922 by another of $9,982,000 for twenty-five years at 6%.

Considerable concern was felt in Britain and in Australia at this new departure since it was felt at the time to be a major policy change and a portent of things to come. The British Trade Commissioner wrote, "The United Kingdom's present share in a valuable market like the Australian will not be retained without severe competition from the United States and possibly other countries. The Queensland loan, recently raised in New York and standing at a considerable premium to day, together with the known offers of United States financiers of loans to the other States are an indication of what
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may be expected, apart from competition in prices of goods and sales organisation."

The Bulletin was strongly attacked by most of the press. The Bulletin urged that the Commonwealth Government should find some way to restrict State borrowings to prevent "fiscal annexation". "The United States as a result of the war owns, or has a lien upon, all the money in the world and a great deal more. It must invest its money somewhere so as to make more money, the making of money being the chief end of American men."

"The position as regards Australia is that, for the first time in its history, more than one fifth of its area has been mortgaged to a foreign power or to very influential subjects of a foreign power." 34

The Sydney Morning Herald commented, "As our cable messages indicate United States financiers are endeavouring to shift the world's financial centre of gravity from London to New York, and ... are particularly desirous of doing business with British dominions and dependencies. So far as this part of the world is concerned, however, it is apparently rather the spendthrift, who is at his wits' end for means to carry on than the sober-minded and reliable citizen that this financier has to regard as a probable client." 35 It also pointed out that the high interest rate was due to the dubious good faith of the Queensland Government which had been unable to raise the loan in London.

That this loan was largely due to increased American interest

34. E. Oct. 20, 1921.
35. S.M.H. Oct. 11, 1921.
in Australia as a field for investment is clear from the comment of the Australasian Insurance and Banking Record. "One of the questions which has arisen in the period of high interest rates and scarcity of capital which has prevailed since the war, has been whether New York was to take the place of London in the flotation of Australian loans. A number of offers from American financiers have been received by various Governments, which, however, have not accepted them, preferring to adhere to the old-established channels in London for the supply of money required for railways and other public works ... The circumstances which have led Queensland to borrow in New York are of a special nature, and are not to be taken as representative of the general feeling in Australia, which would be one of reluctance to depart from London connections. Queensland legislation of recent years has unfortunately been characterised by an absence of good faith, which has alienated the confidence of those whose judgment carries weight in London, and who have a responsibility to the investing public in giving their support for fresh borrowings."36

Premier Theodore of Queensland claimed that the approach to New York had been made on the advice of the Governor of the Commonwealth Bank after a municipal loan for Ipswich Water Supply and Sewerage Board had failed in London.

But this move cannot have come as a complete surprise in Australia. As early as 1916 the Bulletin, in a bitter attack on the
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United States attitude during the war, had said "There is nothing in common between the British and the Americans except language. And language can be used for quarrelling as well as making love. The newspapers in the Western and middle-Western States are not cordial. They don't want to see the Allies lose, yet they wish the British to be hurt or hamstrung. Let Europe exhaust herself, and we will secure the trade, the finance and the power. New York is going to be the financial centre of the world as they hope and now expect. This is the sentiment underlying every editorial and every reference to the war." 38 In the post-war period it was recognised that the United States was now financially stronger than Great Britain. 39 There was a suggestion that the Sydney County Council Loan of 1920, which was undersubscribed, should be made up from the United States, but this was not well received. 40

But whatever the desire of Australian Governments to continue borrowing in London this was made difficult by the lack of money available there for overseas investment. In 1925 the Commonwealth Government raised a thirty-year loan of $74,777,000 in New York at 5%: in 1926 New South Wales raised two thirty-year loans of $25,000,000 each at 5%.

In 1927 the Federal Government again raised $40,000,000 in New York, and in 1928 it raised $50,000,000 there. This compared with about £44,000,000 raised in London by the Commonwealth Government 1925-8, and £60,000,000 raised there by the New South Wales Government 1924-8.

In the field of investment other than Governmental loans the picture is much less clear. "Nobody has ever worked out on an historical basis just where American private investment has been lodged in the economies of the South-West Pacific. Most of it has probably always been lodged in the Australian economy, but probably for the years up to circa 1950 in agency warehouses, assembly plants and such. Branch factories appear to have been exceedingly uncommon until after World War II. American investment seems to have had but a minimal role in getting Australian industrialization going, though America had influence by way of technical advice."41

Since, however, by 1940 United States investments in Oceania as a whole were only 2% of total United States overseas investments, and Oceania had the second smallest amount of United States capital invested there of all the regions of the world,43 the total amount of American investment in Australia cannot have been large.

Few American firms were active in Australia before the first World War; most of them were content to appoint local agents to push their manufactures. The American Tobacco Company's branch factory established in 1894 barely survived into the twentieth century. International Harvester Company, following the lead of the Canadian firm of Massey-Harris, set up its own sales and distribution network about 1907.44 The three large United States life insurance companies operating in Australia were compelled by law to lodge some of their
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funds in Australia; two of them also owned considerable amounts of
real estate in the grandiose head-quarters buildings they constructed
in Australia in the 1890's.

Kodak (Australasia) Ltd. was registered in Victoria in August,
1908 with £150,000 capital in £1 shares fully paid. The Oceanic
Steamship Company of San Francisco had an office in Sydney. Otherwise
the amount of investment was fairly small.

The war years saw an increase in the number of American firms
with branches or subsidiaries in Australia and by 1920 in a Commonwealth
report some 21 American firms operating in Australia were listed, as
compared with almost 200 British firms. The majority of these, ten
in number, were simply branch offices; another nine had Australian
subsidiary companies registered in Australia, but of these only two,
the International Harvester Company and Vacuum Oil Company, assembled
or manufactured parts in Australia. The remaining firms were Wrigley's
Chewing Gum which had a factory in Sydney, and Swift's (Australia) Meat
Export Company, a subsidiary of the American firm of Swift's which was
one of the main firms in the American Beef Trust. Five of these firms
were concerned with the motor vehicle industry and its by-products,
one with films, one with agricultural implements; another six with
modern "gadgets" such as electrical manufactures, adding machines,
telephones, photography and the like. All of these products are
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those in which United States imports were making the greatest impact on the Australian market. The number of firms is, however, small, and their total investment in the Australian economy cannot have been large; except for Vacuum Oil, International Harvester, and Wrigley's Chewing Gum, they certainly contributed nothing to the development of Australian manufacturing industries.

There is however the comment made in 1930 that, "Australia occupies a happy position in the New York Market. In the golden age of United States foreign lending from the outbreak of World War I to the Depression, Australia received about seven per cent of the proceeds, which was considerable in relation to her size."

A large part of this must have been represented by the Governmental loans totalling $186,759,000 between 1921 and 1928. But there is also evidence of growing United States private investment in Australia during this period. The Aeolian Company which had been a proprietary firm became incorporated in 1924 with an authorised capital of £500,000; of which 100,000 £1 preference shares and 200,000 £1 ordinary shares were issued fully paid; this company was a subsidiary of Aeolian Weber Pianos and Pianola Company of New Jersey.

The United States Light and Heat Corporation (Australia) Ltd. was registered in New South Wales in March 1923 with an authorised capital of £50,000. Other firms have already been mentioned in connection with the motor industry: Ford Motor Company of Canada, General Motors
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Corporation, Goodyear Tyre and Rubber Company.

Accurate estimates of United States private investment in Australia are possible only from the late 1920's; but provisional estimates of American investments in Australia in earlier years show them as low. One estimate including overseas loans, and American shares in foreign owned companies gives no investment in Australia of this type before 1917 when a short-term loan of £1,200,000 was issued; by 1924 the amount was £23,700,000 and by 1929 £241,200,000. Loans from the United States to Australia exceeded repayments by over £100,000,000 between 1925 and 1929. The same source gives investment in Australian/New Zealand manufacturing industries as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>6,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>16,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>26,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>49,800,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, according to these calculations, total American investment in Australian manufacturing industry must have been less than the above, since the table includes investment in New Zealand as well. Loans, not investment in manufacturing, accounted for the greater part of the increase.
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in the 1920's.

A United States Commerce Department publication in 1930 analysed some of the reasons for American investment in Australian manufacturing. "The tariff is generally believed to be the chief reason for the American investments in these two British Dominions (Australia and New Zealand) ... other factors (are) the common language, the presence of a good market and the great distance from the United States with the resultant heavy transport costs." 54

The argument about the tariff certainly applies to some investment in the twenties; to the setting up of Kayser's hosiery factory, or Jantzen's, and also to the motor vehicle, tyre, and electrical industries. It also explains the switch in the proportion of branch offices to subsidiary companies; there were ten branch offices to nine subsidiary companies in 1920, 55 but by 1929 there were only five branch offices to twenty-nine subsidiaries; 56 these latter had the advantage of seeming less "foreign". But it does not explain another feature of United States investment in Australia. "Our industrial investments in Australia differ from those in other foreign Eastern countries in that they began very early but have not increased greatly in pace. One reason for the early beginning is that some of the British subsidiaries of American corporations established branches in Australia before the war. The number of factories started in Australia by Americans by years were
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as follows: 1892, 1; 1902, 2; 1903, 1; 1907, 1; 1908, 3; 1911, 1; 1914, 1; 1915, 3; 1917 and 1919-25 1 each year, 1926, 3; 1927, 2; 1928, 4; 1929, 2.\(^57\)

Colin Forster has estimated that only about one-seventh of the finance for manufacturing industries in Australia came from overseas in the 1920's, and that much of this was in the form of re-investment not capital inflow. Of this the British share was larger than the American. Before 1920 the proportion of United States investment must have been much smaller according to the figures given above.

The total American investment in manufacturing in 1929 in Australia and New Zealand was about £49,816,000 of which Forster would place about five-sixths in Australia.\(^59\) Most of this was in the industries in which imports of United States goods were most important: £18,962,000 in motor vehicles and, agricultural and industrial machinery, £7,441,000 in electrical machinery and telephone equipment, £3,196,000 in pharmaceuticals, £3,140,000 in other chemicals and £1,243 in toilet preparations; there was also £4,909,000 invested in foodstuffs other than cereals or beverages and £10,925,000 in miscellaneous enterprises.\(^61\)

Conclusions

American portfolio investment in Australia was non-existent before World War I. As a result of the war and the ensuing tightness on the London Stock Exchange, however, Australian Governments began to turn
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more to New York after 1921.

United States investment in Australian manufacturing began earlier than governmental loans, but grew slowly thereafter. After the introduction of protective tariffs in Australia in the 1920's, many firms who sold a great deal in Australia began to manufacture there.

The investment in manufacturing industry took place in the areas of the economy in which United States imports had previously held a commanding position on the import market such as motor vehicles, electrical goods, or agricultural and office machinery.

There was little or no United States investment in Australian primary industries. 62

Insurance

This section will deal entirely with the question of life insurance. American firms in the non-life fields only entered Australia at the very end of our period and then only in a small way. The following are those which did operate in Australia:

- Fireman's Fund (N.S.W.) 1915-1933 (Fire and Marine)
- Hartford 1920- (Fire and Marine)
- Home 1920- (Fire and Marine)
- Insurance of North America 1920-2 (Fire and Marine)
- National Fire Insurance Co. of Hartford 1920-33 (Fire and Marine)
- Washington Marine 1920-2 (Marine) 63

63. I am indebted for this information to Dr. Garry Purcell of the Department of Economic History, Monash University.
Life Insurance

The early history of insurance in Australia follows a pattern familiar in overseas countries. Marine Insurance was the first form to be introduced, in 1831, by the Marine Insurance Company. Life insurance developed later: the Australian Mutual Provident (A.M.P.) Society, the largest and most successful of these, was founded in 1848-9; while the largest Victorian office, the Mutual Life Association, was founded in 1869.

Life insurance expanded rapidly in Australia. By 1893, despite the financial crash, the A.M.P. had 119,232 policies in force for a sum of £39,331,071, and an annual premium income of over one and a quarter million pounds, while other Australian companies although smaller were also doing well. By 1901 Australasia had at £224 a larger amount of life insurance per head of population than Canada (£17), the United Kingdom (£15) or the United States of America (£19), and the largest number of policies per thousand population, 90, as compared with Canada's 50, the United Kingdom's 45, the United States of America's 40. The average amount insured in the average life insurance policy was, however, smaller than in these other countries: in Australasia it was £261, in Canada £333, in the United Kingdom.
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£348 and in the United States of America £465. In other words more people in Australia and New Zealand carried insurance than in the other main English-speaking countries of the world, although the amounts insured were somewhat smaller. This probably is a result of a relatively high income per capita in Australia, and of its relatively even distribution.

In the 1880's the three largest life assurance firms of the United States of America decided to enter the Australian insurance market. Most of their story lies outside our period, but to understand what happened in the early twentieth century, reference must be made to their earlier career in Australia. It must be emphasised that the incursion of the New York Life Insurance Company, the Equitable Life Assurance Society of New York, and the Mutual Life Association of the United States did not single out Australia especially from other countries. "The American life insurance venture overseas took on substantially greater importance between 1885 and 1905. The New York Life, the Equitable and the Mutual dominated the field: the Prudential and the Metropolitan, apart from some activity on the Continent did not seek business beyond the United States. The foreign business of the Big Three became extensive enough to amount to a sizeable portion of their total insurance in force. By 1901 the

Equitable was active in almost a hundred nations and territories the world over; the New York Life in almost fifty, the Mutual in about twenty. The volume of the New York Life's Paris office alone equalled the company's entire business of a few years before and surpassed all American life insurance firms except the other two giants. The Big Three had almost three-quarters of a billion dollars worth of insurance in force abroad—overwhelmingly in Europe—with a quarter of a million policy holders. The three companies' 1905 premium income of almost $50,000,000 was about one eighth of the total value of the United States finished manufactured exports.68 In view of the volume and extent of overseas business of the American firms the Australian figures for 1906 seem tiny; 26,150 policies for a sum assured of £10,004,616 and a premium income of £395,152.69 This insignificance is borne out by the lack of reference to Australia in Keller's volume on the life insurance; although other small countries such as Austria, Denmark and Turkey are mentioned.

The first two companies, the New York Life and the Equitable of the United States, set up offices in Australia in 1883; the third, the

Mutual of the United States, did so in 1887. The Equitable made the most rapid progress as can be seen from Table ||. By 1893 it had 7,204 policies in Australasia, and the sum assured was over £4,000,000; the New York Life had 2,169 policies for a sum assured of £1,645,535, and the Mutual, the latest established, had 1,468 policies for £1,160,366. By 1903 the Equitable had more than doubled its number of policies in the previous ten years, but the sum assured had increased by less than 50%; the New York Life had more than tripled its number of policies, but the sum assured had increased by about 65% and the Mutual also more than tripled the number of its policies, and doubled the sum assured. In the meantime the number of the A.M.P.'s policies increased by about 65% and its premium income by about 59%. Thus the business of the American companies was in fact increasing faster than that of the largest Australian society and they could not be said to be unsuccessful.

Nevertheless in 1906 two of the Big Three American companies ceased transacting new business in Australia, and the third cut down its amount.

The reasons for this sudden withdrawal are various. Probably the most important, like the reason for their incursion into Australia, lie in conditions in the home country. As early as 1895 the President of the Equitable stated that he did not wish to extend his company's overseas business, and in fact the Equitable withdrew from South America and Asia because of currency difficulties and high mortality rates; while by 1901 mortality rates even in Europe were causing
concern to the Equitable, though the Mutual and the New York Life
still considered their overseas business profitable. These particular
objections did not, however, apply to Australia.

What did ultimately affect Australia was an insurance scandal
which broke in the United States of America in 1905 and which was
followed with some interest by the Australian Press.

The crisis was precipitated by the outrageous expenditure of
James H. Hyde, son of the founder of the Equitable, who had become
principal shareholder on his father’s death. Attempts to change the
company from a proprietary to a mutual organisation, and allegations
of financial dishonesty led to an inquiry by the New York Legislature.
The findings of this Armstrong Committee are described succinctly
in the following quotation "In the course of the hearings Hughes
uncovered a trail of corruption and misrepresentation which made the
gas companies [who had earlier been the subjects of a similar
inquiry] look like models of business ethics. Under Hughes’ questioning
a succession of highly-paid and hitherto respected insurance executives
admitted that they retained control over their companies through
extra-legal devices, made regular campaign contributions to the
Republican party, bribed legislators of both parties, paid out large
sums to corrupt the press, maintained lobbyists at Albany and other

70. Morton Keller op. cit. p96.
71. See for example A.B.R. Apr. 20, 1905, June 20, 1905,
July 20, 1905, Nov. 20, 1905, Feb. 20, 1906 edit., May 21,
pl2, Argus July 21, 1905, July 29, 1905, Argus Aug. 16, 1905,
May 1, 1906, Nov. 11, 1905, Age Nov. 14, 1905, Feb. 8, 1906, D.T.
Feb. 5, 1906.
State capitals, arranged illegal loans between their companies and
banks on whose boards they served, speculated with their companies'
funds in other enterprises, falsified their books and knew virtually
nothing about the actual conduct of their business."\(^{72}\)

The report of the Armstrong Committee led to some stringent
legislation in New York State. The amount of new insurance was
limited to $150,000,000 per annum, all sorts of regulations were made
as to types of investments, and campaign contributions and associations
with other companies were forbidden. Twenty-eight other States followed
suit and passed similar legislation.\(^{73}\)

The main restriction to Australian business was the limitation
on new business; this meant that the companies had to decide upon
which areas they would concentrate. In January 1906 Peabody of the
Mutual announced that his company intended to eliminate unprofitable
overseas departments.\(^{74}\) The Mutual withdrew from new Australian
business early in 1907. In February 1906 the Equitable Manager in
Australia announced, "Owing to the increasing cost of securing new
assurance in Australasia the management of the Equitable most reluctantly
feels compelled in the interests of policy-holders to discontinue at
the present time the acquisition of new business in the Commonwealth
of Australia and New Zealand ..."

"It is greatly to the interests of policy-holders that new
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assurances should be sought only under such conditions as render the acquisition of new business remunerative to the general body of policy-holders. This in the opinion of the management of the society is not profitable at the moment under conditions now existing in Australasia, the present limited population widely scattered over an enormous territory, being already the most heavily insured of any country in the world..." 75

The New York Life still took new business, but the number of its policies dwindled steadily from 1906 on. Gradually the companies, which had kept offices to deal with policies existing in 1906, divested themselves of their Australian connections. In 1914 the Mutual of the United States sold its office buildings in Australia to the Mercantile Mutual Insurance Company; this action was in line with the Mutual's new policy of disposing of its real estate holdings. 76 In 1923 the National Mutual Life Association took over the remaining Australasian business of the Equitable for a sum of £1,750,000 and moved into the Equitable building in George Street in February 1924; in 1925 the N.M.L.A. took over the business of the New York Life Insurance Company in Australia, New Zealand and Fiji for a sum of three quarters of a million pounds. 77 This left only the Mutual still running out its business in Australia.

But if the main reason for the withdrawal of the United States

75. Published in the A.I.E.R. Feb. 20, 1906. A copy of the circular is also available in the A.M.P. Company's archives.
companies from the Australian life insurance field lay in legislative changes in the United States, there were certain peculiarities about conditions in Australia which also affected their operations in Australia.

One of these, the preference for local companies over foreign ones the patriotic "pull", as the Bulletin described it, was also operative in other countries such as Canada, France, Latin America and the Far East. This feeling was, moreover, based not merely on unreasoning patriotism, but on the thoroughly rational supposition that "It seems natural that Australians should rely more upon offices managed here and working entirely under Australian law than to insure in foreign offices." There was occasional protest against the lack of control over foreign companies operating in Australia. The Age pointed out in 1890 that all that was needed to operate in Victoria was to make formal registration with the Registrar-General and deposit a sum of £5,000 which was returned as soon as the life assurance funds from premiums reached £15,000. One of the causes of this worry was a case in the 1880's, David Joseph Joseph V. the Equitable, for arrears of salary due to an ex-employee of the Equitable's; this was won by the insurance company on the technical grounds that it was not registered within the colony. As the Age pointed out this had serious implications

78. B. Feb. 8, 1906 p12.
for policy-holders, for it could mean that the company could repudiate its contractual obligations under a life insurance contract on the same grounds. Another cause for alarm was that the New South Wales Manager of the Equitable refused to say, when in Court, where the New South Wales premium income was invested.

These worries naturally became acute at the time of the Armstrong enquiry in the United States of America. A meeting of policy-holders in the Equitable and the Mutual was held in Melbourne on July 19, 1906 to demand assurances that the present assets of the American companies would not be interfered with and that part of the Australian premiums would be invested in Australia. Some very eminent Australians were among those present. This was mild compared to action in Britain where the manager of the Mutual's British office resigned and joined a rival British firm because of the refusal of the New York Board to give reforms including British representation on the Mutual's Board. The British company then sent a letter to British policy-holders of the Equitable offering to take over the Mutual's policies without any loss to the policy-holders.

The Bulletin commented "Equitable policy-holders have no guarantee that the society will maintain enough assets here to meet claims. Australia has been too busy fussing around about the precious dignity of the States to protect the pockets of its people. It has practically
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no insurance law. Any wild-cat concern can 'take lives'. Any foreign company can do the same and be under no obligation to keep enough assets in the country to cover the liabilities under the policies. The up-to-date European country doesn't take such foolish risks."

This feeling was at least partially behind the Royal Commission on Insurance which was set up in 1907. The Federal Government had power under Section 51 (xiv) of the constitution to pass legislation concerning "insurance, other than State insurance; also State insurance extending beyond the limits of the State concerned." It had, however, used its power only once, to pass in 1905 the first private member's bill to become law; but this in fact dealt only with the amount of insurance on the lives of young children. But despite the insistence of the Royal Commission on the necessity for a uniform law on life insurance; despite its recommendations of the United Kingdom "publicity" method of doing this as opposed to the United States method of government supervision, of a substantial deposit by life insurance companies to be held so long as the firm did business in Australia, of the licensing of insurance companies, to be revoked in the event of insolvency or corrupt practices, nothing came of these proposals
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because of the questioning of the Commonwealth's powers to establish laws dealing with corporations in Huddart Parker v. Moorehead in 1908.  

When an attempt was made in 1915-16 to pass an Insurance Bill in the Federal Parliament, it never emerged from Committee.

Thus the regulation of foreign life insurance companies in Australia was left entirely to the individual States, whose laws differed widely. New South Wales had no special legislation dealing with foreign life insurance companies, and they were simply controlled by the ordinary Companies Acts. There was nothing to prevent an ordinary partnership of less than twenty-one people carrying on business without so much as publishing accounts, while other companies merely had to register with the Registrar-General and did not even have to furnish separate accounts or balance sheets of their New South Wales business. Victoria's supervision was somewhat stricter, requiring a deposit of £5,000 with the Registrar-General, as well as the furnishing of annual accounts, while in winding up all Victorian assets were to be used in satisfaction of Victorian liabilities. Queensland law also required a deposit of £10,000, which was retained by the Government as security. Other States had similar legislation to that of Victoria and Queensland.
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Anxiety about the security of policy-holders was at least partially allayed by the acquisition by the American companies of real estate in Australia in the 1890's. In 1889 the Equitable decided to build its still-existing offices in George Street, and on January 1, 1896, the building was formally opened; while the Mutual also built its offices in Sydney, opened on October 1, 1895, at a cost of about a quarter of a million pounds. This did at least give policy-holders visible security in case of default by the company ... even if it was not a very profitable venture for the American offices.

Thus worry about the security of their policies in foreign companies, combined with "patriotism" worked against the American companies in Australia, even although it led to no particularly drastic legislative action.

Moreover, as Keller points out, the Tontine\textsuperscript{93} insurance on which the American companies relied heavily, appealed only to the sophisticated,\textsuperscript{94} and they did not particularly appeal in Australia, especially since the American companies at first offered no surrender value, nor did they follow the principle, first adopted by the Australian N.M.I.A. and now virtually universal, of keeping a policy in force when the premiums were overdue out of the surrender value. Thus they were in some ways less attractive than the policies offered by the more progressive Australian offices.

\textsuperscript{93} Tontines were a form of insurance named after a Florentine banker Tonti; in their original form they divided all the funds contributed to a pool amongst the survivors after a fixed period of years; in their later form it was the profits which were divided amongst the survivors, the relatives of those who died earlier received only their original payments back.

\textsuperscript{94} Morton Keller \textit{op. cit.} p95.
One other factor encountered by the American companies was practically unique to Australia, since the only other country to which it applied was Canada; "Only in Australia and Canada were domestic firms able to outdo the marketing challenge of the United States corporations." In Britain fraud, dishonesty and out-of-date methods hampered the British firms in their meeting of the American challenge; on the Continent only one out of one hundred and ninety European companies was comparable in size to the United States companies. In Australia, however, there were able, vigorous and progressive native firms, to whom the aggressive and questing techniques used by the American firms were not novel as they were in Europe.

What is more, they were not only vigorous but they were full of fight, and since they saw a threat in the advent of the American firms they had no intention of remaining passive. In 1884 the A.M.P. advanced to the attack. At its annual meeting in 1884 the Society's actuary, George Black, attacked the Tontine system which, he said, gave policy-holders a financial interest in the death of fellow-members or in their allowing their policies to lapse: he pointed out that the sums were payable not in Australia but in New York thus entailing delay. Finally he attacked the Equitable's monetary claims, claiming that interest rates were lower (5% not 6%) and expenses higher (15%...
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not 12½% than the Equitable stated. The New York Life insurance company's Australian manager replied in the Sydney Morning Herald by comparing his company's assets with those of the A.M.P. to the detriment of the latter. Knight of the Equitable also entered the fray to defend the Tontines and to attack Black and the A.M.P. Black retorted "I shall show, before I conclude, that the success of the Equitable is not a matter to render us envious - it is not the part of inferiority to excite jealousy - and that therefore any presumed opposition from us must be due to another cause."

This was the start of a long and acrimonious pamphlet and newspaper war waged between the American companies and the Australian ones, especially the A.M.P. It can be followed in detail from the pamphlet collection in the A.M.P.'s files. Financial claims and counterclaims were made, allegations of sharp practice, dishonest agents, twisting or plain fraud were constantly bandied about. The Australian companies were peculiarly vulnerable to "twisting" since they had business in force and since in 1884 the Americans did not allow surrender of policies for cash. It must however be emphasised that relations between the Australian companies themselves were by no means always as harmonious as they might have been, but the magnitude of the American threat to business was sufficient to jolt them into some attempt at co-operation.

In 1887 Richard Teece, the future General Manager, then the Secretary, of the A.M.P. and for years one of the dominant figures
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of the Australian insurance world, was approached by the N.M.L.A. to join in action to curb the activities of the Equitable. He refused, pointing out that the Victorian Life Offices had used similar tactics to those of the American companies when the A.M.P. had extended its operations to Victoria. "The inevitable has now happened; in resorting to the use of the comparisons to which I have referred, the Victorian offices have been sowing the wind, and now that a greater adept at misrepresentation has come along, they are reaping the whirlwind.

"I have been aware for some time of the discreditable practices of the American offices, and I have been unable to place any reliance upon the undertakings of those among us who are responsible for their management. I am now on the lookout for a case sufficiently flagrant to make them amenable to the law of the land and when I find one such I shall do all I can to induce my Board to prosecute them with the utmost severity." 105

Despite this initial refusal, the A.M.P. in 1890 made a Joint Agreement with the Colonial Mutual Life Assurance Society, the National Mutual Life Association of Australasia, the Mutual Assurance Society of Victoria, and the Australian Widows' Fund. The Joint Agreement forbade "twisting", the circulation of anonymous competitive literature, or the engaging of agents employed by other firms and arranged for the abolition of direct commission, 106 and the setting

106. The commission paid to the insured party himself, not to an agent.
up of a common black list of fraudulent agents. In 1894, however, the A.M.P.'s. Board decided to withdraw from the Joint Agreement. There was another short-lived agreement in 1896.

By 1904, however, the threat of the proposed Commonwealth legislation drove all the insurance companies, American as well as British and Australian, into a Life Offices Association to be set up on the British model. This was to include as well as the American Big Three and the A.M.P., the N.M.L.A., the Colonial Mutual, the Citizens' Life, the Standard, the Australian Widows' Fund and the Temperance and General. Its main aims were:

a) to defend their interests against proposed Federal legislation.
b) to establish uniform premiums for special risks.
c) to set up a common black list of poor risks.

This idea was viewed by Teece, who was at the time in London, with considerable disfavour. "My own opinion is that we should now refuse to make common cause, but on the contrary should continue to play a lone hand. We certainly could not trust the Americans to respect any agreement."

Teece, however, had an even more unpalatable task to perform on his overseas trip. It appears that towards the end of the 1890's some
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of the American companies would have preferred friendlier relations, as several querulous notes to the implacable Teece attest. The New York Life offered to stop using comparative literature and even the Equitable's remarks on a pamphlet published by the A.M.P. that "It adds further testimony to that already supplied by the literature of the A.M.P. in the past, as to the unreliable character of statements contained in the publications emanating from the offices of that Company" were confined to a company publication and not blazoned in the Press.

The A.M.P's. Board also was anxious for better relations, and following a fairly violent attack on the Equitable in the A.M.P's. journal the A.M.P. Messenger, Teece was instructed to see the Vice-President of the Equitable while he was in New York. He protested that "Any indication of the display of the white feather would lead the Equitable to believe that we were frightened, and would induce them to stiffen their backs: I must ask the Board to allow me to use my discretion." In an earlier letter he stated bluntly that
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The agreement was nevertheless drawn up that:—

a) each company would cease attacks on the other by pamphlet or book.

b) that literature would be confined to general statements or tables with no attacks on specific firms.

c) that no anonymous literature would be published.

d) that no twisting would be permitted or encouraged.

e) that no agent of one company was to disparage the integrity or stability of the other.

Teece was still unreconciled, as a circular to agents of November 1904 shows; he was ready to denounce the Equitable on the first breach of the Agreement by it and asked agents to be on the alert to get evidence against the American company. He was made yet more bitter by the claims of some of the Equitable’s agents that the Agreement represented a capitulation by the A.M.P. If it was a triumph for the Equitable, however, it enjoyed it for less than fifteen months before its withdrawal from seeking new business in Australia.

Naturally enough the war between the companies ceased after 1906.

There were also certain financial difficulties about the American companies' business in Australasia. Most overseas business cost more than domestic business within the United States of America. It is unfortunately difficult to get at the American companies' expense rates in Australasia since by the time the Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics began publishing them in 1906 they were no longer really relevant. The American companies began by going after larger insurances, since most Australian offices would not accept policies for more than £10,000, but as can be seen from the proportion of policies to the amount insured in Table II, this type of business gradually petered out. The Bulletin gave expense rates of two American companies and of the A.M.P. as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A.M.P.</th>
<th>New York Life</th>
<th>Mutual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1896</td>
<td>£8 18/1</td>
<td>£20 4/5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
<td>£8 12/3</td>
<td>£20 2/1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1898</td>
<td>£9 4/-</td>
<td>£29 15/3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899</td>
<td>£9 19/8</td>
<td>£20 2/5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>£9 0/6</td>
<td>£19 19/7</td>
<td>£21 9/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>£8 10/-</td>
<td>£18 17/10</td>
<td>£21 2/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td>£8 14/-</td>
<td>£20 12/10</td>
<td>£20 15/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>£8 17/-</td>
<td>£20 14/2</td>
<td>£20 16/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>£8 16/7</td>
<td>£20 1/5</td>
<td>£20 10/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>£8 15/6</td>
<td>£18 9/-</td>
<td>£18 9/11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Thus it appears that the expense rates for the American companies were well above those of the A.M.P., although they were probably not much higher than those of many other Australian Life Offices. Of ten Australian Life Offices whose expenses are given in the first volume of the Commonwealth Year-Book only three reported an expenses rate of less than 20%.

It is not clear what Life Tables were used by the American firms. The A.M.P. was the only Australian insurance firm to construct its own tables based on the Company's experience which were published by their actuary, George Black, in December 1881. Probably after 1892 they may have used Coghlan's statistics for New South Wales published in that year.

Thus, although there was fiercer competition in Australia than in many of the countries the American companies extended to, they could probably have survived if it had not been for events in the United States. But it must be emphasised that the competition was fierce. Only one British company, the Liverpool, London and Globe did business in Australia and it made no great attempt to increase its business. Several British firms kept offices in Australia to collect premiums for insurance originally effected in the United Kingdom. The only other foreign company did not do very well either;
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the Canadian Independent Order of Foresters was involved in a scandal soon after its entry into the Australian market. Its assurance fell off after a Royal Commission had to be set up in Victoria to investigate alleged bribery of the Premier Sir Alexander Peacock; it was found the company had certainly attempted bribery. One British insurance man summed up in 1923 "British life companies have been unable to compete with the Australian companies. American life companies at one time made a determined attack on Australia but failed to establish themselves and are now only running out their business."

Conclusion

In the field of life insurance three large American Life Assurance Companies made an incursion into the Australian market in the 1880's. This move was due to a general expansion of these companies' overseas activities in this period.

Their withdrawal from seeking new business in the early twentieth century was also largely due to events not in Australia but in the United States of America.

The American companies' business in Australia was relatively prosperous, though not so efficient as that of the A.M.P. and they met in Australia stronger competition from indigenous companies than in

---
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any other foreign country apart from Canada.

This was the only field in the area of trade and commerce in which the impact of the United States was not the most important overseas influence after Great Britain in the Australian economy, but was in fact the most important and virtually only direct overseas influence. And this American competition aroused a fierce self-protective reaction among Australian businessmen in the insurance field, and a nationalistic antagonism to the competition of foreign firms discernible beyond the field of professional competitors of the United States companies.

Technology

There were certain fields of the Australian economy in which, although there was no import of American capital, or even of American goods, there was, however, an importation of American skill and experience. It is impossible in the scope of this study to give more than a sketch of the main areas of such influence such as mining, agriculture and transport. It is natural that in such fields American experience could be of more value to Australia than British, since conditions were similar. Australia and the United States were both new, expanding, enormous countries, where the problems of opening up markets and communications, of devising new farming techniques to meet new conditions, of finding the best way of extracting and treating the mineral wealth of the new lands, had basic resemblances. Naturally
Australians found some of the answers for themselves, but if they needed overseas help they were more likely to find it in the United States of America than in the compact, urbanised, industrialised communities of Europe.

Mining

In the field of coal mining United States influence was unimportant, since coal-mining had been developed largely in Britain, and the skills needed were imported from there.

But in the field of metal mining, which developed in both the United States of America and Australia in the late 1840's and early 1850's, and which involved the skills not only of the mining engineer but also of the metallurgist, British experience had little to offer by the end of the twentieth century.

American capital had little to do with the development of Australian mining, although an American Frank Gardner was, as chairman of the two London firms of Great Boulder Perseverance Company and Boulder Deep Levels Ltd., involved in 1904 in one of the worst scandals affecting Kalgoorlie's Golden Mile. This fraud, in which there were "corrupt employees deceiving a corrupt chairman, who had long been deceiving the shareholders", 124 led to the setting up of a Royal Commission by the Western Australian Government. Otherwise there was virtually no American investment in Australian mining until about 1930. 125
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Up till about the 1880's miners and mining engineers trained in Cornwall's tin-mines provided much of the skill needed in Australia's mines. In 1886, however, the newly formed Broken Hill Proprietary Ltd. (B.H.P.) "made perhaps the most momentous decision in Australia's industrial history. They decided to send Wilson abroad to sign the best man money could sign. And they send him not to Cornwall, which had long been the crumbling home of Australia's mining skills, but to the United States, which was probably the most advanced mining country in the world."

Wilson brought from the famous Comstock mining field an engineer and metallurgist named William H. Patten for the huge annual salary of £4,000; while from Colorado he brought a thirty-two year old German-trained American metallurgist, Herman Schlapp.

Patten introduced a method of square-set timbering from the Comstock to hold up the tunnels in the treacherous Broken Hill field and also, in 1888, the miners to instruct the local men: even then the shifting ground was dangerous to mine and there were many accidents. Schlapp made the B.H.P. smelters the largest in Australia with fifteen furnaces and almost a thousand employees.

Other Australian mines began to follow this example of looking to America. In 1891 Bowes Kelly, a former Board member of B.H.P., purchased, together with a partner, an abandoned gold mine at Mount Lyell; the ore
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Schlapp found to be rich in copper. In 1893, on Schlapp's advice he paid £2,500 to the American copper expert Edward Dyer Peters to test the ores from the mines. Peters was enthusiastic about the mine's potential but his belief that the mine would yield 7% copper from the ore proved to be inaccurate. By the early twentieth century the copper content of the ore had fallen to 2\%, too low for profit with normal smelting techniques. In this situation the only way to win through was by improved metallurgical methods. The manager of the Mount Lyell Company, Robert Carl Sticht, born in Brooklyn, had been trained in Germany but had experience in Montana and Colorado. His smelters, opened in June 1896, used the principle of pyritic smelting and by 1902 Sticht perfected the smelting of copper ore without the use of coal or coke, thus making it profitable to mine poor ore. As Blainey puts it, Sticht had succeeded in perfecting of the ancient fire techniques of smelting, which were, however, soon to be replaced by chemical treatment of ore.

The Mount Lyell company's chief rival, North Lyell, had a much richer copper deposit but much less efficiency in management. They also employed an American metallurgist, Lamartine Cavignac Trent, as general manager. Blainey dismisses him as inefficient and a
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poor metallurgist. Certainly his smelters proved a costly failure, unlike those of Robert Sticht.

Americans also appeared on the Australian gold mining scene. Henry Clay Callahan was general manager of Lake View Consols Mine in Western Australia, which, like the Boulder Mines referred to above, was also involved in a financial disaster owing to the dishonesty of the directors. Herbert Hoover, the future American President, spent some time in the Kalgoorlie gold-fields in 1897, but Blainey dismisses the idea that Hoover introduced, as he claimed, the cyanide process of treating gold ore to Australia. 136

B.H.P., however, displayed continued interest in United States developments. Its second general manager John Howell, who had also American experience, introduced open-cut mining. 137 In 1907 the then general manager G.D. Delprat, who had previously paid only one brief visit to the United States of America, 138 was sent overseas to inspect up-to-date machinery and plant in Europe and the United States of America. 139 He also examined progress being made overseas in zinc distillation, a chemical treatment by which the ore was dissolved in chemicals so that the metal should rise to the surface. Delprat had been working on such a process himself at B.H.P. 140 but others both

in Australia and overseas were at work on the process: that which
B.H.P. finally adopted, de Bawya's, was Australian.

But the most momentous decision was that of 1911. The profitability
of the B.H.P.'s mines at Broken Hill had for some time been waning, but
the company owned at Iron Knob in South Australia a huge deposit of
ironstone previously used as a purgative in their silver-lead furnaces.
They took the momentous decision to start manufacturing steel in
Australia. Delprat was despatched overseas to collect the information
necessary to get the venture under way. He visited twelve United
Kingdom firms, seven United States, three German and one Swedish,
and he brought back with him Richard Baker, a Philadelphian consulting
engineer, to design the project. Delprat described his trip overseas
thus: "I had a unique experience in America. I went round a great
many of the principal steel works and told the Managers that I came
to collect information to enable me to start Steel Works in Australia;
in competition with their own works. I did not want to get their
assistance under false pretences, and without any exceptions I was
given the very fullest information I could possibly have desired.
I then went to England, and had exactly the same experience.

"After seeing and admiring the Steel Works in England and Scotland,
I made my way to the Continent and visited Germany. There I had quite
a different sort of experience. Hardly any information was given to
me that was of any value except the information that they were quite
willing to supply all the necessary plant and machinery and also the

143. Paquita Mawson op. cit. p169.
expert to work the plant. Further they were prepared to take a large financial interest in the undertaking, which set me thinking.

"Gentlemen, call it luck or instinct or foreboding, or whatever you like, we decided to place the orders in America, and engaged American experts, and turned our back to the financially more enticing offer from Germany." 144

Richard Baker reported favourably about the project and advised locating the plant near the coal at Newcastle. 145 Other branches of the iron and steel industry in Australia also sought American help. The managing director of Hoskins' works at Lithgow paid several visits to the United States of America. 146

Americans were also engaged in the search for oil in Australia. An American driller T. J. Whaley, convinced of the existence of oil in South Australia, floated the Ocean Oil Company Ltd. A rig was set up near Kingston and a bore made to a depth of 1,100 feet, but although they passed through three "oil-sands", no oil was struck, and the venture was closed down owing to a lack of money. 147

Agriculture

Some members of the first Australian Federal Parliament felt that the United States of America had a great deal to offer in the way of example for Australia. Sir Ernest Littleston Groom tried repeatedly to have a Federal Bureau of Agriculture set up on American lines; he

spoke in favour of it in Parliament in 1907, but the Bill he
introduced on the subject lapsed when Deakin was defeated and the
Government in which Groom was serving as Attorney-General resigned.
Other Bills introduced by Groom in 1909 and 1913 also lapsed,
indicating that despite Groom's interest, no Australian Government
in these years was willing to make such a Department, even if it
were confined to a co-ordinating and advisory capacity, part of its
programme.

There were also strong opponents of such a scheme. In 1908
Premier Wade of New South Wales introduced at the Premier's Conference
a motion "That each State should control the development of its own
agricultural resources." He claimed that "The position in the
United States is by no means analogous to that in Australia. I find
that the present position in the United States, so far as the relations
of the Federal and State agricultural bureaux are concerned, is
chiefly instructive in showing what it is desirable to avoid." He claimed that in the United States there was duplication and
over-lapping of functions, that the States' agricultural departments
were declining because of Federal interference and that in any case
Australia could not afford to set up a Bureau of Agriculture on the
United States scale.

149. ibid p76.
But even if it was not decided to copy United States Federal organisation of agriculture, there were plenty of technical fields in which United States experience could help. The use of American agricultural machinery has been mentioned in Chapter 3. Another source of American influence was the bulk-handling of wheat by means of elevators and specially constructed ships and rail trucks, instead of bags. Australia, to whom the export of wheat was of increasing importance, was interested in the possible economies of this system as opposed to the more conventional one of bagging the wheat.

In 1913 by arrangements made through the New South Wales trade representative in the United States, Niel Nielsen, a Chicago firm, the Burrell Engineering and Construction Company, reported on the feasibility of bulk handling of wheat in New South Wales. They claimed that the system was essential for New South Wales, and advised the setting up of two terminal elevators, one of one and a half million bushels capacity at Darling Harbour and a smaller one to take half a million bushels in Newcastle. They also recommended the setting up of country elevators of 50,000 bushels capacity and the construction of 500 to 600 special grain rail cars a year. A report by Niel Nielsen covered much the same ground as that by

152. ibid p7 at p11-12.
Burrell, but included more technical detail. 153

This was by no means the first interest shown in Australia in bulk-handling of wheat. In 1906 a Select Committee was set up on the motion of Perry, the member for Liverpool Plains, to investigate the Grain Elevator System. In 1909 a South Australian Royal Commission enumerated the advantages of such a scheme, including a saving of at least £50,000 a year for the state on a twenty million bushel harvest, 155 cheaper freight rates between farm and docks, 156 and cheaper sea freight, 157 the prevention of loss through vermin, and higher prices for wheat resulting from the concomitant better grading and cleaning. 158 It did not, however recommend bulk handling because of the amount of opposition encountered among grain shippers and others to such a method of dealing with wheat. 159

Nevertheless a Grain Elevator Bill was passed in New South Wales during World War I. The first attempt in 1915 passed the Assembly but was thrown out by the Council. 160 Despite the opposition of the non-labour members, especially Wade and Carruthers, the Bill became law in September 1916. Meanwhile engineers from all States had
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collaborated on the problem, and Victoria had also been negotiating with the Canadian firm of Metcalfe and Co. : before the defeat of the 1915 Bill, the New South Wales Government had contracted with J.S. Metcalfe and Co. for work on the grain terminals to start in August 1916.\footnote{161} Metcalfe also gave advice to the South Australian Government, advising an expenditure of some £1,000,000 on construction.

The war, however, caused the postponement of the works necessary\footnote{162} for bulk-handling in New South Wales. Even as late as 1920 when work on them had been resumed it was gloomily reported that most farmers would spend no money on the necessary equipment at least until their existing bagging plant was worn out.\footnote{163} The New South Wales scheme was complete by 1921 and other States followed suit later.

**Irrigation**

There was considerable interest in United States precedent in the field of irrigation. This was not only to be found in the early days of irrigation when Alfred Deakin visited the United States of America in 1884 and brought back with him the Chaffey brothers from the United States. They were responsible for the institution of the

\begin{itemize}
\item \footnote{161}{External Trade of Australia for 1914 : Report to the Board of Trade by H.M. Trade Commissioner in Australia, G.T. Milne Co. No. 8090, 1914-16, pp38-39.}
\item \footnote{162}{N.S.W.H. Council April 17, 1917, pp4-5.}
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settlements at Renmark in South Australia and at Mildura in Victoria. The Chaffey brothers' scheme in Victoria crashed with the bank crisis of 1893; but irrigation continued in the State. In 1905 the Victorian Government dissolved all privately owned irrigation trusts, except the First Mildura Irrigation Trust, and set up a State Water Commission as part of the Department of Agriculture and Mines. Their first Chairman of the State Water Commission was an American, Elwood Mead, formerly employed by the United States Federal Bureau of Agriculture. The problem, as in the crash of the 1890's, was mainly that of the inexperience of the settlers in irrigation farming. Western America, where irrigation had been highly developed, was an obvious source of experienced settlers, and a determined attempt was made to attract farmers from there. In 1910 Mead and McKenzie, the Victorian Minister of Lands, visited Europe and the United States of America, to attend the Irrigation Congress at Pueblo. They visited President Taft who assured them he had no objection to their search for settlers.

"... these men of the American West not only represent interests common in Australia - the interests of huge areas of country in the beginnings of development - but they are singularly close to the Australian people both in appearance and in lines of thought ... But with all the resemblance between the American countryman and the countryman in Australia one has to confess here to a spirit of

enterprise which is as yet far ahead of the thought of Australia."  

In Mead's address to the Irrigation Congress he stated the differences between the two countries as he saw it: the optimism, energy and achievement of triumph over obstacle of the United States of America; the lesser interest in the "rat-race" in Australia where "in dealing with questions involving the general welfare, in holding the scales even between the rights of men and money, and in forecasting the requirements of future generations, Australia has shown a marked superiority over America ... One reason why Australia has been enjoyable is that it is like the West. The State of Victoria is an almost exact counterpart of California in climate and production and in the social spirit of the people ... I have never felt that I was working among an alien people, and helping to build up an alien land. No two countries can learn more of value to each other than America and Australia."  

Mead and McKenzie travelled through Wyoming and Colorado: by November 28 they reported that 2,000 applicants were anxious to come from Britain and the United States of America. The Australian agents were instructed to accept no-one with a capital of less than £150 from Britain, or £300 in the United States of America, because of the higher wages there. They used modern techniques of press conferences.

167. In the United States of America there were agents appointed in Chicago and San Francisco.
and so on, but recognised that they would get no farm labourers from the United States of America, and few irrigation farmers from the very successful area of California.

Early in 1911 hopes were high for an early influx of irrigation settlers from the United States of America, and the Victorian Government contacted the Union Steamship Company of New Zealand about cheap fares from the United States of America for prospective settlers in March and April. The s.s. Tahiti was eventually chartered for April 1912 and special low fares were arranged, while two more officers of the State Water Commission and the Ministry of Agriculture were sent to the United States of America to encourage a large number of land-seekers to come on this trip. In the end only fifty irrigationists were on board although the ship could have held some 400 - 500 passengers, and in any case many of these were journalists. In August some forty settlers did arrive in the s.s. Zealandia to take up land in the Rochester area. They came from Oregon, Montana, Alberta and British Columbia and had each capital between £200 and £300, about half were women and children.

New South Wales was also active in investigation of irrigation
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in the United States of America. Their trade commissioner, Niel Nielsen sent back reports on dry-farming and irrigation there. The Director of the New South Wales Immigration and Tourist Bureau, Percy Hunter, visited Spokane, in the Pacific State of Washington to arrange excursions by Americans to Australia, and to get information on the use of irrigated land to grow fruit, wheat and alfalfa. 176 There were even complaints that the New South Wales Government was intercepting land-seekers who came from the United States of America on trips organised by the Victorian Government when they had to tranship in Sydney. 177

176. Argus: July 12, 1911.
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From the foregoing chapter it would appear that Australians at the Governmental level were before 1923 surprisingly little concerned at the growing level of American imports to Australia, and unlike the British took no positive steps to counteract it. On the other hand, in the field of investment there was a positive reluctance to seek loans from the United States so long as money was available either in London or in Australia itself. The Australian Government's reluctance to borrow in New York during the First World War demonstrates this. Even in the field of private investment the small amount and slow growth of American capital in Australia is striking. Much of it in the 1920's came from the development in Australia of distribution agencies and later assembly plants by American firms which exported goods to Australia, and which feared that their markets might be affected by the high protective tariffs introduced in Australia in the 1920's. Virtually no American money was invested in primary or heavy secondary industry, and it thus contributed little to the economic development of the country.

Even in this period there appears to have been a considerable reservoir of latent hostility to American commercial imperialism, especially where it clashed with established Australian interests, as in the fields of life insurance or of the manufacture of agricultural implements and machinery. The reaction appears more violent then
reaction against British commercial domination, perhaps due to habit and to the pro-British sentiment in Australia about which American consular officials in Australia complained so bitterly as a threat to United States trade. It is certainly true that there was no real British competition in the fields mentioned above; yet despite the encouragement given by the New South Wales Government to Hoskins iron and steel works at Lithgow and later to the B.H.P. steel-works at Newcastle, far less hostility was expressed to the idea of importing British iron and steel than was manifested to the American incursions in the fields of life insurance and agricultural machinery.

On the other hand American technical expertise in the fields of metal mining or irrigation was eagerly sought and apparently gladly given. This emphasises the point made in the section on social reform, that although Australians were anxious to reject the British model in certain fields, and to adopt more progressive means of dealing with existing problems, they had no desire to become pale imitations of the United States. Where parallel problems existed they were willing to accept successful American solutions, but they were far from anxious to replace British influence with American in any concrete or lasting fashion, as in the creation of vast commercial American empires in Australia.
CHAPTER 5

THE AMERICAN IMAGE I
THE AMERICAN IMAGE

In the absence of direct conquest of one nation by another, the picture which one people holds of another is usually derived mainly from cultural sources. Plays, films, books and the like are just as important as news items or constitutional theses in forming an image of a society, possibly more so because they have less intention of informing.

The U.S.A. in the twentieth century has always been as prolific in self-description, not to say self-adulation, as in self-criticism. Moreover with the spread of mass media, beginning with the popular press and ranging through cheap books to films to radio and television, the number of channels for the dissemination of images has been immensely increased within this century. Together with the improvement in communications afforded by air travel and telephones, it has become virtually impossible for a moderately prosperous, literate community to remain in ignorance of the type of society of other lands. These developments, together with the emergence of the U.S.A. as one of the economic and military giants of the twentieth century, have made America an object of intense interest throughout the whole of the so-called Western world. This interest has not always been favourable, and overseas criticism of American society and policies has been as vociferous, if seldom as trenchant as domestic criticism.
Many of these developments, of course, lie outside our period, but the process had already begun by 1900. Films and cheap books were increasingly to flood the Australian market. Hesitant as to the significance of the Spanish-American War in 1898, Australians were in no doubt by 1918 that a new and immensely great power had emerged. They were however doubtful as to whether this was or was not a good thing. Apart from occasional complaints about American slang on stage, there was little uneasiness about U.S. cultural penetration before the First World War, but the Roaring Twenties image of post-war American society deeply disturbed many Australians.

In 1930 a worried article by W.A. Payne entitled "Pacific Penetration" wrote with some bitterness of the Americanisation of Australia. He felt this was partly due to the imitativeness of a "young" country. 1 It was more noticeable in the fields of manners, dress and language than in those of art, although Australian commercial art was "quite distinctly a reflection of - and sometimes on - the "Saturday Evening Post"": the Press was also imitative of America. 2 He noticed a growing use of American slang "gun-man" "gangster" : and a further spread of the use of chewing-gum jazz etc.. "The impact of America is not checked at the big cities. The influence has permeated so thoroughly that one would find extreme difficulty in eluding it. The first Jackeroo you meet will be partly hidden behind a four-quarter Stetson." 3 "Our cities grow up modelled upon American lines: and we admire them through

2. Ibid p115.
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horn-rimmed spectacles. Government officials go to the United States to study traffic problems, and on their return refer to hapless pedestrians as "jay-walkers". Business men go across in search of ideas, and come back to sell us "half-hose" instead of socks, and try to lead customers to believe "notions" is a fitter word than haberdashery. American sundaes: Baseball games before the football match begins: wurlitzers: and funeral parlors in the suburbs. A generation ago such Americanism would have been regarded as eccentricity. But they have crept insidiously upon us with the 'inevitability of gradualness' and become habits no longer noticeable to ourselves. The craving for mass sensation and hyperbole is engulfing the old true Australian spirit of independence."

The accusation of Americanisation had come from outside many years earlier. Soon after the visit of the American fleet, two articles were published in the French newspaper La Dépêche Coloniale by M. Corbach on Australia and the U.S.A.: these were forwarded to Attlee Hunt by Yves M. Goblet, who had proposed himself as official Australian correspondent in Paris. Hunt told him to reply to the articles which were erroneous, since any deviation from British standards in food or dress were due not to American influence but to the Australian climate; but he had to admit that there were many American actors in Australia, and that it was possible that there were more American than British

publications sold in Australia — this he explained by the
traditional nomadic nature of the theatre and by the fact that
books were sent by British buyers so Australians read the same
as the British. He also played down trade, constitutional and
sentimental ties with the U.S.A. 6

In some ways Australia was particularly vulnerable to
American cultural penetration. There was firstly the identity of
language, and of racial and political origin as a British colony
in a new continent, but, as F.R. Stephenson says, the comparison
is superficial. 7 Stephenson believed that what the British saw
as Americanisation was in fact Australianisation, 8 and it is of
course true that modification of British culture to indigenous
conditions does not necessarily imply Americanisation. Another
possible weakness was the fact that Australia by 1900 had not yet,
and some people would say she still has not, developed a truly
independent culture of her own, and was thus more open to outside
influences; from the founding of the Bulletin, and possibly even
earlier, Australian artists and writers were rejecting British
traditions but had yet found no adequate substitute. J.F.
Matthews in his "Tradition in Exile" (Cheshire 1962), which
is a comparison between Australia and Canada believes "where
political dependence remains it is difficult to avoid literary
imitation", 9 but nevertheless points out the nineteenth century

6. Letter from Attlee Hunt to Y.M. Goblet May 3, 1910 in
Attlee Hunt pp item 1508 A.N.L. Canberra.
7. F.R. Stephenson: The Foundations of Culture in Australia,
Gordon, N.S.W., 1956 pl6.
8. ibid pl4.
Australian disregard of or hostility to established literary forms, and feels that the work of such men as Dyson, Lawson, Furphy, Patterson and O'Dowd has more in common with that of Poe and Whitman than with their Canadian contemporaries, while he maintains the American influence was stronger in the nineteenth century than it is to-day and much stronger than it is in Canada.

This lessening of literary influence at a time of increasing cultural pressure in the forms of books, films and so on, is probably due to two main factors. Firstly the Messianic democratic image of Walt Whitman as prophet of American democracy in the mid-nineteenth century was overlaid by the actualities of America as the country of Trusts & Combines, by the emergence of America the Imperialistic in the Philippines, thus reducing its appeal to democrats in Australia, and few early twentieth century writers in Australia were right-wing. Secondly the self-conscious search for a national cultural identity meant that there was resentment of any outside influence whether British, or American.

But literary influence is far from being the complete story in a national image. That even to-day there are Australian stereotype views of national character is evident from experiments carried out by the Department of Psychology in this University, and it is evident from earlier newspapers, articles and the like that they existed in the period with which this thesis deals.

11. Ibid p49.
Newspapers of course reported, as they do to-day, tales of violence, corruption, labour disputes, natural disasters: stories which, however striking, were quite probably far from representative of the day-to-day life of the average United States citizen. This process was of course further aided by the channels through which information about the United States of America reached Australia.

Press cables came through Reuter's in London, and in 1895 an American visitor, concerned about the lack of knowledge about the United States which he found in Australia, reported that one American consul firmly believed that news about America was wilfully doctored in England to give false impressions for political ends. The worry about the American image in Australian newspapers was repeated as late as 1931 when Consul-General Roger C. Tredwell complained "The press in Sydney and throughout Australia generally, have followed their usual custom of emphasizing and giving prominence to every cable item of news from America which reflects upon the character of its Government and people. It is unfortunate that only the worst part of American life is cabled abroad by correspondents of the Australian press in the United States. This not only makes for a great deal of ill-will but increases misunderstandings, and ... leads a large number of people to the conclusion that Americans are the most wicked and worst people in the world." Thus any unfavourable image of the United States cannot be solely attributed in the

early twentieth century to the filtering of American news for
Australia through London, since it was still complained of at a
period when Australian newspapers had their own correspondents in
the U.S.A..

The quality of foreign news in Australian papers at this time
however was well be suspect. Claude McKay records that when the
Sydney Sun was started in 1908, he actually used to make up foreign
cable news for the editors, since the Sun did not belong to the
important cable combine. 15

The picture presented by the cultural media in Australia was
not much better. There was a rapid increase around 1908 in the
number and popularity of American plays presented in Australia, a
policy which was led by J.C. Williamson, although other managers
followed it too. From the time when Hugh Ward became Williamson's
Managing Director in 1911 the trickle became a flood, and the war
and post-war years saw an immense amount of American theatrical
entertainment in Australia. Many of these plays were wholly
frivolous - musicals or farces - but even the more serious ones
painted no very flattering portrait of the U.S.A.. Apart from the
dying genre of Western plays whose role was taken over by Western
films, the subjects even of the lighter of these plays were much-raking,
concerned with trusts and combines, dishonest business men, politicians
and judges, divorce, crime and violence.

15. Claude McKay: This Is The Life, Sydney, 1961 p76. - Which
So far as the cinema is concerned, much the same applies, but not only was the increase in the American contribution more spectacular, but it also reached a different and wider audience from the theatre. Its influence was being felt, commented on, and actively resented by 1918. Again the influence of the average film could at best be called popular. Despite the activities of such directors as G.W. Griffith the film had by 1920 scarcely begun to be recognised as an art form. It aimed originally at vaudeville type audiences, and for a long time its staples were those of the popular theatre-farces, cowboy films, melodramas. But because of the wide audience reached by the cinema these unreal presentations were now more vividly presented to more of the Australian population than ever before.

It is perhaps significant that the men who contributed most to the large-scale organisation of both cinema and theatre were Americans. J.C. Williamson, an American from Mercer, Pennsylvania, and trained on the American stage, started the largest and most successful commercial theatre management in Australia. Hugh Ward, also from Pennsylvania, helped establish the financial success of J.C. Williamson during the war years. In the cinema J.D. Williams, Canadian by birth though he had lived much of his life in the U.S.A. and been closely concerned with the nascent film industry, introduced novel methods of cinema presentation in Sydney and by his competition forced the organisation of Union Theatres, the first big cinema chain in Australia, which
amalgamated most of the existing big exhibitors in Sydney.

So far as books are concerned the huge imports of cheap American fiction which flooded into Australia, except for a brief gap due to the war, can have done little to correct the generally unfavourable view many Australians held of the U.S.A.; cowboy tales, muck-raking novels, and the like were rife.

It could be a fascinating subject, not possible within the scope of this thesis, to analyse the topic and content of American plays, films, books in detail. The above are merely compressed generalisations, which do not of course allow for the existence of the occasional outstanding play, book or film.

Australian art is not dealt with in detail in this section, since few Australian artists visited, much less were influenced by America, whose painting was still not highly developed. A.G. Stephens and others were aware of and admired Whistler, but for the most part Australian artists were much more interested in European developments. Some Australian artists exhibited in the U.S.A. particularly at Exhibitions such as the Philadelphia Exhibition in 1876, the Chicago World Fair in 1893 and the Pan-Pacific Exposition at San Francisco in 1915. At the Pan-Pacific Exposition J.C.A. Traill won a gold and a bronze medal, Bernard Hall, Cumbrae Stewart and M. Roxburgh silver medals, Violet Teague a bronze medal and H.B. Harrison and Leslie Wilkie honourable mentions. But most artists who went to the U.S.A. were in fact magazine illustrators: the large number, insatiable appetite and high pay of American magazines was more profitable to them than either England or Australia. Among
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them were Alec Sass of the Globe, Frank Hanks of Puck, Charles
Huttall of the New York Herald, the Century and Harper's. 17

As for music it is not dealt with separately either since,
although a few American singers visited Australia they were very
few and of little abiding importance. Jazz, of course, made its
appearance in the 1920's in Australia; and from the early twentieth
century most of the gramophones available in Australia were Edison's
but on the whole the influence is negligible.

Cinema

The development of cinema management in Australia closely
follows the pattern of development overseas. 18 It began, as it did
in Great Britain and the United States of America as an adjunct to
music hall programmes, and for many years continued to be considered
as a form of cheap popular entertainment similar to vaudeville or
the circus, and without the artistic potentialities of the theatre.
After a period in which the cinema was peripatetic, wandering from
one place of entertainment to another, permanent managements, settled
in one place, emerged; then gradually the managements built "picture
palaces" specially designed to show films. Finally the system of
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Ivor Montagu: Film World, Pelican,1964 for a general concise
history.
obtaining films developed from the position where they were bought outright from the maker, or else made by the exhibitor, into the highly organised business of film exchange and later rental, less expensive for the exhibitor, but tying him more closely to the big film producing companies, especially the American ones. This process was virtually complete by the post-war period.

The first film shown in Australia was screened in August 1896 in one of Harry Rickards variety shows at Melbourne Opera House by an American entertainer named Carl Hertz. Rickards also became Sydney's first film exhibitor when he brought Hertz and his films of British beauty spots in September 1896, soon after Joseph MacMahon had given Sydney its first film "preview". In fact in September 1896 there were only about twenty-four Lumière projectors in the world, and of these two were in Australia. By November 1896 there were nine picture shows running in Australia. Sydney had three of these at Rickards' Tivoli, at the Salon Lumière in Pitt Street, and yet another in Pitt Street run by Joseph MacMahon and his brother Jimmy.

Existing theatrical managers saw its potentialities as a money spinner. J.C. Williamson entered the field, his films — all 15 miles of them — of the Russo-Japanese War and the like, proving very popular. The music-hall motif kept recurring, however. In 1905

21. Lumière developed Edison's principle from the peep-show type to produce a machine which could project pictures on a screen.
the American conjurer Thurston, who had a habit of reappearing at intervals in Australia, put on some films and as late as 1906 the cinema still uprooted itself regularly from the main centres of population and toured such country centres as Ballarat and Bendigo. The Taits even went one better than J. C. Williamson; they made their own film in 1905 of "Robbery Under Arms", a feature film which appeared only a few months after the production of the world's first feature film "The Great Train Robbery" by Edwin S. Porter of Edison's. "Robbery Under Arms" was 5,000 feet long, thus running for approximately fifty minutes, and cost about £1,000 to make, a considerable sum for those days. But although the Taits exhibited this film themselves throughout Australia they did not enter the business as permanent exhibitors till 1909.

Despite competition from the Taits and from other occasional exhibitors, (half a dozen shows in Sydney were showing films of the San Francisco earthquake), 1906 saw two main exhibitors emerge in Australia, with semi-permanent abodes. West's Pictures with the musical group, the Brescians, as accompaniment became more or less fixed, moving between Sydney Town Hall and Sydney's Glaciarium, and Melbourne's Olympia, while Spencer's Theatrescope used Sydney Palace, although it was a trifle too small for the vast crowds which flocked

27. E. Jan. 16, 1907.
to the cinema and they moved to the Lyceum. On New Year’s Day 1909 the Taits’ move into Melbourne Glaciarium as permanent exhibitors raised the number of exhibitors in Melbourne to three. By 1909 West’s appear to have had some sort of arrangement with Pathé Frères, who had agents in Australia; their films were "absolutely the best films yet produced in Australia and the splendid interpretations, the magnificent studies in facial expression make them objects of beauty and interest to everyone." Meanwhile Spencer’s in Sydney attracted vast crowds with their films of Harry Lauder, complete with sound supplied by a "Chromomegaphone" as well as a generous helping of American films. The Taits like Spencer’s tended to show a mixture of English and American films with the latter predominating.

West’s appear to have been the first to adapt a building specifically for the showing of films, in Melbourne where the roof was supported by girders, thus cutting out the irritation of pillars, but their opening night in it was marred by the type of accident all too common in the early days of the cinema — the films were an hour late in being screened because a dynamo broke down. Apart from this building, films were still being shown under the old conditions in buildings unadapted to them, and the uncomplaining public flocked to see them.

This semi-equilibrium was abruptly upset by the incursion in
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1910 of J.D. Williams, who did more to bring into being the present
 cinema management structure in Australia than anyone else. Of
 Canadian birth, Williams had for some years been closely connected
 with the film industry in the Western United States of America and
 Canada. After success with outdoor pleasure gardens in Sydney, he
 bought the Colonial Theatre in George Street. His policies of a
 continuous show of about an hour for prices as low as 3d., of
 changing programmes twice a week, of giving special matinees for
 women and children, were new in Australia, although they were
 becoming popular overseas especially in the United States of America.
 His success was so great that he ended up by buying two further
 cinemas, Colonial No. 2 and the Lyric, in Sydney. Such fierce
 competition forced changes in the method of his competitors.
 Spencer's in May 1910 decided to follow suit in giving more than one
 show a day. By December 1910 there were "rumours of war in the
 cinematograph industry", and by March 1911, Spencer's also were
 changing their programmes twice weekly, causing the Bulletin to
 comment sourly "The trail of the foreign combine is beginning to
 affect Australian picture shows and to produce a sameness which is
 bound to depress trade." 37

 However there was no sign of depressed trade - West's like
 Williams had three cinemas in Sydney, the Bijou, the Palace and the
 Glaciarium. A new cinema, the Lyric, was opened in Praham, 39 and
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Yet another in St. Kilda of which the Bulletin wrote "It is a commodious structure, fitted and furnished with exuberance. The walls are plain white punctured with leaded windows in the pleasing shade of watered absinthe. The ceiling, white, and of fibrous plaster, allows floral forms to dance on its vaulted chest. The dress circle capable of seating about 250 has the sweet look of a vice-regal reserve. The seats are of polished wood, upholstered in a shade of stewed quince. Carpets crawl demurely over the floor, while a lounge, presumably for smoking purposes, retires gracefully to the rear. The main hall holds about 1300 and is comfortably furnished." Cinema architecture, all too hideously alike the world over, had arrived in Australia. In May 1911 West's opened the remodelled Sydney Bijou as the Princess.

But they were all outdone by Williams: his new company the Greater J.D. Williams Amusement Company, formed in December 1910, opened in 1912 a vast and splendid new auditorium in Sydney, named the Crystal Palace. This contained not merely a cinema, but winter gardens, Electric Studios, Halls of Athletic Exercises and the like, and its opening was marked by the free distribution of American ice-cream, nuts, soft drinks and popcorn. It had the best ventilation and projection equipment in Sydney. In its first week it was reputed to have made a profit of £1,600.

The Lone Hand stated that although Greater J.D. Williams
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Amusement Company had been established for less than a year, it was the largest exhibitor of films in the whole world. In 1911 Williams built the most expensive cinema in the world in Melbourne; had another in construction in Brisbane; and planned eventually for four theatres in Sydney, two in Adelaide, five in New Zealand, three in Melbourne and one each in Perth and Brisbane.

Moreover he instituted the system of film exchanges or film hire, running no less than 5 exchanges. 44

Meanwhile 1911 saw, following the incursion of J.D. Williams, a consolidation of the film exhibiting industry. 1911 saw a rush of formations of public companies. Spencer's Pictures Ltd. were registered in New South Wales on September 25, 1911 with an authorised capital of £160,000. Similarly West's Amalgamated Pictures Ltd. was formed on March 4, 1911 to take over the biograph interests of J. & N. Tait and of Johnson & Gibson, its capital was £100,000, and it held shares in Union Theatres Ltd. and Australasian Films. The Greater Wondergraph Company Ltd. was registered in South Australia on August 3, 1911 with £100,000 capital and Brunswick Theatres Ltd. were registered in Victoria on June 21, 1911. But the cinema industry was not yet fully recognised as a safe investment. Many "sound" investors still regarded its success as ephemeral - as they did overseas. There were suspicions that the reintroduction of musical attractions to supplement films by J.D. Williams and by Spencers
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was due to a decline in the popularity of the films. 45 J.D.
Williams was not unaffected by this; and claimed in fact that a bear
rumour was instigated against his company in 1911 to the effect that
he intended to return to the United States of America with profits
of £50,000 made in the last eighteen months. 46 Even at the inauguration
of the company market opinion forced the replacement of the original
Board of Directors in December 1911, only Williams retaining his seat;
he undertook to hold the 70,000 £1 shares (out of 200,000) allotted
to the original J.D. Williams Amusement Co., for ten years. There
were about 500 shareholders, who received a profit of £33,210 in
1911 or about 22% on the 148,281 shares then issued; the net profit
January-June 1912 was £14,292 a much lower rate at just under 8%.
The £1 shares dropped from 55/- when the company was formed to 25/-
in December 1911 to par in August 1912 and then to 15/- in November
1912, recovering to par in December. Finally in January 1913 about
180,000 shares turned over in one week at prices between 7/9d. to
8/6d. 47 The picture is by no means clear but it appears that the
fall in value may have been occasioned in part by rumours of a
merger: but as Isadore Brodsky says J.D. Williams’ financial
affairs in Australia are possibly dubious and certainly obscure. 48
The outcome of it all was that a new firm— or combination of firms
was made in 1913: Union Theatres Ltd. with a capital of £300,000

45. B. Aug. 17, 1911. B. Sept. 28, 1911.
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combining Greater J. D. Williams Amusement Co. with, West's, Spencer's and the Taits' interests, which became thus virtually holding companies. The chain started on January 6, 1913 with twenty-nine cinemas. There was also a film exchange company named Australasian Films Ltd., also with a capital of £500,000, which was claimed by 1920 to have over seventy-five per cent of Australian exhibitors on its lists, and to be the biggest independent buyer of films in London and New York, handling films by makers of all nationalities. 49

This done and his mission accomplished J. D. Williams returned to the United States of America, and Union Theatres continued to grow. By 1921 they had eighty cinemas and claimed more than half the total capital investment in the cinema industry in Australia, their holdings being valued at £2,126,000 altogether. They absorbed a rival company, Electric Theatres Pty. Ltd., thus leaving Hoyt's, who were not incorporated till 1926, as their only real rivals. They also absorbed other small firms - the Moonee Ponds Theatre Company Ltd., the Richmond Theatre Company Ltd. They forced out the "tent shows"; they had interests in the Co-operative Film Exchange which distributed the American Metro Films, and in J. C. Williamson Films which handled the American Goldwyn Films. 50

During the war years the supply of European films became more and more scanty and American film producing companies took the
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opportunity of establishing their own agencies in Australia. Paramount Films set up in a small office in Druitt Street, Sydney in 1916 as Feature Films Limited. It had 10,000 shares of which 9708 were owned in the United States.51 By 1920 it had about 120 employees and by 1921 they were publishing a house magazine Paramount Punch avowedly on American lines.52 By this period they had branch offices in Sydney, Melbourne and Adelaide, were despatching men to the United States of America for training54 and had established a Paramount salesmen's school on American lines in Sydney.55

Other companies followed suit, including Fox Films, Metro-Goldwyn Mayer, First National Pictures, and one British firm slightly later, British Dominions Films Pty. Ltd.56 and by 1920 there was a strong suspicion in many quarters that there was an American film combine in Australia, and this combine was designated as the Australasian Film Company. One member alleged in the House of Representatives that there was a film monopoly, that Australasian Films was an American combine; and claimed that one Sydney cinema had had its supply of American films cut off because it had dared to show the Australian film "The Silence of Dean Maitland."57 But although he demanded a Select Committee, and although similar allegations were
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made in the New South Wales Parliament, and despite outcry in some newspapers nothing was done until 1927 when a Royal Commission on the Motion Picture Industry was set up. It recommended in 1928 that British companies should compete actively with the Americans by setting up agencies in Australia and that there should be enforced in Australia for three years a fixed quota of British films, a recommendation followed only in Victoria. The Commission found officially that there was no combine, but said that financial arrangements between American and Australian firms were such as to make the Australian companies virtually distributing branches of American concerns. The American consul estimated that between 50% and 65% of gross earnings for film hire were remitted to the United States of America, and that seven out of eleven film importing firms were American.

Thus cinema was first introduced to Australia by the American Carl Hertz, organised by the Canadian J.D. Williams, and finally dominated by the American producers.

The Audiences

It is very hard in the pre-war period to estimate the numbers

63. ibid pl1.
of people who saw films. All that can be said is that people such as Spencer's, West's and others found the business profitable; "the receipts at the ticket office indicate that the love of the fleeting image does not diminish".64 "The film is rapidly becoming a disease - the writer feels the insidious progress of it himself."65 "West's pictures are being appreciated highly by Sydney audiences and the house is crowded nightly."66

Such comments are really the only indication, and all they show is that people went to and enjoyed films. The Bulletin felt that the audience was "suburban" in type.67 Low prices attracted a wider and probably different type of audience from the theatre. Prices ranged from 3d. to 1/-, much lower than those of the theatre, while continuous shows, matinees etc. made it easier for housewives or children to attend films. One pre-war figure set the number of picture shows in Australia at 500 in 1910, as against less than 20 some eight years previously.68

There are figures for the post-war period. Union Theatres claimed that there were 808 cinemas in Australia in 1921, of which 303 were in New South Wales, 199 in Victoria, 143 in Queensland, 66 in South Australia, 61 in Western Australia and 36 in Tasmania.

64. B. May 7, 1908.
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of which only 58 were continuous shows, 152 were open six nights a week, and over 500 opened only about two nights a week. They estimated the national weekly attendance at films at slightly over one million. Later in the 1920's the Americans estimated the Australian weekly audience as two and a quarter million out of a population of 6,200,000 the same proportion as in the United States of America and that there were 1,280 cinemas in Australia.

The Films

From the start attempts were made to foster an Australian film industry. This was easy and cheap enough in the days when the novelty of things in motion was enough for the audiences.

In 1897, within eleven months of the first film's being shown in Australia, an Australian-made film was being exhibited. A number of religious films were made soon after the turn of the century, and then came J.H. Tait's feature film "Robbery Under Arms" of which the Bulletin disapproved because of its glorification of bushrangers as typical Australian heroes. It is also claimed somewhat dubiously that the production by S. Fitzgerald and his three sons of "John Vane, Bushranger" was in 1903, making it the world's first feature-length film.
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Australia in the pre-war period. The greater number of them were of current events or "actualities" i.e. simply films of moving things in motion. Since this is not intended as a history of the film production industry in Australia they are not listed here, but a list can be found in *The Film Weekly* Dec. 19, 1946.

Spencer, who had a smaller number of theatres in operation than did West, appears to have concentrated far more on film-making than did his rival: he had with him one of the best photographers in the country, Higgins of Higgins Brothers, and tended to photograph local items such as Sydney Harbour or Children's Demonstrations.

It was in fact rumoured in 1910 that Spencer intended, on returning from one of his many overseas trips, to set up a proper permanent studio in Australia, a project which, thanks to the merger of Spencer's into Union Theatres did not eventuate. West's in 1911 began to make films; and J.D. Williams was showing his "Melbourne Weekly" and "Sydney Weekly".

The first World War gave a fillip to Australian film production, and J.C. Williamson's re-entered the field, this time as film producers rather than exhibitors. They brought out patriotic features such as "Within Our Gates", and they also filmed the stage successes of Fred Niblo before he returned to the United States of America.

---
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In 1920 the Australian film industry reached its production peak, but it declined thereafter because of the lack of overseas markets, and because of the dominance of the American film industry, which was not only better financed and technically more skilled, but had much better distributing agencies.

But even before this happened American expertise was being called in to help make these Australian films, E.J. Carroll, maker of "The Sentimental Bloke" brought out American actors and an American director for his next film. Even as early as 1914 the Adelaide firm Southern Cross Feature Films had an American producer for the series of five 5-reel dramas and three 2-reel comedies it planned.

By 1929 only one company, Australasian Films Ltd., owned its own properly equipped studios. The Australian film industry lacked the technical competence, the money and the markets to survive in what had become a fiercely competitive industry, using all the promotional gimmicks available in the twentieth century.

But however it was encouraged, and, as we have seen, quite a number of films were still being made in Australia at the end of the First World War, the Australian film industry could never hope
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to supply the whole Australian demand, so film had to be imported. The import figures show clearly the growing dominance of the United States of America in this process. The figures are not available for the earlier period because in the 1902 Tariff film equipment was classed with other items "Jewellery and fancy goods" while films were miscellaneous; and later unexposed film was still classed together with exposed ones. The overall picture is, however, clear. Before 1914 the United States of America already supplied over 50% in value of the films imported; by 1922-3 it provided about 94%. These figures do not of course give a wholly reliable index of the proportion of American films actually seen by cinema-goers since they give no indication of the number of the showings of each film, or the size of the audiences which saw them, but it is nevertheless safe to say that both before and after the War a huge preponderance of those must have been American.

The War had something to do with the great increase in the proportion of American films, since it checked the progress of the European film industries especially the flourishing French one; the proportion of French imports fell from 18% in 1913 to 1.2% in 1922-3, the proportion of Italian films from about 3% to less than 0.5%, and of British from 23.8% to 3.4%. The domination of the market by American productions can hardly be ascribed to the use
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of the English language, since talking films were not made until the end of the nineteen-twenties.

Rachael Low, however, points out that the position of the British film industry in relation to the American was already weak even in Britain before the War. The poor quality of British films complained of in the post-war period was evident earlier. "No account of British production before the First World War would be honest if it did not make very clear that the recognised artistic poverty of the twenties actually ante-dated the War by some years and was not solely the result of it." 86

American and French producers were already operating in England. 87 Even as early as 1909 only 15% of the films released in Britain were British-made, while 40% were French and 30% American. The proportions in 1910 were similar; 15% British, 36% French, 28% American and 17% Italian. 88 Thus the failure of British films to maintain their place in the Australian market can by no means be ascribed to the War alone, although the imports from the flourishing French and Italian industries were probably destroyed by the War.

The growing preponderance of American films can be noted from the all-too-brief film criticisms, which began to find it a circumstance worth commenting on when films other than American were shown. It appears to have been due in part to the War, in part to
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the poor quality of British films and in part to the control of distribution outlets in Australia.

This development did not pass unnoticed. Under the 1902 tariff, imports of film were free of duty although moving picture equipment was subject to a 20% ad valorem charge. It was not in fact till during the First World War, when the influx of American films was at their peak that a duty was imposed, partly to protect the Australian film industry. By this time, the growing awareness of the importance of the United States of America to Australia, coupled with a resentment of this importance, fanned by memories of the United States of America's tardiness in entering the War, and reinforced by her seemingly irresponsible refusal to support the League of Nations, produced a great deal of worry about the "Americanisation" of Australia.

This is to be found at the most vocal in the "nationalistic" press such as the Bulletin. As early as 1910 the Bulletin wrote half-jokingly that "One valuable service rendered to Sydney by the Spencer Theatrescope at Sydney Lyceum is that it furnishes an innate knowledge of how to do things in the United States of America, if ever one should find himself there. If it is necessary to carry off another man's wife, the husband is first of all to be shot ..."89

By 1921 Hilary Lofting wrote "one passes over in respectful silence the vision of an Australian audience not forced to look at a "play" written (or dictated) by the operator to the New York stall productions. Even a sketch not written around a famous vamp, ingenue 89. B. June 9, 1910."
or a perfect lady in trousers would be something to go on with."  

As the flood of American films increased so did the protests against the flood - futile though they were. It proved impossible to get more British films onto Australian screens. Apart from the attacks - by no means confined to Australia, and not new even there - on films as a bad influence on the health, morality and independence of the people, especially children, attacks were made specifically on American films. Members of Parliament objected to the untaxed earnings made by American film stars from the showings of their films in Australia. Bad morals were now exclusively the prerogative of American films, even if the Royal Commission found in 1928 that a much higher proportion of British films than of American was rejected by the censors on the grounds of unsuitable subjects or treatment. Of the rather scandalous death of one film actress in a "beastly orgy in a San Francisco Hotel" the Bulletin wrote "Parliament may likewise like to enquire whether Arbuckle and the other rotters - male and female - concerned in the unspeakable proceedings at the "Frisco hotel are fair specimens of the people who make the Yankee films, and whether the pictured glorification of crime, extravagance, vulgarity and sensuality which comes to us from America and which exercises a visible influence on wayward youngsters hasn't gone far enough."  

When the Mothers' Union of Melbourne
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Anglican Cathedral complained about the slang, bad morals and the like of American films the Bulletin commented "Most of the things the mothers said can be urged against much of the spoken drama that comes from 'Murka. The greater evil of the pictures is in their greater frequency. The average young citizen might see four or five farcical comedies in a year that are antipathetic to the settled policy of Mrs. Grundy in bringing the holy bonds of matrimony into disrepute. At the picture-shows he might see lawful wedlock repellently presented four or five times a week."  

The other objection was a nationalistic one, natural enough anywhere but even more so in a country which had only recently become an independent nation, and was still enthusiastically developing a national "character". This probably reached a peak in about 1930 - outside our period. Beatrice Tildesley wrote that there was growing dissatisfaction with the increasing Americanisation of Australia, which was largely due to films.  

In 1920 the Bulletin wrote a leader called Australianism for the Australians. "They (Australians) read American books and magazines, chew American gum and wear American clothing. They sing American songs and import large quantities of American music-hall performers to show them how to do it... Above all they are munificent and credulous patrons of American moving-pictures. In reality the

96. B, July 28, 1921.  
Americans are poor film actors compared to the more emotional and mobile-featured Latin races, particularly the Italians and French, but thanks to the picture combine and its press agents Australia is flooded with the gaudy productions of American "studios" and it crowds the biograph theatres to see self-conscious and flat-chested American actresses who get far more adulation than is good for them, trailing their robes through pretentious travesties of life and art. There is an occasional protest against the cult of Americanism especially when some whooping Yankee war picture happens to meet a crowd consisting largely of returned diggers but the rising generation has got it bad." Two years later it could report gleefully that "Australia is experiencing a general reaction against the craze for things American that came in with the Armistice. If some of the finer features of Americanism came across the Pacific the undesirable imports might be suffered ... But the virtues and graces of America mostly remain on the far side of the Pacific; it is the fads and follies, the vices and vulgarities that get across. Deluged with cheap Yankee songs, films and novels, the mass of Australians are careless of the fact - which is important for the nation that they should remember - that fellow country-men of theirs can compose good music, make fine pictures, write admirable books. Deceived by the subtle propaganda of animated photography and fiction they drift into the habit of thinking that America is a vision of loveliness from sea to sea, whereas Australia has mere patches of
beauty and enormous tracts of ugly sand and scrub ... above all
has the American moving picture lost its domination over the minds
of the large section of Australians that used to be rather mad about
that alleged form of art. Months ago there were the beginnings of
a revolt against the aridities and banalities of the films that
come from Los Angeles, ... but the Arbuckle case with its hair-raising
revelations of moral rottenness among the people who make pictures
has converted it into a nation-wide movement of definite hostility
to the silent drama of the United States ... This feeling will
persist in Australia until the vice and degeneracy which have
sickened the healthy-minded public have been scourged out of the
American film business and the average citizen can take his wife and
children to a cinema theatre reasonably assured that he will see
pictures made by normally decent people for normally decent people
and not by ruffians for ruffians."

The types of films shown followed the standard overseas pattern,
beginning with actualities or newsreel type of film in the earliest
days, but by 1908 the story or feature film, launched first in 1905
was widely accepted and sought after. Films grew longer. "The
short-story cinematograph has been with us for some time, and
now Charles MacMahon and Edward Carroll have brought along the
complete novel film." Much of the concern in the early days was
not with the style or content of a film, but with its technical
presentation. Absence of flicker was thankfully remarked upon.
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Thereafter films began to branch out more. Spencer’s in 1908 found melodrama to be as popular on the screen as on the stage, but also included some satirical and educational films too. Of melodrama the Bulletin commented that the stage would be killed by the screen since the technical flexibility of the latter could let one be far more horrible more convincingly.

In the period preceding the First World War 'story' films, especially of stage successes, became more common from overseas. Among the American films Westerns predominated although there was the occasional "love" film. West’s tended to show Pathé films in preference to others, and these were usually very popular. In fact the Bulletin thought them the best yet seen in Australia.

The tendency in the pre-war years to film classics, though most common among the Italians, was also shared by the Americans: a film version of Tolstoy’s "Resurrection" "lacks force and effectiveness through the palpable artificiality of some of its backgrounds and might be a revised version from the hands of Marie Corelli." As well as this there were innumerable cowboy and Indian films such as
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"The Indian Scout's Vengeance" or "Davy Crockett" or "Percy the Cowboy".

Perennials such as "Uncle Tom’s Cabin" or Civil War stories often appeared also. So did patriotic melodramas such as "Saved by the Flag". Cowboys were popular as the Bulletin reported "Buttered cowboy is the most popular dish at Prahan's New Lyric (Vic.). The local gentry rage for the cowboy films."107 "Present programme at the Lyric, by the way, contains nothing so popular as Red Indian dramas. These things are crude in story and construction ... Yet the picture-public loves these yarns with a red-meat lust for the savage and primeval."108

Other films such as some of the early "greats" of the cinema were shown; "Henry VIII" with Tree, "Tale of Two Cities", Italian spectacles such as "The Fall of Troy" or the French "Count of Monte Cristo".

Film criticism on the whole was off-hand, recording little beyond the names of the films shown and some brief comment. It failed to realise in Australia as elsewhere, the art potentialities of the film. The film was a vehicle for entertainment. Even when Griffith's classic "Intolerance" was shown in Sydney in 1917 it was slated in the editorial columns although the film critic wrote "The three-hour film "Intolerance" unwound its 13,000 feet of architectural wonders gorgeousness, and horrors to a packed-tight Sydney Royal. The plot is woven of four threads each a world story of the havoc wrought by

108. B. Apr. 27, 1911.
man's intolerance, tempered only by the grace of love. New York, Paris, Babylon and Jerusalem are the centres of action. Though the picture is well worth seeing the agony of three of the scenes is drawn out; one's spine becomes jelly from the succession of thrills. But the story of Calvary - that greatest tragedy in the world's history conveys no sense of reality. Perhaps the murder of that "Just Man" is beyond the power of film factory to comprehend and portray." The next week's editorial wrote "Somebody in America with millions of dollars to spend was seized with the idea of teaching the world by a lavish display of murder, nudity and pseudo-historical stage properties that the bane of human existence first and last is intolerance. It is a good yarn to go to the public with, and one likely to prove a good cash gatherer; but it has a distinct weakness in that it isn't true. The raging insanity of the picture-drama itself, where Cyrus in his chariot, runs races with a modern motor-car, and the Huguenot-girl is raped almost in the presence of the Woman Taken in Adultery fails utterly to make any sort of case good; but even if the thing had constructive genius behind it instead of mere dollars, the fact would still stand that it is barking up the wrong tree or down the wrong well ..." 110

Otherwise the main points of interest were the stars or the cost of a film. The American film "The Count of Monte Cristo" by Selig was remarked on "Where I would like to ask, can we find another producer willing to sink £4,000 in the making of a single picture?" 111
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"But this film could also challenge the European spectacles. In Monte Cristo the Selig Polyscope have out-Heroded Herod and have set up a standard which will remain for all time as the high water mark of film productions. Never has the legitimate theatre given us such a superb rendering of Dumas' work."

In other words for quite some time the film was considered not as an art form but merely as a means of popular entertainment, a product of a foreign industry notable for its extravagance, rather than its artistry. In the 1920's it filled a position, nowadays held by television, as a purveyor of mass amusement, demanding no intellectual effort on the part of its audience.

And most significantly since the industry was dominated by the United States, it familiarised the Australian cinema-goer with the scenery, social structure and ideas of that country to a far greater extent than had ever been done before. As a medium for the dissemination of the American image the importance of the cinema in Australia cannot be overrated.

Moreover not only did American firms virtually control the distribution system in Australia by the 1920's, but it had been an American, Carl Hertz who had first introduced the moving picture to Australia. It was another North American, J.D. Williams, who had introduced modern exhibiting and distribution methods to Australia.
In other words in this field the American impact on Australia in this particular area of mass communication had been far and away the most important, more significant than the British or even the indigenous Australian contribution.

In older cultural fields, such as literature or the theatre, the British and the Australian strain was far stronger, but in this new field, as in newer industrial fields, the American influence was paramount.

Theatre

Unlike the cinema, the history of theatre in Australia has already been subject to some research, although mostly so far histories have been brief chronological accounts lacking in analytical study or concerned largely with a later period. This chapter may well be accused of the same fault, since, as no-one has before attempted to collate the number or type of American plays in Australia, or the impact they may have had, some part of it at least must be a tally of names, few of which are remembered to-day. Other histories have emphasised the important part played by English plays and actors in Australia, but few have commented on the role of American drama or actors.

The early twentieth century saw a great change in the nature of theatre organisation in Australia as in the United States; a switch

from the days of the peripatetic actor-managers, to a system of organised theatre managements, which, by their gradual control through ownership of the theatres exercised a decisive influence over the types of plays presented, their policy being dictated mainly by commercial motives. The American J.C. Williamson founded a management which gradually absorbed most of his competitors, while other competition such as the Rickards variety empire, centred on the Tivoli Theatres in Melbourne and Sydney, never really recovered from its founder's death in 1911 till many years after our period.

But in 1900 Williamson was once more on his own, having broken temporarily with his partner George Musgrove, and the Australian theatre appeared in a lively state. There were some seven to eight regular companies plus touring companies for the country towns. The actor-managers Bland Holt, Alfred Dampier, Wilson Barrett, Harry Rickards were still active and successful. Many writers on the Australian theatre see this as the golden age of the theatre, and feel that a catastrophic decline in standards began before the First World War. Ada Reeve, an Australian actress, wrote in 1954 "To my mind there is no question that the drama in Australia fifty years ago was in a much more flourishing condition than it has been since the arrival of the cinematograph." Beatrice Tildesley was not sure.
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whether the decline dated from 1900 or 1918, but was sure that the theatre was no longer a healthy organisation. Paul McGuire sees the decline as from a peak in the 1880's and 1890's. A.L. McLeod places the peak of Australian theatre earlier in the 1880's, but there is virtual unanimity that there has been a decline in standards. J.C. Williamson's publicity department, however, believes that in some ways standards have improved, that the influence of the cinema has led the theatre-going public to demand better acting, staging and production. This, of course, is a technical matter and does not affect the question of the quality or type of the plays produced.

Two factors have been blamed for this decline - the cinema and the commercial managements. But the cinema audience was by no means exclusively drawn from theatre-goers, and in its pre-talking days was obviously a different type of entertainment. It seems probable that the cinema may have killed certain forms of theatre such as the melodrama - the Bulletin commented on this phenomenon as early as 1908 since there was far more opportunity to be nasty on film, but the loss of the "bellowdrama" as the Bulletin insisted on calling it, would be regretted by few people to-day.

As for the commercial managements they have been blamed not only by later commentators but by contemporaries. The rueful comment that

since theatrical managers were not philanthropists, the Australian public would probably have to wait to see the latest French or Italian operas or the comedies of Shaw or Pinero. was echoed by Leon Brodsky's outburst in 1908 that "We must begin by making up our minds that nothing can be done through the business men who own and control our theatres. Their business is to make money by importing plays ... These theatre managers are not concerned with art or national aspirations or local talent, though of course they all pretend to be intensely patriotic. Let us ignore them." A.G. Stephens' Bookfellow commented "We owe it to our Australian theatres that we have no Australian drama. The commercial theatre has eliminated the serious dramatist." Much of this opprobrium has been heaped on J.C. Williamson himself, but in this writer's opinion, the decline did not start till after his death in 1913. Williamson himself belonged to the old actor-manager tradition. He had been brought over to Australia by George Coppin in 1874 to present his play "Struck Oil". Subsequently he had toured foreign countries with his own company. "I had always said that I would never go in for permanent management. Why? Because a manager's life is never his own; he has to be at work all the time. I was doing well enough as an actor, and when a star actor wants a rest, he can

121. Leon Brodsky was founder of the Australian Theatre Society in Melbourne in 1904, the earliest attempt to found a repertory society in Australia.
122. Leon Brodsky: "Towards an Australian Drama" pp223-4 in L.H. June 1, 1908 p223.
simply knock off and take a holiday for six months or as long as he likes, and then begin again." His principles of play selection, though no doubt anathema to dramatists or high-brows, are as much those of the actor as of the manager "Well, a good play must have heart interest; it must hit the audience below the collar button. And it must have head; it must not be intellectually below contempt.

And in the third place it must admit of an appeal to the eye ... The language must not be above the head of the average playgoer. People go to the theatre as a distraction, as an amusement, as a relaxation after the toil of the day, so that they can drop their burdens and forget their troubles for a little time. They do not go to be instructed or to be puzzled or to be bored - and being human beings the same human qualities appeal to them generation after generation.

"A drama may be literature but the words are not the essential thing about it. The essential thing is that it should live and move like a piece of real life - and that depends on the construction.

Words are only the clothes, the dress for the drama itself. 'Struck Oil' for example was in a great measure written upon the stage as you might say. My part wasn't even committed to paper until we had taken it all round Australia. We used what we call a skeleton manuscript with only the cues given, and one night a good phrase would occur - another night we would invent a little bit of business and so on, until the whole thing was different from the play as conceived by

the original writer ... In real living drama the language is the last
thing to think about.125

If there is commercialism in this statement it is that of the
actor-manager not the modern theatrical entrepreneur, and it is in
this connection interesting that Williamson himself fought shy of
owning theatres.

In July 1904 Williamson formed a partnership with Tallis and
Ramaciotti, and from 1904 till 1911 his main rivals were Clarke and
Meynell, who were absorbed in 1911. William Anderson's melodramas
also provided competition. In 1911 Hugh Ward, another American from
Pennsylvania was appointed managing director, which position he
retained until he left to join Fuller's in 1921. It was really in
this period that the policy started by Williamson of importing stage
successes from the United States of America as well as from Britain
reached its peak in quantity, if not in quality.126 From 1916 to
1920, when they amalgamated with J.C. Williamson, the four Tait
brothers provided J.C. Williamson Ltd. (Williamson himself died in
1913) with their chief opposition: E.J. Tait had been J.C. Williamson's
general manager from 1913 to 1916. There was also Hugh D. McIntosh,
who had taken over Rickards' empire on the latter's death in 1911.

It was generally agreed that "Australians are, considering the

125. Quoted Lindsay Browne op. cit. pp5-6.
126. This judgment may seem harsh but most writers on the American
drama agree that little of permanent worth was produced before
the work of Eugene O'Neill see e.g. Marcus Cuniffe: The
Literature of the United States, revised edn. Penguin, 1963
pp295-7; Jordan Y. Miller: American Dramatic Literature: New
York, 1961 pix. Even such plays as the more serious efforts of
Julius Klein were regarded as mere melodramas in their country
of origin see A.H. Quinn: History of the American Drama from
the Civil War to the Present Day, New York, 1945 II p4, 103, 104.
meagre population of their country, the best theatre-goers in the world. "While" Australia is known in the theatrical profession as the actor's paradise partly because of a system of contracts for a fixed period, and not merely till the end of a particular play. Nevertheless the policy of theatre managers of importing not only their plays, but frequently their actors from overseas led to protests in Australia, especially from those whose desire was to promote a national drama.

The American contribution to the stage in Australia in this period can scarcely be described as distinguished. It tended on the whole to be confined to musical comedy, farce, Westerns, and detective stories, with a few exceptions. Individual actors from the United States of America might be good, but few of them were in the class of Henry Irving or other English actors of the time. The truth is, of course, that American drama was really still in its infancy, and the plays which reached Australia reflected this. What is significant is the increasing amount of American fare of this type which was presented to, and apparently enjoyed by, Australian audiences. In 1907 it was commented that Australian theatrical taste ran to musical pieces and melodramas; fanciful plays such as "Peter Pan" flopped but pantomime and romantic dramas usually proved popular.

129. William A. Crawley: The Stage in Australia pp31-4 in Howlandson's Success No. 1, 1910 p34.
130. Few of them are mentioned in histories of the American stage; the nineteenth century actors were more distinguished: only Margaret Anglin is mentioned in Arthur Hornblow: A History of the Theatre in America: 2 vols. Philadelphia 1919 II pp294, 329.
Ten years later it could be claimed that the only change was the replacement of melodrama by "detective" plays, and a distinct increase in the number of American plays. This statement refers primarily to the commercial theatres, since the "little theatres" such as Gregan McMahon's Melbourne Repertory Theatre or Adelaide Repertory presented mostly the best modern drama, and at this period this tended to be largely European; Pinero, Synge, Shaw, Arnold, Bennett, Galsworthy, Sudermann, Pirandello. After all the United States of America had still made little contribution to drama. In 1899 the Australasian Art Review wrote of the lack of native Australian drama; "For instance, the United States has not yet got its character or any distinctive phase of it on to a stage of any popularity home or foreign, except perhaps in the satirical farce comedies of Mr. Hoyt. Hutton's remark 'The American play has yet to be written' is, except for Hoyt's merry trifles and Augustus Thomas' sad splendid 'In Mizzoura' as true now as when it was first made."132 While in 1917 Louis Esson, one of the few Australian playwrights who had had the fortune to get his plays actually staged in Australia, wrote "But I'm afraid there isn't any hope for any American art or literature ... with anything like a chance Australia could do both. I should think America is the least artistic country in the world."133

American actors or even American companies were not new to Australia. Some had played here in the gold-field days of the 1850's, the most notable being Joseph Jefferson who portrayed Rip Van Winkle; others were John Drew and Tyrone Power. The first performance of Ibsen's "Doll's House" in 1892 had starred an American actress, Janet Achurch. As already mentioned J.C. Williamson and his wife Maggie Moore came in the 1870's from America to play "Struck Oil" with great success. But from about the turn of the century these importations became more and more frequent, more and more accepted by the public.

In 1899 Williamson imported to Australia, cast, stage manager and all, the American musical comedy success "The Belle of New York", over the English production of which he had quarrelled with his partner, George Musgrove. The cast came on the S.S. Moana from San Francisco: the stage manager Mr. Coventry had arrived a few weeks earlier. Despite the lavish staging it was reported that the first-night Melbourne audience became impatient at the slow pace of the second act. 135 1899 also saw the second visit of American comedian Harry Connor, this time with his own American company and a repertory of American plays; they staged under Williamson's auspices such unmemorable plays as "A Texas Steer", "A Stranger in New York", "A Day and a Night". 137

134. The Theatre IV No. 7 Aug. 1, 1906.
In 1900 American actors were performing in Australia under Williamson's auspices in "serious plays". Nance O'Neil, a tragedienne, in "Queen Elizabeth", "Ingomar", "Fedora", "Tess of the D'Urbervilles" 138; she reappeared in 1905 in "Marie Antoinette". 139 Meanwhile Edith Crane and Tyrone Power presented "Trilby" 140 and yet another J.C. Williamson company was presenting opera. An independent American "all-negro" company put on "Uncle Tom's Cabin". 141 The Crane-Power company worked in 1901 for George Musgrove; 142 while American musical-comedies were presented by an independent American company. 143

In 1902 Williamson's American imports were still devoted to "legitimate" theatre: Janet Waldorf, an American actress, was starred at the head of his recently formed New English Dramatic Company in such plays as "As You Like It", "Romeo and Juliet", "Camille", "A Royal Divorce", 144 although she was not in fact an outstanding actress.

1903 saw another American company "led to loot and lustre by classic-featured Daniel Frawley. The pieces produced by this company really belonged to what may be termed Local Character Drama, ranging up and down a whole gamut of his triotic situation and suggestion from screaming farce to starkest tragedy. These Americans brought with

138. E. June 23, 1900.
139. E. Aug. 31, 1905.
140. E. Mar. 5, 1900.
141. E. May 5, 1900.
142. E. Sept. 7, 1901.
144. E. Apr. 19, 1902, May 31, 1902.
them a breath of the prairie, a breeze of the strenuous life that
strong, kindly, soft-hearted, stern-faced folk live in the land where
the vision was wide. 145

Again under Williamson's management they presented a medley of
plays - some American in character; "Secret Service" (Civil War drama)
"In Missouri," "The Girl I Left Behind Me," "Arizona," "Brother
Officers" and some less American; "In Paradise," "Madame Sans-Gêne".
This was perhaps the last of the American touring companies to mix
tragedy and farce in this fashion.

Two American companies, which toured Australia in 1904 under
different managements, were devoted to comedy. George Stephenson's
own American Comedy Co. was imported, a mere variation on his English
Comedy Co. Of one of their plays the Bulletin wrote "The present
musical farce is a hustle of even less magnitude than the previous
sample; an entertainment to be taken as it comes along, bright at the
beginning, exhausted at the finish, and frankly inconsequential most
of the time ... this sort of thing is not up to the ordinary level
of musical comedy at Princess's prices. "Other People's Money" looks
too thin for the theatre, and too long for its strength. Played on a
smaller stage as a two hours' show it would disarm criticism and drive
dull care away." 146

The other company was the American Travesty Company, imported from
the convenient port of San Francisco, and performing under the management

145. The Theatre No. 1, March 1904.
146. E. Sept. 15, 1904.
of James and Coombe in such burlesques as "Fiddle-Dee-Dee" and "Hoity-Toity" which were, said the Bulletin, merely variety shows with a ballet attached, but which nevertheless kept the Sydney Palace full. For three months the company has kept the Sydney Palace's "Standing Room Only" tickets busier than they have been for several years; yet many a better show has had to leave some of its wardrobes at the boarding-house as security. It has been the triumph of hustle. The company toured Australia and left in January 1905. George Musgrove imported Walter Sanford with his American players in melodramas popular with the gallery such as "The Power of Gold", "The Struggle of Life", "Uncle Tom's Cabin".

Meanwhile Williamson was presenting an American actress, Tittel Brune, as the leading lady of his Williamson Dramatic Company: she was an actress of wide emotional range, but at her best in high drama such as "L'Aiglon" or "Sunday".

In 1906 Williamson also imported a comedy company which included John Barrymore with William Collier as its principal actor. Unfortunately, despite favourable Press notices, he failed to attract audiences, although "an appreciative few who accounted him one of the most amusing entertainers that had visited Australia were at a loss to understand his lack of success" while the magazine The Theatre commented on "the number of failures which visiting companies,

147. E. July 7, 1904.
148. E. July 21, 1904.
149. E. Sept. 29, 1904.
150. E. July 7, 1904.
152. Claude McKay: The Theatre in Australia pp135-7 in Australia To-day 1912 p135.
especially American, have experienced in Australia and New Zealand during the recent year." 153 McKay felt that "The first time that American goods really came into favour in the Australian theatres was three years ago (1906). 'Mrs. Wiggs of the Cabbage Patch' scored and simultaneously an American star actress Miss Margaret Anglin packed the theatres by her remarkably brilliant emotional acting." 154

'Mrs. Wiggs of the Cabbage Patch' was a 'problem' play, and all but two of the American company which presented it were new to Australia. "So is the environment of the play, (new to Australia) the cadences of its poetry, the point of its kitchen-fire philosophy, and its strenuous presentation of the commonplace and the unavoidable in a new form. To dissociate the play and the players...is difficult. The show achieves a fine degree of unity. Probably the book of Alice Hogan Rice was poor literature; but it makes unique drama." 155

Encouraged by the success of Mrs. Wiggs, Williamson decided to stage two more American 'problem' plays by Klein, "The Lion and the Mouse" and "The Third Degree". The former dealt with corruption in American business ethics, the latter with police brutality. Neither painted a pretty picture of the United States of America, but they treated their subjects with intelligence and respect. The Bulletin thought that the dialogue of "The Lion and the Mouse" was bright, and the construction skilful, but deplored a sketchiness in

155. E. July 2, 1908.
characterisation. 156 Claude McKay wrote in 1912 that "A clever actress of considerable emotional ability, Miss Katherine Grey, 157 was imported for the central roles and the experiment prospered. The movement of these plays, as well as the story and atmosphere, was foreign to Australian life, being really typically American. This made their success all the more remarkable. They were toured throughout Australasia and proved consistent money-makers."

In other words the American invasion had begun but so far J.C. Williamson and Musgrove were on the whole calling the best; up till 1908 they preferred to import American actors to play with Australian companies in well-established plays. From 1908 Williamson attempted to give a representative picture of the more serious developments of the American drama as well. It was left either to independent American companies or to other managers to import vaudeville farce.

Edwin Gaech produced in 1907 "Human Hearts" which had had the greatest American success since the melodrama "The Fatal Wedding". It was described as "inane drivel thickly sprinkled with moral platitudes," 159 but proved highly successful. In 1909 Maggie Moore revived "Struck Oil" yet again, and Allen Doone, an Irish-American actor-manager who survived on the Australian boards with Irish plays till well into the 1920's appeared in "Sweet County Kerry". Hugh Ward, once more back in Australia, produced a sentimental comedy "The Fencing Master".

156. B. Jan. 27, 1910.
157. She was Canadian.
159. B. Sept. 12, 1907.
In 1911 Hugh Ward, like J. C. Williamson an American from Pennsylvania, joined The Firm as Managing Director and from this period the amount of American material shown by J. C. Williamson rose, while its quality might be said to have dropped. He believed in quick-fire comedies, and realising the boom in things American which coincided with the American Fleet, decided to import from America a company headed by Fred Niblo and Josephine Cohen with a repertoire of farces such as "The Fortune-Hunter", "Get Rich-Quick-Wallingford", "Seven Keys to Baldpate". The experiment, even if Niblo's salary was an unprecedented £200 a week, was a riotous success. The cast contained both Americans and Australians including a daughter of Marcus Clarke. The Bulletin might complain about the amount of American slang used by the company in "Get-Rich-Quick-Wallingford" it had to admit that both in Sydney and in Melbourne it was immensely popular. It preferred "The Fortune-Hunter" because it had good slick dialogue and a swiftly-moving plot, and by April 1913 reported that this play was "stalking a box-office fortune"; while in May it reported despairingly "This critic has nothing further to in reference to that badly-built but highly popular American comedy 'The Fortune-Hunter' except to reiterate that it is badly built and
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162. B. Aug. 22, 1912.
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165. E. Apr. 3, 1913.
still highly popular at the Criterion. In 1914 Niblo introduced a comedy thriller called "Officer 666" while by early 1915 he was playing in "Broadway Jones" and "The Travelling Salesman" and did not in fact return to America until mid-1915 when J.C. Williamson had filmed the performances of some of his greatest successes: he there became a silent film producer.

William Anderson, who had taken over Bland Holt's and Alfred Dampier's role as the main producer of melodrama, also evinced interest in the American scene. He imported, by arrangement with the Oriental Amusement Company of the United States of America, the American Musical Burlesque Company in such musical plays as "The Grafters" or "The Speculators". This toured Australasia in 1913, thus in virtual competition with the Niblo company, and also with great success. The remnants of the company were still around in Australia in 1917. He also arranged to get the Australian rights of an American 'problem' play "The Confession", and even his Christmas pantomime "In the Land of Nod" was produced on American lines.

1913 also saw the introduction of two new American actors to lead J.C. Williamson's dramatic company. Williamson stated on his return from one of his overseas trips in 1912 that American acting

166. B. May 8, 1913.
167. Claude McKay: This is the Life: 1961 p85.
168. Footlights Apr. 25, 1913.
had improved far more in the previous eight years than had English, 170
an opinion which may partly explain why so frequently American actors
were engaged to star in his company.

This trend towards an increasing number of American plays, actors
and companies on the Australian stage continued and was accentuated
during the war years; J.C. Williamson himself died in 1913.

In January 1915, for example four major American productions
were in full swing. For the J.C. Williamson company Niblo was still
appearing in his comedy repertoire, while Muriel Starr headed a
dramatic company which was presenting such dramas as "Bought and Paid
For", "Within the Law". George Willoughby was presenting a Western
named "At Cripple Creek", while the remnants of the American Musical
Burlesque Company was ensconced in revue at the Melbourne Bijou.

In April 1915 "For the sixth or maybe it's the twenty-sixth
time Allen Doone has revived 'Burry of Ballymores' in Sydney. The
deed was done on Saturday night at the Palace, and Doone, Edna Keeley...
reassembled after a few months' rest cure, were shown what an Irish
Australian spirit can do in the way of a welcome when its favourite
bhoys and colleens come to town." 171

In fact 1915 saw an incredible number of American plays, from
those listed above to "Playing the Game" staged by the Bert Bailey
Company the " 'intensely human comedy drama' we have learnt to expect
from the United States of America." 172 Muriel Starr continued a

171. B. Apr. 8, 1915.
series of dramas such as "Under Cover" or "Kick-In" all year. Allen Doone was around all year too. An American comedy "Nobody's Widow" invaded Sydney for J.C. Williamson's in October; a very funny American farce called "A Pair of Sixes" kept J.C. Williamson's coffers full at Sydney Criterion in the same month. Adelaide had Julius Knight in the American plays "Bought and Paid For" and "The Third Degree".

This was the year which most theatrical histories see as notable for the visit of Alan Wilkie to play Shakespeare; but to some contemporaries it seemed much more notable for an American cultural invasion. "Must all our modern drama come from the United States of America? Aren't any plays being written in England or even by our Allies? And does this Continent particularly want such large doses of American slang, American mispronunciation and American self-made men?

While of "Kick-In" it wrote "The success of 'Within the Law' seems to have encouraged J.C. Williamson's Ltd. to go on searching for another of the same unpleasant kind so we are suffering yet another American crook-drama, the rankness of which is not compensated for even by admirable acting."

But despite such protests the number of such plays, the stage precursors of the modern detective novels, to be seen continued to increase, and it was not until 1917 that the Bulletin was able to report that one play of this genre "The House of Glass" by Max Marcin

174. B. Nov. 18, 1915.
had to close because it was not attracting audiences. "When will the
Firm discover that it can't keep on feeding American crook plays to
Australian audiences."175 This Williamson flop was redeemed by the
huge success later in the year of "Daddy Long Legs" with a cast
including the American Charles Waldron, the Canadian Kathlene O'Donnell
and even Maggie Moore.176

In fact despite the hopes of the Bulletin the American
"crook-telephone" drama was still flourishing on the Australian stage.
George Willoughby, Hugh Ward's former partner, presented such a play
in January, "The Woman," at Melbourne Royal; the plot showed the
difficulties of the son of a dishonest politician who wanted to marry
the daughter of a respectable politician ruined by his father.177 This
was followed by "The Misleading Lady"178 another American play; both
of these scored better houses than did his attempt to stage a
"legitimate" musical farce in June, called "Joyous Jones".179

The Tait Brothers who had come into competition with Williamson's
in 1916 were also treading the American path with a play called "Turn
to the Right", which dealt with released convicts and their attempts
to go straight180: this was highly popular181 even if it was"

the same old mess. Apparently this kind of play is the only kind

175.  B. Jan. 11, 1917.
177.  B. Jan. 11, 1917.
179.  B. June 7, 1917, June 14, 1917.
available in the United States, whether sought for by the Firm or the Taits.®

The Taits also competed in the musical comedy field which was becoming even more popular. J.C. Williamson was, as already mentioned, the first to import an American musical comedy "The Belle of New York" cast and all, in 1899. The policy had been followed in a desultory fashion since with "The Prince of Pilsen". Hugh Ward speeded it up: he paid £300 for the Australian rights of "So Long, Letty" in Los Angeles® and imported from America the English actress Connie Ediss to play it®: it was the success of 1916. The Taits in 1917 brought over "Very Good Eddie", a Jerome Kern musical which with its lavish production and haunting music proved very effective;® they followed this by "The White Chrysanthemum": Williamson's retaliated by an unsuccessful revival of "So Long Letty"® and then by the same authors' "Canary Cottage" with the immensely popular Australian Dorothy Brunton®: and by the production of the non-musical "Good Gracious Annabelle" with Marie Tempest "who carried the cobweb-like plot through with superb panache."®

The Firm also produced a Broadway winner "Baby Mine"... announced as an overseas success in three acts, it is an Australian failure in one yawn, one double-bed and three dolls. It begins in the second

183. Claude McKay: This is the Life Sydney 1961 p89.
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act and ends when the supply of dolls runs out. This Broadway winner, 
picked by the Firm looks like being an also-ran in Australia. It is 
the flimsiest, thinnest pretence of a play ever imported. The plot 
is not worth discussing; there are laughs in it, but no real characters. It 
was not a success, and came off some eight nights later.

Meanwhile Kathlene O'Donnell and Charles Waldron were working 
hard for the Firm's money in "L'Aiglon" as well as in other American 
plays. "The Outcast" was a breath of fresh air on the age old problem 
of prostitution "treated with a common-sense and a directness and a 
truth and a freedom from the least suspicion of sentimentality that 
are seldom to be found in the plays from our latest Ally". "The 
Rainbow" and "The Cheaters" were further American plays in which they 
appeared in November and December. These were serious plays treating 
seriously of American life and problems; they were still not great 
drama. American actors and plays were dominating all fields of the 
theatre from musical comedy to serious theatre.

Nor did the end of the war bring any relief from American fare. 
Apart from the efforts of the repertory theatres and some grand opera 
"The list of new productions in Melbourne other than musical shows, 
comprised "Nothing But the Truth", "A Tailor-Made Man", "The Great 
Divide", "Eyes of Youth", "Three Faces East", "Common Clay", "The 
Silent Witness", "Lightnin'", "Old Lady 31" and "Possum Paddock".

189. B. Oct. 18, 1917.
190. B. May 10, 1917.
If there is one play in this batch which rises above a level of barely tolerable mediocrity, I missed it. I should also be charmed to hear the name of any mummer brought to Australia in the past 12 months whose talents revealed anything other than the dead-level qualities of an ideal billiard table ... Yankee farce (as Australia knows it) has never been more tiresome than "Nothing But the Truth", Yankee bellows-drama never more crude than "Common Clay" and Yankee sentimentality achieved the dead limit in "Daddies".

"The musical shows of the year were scarcely more inspiring. McIntosh, who has been paying more attention than his brother managers to the English market, presented a decent enough thing of its kind in "My Lady Frayle" but how does such an offering compare with "The Chocolate Soldier" or "The Arcadians" ... Managers may declaim with lofty condescension that they give the public what it wants, but the enthusiasm with which the public stayed away from some of the shows mentioned, and the number of occasions on which revivals had to be employed to fill unexpectedly long intervals between new drinks do not go far toward justifying the legend of managerial infallibility."

Of the plays listed above not only the three mentioned as such were American: "The Great Divide" was a J.C. Williamson production with Muriel Starr, dealing with the redemption to virtue of a western cattle-rustler while "A Tailor-Made Man", a comedy, dealt with a confidence man's success in New York Society: "Lightnin'" was another.

American comedy for J.C. Williamson which proved very popular and ran for months.

No change in the pattern of the commercial theatre is observable in the next four years; the number of American productions remained high, and the Australian public was still content to go to them.

Hugh Ward's first venture when he left J.C. Williamson's in 1920 and joined with Fuller's was yet another American play "The O'Brien Girl" of which the Bulletin wrote "You get the same paucity of purely American plot and prevalence of picturesque intruders with lively legs." For this play Ward introduced an American producer Henry Hall, and two American dancers from the famous Ziegfeld Follies. But the departure of Ward did not prevent J.C. Williamson continuing to present American plays: 1921 saw them presenting another American-born actor Joseph Coyne in a series of comedies such as "His Lady Friends", "The Sign at the Door" and the like; while the Sydney Palace was showing "Nightie Night" and "Wedding Bells".

But the post-war theatre saw a new and interesting development in the realm of the non-commercial repertory-type theatre. Louis Esson, the Australian dramatist, visited the United States of America during the first World War and was impressed by the work of the

192. B. March 15, 1919.
Washington Square Players in New York as indeed he was by the Abbey Theatre in Dublin. Now, the Washington Square Players were amongst the first to present the plays of Eugene O'Neill, the first American playwright of international status and possibly still the greatest the United States has produced. By 1923 Esson was writing enthusiastically about O'Neill's "The Emperor Jones". He claimed that the United States of America had never before had any dramatic literature, although some reasonably good work had been done in the fields of picturesque melodrama and social comedy; such as "Bought and Paid For" "something like a fifth-rate Ibsen". O'Neill however was in a different class; he was a genius of world standing, who "may not yet be an absolute master though he seems destined to become one"; a couple of years later O'Neill's Anna Christie was performed by J.N. Tait's Repertory company, which G regain McMahon ran.

Thus by the end of our period not only was the American drama strongly represented on the commercial stage, in the form of comedies, musicals and the like, but it was recognised that America was beginning to produce great dramatic literature.

196. Ibid p2.
197. Ibid. Feb. 15, 1923.
CHAPTER 6

THE AMERICAN IMAGE II
THE AMERICAN IMAGE II

Literature

Imports of American books and other printed matter increased greatly during the period under review. Part of it was accounted for by the growing volume of Governmental or University publications finding their way into the various public and University libraries of Australia. These came largely through the Smithsonian Institution which acted as the book exchange centre of the United States with many other countries.

In New South Wales the Board of International Exchanges was set up in 1879, but it ran into trouble of various kinds such as the cutting back of its grant in 1896, or a row with Gullick, the Government Printer who became a member of the Board in 1903. The Board carried out exchanges with the other States of Australia, with New Zealand, with eleven European countries, Cuba and Brazil as well as the United States of America, and by 1891 some scientific bodies as well as all Government departments, except the Post Office and the Department of Mines were exchanging publications through the Board. In other states such as South Australia and Western Australia the State Public Libraries took the place of the New South Wales Board in exchanges with the Smithsonian Institution. The amount received

1. See Table.13
was much greater than that exported. In 1904-5 the South Australian Public Library received twenty-three cases of publications containing 395 packages from the Smithsonian, which it divided between some fifty-two bodies or individuals, while in 1905-6 they got nineteen cases of publications containing 386 packages, and returned two cases of South Australian publications to the Smithsonian for distribution in the United States of America and South America.

Libraries were also showing a greater interest in American publications; by 1900 fifty-six, or over 10% of Fisher Library's periodical holdings were of United States journals, of which 23 had been started from 1890 onwards; most of these were scientific and engineering publications. In 1900-1 about a quarter of the acquisitions in the New South Wales Parliamentary Library were either published in or about, the United States of America, while by 1907-8 the Library was taking some 10 United States periodicals as compared with 14 Australian and 22 British; in 1900-1 the figures were with 6 American, 5 Australian and 27 English. The New South Wales Public Library received 7 United States periodicals and newspapers in 1899 as compared with 14 English, 5 Scottish, 2 Irish, 2 Indian, 4 South

5. Fisher Library Periodicals List 1900 : manuscript : Fisher Library University of Sydney.
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African, 1 South-East African, 1 Fijian, 1 Samoan, 1 Japanese and 1 Canadian; about 16%: 3 of these were various editions of the Scientific American - its supplement and its building edition; they were all from the Eastern States. By 1902 there were 24 United States periodicals as against 19 English, 1 Welsh, 7 Scottish, 3 Irish, 2 Indian, 2 South African, 1 South-East African, 1 Natal, 1 Rhodesian, 1 Syrian, 1 Samoan, 1 Japanese and 1 Canadian: a proportion of about 57%: these now included quite a number of West Coast daily newspapers, five from San Francisco and one from Seattle.

This would indicate that the amount of interest shown by libraries in the United States of America was increasing, and that the amount of information available to readers was considerable; whether these were or were not read is, of course, another matter.

Many of the imports, however, were less weighty. Much was fiction: and this was a new development. Previously the book trade had in fact depended very heavily on London publishers, and the majority of American books which found their way into Australia did so in British editions, thus undergoing, like the cable news received in Australia, a process of pre-selection on the basis of British taste and opinion.

The popularity of American books followed closely upon the growing sales of Australian literature from the late 1890's on, a fair proportion of which, thanks to the example of such firms as

7. List of newspapers received for newspaper room of New South Wales Public Library, 1899.
8. ibid Jan. 1902.
the Bulletin's publishing company, were not British-produced. A.G. Stephens commented in 1915 that Australians no longer demanded the "London hall-mark" in literature. "Two things show this; the remarkable sale of American fiction in Australia during the last six or seven years, the remarkable sale of locally-produced books in Australia during the last fifteen years."9 As early as 1905 Stephens had claimed in the Bulletin that American fiction was becoming worthy of recognition. "Who reads an American book? Everybody. The ancient sarcasm holds only the reminiscent ghost of satire."10

In fact American books were "dumped" in Australia; a £1.20 or £1.25 book (about 5/-) selling for 3/-d. here. There were also agreements with booksellers which amounted to a "sole agency" system; books were accepted on condition that they were sold wholesale by the publishers to no other firm in Australia.11 This naturally slowed sales down, and meant that the supply of American books was not really greatly helped by the replacement by direct imports from the United States of the importation of English editions, more especially since there was for example no direct parcel post between the United States of America and Australia. The chief marketing firm for American books in Australia was George Robertson Pty. Ltd..12

Naturally with such an increase in volume came a great deal of

11. The Bookfellow : Sydney 3rd series I No. 12, Nov. 1, 1912 pXLV.
worthless fiction. The Bookfellow wrote, "Half the American fiction we read about is drapers' goods; it ranks with shirt-waists, candy and chewing gum. Its manufacture is a decorative art. Really it is not read, but consumed like chocolate. Its personages and plots, like the factory-costs and covers are calculated to percentages of value." The American novel is usually perfumed like soap, packed in a purple box and tied up with puce ribbon ... There is a lot of girl and a little story and it happily solves the wedding-present difficulty." There are two kinds of books - books and birthday presents; and 'Tobacco in Song and Story' by John Bain Caldwell, (New York per Ryecroft Library, Sydney) hastens to locate itself in the second class. Daintily bound and packed in an imitation cigar-box ... "The American novel with its fashion-plate heroine beaming at us from the cover, its illustrations in lordly colour, its beautiful type and its immediate appeal is nowadays the standing dish at all our libraries."

But despite such strictures from the literary arbiters American books continued to be imported, sold and presumably read. British publishers were, in this field as in others, less energetic in pushing their wares on the Australian market. Few of them had good Australian connections or even advertised in Australia. It was not, in fact,

13. The Bookfellow : Sydney 3rd series II No. 5, May 1, 1913 p112.
15. B. Apr. 16, 1908.
until the First World War, with its concomitant shortage of paper and shipping, affected the United States of America, that imports dropped. Average London fiction prices shot up by 2/6d. to about 7/- net while United States fiction went up to £1.75 (about 7/6d.) an increase of about 50c. "Direct United States fiction trade has greatly diminished and American books are reverting to their old way of reaching Australia through English editions.\textsuperscript{18} The process of adjustment will continue till paper prices come down."\textsuperscript{19}

But the importation of rubbish did not preclude the arrival of books of lasting value in American literature. The post-war period shows a greater critical awareness of United States literature than is evident earlier, especially in such journals as the Bulletin. The early period is nevertheless interesting, not merely in itself but for the sidelights it can throw on the development of Australian literature and criticism.

Australian literature is usually seen to have emerged in the later 1880's and 1890's, coinciding with, and naturally encouraged by, the Bulletin, which had been founded in 1880; At first much of it was poetry frequently in ballad form, and usually nationalistic or localised in tone.\textsuperscript{20} Around the turn of the century the novel began to develop with the publication of Furphy's "Such Is Life" and Miles

\textsuperscript{18} This is thoroughly confirmed by the book reviews of the late war and post-war period.
Franklin's "My Brilliant Career"; again Australian in spirit and content. Drama was still horribly lacking. A slightly modified view of the role of the Bulletin is presented in the most recent history of Australian literature, contributed to by many creative writers as well as critics. This view stresses the immense importance of the Bulletin to the development of Australian literature while A.G. Stephens was editor of the Red Page from 1898 to 1906. It is because of this that this section concentrates mainly on the Bulletin and the Bookfellow in literary criticism, as reflecting the views of Stephens and of his successors on the Bulletin and the "official" critical view of American literature. The Norman Lindsay circle did not become widely known or influential till towards the end of our period, and since they were less eclectic than A.G. Stephens their interest in United States literature was less. 21

The United States produced no great dramatist till Eugene O'Neill, but in the fields of the novel, and also of poetry and the short story there were signs of literary maturity. There was also diversity; Whitman might be aggressively democratic and technically daring, but Poe was in the European tradition, and more admired overseas than in America. Mark Twain, Zane Grey etc. wrote of and perhaps for the West and the open country with its turbulent cowboy image, while other

novelists such as Henry James or Edith Wharton were literally or spiritually exiles from American society, and yet others, Upton Sinclair or Frank Norris were beginning to write the "muck-raking" novels dealing journalistically with the social problems produced in American society. There was also the remainder of the New England Puritan tradition.

American literature was peculiarly accessible to Australian readers in that it was written in English, thus posing no language barrier as in the case of some European literature. There were also certain aspects of the United States of America likely to attract the Australian nationalistic writer of the early twentieth century; its democracy and lack of "feudalism", its immense growth as a prefiguration of Australian potential, its literary successes as examples and encouragements. Nevertheless it is extremely important to bear in mind that such influences had the whole weight of English literary tradition against them, a tradition frequently so thoroughly assimilated as to make independent judgment of the alien more difficult. No American literature was taught by Australia's universities for quite some time hereafter. This clash of opinion can for example be seen in the critical writings of A.G. Stephens where a recognition of emerging American literature still could not subdue the feeling that it was still not "world-class".

"... we are beginning to read American books that are distinctly American, that reflect the eager, practical, sentimental mind which is essentially America's. In poetry the characteristic note is not discernible, in philosophy one seems to find nationality in the peculiar seal with which American students devote themselves to experimental
science ...; but in fiction, though only within the last five years, one is assured that the temperament of the States has found a true and definite expression. We have the novel of journalism, the novel that Norris prefigured, yet was too cosmopolitan and too reflective to write, the novel as concocted by Merwin and Webster, and - less characteristically - by McGrath Phillips and some others.

"It is not a realistic novel in the ordinary sense though it deals with events and personages that are transcribed from life. Nor is it idealistic: there is no conscious aim toward an interpretation of life in terms of art. It is journalistic; that is to say it doctors realism cunningly to be palatable to the public of readers, instead of permitting the fact to work its own inevitable issue ... The plan fits the American reader's need that is governed by haste and impatience, and in an age of shallow literature, has much to recommend it."^22

But after referring to one or two such "muck-raking" novels Stephens ends up "Withal one likes the English books better ... They appeal to one as literature, not journalism, and throw deeper roots in a reader's mind."^23

The emphasis on Stephens is deliberate. He is still regarded as the greatest Australian literary critic by many and indisputably so in the ten years from 1896 to 1906 when he was editor of the Red Page of the Bulletin. His judgments of Australian literature still stand, though they may have been questioned in detail. As Red Page editor he encouraged and even shaped emerging Australian writers, to whom he appeared as a paternalistic figure. The ideas of such a man

---

23. Loco. cit.
it cannot be proved without considerable further research whether his views on American literature were influenced by these or not, but the suspicion at least remains.

Stephens did not it is clear, like the muck-raking novelists. Upton Sinclair had, he said "a vivid journalist's talent, essentially pictorial... his sincerity is unalloyed by a sense of humour"28; while of Sinclair's "Sylvia" he wrote "it should really be called Syphilis. It was published in America nearly a year ago, and in the devious course of commerce, is offered to Australian readers this month. We could very well have done without it altogether.

"With a moral purpose, or a pretense of moral purpose, several American authors are engaged in what an American newspaper describes as "trafficking in filth"... With every inclination to maintain the liberty of literature, we cannot see any public advantage in permitting such a mess of horror to be lent or sold indiscriminately in the guise of popular fiction. The moral purpose does not justify the author in offering what is essentially a dubious medical tract on loathsome disease as "a novel". In the Bookfellow's opinion Sylvia should be withdrawn from general sale."29

Nor was this only Stephens' opinion. His successors on the Bulletin Red Page commented in 1910 that "corruption, lawlessness and conceit figure in nearly all the later criticisms of America."30.

on foreign literature, expressed in the Red Page, could not fail to have weight in Australia.

A self-made man, not University-educated, and with some scorn for the academic approach to literature, Stephens read extraordinarily widely, much more widely perhaps than the next generation of critics; even Brennan's interests did not extend to the United States. In his judgments of Australian literature Stephens speaks for himself and "helped to crystallize a set of attitudes which have been close to the centre of criticism in this country ever since."24 Whether he does so in his assessments of American or even English literature is more open to question. There are one or two appalling examples of dishonesty in Stephens' literary opinions,25 and one student of his work describes much of his critical work on overseas literature as a "scissors and paste job"26 only to be expected perhaps in the busy life of a journalist. It is certain that Stephens read many overseas English and American journals of literary criticism27:


25. e.g. an article on Tolstoy's What Is Art, Stephens gives as his own work quotations and descriptions on aesthetic theory which are taken word for word from one English translation of Tolstoy's book B. Sept. 24, 1899. I am indebted for this information to Mr. W.M. Maidment.

26. Mr. W.M. Maidment, Lecturer in English, University of Sydney in a letter to the author, July 9, 1965.

27. see e.g. Stephens' "Magazine Rifle" Column in the Boomerang (Brisbane), 1891.
most criticism being carried out in fiction. "In American novels it is rare to find a judge who is just or a successful politician who is honest."31 While it complained in 1911 that "Books of the kind (muck-rakers) have been plentiful during the last ten years and the edge of sympathy has been blunted by their rough craftmanship."32

More left-wing Australian publications, however, depended quite heavily on such novelists for their picture of American society, but this is rather a matter of political influence than of literary criticism. Jack London or Upton Sinclair were admired rather for their politics than for their style, and the more political the book, the more it was admired.33

There are some odd features in literary criticism of the United States, particularly the preference for non-nationalistic writers, although American writers were sometimes praised for their portrayal of some specific aspect of American life. The only piece of criticism I have found which suggests that Australian literature could learn from American is in the Bookfellow and is based on some fundamental misconceptions about the trend in American fiction. "American fiction frequently sets forth the story of a struggle towards a creditable ideal. Its familiar recipe is the conquest of nature for the service of man with woman as reward. Though it is apt to put tinsel heroes

on a sawdust stage, yet its stage is worth strutting, its drama
deserves acting. The grand march of American settlement across the
American wilderness is a grand topic of fiction. The Australian
difference is shown in the choice by Australian writers of fiction.
The American mind, as exemplified by its novelists, turns away from
the cities. The Australian mind, far from regarding the bush and
the desert as the scenes of great deeds and ennobling combats depicts
them often as mean, sordid, gloomy, uninspiring ... America and
Canada, as reflected in fiction are full of energy, enthusiasm and
hope. How discreditable is the reflection of Australia in much
recent Australian fiction.34 In other words he was looking for
national myths around which to build a national literature.

But the Bulletin recognised that the moving American frontier
was no longer a theme for serious literature. "The kind of stories
which Americans might be expected to produce in better style than any
other is that of adventure ... Fenimore Cooper turned 'the noble
red man' and the white pioneers to good advantage and Bret Harte
found rich romantic material in the sentimental diggers and proud
outcasts of the Western States. But the Indian, the Scout and the
Cowboy soon fell into the hands of the manufacturers of penny
dreadfuls and rarely has the free and unconventional life of the West
found expression in a novel of any quality."35

Despite the fact that in 1907 Stephens' Bookfellow, discussing
Australian literature wrote "Our poets probably cannot tell their

34. The Bookfellow 3rd series I No. 3 Feb. 1, 1912 p66.
mistresses any more than Horace told Lydia, but they can make it clear that Lydia's name is Mary Ann and that she lives in Cow Flat. Thus poetry will be re-created for the generation of Mary Ann, and the country of Cow Flat ... More it is unreasonable to hope for. 36 Yet in 1922 it said "A familiar United States complaint during fifty years has been that American literature was too English. Now we complain that American novels are localising themselves - they are becoming too American. And in reflecting the alien half of United States population many of them are too foreign for AustraZealand readers." 37

And it does appear from the paucity of critical reference to them that although "Western" writers were read in Australia, they were not highly regarded - even Mark Twain or Fenimore Cooper are scarcely ever mentioned, let alone discussed.

In fact in the pre-war period, those novelists to whom the greatest attention was paid were the expatriates such as Henry James, and Edith Wharton. In reviewing Edith Wharton's "House of Truth" (London: Macmillan) the Bulletin wrote that "Between Henry James and Edith Wharton there is only sex to choose. James's work is just a trifle tenser and intenser, his sense of the shades of an idea a little more acute." 38 Praise of their books was however ambivalent. "Mrs. Wharton has acclimatised in America the traditional solid workmanlike

37. Ibid 3rd series VII No. 5 May 31, 1922, p 48
38. F. Jan. 4, 1906 A.G.S.
deliberate English novel" but "... her latest work "The Fruit of the Tree" lacks constructive power - the ability to work out gradually and with cumulative force one broad and well-based theme ... so lacking the human touch, the human weakness and warmth, Edith Wharton remains outside the rank of great writers ... But in observation of life pithily expressed, the book abounds. The author's style is precise, logical, neat and frequently epigrammatic." James, an established literary figure by the twentieth century, was also regarded with respect but puzzlement. His defection from literary criticism was regretted. His genius was recognised - only Ambrose Bierce was permitted to share this title among living writers: but it was not characteristically American; "none of his numerous novels is typical of America." His style was difficult, a style which 'feminised' the English language: "But 'The Outcry' cannot be adequately reviewed except in the Henry Jamesian language. It is like the American accent, a quite too dreadfully easy thing to, let us 'competently explain', pick up." It was "a style that left him unintelligible to any but his worshippers.

This accusation of 'feminism', or literary Momism is fairly common. It was regarded as stemming from the conservative New England puritan tradition which had produced Hawthorne, Emerson and others.

In 1904 the Bulletin preferred the English novel to the American.

40. Toc. cit.
42. B. Mar. 5i, 1910.
43. Toc. cit.
44. B. Apr. 25, 1911.
45. B. Apr. 25, 1912.
"The American tribe are pleasant for a change: but the substitution of sentiment for passion in deference to the neo-puritan ideal, ends by devitalising them."46 "At present American fiction is in a flabby state. The strong Puritan strain in the early inhabitants of the States which is represented in Nathaniel Hawthorne's work, and can be seen, thinning out, in the stories of Mrs. Sally Green and Mary Wilkins, has left a blur of smugness in the American character ... The greater part of their current literature has been brought up on a milk diet; it lacks the breadth and depth of virility."47

Thus there was nothing for literary Australia to learn from literary America. The Bulletin in 1921 said that what Australia needed was clean thinking and straight talking which could not be found in American books and magazines "The United States isn't all New York, or all San Francisco, or even all Chicago; but it is predominantly loose-thinking, and slack of expression, and shoddy of soul. God knows why! It had a fair start and a good run, and might have been the greatest nation on earth ... But whatever be its nature or the cases of it, it is not a fit example (or preceptor) for Australians."48

But the post-war scene also saw, as well as the revulsion from things American, a growing recognition by a new generation of Australian writers and critics such as Vance Palmer, Louis Esson,
The voice of America has no overtones of undertones in it. It is
money, mean, and progress. The future of the country and steamboat
betray the same accord and has the same faith in
life is hardly complex enough to develop really intelligent writers.
American literature is a mechanical art of the usual pattern—American
mercy produced a mechanical art of the usual pattern—American
so that they believe they are doing genuine, intelligent work when they
atmosphere of American Life Israel_perez_the_writers_of_real_talent
exertion to a common denominator of corruptions serves no
are the great essays measures that set the standard and reduce all
something in the American art that illustrates a great quantity.
There
perhaps one should use the past tense. There seems to be
production, and would swamp the world's markets and oblige the standard.
It seemed as if the Americans had a genius for this low standard of
they had all come from the one tradition. It was a depressing spectacle;
blend of optimism and sentiment Franked part in succession as though
of destitution. Loads or best-sellers dripping with the standard
generation American writing has been altogether lacking in any
been cumbred from that country in Greater number. For the past
writer has appeared in America, but books of importance have
has been some justification for the prophecies. No very distinguished
unless one were searching about with a microscope... Since then there
there was hardly any evidence
the statement seemed surprising then. There was hardly any evidence
said to me that he had hopes of a literary renaissance in America.
1922 James Farmer wrote: "Three years ago a well-known British critic
in C. N. Radek's, "The developments in American Literature." In
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repeats its optimistic catchwords in a tireless monologue that has the slightly metallic sound of a gramophone.

"And since all literature depends on a personal vision and a personal accent, it has been mere waste of time looking for it among the hordes of American novels that line the bookstalls. From time to time "sports" like Ambrose Bierce and Stephen Crane have appeared, but whatever success they have achieved has been outside their own country. Jack London, another writer of real talent, became a magazine hack, striving to justify his 15 cents a word by the discovery of home-grown supermen . . .

"What is there to justify talk about an American literary renaissance then? Not much, perhaps except a few stray signs and portents. There seems to be growing up a school of individual novelists like Joseph Hergesheimer, Willa Cather, James Branch Cabell and Sherwood Anderson who have thrown the magazine standards overboard . . ."

"Poetry has had its revival, too, in the work of writers like Vachel Lindsay, Robert Frost, John Gould Fletcher, and Edgar Lee Masters . . . As for drama there is Eugene O'Neill whose 'Emperor Jones' has brought a new color and vitality into the theatre. O'Neill is probably the most important writer of all the crowd. He has Jack London's fondness for the primitive without his belief in cheap science and he has already won recognition in England and France."49

There are many points of significance in this quotation. There is, of course, the recognition of the validity of overseas criticism: there is the summing up in one essay of names which had been appearing in the review columns for the previous six months or so, and there is
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\(^{49}\) E. Mar. 1, 1923: Vance Palmer: Literary America.
the Western intellectual's dislike of American shoddiness, and his feeling that Art, or Truth or Justice succeed in the United States of America despite their environment, and are thus in this sense exiles from the United States. "Consider the fact that while cheap American novels of to-day sell by the million, most of the books that can honestly be classed as American literature are out of print."

1923 saw intelligent reviews of James Branch Cabell's "Jurgen" by C.R. Bradish: "a heady romance, or frolic of the senses, sometimes dark with doubt and melancholy, but pleading with a poet's wistfulness against the everydayness and dulness of Reality. It takes the sympathetic reader down the avenues of Time into regions of myth and sorcery, its lucid language, sly jousts at modernity, with its over-color of a sceptical philosophy, reminding one again and again of Anatole France. Often it has a baffling touch of allegory, occasionally a flavour of Rabelais, and one detects in the love episodes the amatory brio of Stendhal's 'Chartreuse de Parme'." Louis Esson wrote at length on Eugene O'Neill.

Herman Melville was also rediscovered in Australia at the same time that his reputation was beginning to grow overseas. The contrast between the attitudes of the older critics such as Stephens, and those of the young is striking. In 1921 Stephens wrote "Any bookfellow who can accredit himself with a share of the taste of Charles Lamb should give his taste the treat of H. Melville's 'Moby Dick' in the cheap and attractive reprint just issued by Oxford Press. There is a dramatic story with chapters of glorious prose, much rare science

50. B. May 25, 1922.
51. B. Aug. 16, 1923.
52. B. Feb. 15, 1923.
and many inspiring reflections. We recommend it as a bedbook that Lamb would have lingered over for a month and loved perpetually — and a piece of classical English literature always worth re-reading."53 Vance Palmer saw perhaps deeper. Classing Melville with Poe and Hawthorne, he wrote "In his mind there seems to have been some dark pool of glamour in which he steeped the materials of his art. His 'Moby Dick' is a breathless tale of adventure and human passion and his descriptions of whale-hunting are as exact as any cetologist could desire; but in every turn of the chase after the Leviathan you are haunted by the whisper of allegory."54 C.O.M. in 1923 however thought that modern extravagant praise of Melville was as little accurate as the previous neglect, and urged the merits of "Typee", which lacked allegorical content, against "Moby Dick". "'Moby Dick' a spiritual romance which is more comparable to 'The Idylls of the King' than to the 'Pilgrim's Progress' - is probably in its surface meaning the greatest story of the sea ever written, though full of lapses and very uneven in quality."55

This renewal of interest parallels the critical opinion in England; the fact that Australian critical opinion of American literature varies little within itself may be an argument for the influence of overseas critics.

Poetry

The body of criticism of poetry is slighter, and general value

53. The Bookfellow 3rd series VI No. 1 Feb. 15, 1921. 56
55. E. Sept 27, 1923.
judgments are rare. At the turn of the century it appears that only a few American poets were read widely in Australia. Edgar Allen Poe, Sydney Lanier and Walt Whitman being those most frequently mentioned.

Emily Dickinson might receive an occasional mention "Miss Dickinson's mind suggests rather a witch broth, with New England religion, Emerson's philosophy and lonely womanhood bubbling together in a turmoil and jetting forth hot spurts of doctrinal emotion. She wastes no words and her words gleam often."56

In their evaluations of those poets there is again in the earlier part of the twentieth century, an emphasis on universality as preferable to Americanism.

In an obituary review of the colourful Californian poet Joaquín Miller the Bookfellow wrote in 1913 "As Poe and Lanier among American verse-writers poets may be placed side by side by reason of their pre-eminence in the knowledge of that beautiful mystery which is Poetry, and by reason also of the similar minds and moods and methods with which they received and transmitted the poetical message, so Whitman and Miller on a lower plane may be conjoined in respect of many qualities of temperament and art" (my italics). Both Whitman and Miller instinctively extol the savage virtues, turn from civilised shows and nullities and cleave to the larger life and rarer which lives at the core of human onset and effort. Poe and Lanier are universal poets, the American others are mostly faint reflections of European types following more or less skilfully in the footsteps of Longfellow."57 It also appears

56. B. Apr. 12, 1906.
57. The Bookfellow 3rd series Vol. II No. 4 Apr. 1, 1913. p87
that as early as 1898 he was spreading his views on Lanier to contemporary Australian writers: among his papers in the Mitchell Library, Sydney, is a letter from James Brunton Stephens thanking A.G. Stephens for the loan of a book on Lanier. "Lanier continues to rise in my estimation. I humbly take the liberty of affirming that he is the most original poet America has produced. I don't except Poe. As Lanier himself says, Poe didn't know enough. I mean his knowledge was not wide enough to give his originality scope to work in."58

But Whitman was the American poet who aroused the greatest interest and the greatest controversy in Australia. Professor A.L. McLeod in his "Walt Whitman in Australia and New Zealand" (Sydney Wentworth Press 1964) has made a collection of some eighteen articles and letters to indicate the reception given to Whitman's work between 1875 and 1907. Of these only three come from Australia post 1900: most are grouped between 1891 and 1894. He hopes at some later date to complete a study in depth of the influence of Whitman on Australian literature.59 From this it is clear that Whitman interested Australian writers and critics: it is also clear that the interest was mainly in his philosophy of democracy and individualism rather than in his

poetical technique.

Le Gay Brereton, writing in 1894, deplored Whitman's vanity and lack of humour, and declares that the 'Leaves of Grass' are neither verse nor prose but declares him to be a Titan. 60 F.M., writing in the Bulletin in 1902 declared that Whitman was the "soul and heir of Blake" that "Whitman announced himself, springing a mine under all conventionalities, and had the satisfaction, after the shrieks of horror had ceased, of hearing the question raised, "What does the man mean? ... It is as well that he died in 1892, for ere the last decade of his century closed such things came to the United States as must have frozen some at least of the founts of his furthest reaching hopes ... In the face of the suppression of the Filipinos the soul of Whitman would stand aghast." 61 H.M. Green saw Whitman as a true lover of humanity whose "beauty and depth of thought is wedded to so vile an expression." 62

"His revolt from precedent as a reason, is good; but he revolts from all precedent. He overturns artificiality; only unfortunately he overturns with it, art ... Whitman's matter is not, perhaps, so open to criticism as is his form. Still, one is often reminded of certain Sunday groups in the Domain. There is a great deal of truth in what he says, but much is merely the cawing of the eagle of

democracy - some in Australia would call it a crow. And much of what
he says is insignificant, and a great deal is hysterically overemphasised.

"In short Walt Whitman is what Kipling would call 'another good
man gone wrong'. What a pity that an enthusiasm so heartfelt and
sincere should have urged him even deeper into licence that a poet,
of all writers, must avoid if he would wish to live."63

Two articles in Stephens's Bookfellow in 1907 discuss Whitman:
the first is mainly biographical,64 the other does deal favourably
with his style. "The style of Leaves of Grass was old and new. It
had its forerunners in the Bible, in Blake, in Ossian, in the religious
books of the East, and in less important works, but in Whitman's
hands it is original and individual. He drops rime, flings poetic
diction in the dust-box of the past, avoids regular melody. Instead
of the jigging veins of riming mother-wits he gives us a free
chant, a wild but harmonious recitative, approaching at times an
intense lyric strain. There is nothing little about his poems. He
is huge free elemental. His habitual style is certainly not verse.
When he approaches regular measures and rime or assonance, he is
grotesque, like a leviathan with an eyeglass."65

And it is of course true that Whitman made a direct impact on
Australasian literature through the work of Bernard O'Dowd. O'Dowd
was a fervent Whitman admirer; A.L. McLeod notes that in his first
two years as a member of the Australian Natives Association (around

63. H.M. Green: First Impressions of Walt Whitman: pp14-16 in
Hermes July 31, 1903.
64. Wollombin: Walt Whitman I The Bookfellow 2nd series I No. 4
Jan. 24, 1907.
65. Wollombin: Walt Whitman II The Bookfellow 2nd series I No. 5
Jan. 31, 1907.
1890) he addressed every one of its Melbourne branches, usually on
Whitman. In March 1890 O'Dowd wrote to Whitman, and from then on
the two men corresponded till November 1891: O'Dowd shared Whitman's
letters with the small group of people of similar literary, political
and other interests known as The Australeum and O'Dowd acknowledged
later "The wonderful stimulus of my communion with Walt Whitman, who
redeemed me from a growing disgust with the tinkling cymbalism of so
much of what was then 'modern' verse, and implanted in me a sense
both of the real meaning of democracy, and of the revolutionary
functions and power of true poetry."

To O'Dowd Whitman embodied democracy, and was in a sense a
poetic embodiment of the political freedom from British influence that
he desired. His first book was "Dawnward" (Sydney, 1903) dedicated
to "Young Democracy": While his "The Seven Deadly Sins and other
Verses" (Melbourne, 1909) includes a poem called "True America's
Message" which ends -

"Yea, you who freed unborn Australia when
You singed King George's beard on Bunker's Hill."

The meaning which Whitman had for O'Dowd is partially expressed
in an article "Walt Whitman: his Meaning to Victorians - Democracy
v. Feudalism" published in the left wing Toosin in 189968 "Walt
Whitman is the poet of Democracy as opposed to the older poets and
most of the moderns who were and are poets of Feudalism, poets of

66. A.L. McLeod: Walt Whitman in Australia and New Zealand Sydney
1964 pl1.
67. Hugh Anderson: Bernard O'Dowd: An Annotated Bibliography,
Sydney 1963 pix.
Caste, poets of the alleged Upper Classes or what our own good Democrat, Higinbotham, called the Wealthy Lower Orders. Those who are heroes in Shakespeare and Virgil, and Dante, and Homer, and Tennyson, are very little regarded in Whitman, whereas those who are either patronised or despised in these great poets of Feudalism in its various forms, namely the serfs, the common workers of the world, the ordinary men and women of the world are the heroes and the subject matter of Whitman.  

"The institutions of England, the literature of England, the laws of England, the customs of England are, however good and wholesome they may be as compared with those of some other nations, so steeped in feudalism, so founded on feudalism, so diverted from their true natures and purposes by feudalism, that they are very dangerous for a Democratic, that is, anti-Feudal people like the Australians to adapt in wholesale fashion. And yet there can be little doubt that we have adapted somewhat blindly laws which threaten to include our Democratic growth simply because they were English, that we have planted in our soil anti-Democratic institutions of a baleful nature because we had not moral courage enough to know that we could, if we chose improve on English experience; that we have very many unwholesome customs in our daily lives, such as paltry class distinctions and the like ... and that we are so apt to be swayed by English standards of literary excellence that our own literary powers are thereby dwarfed into insignificance and our own literary progeny are starved into silence. This should not be

so. If we are to be a really great nation we must... write the poems, sing the songs, create the literature, art and music that shall voice the message of Australia, that shall unmixed with foreign false note inspire the onward, forward, Democratic 'triumphal march of Australia'... But what has all this got to do with the subject. It has this - that until we evolve in Australia the same sort of resolute defiance to played-out European standards that Whitman has shown exists in America, we can never become a great, that is, creative, original, self-reliant nation."

"He (Whitman) is a protest against the tyranny of the past and of Europe in American towns, literature, manners, and customs, and while I don't say that we must take him as an Australian Bible, I do say that our hope of democratic salvation lies in our evolving for ourselves and in ourselves an attitude of mind in Victorian matters something similar to that which inspired Whitman in his treatment of American matters."70

His belief in the literary importance of Whitman is to be found in A Few Thoughts about Walt Whitman in manuscript form in the State Library of Victoria;71 that Whitman had done more to free poetry from its false exoticism, its distance from everyday life, from "the poetic diction of the classical schools, and against the withering ancient heresy of a limited class of poetical subjects"72 than any previous poet. "I take the opportunity of saying little about which I consider
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is Whitman's significance to Australia and its literature. I need
not dwell upon the obvious analogies between our newness, and America's
newness, our racial qualities and America's; our industries and
occupations and those of America; nay, our political constitutions
and those of America; but looking broadly at Australia and at America
at our needs and its needs; at our ancestry and its ancestry; at
our environment and its environment - I am inclined to say broadly
that if our would-be poets and literary men need a guide-book to
the duties of the high calling they desire to follow, they will not
find as sound in the guide-books of Europe or Asia as they will
assuredly find in two poems by the author of *Leaves of Grass*. (*Song
of the Answerer* and "By Blue Ontario's Shore").

"Remember, however we may claim that true poetry is universal,
and needs no country-soil on it to make it poetry, that Australia also
needs some distinctively Australian poetry, in order to realise
herself. The Australian poet must absorb his country as affectionately
and as thoroughly as Walt absorbed America; he must look at it through
Australian eyes, and not through feudal or European, or even through
Universal eyes, and he must write its national spirit into being by
the force that is intensified to the requisite degree by the very
narrowness of his over-powering love. We need not all do that, of
course; for while some of us aspire to be Australian poets, others
are content with trying to be merely poets; recognizing neither
boundaries, nor races, nor nations, nor colours, nor creeds."75

Thus O'Dowd states explicitly the democratic nationalist note
which seems to have been Whitman's greatest attraction in Australia, an interest which shows signs of diminishing by the First World War.

One other American poet was given more than passing mention, and that at a time when fierce controversy surrounded his writing. When Ezra Pound's first volume of poems "Personae" reached Australia the Bulletin wrote: "It is a slim volume, but so unusual in character as to compel attention. The audacity of youth eager to be heard has broken out in strange modes of expression, with antique English words and scraps from various other languages to accentuate his difference. Only an American would address Apollo as 'Polo Phoibee, old tinpan you' in a serious poem. His lines run to all lengths and sometimes into prose. The verse does not trickle smoothly; it is jagged, abrupt, explosive. But it is concerned with life, it is very much in earnest, and there is a sense of power about it."

"Personae, in spite of its violence and its occasional absurdity contains enough good stuff to make it worth having. A second volume entitled Exultations was published towards the end of last year and shows less tortuosity than the first." 74

It is perhaps important that Pound, like Henry James, was an "exile" both physically and in that he drew much of his inspiration from Europe, especially mediaeval Provence. The Bulletin by 1920 although respecting his intellectual honesty and knowledge yet felt that he had become divorced from reality and was now "the gamin of Futurism letting off squibs in a back yard," 75 while A.G. Stephens denounced Pound, Eliot and Slessor as 'the patter of the poet-apes

and the gabble of the schools." 76

**Other Literary Forms**

American supremacy was recognised in the field of the short story, O. Henry, Ambrose Bierce and Jack London being the writers most widely admired. Much of this supremacy before 1914 was ascribed to the superiority of American magazines over British.

**Influence of the United States of America on Australian Writers.**

The influence of Whitman on Bernard O'Dowd has already been mentioned above; apart from this it appears to have been to say the least minimal. Professor Cross of Newcastle says "Very little work has been done on literary interchange between Australia and America, for the excellent reason that it was almost negligible." 77 A.G. Stephens believed that Victor Daley had been slightly influenced by Joaquin Miller. 78 Furphy is supposed to have been influenced by Oliver Wendell Holmes's "Autocrat at the Breakfast Table" in the writing of "Rigby's Romance" which was in fact an excised portion of "Such Is Life". He may have been influenced by the style but his recorded comments are that "I hate that beggar (Charles Kingsley) as I hate O.W. Holmes" 79 and "... the Autocrat of the Breakfast Table - a man I specially hate - a man who can sneer at an angular Poor
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Relation in a bombazine gown - a man who always sneers at illiteracy and helplessness and plebeian poverty - a man whom it would be no sin to shoot ..."80

A fair number of Australian writers visited the United States of America. A.G. Stephens on his first trip abroad in 1894 spent some months in the United States of America, as he did again in 1900. On the first occasion he wrote and had published "A Queenslander's Travel Notes" (Sydney 1894) which make no reference to literature or art. Louis Esson spent some time there during the First World War but found it un congenial. "I seem to be out of sympathy with the great American character ... There is plenty of energy but from my old-fashioned point of view it seems misdirected ... I think there is a better view of life in the older countries."

Miles Franklin visited the United States of America where she worked for some years as secretary-treasurer of the National Women's Trades Union League, and later as editor of the organisation's magazine "Life and Labour".82 Hugh McCrae was there in 1914, and like Esson disliked the country.83

Will Ogilvie also worked in the United States of America, first as editor of the Bulletin of the Iowa Experimental Agricultural
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College at a salary of £400 per annum; in 1905 they made him Professor of Agricultural Journalism at Iowa as well. He returned from America to Scotland in June 1906. Ogilvie liked the people and was sorry to leave, but the "dull monotony" of his job induced him to leave. He found it an excellent country for "a good deal of golf, tennis and baseball and a little horseback joy occasionally." But his first impressions were borne out "It is a wonderful country. A fellow won't write many verses here, I should say. Judging from the kind which appears in the local paper there is no time to devote to cultivating the art.

"American provincial verse seems built quick like American houses, reputations and other things.

"If I can go the pace I'll stay here for a bit. But the place does not look healthy for a dreamer."

None of these writers, however, made any use of their American experience in their work; perhaps because of the consciously "national" aims of Australian literature before the influence of Norman Lindsay became paramount, perhaps because the latest manifestations of American life — the big cities, the huge corporations, were inimical to the Australian viewpoint of what society should be, partly because

of the late emergence to prominence of American literature, especially
drama and poetry, and lastly the continuing force of the British
tradition.

Architecture

At the start of the twentieth century Australian architecture
was in a by no means flourishing state. It was, despite its early
promise in the work of Francis Greenway and other men, heavily
derivative. The nineteenth century had seen in Britain a "battle
of the styles" - not between old and new, but as to which form of
the old - Gothic or Romanesque, should be revived.

Early building in Australia had made some attempt to adapt
itself to local conditions,89 but by the late nineteenth century
Australian building also reflected this battle of the styles.90
Australian architects even when talking of the possibility of
developing an Australian architecture could write, "In England
during the period of the Georges, architecture as an art became almost
defunct. The Victorian era saw a wonderful revival of the artistic
spirit. This commenced with tentative efforts to adapt to modern
requirements one ancient style after another. The Gothic, Elizabethan,
Jacobean, Queen Anne, Romanesque, Byzantine and Renaissance followed
each other in quick succession."91
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There was, however, an accompanying nationalistic preoccupation about creating an Australian architecture. Hardy Wilson, who did much to restore appreciation of Greenway's buildings, and to introduce new ideas of oriental influences into Australian architecture, wrote sadly of his return to Sydney to find that the Equitable Building, designed by an American architect in the 1890's was generally regarded as "still the most spacious, the most massive, the most admired building in Australia, just as it was when I was a boy" although such solid four-square buildings he had found to be regarded by now as obsolete and ugly in the United States itself.

But towards the end of the nineteenth century new architectural ideas were beginning to come out of the United States of America. Not only were new structural techniques such as the use of steel frameworks to reinforce concrete pioneered thus making possible the development of the skyscraper, often still erroneously regarded as the typical American form of building; but by 1900 the reaction against Victorian eclecticism had found expression not merely in Vienna and with Charles R. Mackintosh in Glasgow but in the so-called prairie school of the United States of America, the best-known exponent of which was Frank Lloyd Wright.

Many Australian architects visited or studied in the United States of America to learn new techniques. Grace Brothers, Broadway, was erected by Walter Newman with a steel skeleton of the type he

had studied during two years spent in America. Clarence Backhouse
who specialised in building such theatres as the Tivoli, the Palace,
the Lyceum, the Criterion in Sydney, had visited the United States
and examined theatre architecture there. Other architects did
likewise, either incidentally on their way to Europe or else
specifically to study steel construction, but the proportion - less
than 5% in South Australia in 1907, about 12% in Victoria in
1908 - was still small; it was nevertheless an indication of a
willingness to accept overseas ideas other than those from Britain.

Some of these ideas were not altogether acceptable; the New
South Wales Government, alarmed by reports of people being trapped
in fires in skyscrapers, passed a Height of Buildings Act in 1912.

Nowadays, of course, the skyscraper is as familiar a feature of
any Australian city landscape as it is in the United States of America.

But the main source of American influence on Australian architecture
was through the work of Walter Burley Griffin, who was born in Mayfield,
Illinois on November 24, 1876, and who entered the Australian scene
after winning the competition to design Australia’s national capital
at Canberra in May 1912, the famous Finnish architect Eliel Saarinen
being placed second.

Robin Boyd, the most prominent and prolific of Australian
architectural commentators, wrote in 1962 that "Three national
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influences have acted on Australian architecture. One is the English tradition which was the fountainhead of nearly all building ideas through the nineteenth century. Another is the more recent influence of the United States of America, which may be subdivided into two kinds, Hollywood and serious. Thirdly there is the complicated set of indigenous influences ranging from the native materials to the psychology of isolation.  

He saw three architects as typifying these three national streams: Robert Haddon, the English, Frank Annear, the Australian and Walter Burley Griffin "radiating gentle warmth, organic theory and democratic New World idealism" the American.

When Griffin arrived in Australia in August 1913 he was accompanied by his wife, Marion Mahoney, whom he married on June 29, 1911, and who had helped him to design the prize-winning Canberra lay-out. When he returned from an overseas trip in 1914 he brought with him his sister Genevieve, and her husband Roy Lippincott, who was also an architect.

James Birrell in his recent book on Walter Burley Griffin (University of Queensland Press: Brisbane 1964) has shown that the basic principles of Griffin's architectural style were already evident in his town-planning schemes and domestic architecture before he left the United States of America, and dismisses the idea that Griffin was a mere shadow of Frank Lloyd Wright. He emphasizes Griffin's debt to Louis Sullivan, but also traces European influences, and the importance.
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of pre-Columbian Mexican architecture, in Griffin's work. I do not propose to do more than summarise Griffin's work in Australia since it has been dealt with in detail in Birrell's book.

There are three main areas of architecture in which Griffin's impact has been felt. There is first of all the question of town-planning. Canberra is, of course, the most important example. Griffin's plan was a complex radial system which would allow gradual growth in harmony with natural surroundings and would be dominated by the Federal Government buildings grouped around Capital Hill. Unfortunately although much of Griffin's plan remains, a great deal has been changed.

Birrell claims that there was hostility to Griffin even before he reached Australia: and from the moment of his landing he was met by obstruction. A Departmental Board of the Department of Home Affairs began construction early in 1913 not on Griffin's plan; they attempted to rush the construction of a railway across the bed of one of his proposed lakes, and a power house across his street pattern. This was however prevented by Joseph Cook then Prime Minister, and Griffin was invited to Australia.

But as a result of the opposition he met he abandoned his original scheme first to establish a town of about 11,000 south of the Mongolo River: this would later have been integrated with the main site plan, and would have permitted Parliament to meet in Canberra fairly early.
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Instead he decided to establish as much of the main street plan as possible. He built Commonwealth and Adelaide Avenues, part of the National Circuit, the Hexagon around the Civic Centre and part of the embankment for the western circular basin during the four years in which he was in local control of construction, although the money he was allocated was insufficient being £8,744 per annum for 3 of those 4 years. Birrell comments that the areas adjoining this work show less subsequent alterations than do other areas of Canberra.

Friction with the Department of Home Affairs became so acute that a Royal Commission was set up in June 1916 to enquire into Federal Capital Administration. The Commissioner, Wilfred Blacket, found that Griffin had persistently been obstructed by the withholding of information and assistance from the Home Affairs Department and that he had not been consulted on the erection of buildings worth £30,000 and municipal services worth £196,000, which had been established at Canberra since his arrival.

In 1919 Griffin's original agreement with the Commonwealth ran out, and in 1920 after a disagreement with Hughes, Griffin left Canberra.

During the vicissitudes which bedevilled the building of Canberra thereafter, the Federal Capital Advisory Committee set up in 1921 under
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the Chairmanship of Sir John Sulman, the National Capital Planning and Development Committee of 1939, the National Capital Development Commission of 1957, Birrell claims that planning has been hesitant and inconsistent,\textsuperscript{110} and that no solutions have been made to the greatest weaknesses of Griffin's plan; the symmetry of the Government triangle, the six-way repetition at Civic Centre and the large numbers of intersections along arterial roads. He claims that the main alterations are in fact weakening to the main concept, that the altered form of the central lakes is less elegant, the alteration of the site of the Houses of Parliament is a mistake;\textsuperscript{111} and that while Griffin provided a thoroughly satisfactory, and indeed inspired town scheme, this has been betrayed by his successors.

Apart from plans for Mossman in the United States of America, Griffin also made designs for Leeton and Griffith for the New South Wales Murrumbidgee Irrigation Authority: but of these concepts all that was erected to Griffin's plans was one water tower at Leeton.\textsuperscript{112} That the principles of town planning in Australia had not really been influenced by Griffin is all too evident from the proceedings of two Australian Town Planning Conferences held during the first World War, the first in Adelaide in 1917, the second in Brisbane in 1918.

Griffin was not present: and the main topic was not in fact town planning, but the resettlement of ex-soldiers. No reference was made to Griffin's efforts in Canberra; and the Ideal Homes
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not only for its ideas of landscape architecture but for some of the constructional innovations that Griffin made. He developed a concrete block system with a 6 inch module which required no cutting, bedding or plastering: this he patented as "Knitlock";\textsuperscript{117} as well as a new roofing tile to replace the dominant Marseilles tile, which permitted a lower pitch to the roof as well as covering a larger area, but these got a bad name because they leaked when pitched at too low an angle, and never became generally used in Australia.\textsuperscript{118}

One of the problems at Castlecrag was that Griffin was not on the spot to supervise the construction: Birrell claims that the Five Knitlock buildings in Melbourne were on the whole better executed than the Sydney ones.\textsuperscript{119} Thus Griffin was not very successful in the field of domestic building either. Robin Boyd says that he was not interested in details of construction, and was perhaps too mild to deal with tradesmen, that he relied too much on theory and thus took risks; "Thus his legacy to future generations of Australian architects included a few leaky roofs and a gallery of buildings which could have been their greatest inspiration."\textsuperscript{120}

Griffin built some eighteen non-residential buildings in Australia, of which twelve were municipal incinerators which lie outside our period. Of the others the best known are probably
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illustrated are a good deal more like ideal nightmares. 113

Domestic architecture is another field in which Griffin was an innovator in Australia. His idea of "Democratic architecture" was new to Australia and possibly unique to Griffin; while his desire for landscape architecture which would relate a building organically to its natural surroundings was also a novelty. 114

In 1921 Griffin became the managing director of a company called The Greater Sydney Development Company, backed by a group of Melbourne men including King O'Malley, in a scheme to build a new suburb at Castlecrag, Sydney. Birrell writes "by building a series of houses at Melbourne and Sydney he consolidated the foundations of modern domestic architecture in Australia." A previous lay-out of three streets in Eaglemont, Victoria had given a foretaste, but Castlecrag was to be a real example of landscape architecture with no fences or red roofs: communal activities were planned out, as were public reserves. The first buildings were constructed out of native stone, to blend with the landscape, but later a system of concrete tiling was used for economy, pitched roofs were eschewed, while courtyards or terraces were built to encourage outdoor living. 115

Only about 15 houses were designed and only about 20 built by Griffin himself in Castlecrag; banks refused to lend money on houses built to his designs, while workmen gave him shoddy materials, and ignored his specifications. 116 But the Castlecrag scheme is important
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Newman College, University of Melbourne, and the Capital Theatre, and Cafe Australia (now demolished), Melbourne. The Capitol is most significant for its superbly ornamented roof, with the everchanging pattern of light and shade and its use of rectilinear forms. These buildings are fascinating but cannot be said to have contributed to the mainstream of Australian architecture.

Griffin's career in Australia was a sad one; his project for Canberra obstructed and undermined, his reputation in domestic practice destroyed by faulty construction, his public commissions few and far between. Birrell probably whitewashes Griffin too much - letters in O'Malley's correspondence indicate that Griffin could be unco-operative, and that he was very vague on such things as costing, but as Robin Boyd summed up his importance to Australian architecture, in a recent television programme, it lay not so much in the buildings he created, or even in his technical innovations, but rather in a spirit of excitement and experiment, of new ideas, which only now are slowly coming to be appreciated in Australia.

It is clear that in the sense of making an impact in the creative arts, American influence was in fact slight. Even in architecture Walter Burley Griffin left no successors to carry on his work, only some revolutionary ideas which are only gradually coming to be recognised in contemporary architecture. Except in the case of O'Dowd, British and indigenous influences were much more
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powerful in the development of Australian writers than were American influences.

On the other hand in the "entertainment" section of the more passive side of culture reception rather than artistic creativity, United States influence played a growing and extremely important part. In theatre the quantity of American plays and actors rivalled that from the United Kingdom, and both flourished at the expense of indigenous drama and actors - a state of affairs caused largely by the deliberate policy of the commercial managements of importing overseas successes. In the field of printed matter an increasing a mount of American official and University publications is evident, while American popular fiction rivalled that from Britain between about 1904 and 1914. As for the cinema, by the end of the Great War American products not only rivalled but far surpassed British competition, and dominated the field.

Thus in the media most suitable for the widespread dissemination of popular images in this period the cinema, the theatre and popular fiction American material was rivalling British, adding a third important strain to the British and native Australian influences previously predominant on the Australian scene. The Australian public could not have avoided becoming increasingly aware of American life and society in this period; it also seems reasonable to suppose that from about 1906 on they were increasingly interested in the presentation of life in America, or they would not have continued to go to American plays and films or to read American books. The image presented of
the United States of America appears on the whole to have been
unfavourable, especially on stage and screen, being concerned largely
with the abuses to be found in American society so that Australians
were given a very jaundiced view of American dishonesty and wickedness
in politics, business, justice and the like.

Finally it is worth emphasising the central role played by
Americans, J.C. Williamson, Hugh Ward and J.O. Williams in the
organisation of the management of the entertainment industries of
theatre and cinema, a role which echoes what has been indicated
above, that the United States was more important to Australia in
the field of organisation and publicity than in that of creative
activity.
CHAPTER 7

SOCIAL REFORM
SOCIAL REFORM

This is an enormous, and, so far, inadequately investigated field of Australian history, covering as it does such diverse topics as social security monetary benefits, environmental reforms in public health, the education and protection of both the fit and the handicapped members of society, economic conditions affecting employment, temperance and social purity movements, women's rights, the history of medicine, dentistry, hospitals and charities, penal reform and the like.

The literature on the subject is scattered, for while considerable attention has been paid to certain aspects of socio-economic legislation such as old age pensions or compulsory arbitration, little attention has been paid to non-governmental bodies, or to the influence of groups outside the Labor party. This is true even of the latest and most comprehensive volume on social welfare in Australia.1 Another example of fragmentation is the fact that although several histories of individual hospitals have been written, no survey exists of the hospital system of Australia as a whole, and only one of these works integrates its study of the hospital with the Australian social framework.2 No comprehensive study exists of the role of charitable societies in Australian life, or of the development of social work in Australia before 1930.3 Despite the considerable literature on

the development of education in Australia, virtually nothing exists on the treatment of the mentally or physically handicapped.

It became clear from research for this thesis that a certain amount of reassessment is necessary of the role played by private individuals in social reform in Australia. This is contrary to the view that "It is a peculiarity of Australian life that issues which elsewhere are only incidentally, or in the last resort, the concern of the legislature, tend to be treated politically from the beginning. There have been few social reformers ... but the views and attitudes of political leaders and political parties take the place of non-political reforming activity and social reform and social experimentation have never been confined to one party; though the rise of the Labor party in the nineties and its attitudes have probably set the tone for much of the period." 4 Certain important reforms were urged by individuals and groups, especially in the period before 1914, in the face of the indifference of the legislatures.

The establishment of Children's Courts in New South Wales in 1905 owed much to the persistent efforts of Sir Arthur Renwick, President of the State Children's Relief Board, and to his successor Sir Charles Mackellar. An abortive Bill introduced in 1901 by B.R. Wise, which would have provided among other things for Children's Courts, had been allowed to lapse by the New South Wales Parliament through lack of interest. This reform also owed much to Frederick

William Neitenstein, Comptroller-General of New South Wales prisons from 1896, a man who also carried out a considerable number of administrative reforms in the penal system such as the classification of prisons and prisoners, and who attempted to reform rather than punish the criminals. This type of matter was within his powers as an administrator. Many of the other progressive reforms he advocated, such as measures designed to keep the drunk, insane or diseased out of gaol, and to treat them in specially-designed curative institutions, were dependent upon legislative action and were not carried out till very much later; some of them indeed still await implementation.

An immense amount of "social work" was also done by men such as George Ardill, who ran the Sydney Rescue Work Society, which covered matters ranging from the welfare of mothers and babies to the institution of a labour exchange. It was private action, backed by the National Council of Women of Victoria which set up the first settlement there for epileptics. Other highly desirable reforms had to wait for years, despite recommendations from professional administrators, because of the disinterest of the legislature. The Inspector-General of Mental Hospitals in New South Wales pointed out wearily in 1926 that reform of the existing legislation relating to the insane, which had been passed in 1898, had been recommended for years and was long
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overdue, as was provision for a Mental Defectives Act.  

In Victoria the legislative proposals for reorganisation of hospitals and charities remained in abeyance between Sir George Turner's unsuccessful attempt to pass a Hospitals and Charities Act in 1897, and 1922, despite pressure from bodies such as the Melbourne Charity Organisation Society, and even from some of the hospitals for reformation and rationalisation. 

To reconstruct the social framework and the motives and pressures behind reform is not the purpose of this thesis, and space and time do not permit one to undertake such a study. All that can be said is that traditional views of this framework are only part of the story and must be treated with caution. Since the full story of Australian social history still remains to be told, it is probably difficult to assess definitively the relative importance of British, native Australian, and United States influences on social reform or on the social structure.

Yet from the research for this chapter it would appear that the United States influence must be regarded as peripheral in that it is almost always confined to detail, not principle, and the detail is usually one which simply carries out efficiently an idea or principle already in the minds of Australians.

For example the main Australian Christian faiths have been imported from Europe, and the adherents of the Roman Catholic, Anglican, Presbyterian and Methodist Churches have looked to their European roots, and not across the Pacific to the United States. Only the minor fringe movements, such as the Church of Jesus Christ of the Latter-Day Saints (the Mormons), the Spiritualists, the Christian Scientists, never strong numerically, and without any fundamental influence on the social fabric, have originated in the United States.

The same point applies to the question of drink. The temperance movement was one of the two main lines of attack on the problem of drink in the nineteenth century; the other being the rarer approach which attempted to rehabilitate alcoholics medically and socially. Those who attacked the problem from the latter point of view in Australia were few, but they did exist. Some social workers refused to blame all social evils on drink while there were bad economic conditions, low moral ideals and poor systems of education which could also be held accountable. Recognition of alcoholism as a disease was confined to a very tiny section of the population. Government attempts to do anything about the problem were sporadic and ineffectual. Embryonic Victorian inebriate retreats were closed

down after the commercial crash of the early 1890's. The New South Wales Government, partly due to the urging of its Comptroller-General of Prisons, Frederick Neitenstein, passed an Inebriates Act in 1900, which provided, among other measures, for the establishment of special houses for alcoholics to which they could either be admitted voluntarily or committed by a close relative. Although two islands in the Hawkesbury were bought for this purpose, no further action was taken.

In 1906 the Central Methodist Mission in Sydney ran the only inebriates' home licensed under the 1900 Act; this home used an American method of treatment, Laurence Keely's system of injections of bi-chloride of gold together with sodium. Other American firms advertised similar treatments in Australia, some even offering cures by post.

But the impulse which desired to treat inebriates came from within Australia, even if some of the details of treatment came from the United States. It had sprung up throughout the English-speaking world in the nineteenth century, an almost evangelical approach which saw drink as the mainspring of all social evils.

On the other approach to drink, that of reform by prohibition,

the temperance movement in Australia never achieved the success in Australia which it did in the United States by the Eighteenth Amendment of 1919. Naturally enough this achievement of prohibition inspired the Australian temperance workers.\textsuperscript{16} Attempts to achieve prohibition in Australia proved unsuccessful, a referendum in New South Wales being defeated by a two to one majority in 1928, and by almost the same proportion of voters in Western Australia in 1925.

But the roots of the temperance movement in Australia were not American. The first temperance societies founded in Australia in the 1830's and 1840's were set up by British immigrants on British lines\textsuperscript{17} although the temperance movement had begun in the United States and one of its British leaders in Australia, the Reverend M.T. Adam, had been in the United States before coming to Australia.\textsuperscript{18}

Not until the 1860's did American influence begin to be felt in this field. In 1882 Mr. T. Allen of Echuca set up a branch of the American Blue Ribbon Movement upon his return from a visit to the United States. In 1883-4, Mrs. Mary Clement Leavitt, the first World Missionary of the Women's Christian Temperance Union (W.C.T.U.), formed in Cleveland in 1875, arrived in Australia. The first branch of the W.C.T.U. was formed in New South Wales by an American, Mr. E. Johnston.\textsuperscript{19}


\textsuperscript{18} M. Roe : op. cit. p167.

\textsuperscript{19} Australasian W.C.T.U. Minutes of the Second Triennial Convention Sydney, Mar. 29 - Apr. 6, 1894, Brisbane 1894, p65.
Mrs. Leavitt, however, set up the first branches in Victoria in 1884, in Queensland in 1885 and in South Australia in 1886.

These two movements were not only set up by but constantly encouraged by, American visitors. Mary Love from Virginia, arriving in Australia in 1886, became the President of the Victorian W.C.T.U. Jessie Ackermann, author as well as temperance reformer, arrived in Australia in 1889 and remained in the South West Pacific area until 1897.

The methods used by the W.C.T.U. in Australia were directly modelled on those in the United States, the wearing of white ribbons, the marshalling of children, petitions and deputations to ministers, the canvassing in elections for candidates favourable to temperance reforms, the pressure for temperance teaching in schools.

Yet the backbone of the Temperance movement still remained the Alliance in New South Wales and the movement was never dominated by American methods or ideals. American influence was strong in this field, yet it was once again a question of organisation rather than principle.

It remains to ask why this should be so. It is obvious that the social structure in Australia differs from that both of the United States and of Great Britain. It is not proposed here to discuss that

21. Ibid p68.
22. Ibid p70.
much debated and thoroughly elusive concept of class, but rather the
development in the early twentieth century of ideas about social
reform and social services.

Even in this field the British foundation is, in a sense, all-important;
this time as something to be avoided rather than to be copied. It is
possible to trace back basic Australian attitudes to social reform
to a revulsion against the British Poor Law of 1832, and a consequent
dislike of Governmental intervention in the social, as opposed to
the economic field. Thus voluntary charitable relief largely took the
place of Governmental intervention. Special circumstances, such as
the responsibility felt in South Australia for colonists brought out
under the Wakefield scheme could lead to the assumption of Governmental
responsibility in the form of the South Australian Destitute Board, and
the provision of indoor relief in institutions. Mostly, however, such
responsibility was avoided although, paradoxically enough, Australian
governments have almost always provided for the care of the mentally,
as opposed to physically, sick.27

The drive for social reform has also varied greatly in intensity.

Before Federation in 1901 Australia was regarded as "the social

27. There appears to be no serious challenge to this view of the
colonists' revulsion from the Poor Law: the main authorities on
social welfare support it. See T.H. Kowley: Social Security in
Australia, Sydney, 1965 pp7-3, 19-20; R.S. Mendelsohn: Social
Services, pp126-166 in R.N. Spann (ed.) Public Administration in
Australia, Sydney 1962, p129. In reply to a question from the
United Kingdom Royal Commission on the Poor Laws, no Australian
State accepted that there was a right on the part of the destitute
to claim public relief, though South Australia recognised a duty
to its destitute: United Kingdom Royal Commission on Poor Laws and
Relief of Distress, Appendix to Vol. XXXIII; Foreign and Colonial
Systems of Poor Relief, Cd. 5441, London, 1910, p351. This right
to relief was inherent in the provisions of the English Poor Law
of 1834, though it was. For the Australian dislike of the
English Poor Law see e.g. T.A. Coelan Labour and Industry in
Australia, 4 vols., London 1918, Vol. 1 p7-42.
laboratory of the world." Nowadays, however, Australia, together
with the United States, could be regarded as one of the most backward
of the "developed" nations in the matter of the provision of social
welfare at governmental level.

Most writers on the subject see social reform as falling into
certain distinct periods. Before 1900 social legislation was mainly
concerned with environmental reforms governing conditions of work,
education, or public health; but sufficient debate had gone on to
persuade the framers of the Australian Constitution to include, albeit
reluctantly, powers to deal with old age and invalid pensions, and
conciliation and arbitration among these powers granted to the Federal
Government.

Between 1900 and 1914 the Commonwealth Government entered the
field, providing for cash benefits in the form of Old Age (1908) and
Invalid (1910) Pensions and maternity bonuses. These were direct
monetary payments to the recipients, made possible by the ear-marking
of surplus revenue which had previously been returned to the individual
States. This form of cash benefit is in fact the only type possible
for the central power in a federation where the residual power over
social conditions is retained by the States, as in observable also in
the United States. The individual States were also busily occupied

Projects in Australia: a case study p145-174 in Nicholas
29. B.U. Ratchford op. cit.; R.S. Mendelsohn: Social Services pp
126-156 in R.N. Spann (ed.): op. cit.; A.H. Birch: Federalism:
Finance and Social Security in Canada, Australia and the United
Australia, Sydney, 1965.
during this period with various social reforms in the field of education, child welfare, penal reform and public health.

From 1914 till 1939 the progress of social reform at governmental level, apart from repatriation legislation, slowed practically to a halt. New South Wales introduced widows' pensions, and Queensland, under a Labor government, began a scheme of unemployment insurance, but the Federal government did very little. After 1939 until the early 1950's there was yet another busy period of reform whose impetus would seem by now to be spent.

One thing which is obvious from these divisions is, that as one might expect, they correspond closely to periods of Labor Federal ascendancy, ending during the First World War when the Labor party split over conscription, and recommencing with the renewed period of Labor Federal government in the 1940's. 31

It must, however, be emphasised that the Labor party in Australia has differed from European, or even British, Socialism in its more pragmatic approach to problems of politics. It is in fact dubious whether it has ever been deserving of the title "socialist". It has this in common with Labor movements in the United States, that it developed in circumstances where the fight for universal education

31. After a brief and ineffectual period in office in 1904, the Australian Labor Party supported Deakin's Government from 1905 to 1908, receiving certain desired legislation in return. In 1908-9 the Australian Labor Party was the Government and after the defeat of the Fusion Party which held office briefly they returned to office in 1910 with a substantial majority and remained in power until the 1916 split on conscription. In 1929-31 Labor again held office, but were virtually powerless because of the economic depression and yet another split. In 1941 they were again returned to power and remained in office until 1949 since which date they have again been in opposition.
and political democracy had already been more or less won by the radicals before economic circumstances caused the emergence of a Labor movement. It has thus lacked the intellectual rationale of European socialism which has linked political democracy with economic justice. Intellectuals have always been suspect in the Australian Labor movement, in contrast with the British Labor party where not only did the Fabians exert a powerful influence on its formation, but the radical intellectual group is still prominent in the fight for complete social justice, often to the discomfort of the more conservative trades union element.

Thus, lacking a coherent theoretical framework, the Labor party's reform programme in Australia has betrayed some inconsistencies. Although interested in promoting the educational system, the Labor party before 1914 manifested little interest in the problems of the child delinquent, although logically the two are closely connected. Mendelsohn suggests that this type of dichotomous thinking may be in part due, paradoxically enough, to Australian egalitarianism; that the principle of "fair go" has hindered forms of organisation which, by helping the weak, might interfere with free enterprise. There was also perhaps a feeling, a variant on the Victorian belief that poverty was the result of idleness.

or dissipation, that there was no reason for poverty to exist in the
new progressive Australian community.  

... This Mendelssohn sees as partially
responsible for Labor's acceptance of the basing of Old Age Pensions on
a means test, rather than either making them universal; or tying them
to a system of contributory insurance as was done in Britain in 1911.

Thus a certain amount of the enthusiastic if fragmentary character
of reform in Australia between 1900 and 1914 can be traced to the
character and political fortunes of the Labor party. Yet in view of
Labor's lack of interest in some of the reforms which were passed in
this period in the fields of education, child welfare and penal reform
it might be safer to conclude that it was due rather to a political
climate favourable to social reform. This would imply that the
combination of survivors of the nineteenth century breed of non-Labor
radicals and of the Labor party, together with the fluid party structure
up till about 1908-9 meant that many reforms were not party issues,
and were thus easier to carry.

Attempts have also been made to apply Frederick Jackson Turner's
frontier theory to explain the pattern of development of social
services in Australia. The first attempt to explain Australian differences
from Britain in terms of the frontier was made by Francis Adams in 1895,

35. See e.g. Commonwealth Year-Book I, 1901-7, p774.
36. R.S. Mendelssohn op. cit. (note 29) p129.
before Turner had even enunciated his theory. 37

In 1928 Carter Goodrich, an American visitor to Australia pointed out the difference between the American and Australian frontiers:
"Certainly the United States owes its individualism largely to its small man's frontier; I think it is not fanciful to suggest that Australia owes much of its collectivism to the fact that its frontier was hospitable to the large man instead." 38

This distinction has been accepted by Russel Ward, 39 A.H. Birch 40 and H.C. Allen 41: that the type of static frontier which developed in Australia due to the arid nature of the central region favoured the development of large-scale stations, not small farms; that as a corollary of this the vast tribe of nomadic bush-workers were employees, not independent farmers and that this in turn developed a collective egalitarianism in action together with a dislike of established authority.

Ward in fact tends to see everything distinctively Australian as emanating from the bush-workers 42 a point of view which has more recently come under fire. 43 Kewley on the other hand at one stage

42. H.C. Allen: Bush and Backwoods, Michigan, 1959, ppl11.
44. see e.g. Max Harris: Manners and Morals pp47-77 in Peter Coleman (ed.): Australian Civilization a Symposium, Melbourne, 1962, pp56-9. Harris, however still sees the frontier as the origin of egalitarianism but denies that this was confined to those of working-class origin.
attempted to apply Jackson’s theory, virtually unmodified, by stating that, “The expanding frontier made a Poor Law, such as that which developed in Great Britain, either unnecessary or inapplicable”\textsuperscript{44}, thus appearing to accept the most dubious part of Turner’s frontier thesis, namely that the frontier, by acting as an economic safety valve, removed both the need and the demand for social reform.

It is natural enough that attempts should be made to apply such a fascinating theory, and one so central to the development of American historical thinking, to Australian conditions, which offer certain basic similarities to those in the United States.

In both cases a settlement, primarily of British stock, has spread across a continent, making of itself a nation by slow and painful degrees. In both cases the main enemy has been not human but inanimate, in the form of natural hazards and difficulties. In both cases it is tempting to explain the transformation of British ideals and attitudes solely by reference to the frontier.

Yet whatever the significance of the frontier to Australia, it is obvious that because of differences in geography and economic structure it is not the same phenomenon as in the United States, nor have its results been altogether comparable. A source of the Australian legend, a myth, and a symbol, it is by no means the sole basis of the social

structure. Nor is it, for our purposes here, a satisfactory explanation for the pattern of social reform in Australia, since it offers no explanation of the fluctuations in intensity of reform.

Other theories have been propounded. Bland sees the development of social welfare in Australia as being due to the differing roles played by local government in Great Britain, Australia and the United States. 45

Another factor which is often overlooked is the effect of the constitution on the development of social reform. Many of the reforms carried out between 1900 and 1914 by the Federal Government were specifically provided for in the Constitution, such as Old Age pensions or Conciliation and Arbitration. Much of the New Protection legislation of 1906 to 1908 which could have foreshadowed extensive social and economic change was later declared to be invalid by the High Court. Two referenda in 1911 and 1913 failed to extend the powers of the Commonwealth over economic and social matters. Thus there has been a perpetual division of powers on matters of social concern between the Federal and State governments. The growing wealth of the Commonwealth Government and the relative poverty of the States has naturally tended to make the latter reluctant to innovate costly social schemes, while the Federal Government has lacked the power to carry them out.

The motive forces behind the reforming era of 1900 to 1914 in

Australia were thus diverse and complex. As indicated above, the rejection of the British Poor Law by the colonists meant that no Australian Government fully accepted the right of the destitute to relief from public funds. This was a rejection of the British tradition on which Australia was built, and meant that Governmental intervention in the field of social security was reluctant and piecemeal, not part of an over-all view of the duties or responsibilities of society towards its less fortunate members. Yet the constitutional and party structures of the early years of Federation facilitated the implementation of certain types of social reform.

In the fields of child welfare, education and hospital structure, dealt with in greater detail below, the British tradition was explicitly repudiated as inappropriate for Australian circumstances, and a deliberate attempt was made to create something distinctively Australian. In this attempt, examples were frequently sought from overseas, particularly from the United States. This was because it was felt that the basic tenets of the United States, of freedom and equality of opportunity, were more in keeping with the Australians' image of their own society, than was the structure of older and less democratic countries such as Germany, however efficient the latter might be. This is not, however, the same thing as ideological imitation, but the recognition of ideological similarities, which meant that it was only logical to adopt similar means to achieve a similar end. This applies to such fields as the treatment of inebriates, or to dealings with the child delinquent,
or to modifications of the educational system.

Most of the changes detailed in this chapter were an attempt to create something distinctively Australian. What was Australian and how it differed from that which was British or American is an almost impossibly complex problem. It appears to be, and to have been in the period of this study, a complicated amalgam of British tradition, and of native influences of climate, geography and social structure. Few would deny that there is an Australian character, which differs from both the British and the American. Equally few would care to be dogmatic as to the origins or definition of that character. Many factors obviously have played a part in its formation; the influence of frontier living upon British traditions, the large proportion of Scots and Irish to be found in Australia, the British class background of Australia's settlers, the Governmental history of the penal colonies have all contributed.

In none of these factors has America had any direct influence upon Australia; even the "egalitarian" ethic of Australia is admittedly different in type from that of the United States, collective not individualistic. To sum up the preceding section, there are certain resemblances between the development and social structure of the United States and Australia but these are resemblances and not direct influences.

Although the United States might offer certain concrete examples of how things might best be done, it had very little ideological
influence at that period. This statement must be modified in that considerable interest was shown in the American educational structure on ideological, democratic grounds, not by politicians but by professional educators and university men.

It is, however, interesting to see the type of change which was imported in certain main fields of social development can be traced. For reasons of space and coherence some fields such as religion, women's rights or temperance are not dealt with except in passing.

**Education**

It is not proposed to deal in detail with developments and changes in the educational system of the Australian States, since education is the field of social history which has been most thoroughly covered by various secondary studies. This section will deal primarily with the system of New South Wales, largely because of the important influence which the New South Wales educational structure had on the other States. 46

The first decade of the twentieth century saw a considerable shift in educational philosophy. Greenwood puts it thus: "Education felt the stimulus of the burst of national energy which was sustained until 1913. The policies of the separate states reflected the drive for

equality of opportunity, expressed the prevailing spirit of experiment and sought to adapt existing systems to the needs of a maturer and more complex society." 47

Yet as Hartley Grattan points out "education (was) to a peculiar degree the concern of the schoolmen, not the parents, least of all the general public." 48 This was also recognised by contemporary observers. "The worst symptom of the educational position in Australia some years ago was the almost entire absence of discussion. There was no free play of ideas. Methods were left to routine. Standards and ideals of education were not determined in a rational way. And the result was stagnation with the Department of Public Instruction and ignorant complacency on the part of the public" 49 wrote Francis Anderson.

Walter Murdoch commented around 1913, "My point for the moment is that neither Mr. Tate nor anyone else, however capable, will ever do very much toward the solution of our educational problem so long as the present general apathy and indifference last ... The public at present takes little or no heed of what the handful of men who 'run' our educational system may do or leave undone." 50 Peter Board himself later wrote that it was the supply of secondary education which created the demand, not vice versa. 51 a point of view also taken by Royal

47. G. Greenwood op. cit. p249.
Commissioners on Education in both Victoria and New South Wales. 52

A perusal of the Press and Parliamentary Debates of this period confirms this impression. Educational ideals, principles and influences were not discussed. 53 Even within the ranks of the teachers, the official journal of the New South Wales Department of Public Instruction concerned itself largely with practical matters such as salaries or conditions. 54

The position of education in Australia in 1900 was, briefly, as follows. The State system was free, compulsory, 55 and secular. In all states there was also a separate independent system of Roman Catholic schools, as well as a handful of other private schools. The age for compulsory schooling varied from six or seven years to twelve to fourteen years. Between 1891 and 1900 the figures for enrolment and attendance respectively at State schools had fallen from 635,478 and 450,246 in 1891 to 609,592 and 442,440 in 1900. Those at private schools had risen correspondingly. Of the fairly large annual outlay on education, varying from £656,957 in Victoria to £37,710 in Tasmania.

53. See for example the debate on the Bursary Endowment Bill of 1912 in New South Wales, where what was really discussed was not the important principle contained in the Bill, which attempted to tie the University and school systems together, but the question of State aid to religious institutions, N.S.W. H. Ass. Mar. 12, 1912 pp3838 et seq.
55. N.S.W. and Tasmania charged a small fee.
56. The degree of compulsion varied, and minimum requirements for attendance were generally low.
(or from £5.7.8 per head in Western Australia to £2.12.11 in Tasmania) only a fraction was spent on education other than primary. The University in New South Wales for example got £10,000 a year, and technical education £30,000. State secondary education barely existed: there were six State High Schools in Australia, five being in New South Wales and one in South Australia. In Queensland the Government subsidised ten independent grammar schools while in the other states there was no state secondary education. 57

Not only was there, in the much-used metaphor of the period, a rung missing from the educational ladder, but the vital training of teachers was carried out by the antiquated and deadening pupil-teacher system. The Universities, meanwhile, stood completely outside the State educational systems. There were in 1900 four Australian Universities, Sydney (founded 1851), Melbourne (1853), Adelaide (1874) and Tasmania (1889). They were all independent although State aided, 58 and unlike the first universities of the United States of America they were secular, not religious foundations. 59 In 1906 the number of matriculated students at Sydney was 836, at Melbourne 620, at Adelaide 409; in other words a minute fraction of the population, made smaller by the Universities' continued insistence on Latin as a matriculation requirement. Extension

58. In 1906 Sydney and Adelaide got a little over a quarter of their revenue in Government grants, Melbourne about half, and Tasmania four-fifths.
work was carried out by all four Universities, but the number of courses was small, and declining. As for technical education, despite the existence of schools of mines in Victoria, South Australia, Western Australia and Tasmania, and of a Technical College and Museum in Sydney "The total provision made would imply that this branch of education has not been regarded as of great importance." 60

Education in Australia was, in other words, on much the same lines as that in Great Britain, free compulsory and secular, yet with the weaknesses of concentration purely on elementary education: the main differences were in the centralised system in Australia, as opposed to the fragmented local authority system in the United Kingdom, and in the absence in Australia of the strongly entrenched British Public School or even the old endowed merchant grammar schools.

Reform and Extension of State Education

Austin writes that in 1900 all the States had failed to fulfil the promise of the 1880's and had attempted to hide their shortcomings by misrepresentation." ... at the moment when the Australian colonies were accepting the responsibilities of federation and nationhood, they had clearly failed to educate their citizens for the national status they were assuming." 61 Yet the Sydney Morning Herald could state

categorically in 1901 "The New South Wales system is one of the best in the world. For all that is known to the contrary, it is the best," a happy belief resting entirely upon ignorance and complacency, and not long tenable in view of the reports soon after produced in both Victoria and New South Wales on the subject of education. In 1899 a Royal Commission on Technical Education was appointed in Victoria, thanks largely to Alfred Deakin. It followed the traditional pattern of visiting the other Eastern States of Australia, and consulting written material upon European and American educational systems.

The Final Report paid scant attention to the educational system of the United States, and expressed the view that France led in primary education while Germany was pre-eminent in the fields of secondary and technical education.

The next Royal Commission on Education was that appointed in New South Wales in 1902, when Messrs. Knibbs and Turner were appointed to inquire into various aspects of education, primary, secondary and technical in Europe and America. It was in itself a departure from precedent that Commissioners should be sent overseas, but it was felt necessary to obtain more first-hand information than was available in Australia.

The two men appointed were extremely unlike one another, and one of them, Turner, was a solid, unimaginative product of the New South

Wales system, yet they both returned utterly convinced of the urgent need for reform in their State's education, and fervent advocates of the New Education, a movement based on the teachings of various educationists from Froebel and Herbart in Germany to Dewey in America.66

After a little over ten months spent overseas the Commissioners presented four reports, each of enormous size, criticising the inadequacies of education in New South Wales in comparison to the systems in Europe and America. Their main attack was on the pupil-teacher system, and on the rigidity of the syllabus, but some more fundamental statements were also made. "In the initiation of our present educational system," said Knibbs, "certain educational traditions derived from the United Kingdom, which even then did not represent the best knowledge on this subject and which are now wholly outgrown, dominated the fundamental conceptions of its initiators."67 In other words the British system of education was no longer satisfactory and must be rejected: in favour of what?

The Report on Primary Education attempted to take the best from many of the huge number of countries visited, from England, Scotland, France, Germany, Italy, Russia, Austria, the United States and others. Only a few minor aspects of American schools were recommended, such as co-education,68 an enthusiasm not shared by the mass of teachers in

68. ibid p91-2.
New South Wales; or rural schools, in this case approved of and instituted in New South Wales in 1904.

The British model for secondary education also was rejected by the Commissioners on the grounds that it was completely unsystematic, although the Scottish system was recognised as being much better than the English. "It will be unfortunate for the future of our State," they wrote, "if the drift along the lines of English Secondary Education be allowed to continue ... The whole difficulty of perfecting secondary education lies in the fact that it has developed in New South Wales without definite organisation and has merely reproduced the types to be found in the United Kingdom. The absence of organisation and the existing types of secondary education in the mother country are unsatisfactory."

Of United States secondary education they wrote, "Nationally, however, the organisation of education is imperfect and the American education scheme is less complete, both as regards co-ordination of education and the professional training of teachers than the organisation, say, of Germany."

To accusations that they advocated a German scheme of education, however, the Commissioners replied that they had simply tried to take the best from all available systems. This claim, from the vast evidence of the Reports would appear substantially true, but the fact

69. *Aus. J. Educ.* June 1, 1904, p7
73. *ibid* p54.
74. *ibid* p34.
remained that if the British model was rejected something must be put in its place.

German education was widely felt to be the most efficient and thorough, 76 and even if the attempt was to be made to set up a distinctly Australian system of education, 77 it was felt among those who had experience of overseas education that something might also be learnt from the United States in certain fields of education other than primary.

Turner recognised the superiority of the United States in technical education, pointing out "The country which in its social condition bears the nearest resemblance to that of our own is America," 78 even if Knibbs thought "The German methods of higher technical education seem to fall short of an ideal scheme by but a small distance." 79 Turner enlarged on this, commenting on the value of overseas visits for teachers, 80 and recommending visits to the United States of America not merely because it was nearer at hand than Europe but because "in that country ... they would find systems and methods of teaching based on the best ideas of the Old World modified and adapted to the conditions of the New World" 81 while he saw America as the best example for manual training in schools. 82

79. ibid a) p1610.
80. ibid p211.
81. ibid p211.
82. ibid p217.
and, unlike some other observers commented on the excellence of American secondary schools.

Opposition to reform in New South Wales came partly from entrenched conservative elements within the Education Department - this was quickly overcome\(^{84}\) - and partly from representatives of the private schools, who were fearful of attacks upon their position. Their chief spokesman was the Reverend C.J. Prescott, headmaster of Newington College; and his opposition to reform is less convincing than it might have been when one finds him arguing that teachers' salaries would be reduced if education above the primary level became free,\(^{85}\) declaring that there must be something radically wrong with American education since boys were extensively taught by women teachers\(^{86}\) and going so far as to question the accuracy of the information contained in Knibbs' and Turner's Reports because it differed from that in an out-of-date book which he possessed.\(^{87}\)

Reform was however necessary and inevitable. In New South Wales it was accompanied by the unexpected appointment in February 1905 of Peter Board\(^{86}\) and in 1902 in Victoria of Frank Tate. Board was to prove a radical innovator; his biographers consider the turning point in his educational philosophy to be his trip to Europe in 1903. They see him as strongly influenced by the new education and more particularly by an American, Francis W. Parker.\(^{89}\)

85. S.M.H. June 25, 1906: address to Teachers' Association of New South Wales (The Teachers' Association was formed in the 1890's and was composed largely of staff from the private schools or University).
89. ibid pp46-9.
He was affected by the new philosophy of education which saw education in the context of increasing trade and colonial competition as a national asset, if not a national necessity. "If it is admitted that educated citizens are among the greatest assets of the State: that the history of the last half-century has clearly shown that national progress and prosperity are intimately related to wide facilities for higher education, there can be no doubt that it is the duty of the State to concern itself with the matter." "

The old cry of education being necessary to remove the ignorance of voters in a democratic society was seldom heard any more. Most educators would have endorsed Turner's comment "What the Commissioner saw in his recent travels through many countries has opened his eyes to the criminal fallacy which has so long been a British delusion, viz. that the Government of a country should stand aloof from industrial development ... The highest politics of a country are those connected with industrial development ..." Percival Cole, a product of both English and American educational systems, and Vice-Principal of Sydney Teachers' College under Alexander Mackie, writing much later saw the


Others saw the spread of education as an antidote to the degradation inherent in urbanisation.
basic difference between English and American systems of education as the contrast between a non-utilitarian system of culture and one in which culture and everyday life were expected to interact upon one another. The British system in his view implied the existence of a large leisured class and an education open only to the wealthy, this meant the existence in Britain, as on the Continent of Europe, of a dual school system, the public schools for the future leaders, and the State schools for the future led, a state of affairs which did not exist in the United States and certain of the British dominions. This type of analysis goes some way to explain why Australians, with ideas of national utilitarianism and democracy in education could not continue to accept the British model.

Peter Board in 1909 stated plainly the principle of utility in education. "Not the mere minimum education for a rudimentary citizenship but the preparation of the youth of the nation for the most efficient participation in productive industry is now being recognised as determining the range of the State's responsibility. In several States of America and Germany this has already led to the extension of the compulsory age from 14 to 16 years." while Frank Tate in 1906 expressed the humanitarian concept of education when

95. ibid pp293 & 296: an accusation sometimes levelled at Australia's private schools.
96. ibid p299.
97. Peter Board: Presidential Address to Section J (Education), pp703-712 in Australasian Association for the Advancement of Science: Vol. XII Brisbane 1909, published Brisbane 1910, p705.
commenting on the upsurge of interest in education he said "...education is concerned with the development of all the resources of the self so that an ideal education results in complete self-realisation." 98

These two principles, the utilitarian, and the humanitarian, were the main forces behind educational, as well as other forms of social, reform.

The first interstate Conference of Directors of Education in 1906 held at Peter Board's instigation accepted the need for a wider development of higher education, 99 and the following year two more of the Australian Directors of Education travelled through Europe and America while on a visit to the Federal Conference of Education in London. Frank Tate of Victoria and Alfred Williams of South Australia travelled together on this trip. 100 They returned convinced of the necessity of State secondary education 101 and also rejecting the British model. Frank Tate wrote "On the whole popular education in England was undertaken grudgingly and distrustfully. It was unlikely, therefore, that a people who took up the business of public education in this spirit would make much of a success of it and so it proved for the next thirty years. The idea that popular education by the State partakes of the nature of charity persisted long in England and does so in Victoria to some

101. ibid pp3, 8, 9.
extent."

Steps towards free secondary education were taken in 1910 in Victoria and Queensland, and in 1911 in New South Wales; Prescott saw this as an American innovation to be deplored. Board himself claimed that "what we had to do here was not to establish a British or American type of school but an Australian type fitted to bring out or teach all that was best for the development of Australian national life", and for this a State system of secondary education was necessary.

Some did, however, see considerable good in the American educational system. At least two New South Wales inspectors took Turner's advice as to visiting the United States on leave, a practice which, with the institution of long service leave and of better steamship services to the United States was becoming increasingly common among public servants. Inspector Noble, who only just missed the San Francisco Earthquake of 1906, was impressed by the success of co-education and by the high standard of school buildings and equipment. Inspector Joseph Finney thought that the American system of secondary education was more suited to Australia than was the German, commenting, "Their curricula are a compromise between the Puritan demands and utilitarian

needs. So I take it, must ours be.\textsuperscript{106}

H.C.L. Anderson, Public Librarian of New South Wales and a member of Sydney University's Senate, returning from a trip to America said, "After seeing something of the educational systems of Italy, Switzerland, Germany and France, a good deal of that of Great Britain and reading the judgments of many capable observers, I feel no hesitation in choosing the United States as the country from whose experiments and present conditions we can learn more and adopt more than from any of the older civilizations of Europe, not excepting our own beloved Fatherland ... Any national system must be the outcome of a long process of evolution, not of sudden revolution and must finally embody the finer elements, the ethical and spiritual factors in the national character which defy quantitative analysis. But in a democracy such as we find in the United States and in Australia, the first essential must be equality of opportunity."\textsuperscript{107}

E.R. Holme, who had not yet at this period visited the United States, was more cautious about American precedents in education mainly because he thought that there was in the United States a dual school system due to the importation from England of the class system: he nevertheless thought "America can show us how to level a road through all our natural and traditional diversities, how to make it run straight from highest to lowest, how also to keep it clear of artificial barriers. The Americans

\textsuperscript{106} S.M.H. Feb. 26, 1906.
have had to do much of what is before us now and they have had an equal regard for the individual man, an equal admiration for initiative and faculty. In like manner we must connect our primary, secondary and University branches so that we shall have a system open to all and as free as we can make it ... We have no American aristocracy or plutocracy to resist our demand for efficiency and a reasonable measure of uniformity regardless of privilege. We have no American cult of material success, the product of a hypertrophied individualism, to block our way. Our aims are most genuinely democratic.

To sum up, it is probably true to say that the most important development in early twentieth century State education in Australia was the repudiation of the pure British tradition by a broadening of the extent of education from the elementary field into secondary education and by the search for a new and typically Australian system. Although there was considerable admiration for the efficient German system it was not adopted in Australia since the social structure for which it was designed was too alien to Australian democratic tradition, and a considerable number of Australians, after gaining first hand information of American conditions, tended to see a basic similarity to the Australian position which could make the United States a useful model. The similarity lay in an identity of aims which saw equality of educational opportunity as the best means of strengthening a democracy, and in a

utilitarian spirit which saw wider education as a national asset in an increasingly competitive world.

In other States the same pattern of agitation and reform was followed. In Western Australia, however, where the Education Department was not set up until 1895, and where it was staffed by two progressive Englishmen, Cyril Jackson, as Inspector General from 1896, and Cecil Andrews as Principal of the Teachers' College which opened in January 1902, education never reached the stagnant condition which it did in the Eastern States. In Queensland, reform was delayed until after the retirement in 1908 of D.G. Ewart, Inspector-General of Schools for the previous twenty years. States other than New South Wales (and to a lesser degree, Victoria) tended to turn to one another for advice; South Australia's Royal Commission on Education refers throughout to other Australian States in primary, secondary, technical and agricultural education, while a report in 1916 upon Technical Education in South Australia was carried out by the Chief Inspector of Technical Schools in Victoria, and contains no references except to Victoria. This would imply a considerable respect for the educational systems of the Eastern States on the part of South Australia, since public officials went from there overseas in this period to investigate other institutions such as inebriate asylums. In Western Australia interest was taken in the New South Wales and Victorian Royal Commission reports and a Royal Commission in 1921 was actually chaired by Peter Board, and in

110. A.C. Austin: *op. cit.* pp245-255.
its report produced comparisons only with other Australian States. 115

Tasmania was very powerfully influenced by New South Wales: in 1907 W. T. McCoy, a New South Wales Inspector of Schools, was appointed Director of Education there and from then on education was run by men of the New South Wales school and modelled on the New South Wales lines. 116

Kindergarten

Crane and Walker claim that American influence also played a part in the establishment of the kindergarten movement in Australia, and that Margaret Windeyer, who had been a commissioner to the World Fair at Chicago in 1893, was so impressed by kindergartens she saw in Honolulu and San Francisco that she then helped to set up the Kindergarten Union of New South Wales on her return. 117 It is certainly true that some of the first teachers employed by the Kindergarten Union to establish the movement and its training school, were brought from the United States. Four American women helped in this process. Some two and a half years after the foundation of the Kindergarten Union, in 1899, Miss Buckley, who had been trained at the Normal School, Chicago, came from Honolulu to Sydney at the period when the Kindergarten Union was expanding from its original one school. When she broke down

117. Crane and Walker: op. cit. p200. The reference given there is faulty and refers to Miss Windeyer's connection, not with the Kindergarten Union, but with the National Council of Women of New South Wales.
soon after under the strain of the work, Frances Newton came from the United States to replace her.\textsuperscript{118} It was she who insisted on the institution of a training college for the Kindergarten Union's teachers. Later, about 1905, Elizabeth Jenkins came from Chicago to help in the expanding work, to be followed soon after by Miss Arnold.\textsuperscript{119} By 1908 however, the training college was operating satisfactorily and, "As the years passed and our girl students became women, many of us desired exceedingly to make our college staff Australian. Not that we loved America less but that we loved Australia more."\textsuperscript{120} Accordingly in 1910 Miss Dumolo, an Australian who had visited Europe, was put in charge of the Kindergarten Union's schools.

The American women fought for the establishment of a wide network of schools, with a proper training scheme, and carried the movement beyond the Kindergarten itself by interesting themselves in the social and economic circumstances of the parents of their charges. They really founded the movement but left it in Australian hands once it had been firmly established.

However, the Kindergarten Union was rather a charity to provide care for the children of working mothers than a true application of


\textsuperscript{120} M. Anderson \textit{op. cit.} p12.
kindergarten principles. The States' systems tended to look to
Europe, where this new method of teaching young children through free
play with suitable materials had originated.

Teachers from Queensland 121 and New South Wales 122 visited Europe
to see how the system worked. In Victoria English-trained kindergarten
teachers appear to have predominated. 123

Universities

The level at which most interest appears to have been taken in
United States models was at University standard. In 1878 the complaint
made at the time of the foundation of Sydney University that Oxford and
Cambridge were bad models for Australia, models moreover which had not
been followed by the Universities of Scotland, Europe and America, was
reaffirmed. 124

The Queensland Royal Commission of 1891 on the setting up of a
University showed considerable interest in the evidence on Cornell
University, New York State, given them by E.M. Shelton, the American
Instructor on Agriculture recently imported by the Queensland Government.
Reference was made to the idea that Cornell "would be nearer our
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especially Germany.
circumstances in organisation than any (university) of which we have
a knowledge, and the possibility of setting up a system similar
to the Morrill Land Grant Scheme in Queensland was touched upon.

Four of the eighteen commissioners, who were unanimous in recommending
the establishment of a University, also recommended that it should
be free. The Report was never discussed in Parliament because
of the bad economic conditions in the 1890's.

The Chancellor of the University of Sydney Dr. (later Sir)
Normand McLaurin in his speech on Commemoration Day in 1898 spoke with
enthusiasm of the University of California at Berkeley saying "Can
we wonder that a nation with such magnificent ideals is rapidly
attaining the highest position, not merely in scientific studies
but also in the practical arts of life, success in which is always
dependent on thorough and accurate theoretical inquiry. His
greatest admiration however appears to have been for the size of
Berkeley's endowment, rather than the loftiness of its ideals.

There were others in Sydney University at this period who knew
the United States at first hand. Professor Barraclough spent some
time there at Columbia University, while Professor David had
visited it while going to the American Science Congress in Mexico.
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The interest of Australian University men in the United States of America is hard to explain, especially in view of the large proportion of Scots among the staff, but it may be due to identification with their new country, and a desire to improve it. It was not a typical interest, but then as Hartley Grattan points out Australian academics were at that period much less representative of or in touch with Australian currents of thought than they are to-day.\textsuperscript{131} Parallel with the extension of State control into the field of secondary education, there came more widespread interest in the role of the University in the educational system for it was felt, then as now, that the University controlled through matriculation the work of all secondary schools.\textsuperscript{132} In 1901 a New South Wales teacher declared, "when an institution received over thirty per cent of its income from the State, surely it should educate thirty per cent of the poor children of the State" and that "the University should go to those who could not come to it."\textsuperscript{133}

H.C.L. Anderson, a member of Sydney University's Senate, returned from the United States full of enthusiasm for what he had seen. He visited every university, agricultural college and large library he could reach, between Boston and San Francisco. The reason for his

\textsuperscript{131} C. Hartley Grattan: \textit{The South-West Pacific Since 1900}: Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1963, pp227-8.
\textsuperscript{132} Thirty-Fourth Report of the Secretary for Public Instruction for 1909, Q.P.P. 1910, No. 37, p36.
\textsuperscript{133} Report of Public School Teachers Association Conference, June 25, 1901 in \textit{N.S.W. Educational Gazette II} (1901-2) July 1, 1901, p36.
interest was "because I was aware that they had much the same
problems to solve as we have, very similar material to deal with,
and practically the same conditions of existence" and while pointing
out that many institutions bearing the name of College in the United
States were not of University standard, felt that the best American
Universities were much better than those in Australia. 134

Following the Knibbs and Turner Reports, and the radical rethinking
of educational policies which these stimulated, some criticism was
levelled at the University and some small upheavals took place within
it. Minor modifications were made such as the alteration of the B.A.
regulations to admit of the taking of an Honours course, but nothing
was done about matriculation requirements 135 and thus no change had
been made in the relation of the University to the community as a
whole. 136

Some Sydney University men recognised the need, if not for
reform, for expansion, but felt the answer lay in providing the
University with greater revenue. Professor Mungo MacCallum said, "To
give Sydney University and its students and its teachers fair play, it
must develop its branches and ramifications as the American Universities
have done and it can only do this with far larger resources." 137

134. H.C.L. Anderson : Notes on Higher Education in the United
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Peter Board, however, passionately concerned with the success of his reforms, and impatient of the University's refusal to change its matriculation standards, saw something to admire in the American system of accrediting. This was a method whereby the headmaster or headmistress of a school which had been inspected by the University, and found to be of sufficiently high standard, would determine whether or not a pupil of his or her school was fit to proceed to the University, thus doing away with matriculation examinations. This system was also suggested by E.R. Holme, later Professor of English Language and by E.C.L. Anderson, a member of the Senate.

It was not, however until 1909, after his return from travelling through the United States, that Board mounted a really serious attack upon the University. He had been greatly impressed by the University of Wisconsin, which dominated all education in that State, carrying out correspondence education on a vast scale, and receiving about one third of the State of Wisconsin's total revenue. To the Public School Teachers' Association he said, "There were two things in America he would like to steal for this country and they were Niagara and the University of Wisconsin. The uses of Niagara were too patent

to need explanation, but those of the University of Wisconsin were equally great. While the one was the manifestation of material power, the other stood for intellectual power. We could not have Niagara but we could learn from the University of Wisconsin. It was an institution to which everybody looked for help; it represented so much of the national development. We had here a young and vigorous institution which might be similarly expanded but at present it was an Australian institution in its infancy. 140 In his report to the Minister for Public Instruction Board wrote, "The University in America stands intimately related to the people. The son of the farmer, as well as of the city man looks forward to entering it. Its graduate is sought after in every department of industry. It is the place to which the nation looks for new discovery and for the results of research, and does not look in vain. Its doors stand wide open and the inquirer after specialised knowledge feels no hesitation in seeking it there. In some States the University is a public utility, as are the waterworks and the post office. The American people act as if they believed in their Universities as necessities. And this is the kind of belief which expresses itself in hard cash, cheerfully paid by the people to maintain their Universities: in fact the

Universities fill such a large part in the life of the people, come into such close contact with the practical interests of the people that they are felt to be indispensable."  

He enlarged on the Wisconsin system, praising the ideas of technical University studies which would enable the student to contribute to the State's prosperity. "... the highest education is not that which enables the student to enjoy his books in the chair of his leisured hours, but rather that which best enables him to render service by doing something which other people want done."  

Board's observation was keen, his ideals democratic and his suggestions for his period radical. He commented on certain American features such as the decline in the number of men in the arts courses, the habit of working one's way through college, especially prevalent in the newer Western universities, and the absence of tuition fees in State Universities: he noted and praised the development of post-graduate research and the huge funds poured into American education. Of the increasing amount of State money received by the Australian Universities he said "The question arises whether, with the increase of State endowments, there is a corresponding widening of the contact of the Universities with the needs of the State.

Is the Australian University becoming increasingly available to
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students? Is it a mainly metropolitan institution? Are opportunities for University assistance being spread over a wider area of the State?"

The Wisconsin ideal was one with which even his close friend Francis Anderson was not in agreement. He agreed that the New South Wales educational system needed reorganisation but felt that there was no parallel between the educational histories of New South Wales and Wisconsin, and that the Government would never allocate sufficient funds to make such a scheme viable. The other solution was that reorganisation should be carried out by the Education Department but he suggested that they should start with secondary, not University, education. He pointed out that American universities were pre-eminent in economics and education, subjects in which Sydney should have chairs, but could not because the government would not give any money for them.

In the end some of the problems posed by the existence of a large number of academic conservatives on the Senate were overcome by the offer of an increased subsidy to the University. In return for an annual grant of £20,000 and the provision of State bursaries at the rate of one for every five hundred of the population between 17 and 20 years of age, some modifications were made in the constitution of the Senate and a chair of economics was at last established.

Board had not got his Wisconsin system but his trenchant criticism

144. *S.M.H.* Oct. 4, 1907.
of the University of Sydney had forced it into some sort of relation with the State system of education.

It is interesting to note the differences between the genesis of the two universities set up in Australia in the early part of the twentieth century. In Queensland because of the economic crisis of the 1890's no action was taken to set up a University despite the recommendation of the Royal Commission of 1891, but provision was made to allow Queensland students to be external students of the University of Melbourne. In June 1895 a University Extension Council was appointed by representatives of the Queensland University movement and was affiliated to the Sydney University Extension Board, which set and marked examinations and arranged for lectures to be given. In 1906 a University Congress was held in Brisbane and a petition was sent to the Premier praying for the establishment of a University. Finally in December 1909 the University was inaugurated and started functioning in 1911. Utilitarian arguments carried the day where purely cultural ones had not. Reginald H. Roe, later Vice-Chancellor of the new University, said in 1905 "America is the country most suitable for us to turn to for example, partly because its condition a century ago was very similar to that of Australia now in origin and population and in material condition, so that the difficulties our

our kinsmen there have had to face are, in many respects, similar to
those which confront us, but partly also because it is in America that
the most striking examples are furnished of magnificent benefactions
by States and individuals for University purposes, and in America that
the most marked advances have been made in the expansion of the University
curriculum and the extension of its influence into the agricultural,
commercial, technical and professional life of the nation. There is
no doubt that when a Queensland University is established it should
be on the lines of the best American Universities rather than on the
model of the venerable and noble foundations of our mother country
which have to supply the wants of social conditions very different
from ours." 147

At the Inaugural Ceremony on June 1, 1911, despite disappointment
at the Government's refusal to give money for chairs of agriculture
and commerce, 148 it was announced by the Chancellor that correspondence
classes would be instituted although they had failed at Sydney University. 149
Admitting that "Correspondence classes must remain as inferior to
evening classes as the latter are inferior to day classes," the
Chancellor felt that "We are too fond of quoting Continental methods of
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education instead of taking examples from America, where custom and thought more nearly resemble our own. Thence we may have good examples of what can be done by correspondence courses outside University education altogether. 150

As evidence of its determination to bring the new University to as many people as possible the Queensland Government in 1910 granted the University an additional endowment of £2,500 per annum on condition that the Correspondence School be placed under a special officer, that plenty of evening lectures be offered and that conditions for external students be reasonable and fair. 151 In August 1911 Thomas G. Jones, the lecturer appointed to take charge of correspondence education, set off to visit the United States; where in the course of his investigations into correspondence courses he visited some seven institutions in the American West and Mid-West. He too was impressed by Wisconsin 152 and adopted some of its features in his recommendations that the work of external students should harmonise with that of internal students, that they should sit the same examinations, and that financially they should be on the same footing as evening students. 153

In Western Australia the University of Adelaide had given extension lectures since 1898, and set exams since 1905, but as a result of intermittent public pressure the Government in 1909 was persuaded
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to appoint a Royal Commission on the possibility of setting up a University. Some members of the Commission visited the newer Universities in Britain such as Manchester, Liverpool, Birmingham, and London, and the Eastern States of Australia were consulted, but in the main the Commission contented itself with written information. It reported, "The answers from the American Universities, the constitutions of the modern Universities which are being spread over the United Kingdom and lastly the constitutions of the Universities of the Eastern States were all taken into careful consideration. The Commission had no doubt as to the model to be followed. In combined simplicity, effectiveness and closeness of touch to ourselves, the Universities of Eastern Australia stand unexcelled." While Dr. Hackett, reporting on the new British Universities of Manchester, Sheffield and Belfast, said that he did not want to import an English or an American model, but an Australian one.

This comparison reflects two things; firstly the more "British" character of Western Australia, the last of the Australian colonies to gain self-government, reflected in its interest in the new British Universities, reinforced by the presence in the Western Australian educational system of young and enthusiastic Englishmen who were in touch with newer educational developments in Britain. The longer
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a State had had self-government, the more likely it appears to have
been to look for educational models outside the British tradition.

Secondly there is the point that although Queensland, in its
attempt to reach as many people as possible through its University
system, drew upon American precedents, this was because it was felt
that the American social structure corresponded more closely to the
democratic ideal held in Australia than did the British. In other
words it was not an ideological imitation, but an attempt to adapt
to existing Australian conditions a system which was founded upon
ideals similar to those of Australia. It was a rejection of the
British tradition in favour of something more truly Australian in
character, not an attempt to replace a British structure with an
American one.

It is also noticeable that the greatest interest in the United
States was manifested by administrators such as Peter Board and Frank
Tate and by men, such as Francis Anderson, who while not politically
conservative, were not Labor party members, but nineteenth-century-type
radicals.

So far as direct contact between American and Australian
Universities were concerned, these were slight. The Australian
Universities, particularly those of Sydney and Melbourne, exchanged
conventional courtesies with Western American Universities. The
Universities of Sydney and Melbourne accredited delegates to the
Jubilee of the University of Wisconsin in 1904, but they did not
actually attend\textsuperscript{158} while the Conference of Representatives of the Universities of Australia and New Zealand decided to send a cablegram of condolence to Leland Stanford Junior University.\textsuperscript{159} Representatives of American Universities attended Sydney and Melbourne's jubilees.

Students went from Australia to the United States,\textsuperscript{160} although in small numbers, and mainly in the more technical branches of education such as engineering or dentistry.\textsuperscript{161} Professor S.H.G. Barraclough has already been mentioned in this connection; he went over to Columbia on a science scholarship offered by H.M. Commissioners of the Exhibition of 1851, in 1892, and was followed a year later by another Sydney engineering student named W.H. Ledger.\textsuperscript{162} In 1891 the then headmaster of Brisbane grammar school said that of former pupils of that school one was at Philadelphia University while 17 were at Australian Universities, 11 at English and 3 at Scottish Universities.\textsuperscript{163} Margaret Windeyer attended the New York State Library School at Albany from 1897 to 1899,\textsuperscript{164} and returned to become an Assistant Librarian in the
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New South Wales Public Library. It was however still a small trickle and despite hopes for more organised exchanges with American universities,\textsuperscript{165} nothing definite emerged, although the trickle went on. Edward Jordan, B.Sc. Sydney did an M.A. at Leland Stanford which was published in Brisbane in 1910,\textsuperscript{166} while at least two tutors for Sydney's Joint Committee for Tutorial Classes went to Columbia University, New York.\textsuperscript{167}

The traffic in the other direction was not really heavy, either. Professor David's visit to America resulted in the importation of David Starr Jordan, President of Leland Stanford University, in 1906 by the Sydney University Extension Board. He lectured in Sydney, Brisbane, Adelaide and Melbourne\textsuperscript{168} on various subjects while the author of a book on "Great American Universities" Dr. E.E. Slossen came over with an introduction from Starr Jordan in 1912 and was lionised.\textsuperscript{169}

Even though contacts were slight, interest in American Universities still existed. At the end of the First World War, E.R. Holme of Sydney University was appointed as chairman of the
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Administrative Committee of Australian Universities, which was designed
to help in the transition back from the forces to University life.
Since the Americans were also engaged in this task he came into
contact with them and arranged to travel home via the United States
where he visited, among others, the Universities of Stanford, Chicago
and Columbia. He was most cordially received and once again the
question of exchange with American Universities arose, Holme feeling
that, "It became clear to me that in certain classes of American
society, and particularly in the University class - if one can speak
of such a class - a strong movement has begun in favour of more
friendly and intimate relations with the British Empire." 170

No organised scheme eventuated, although some twenty Australian
dental students went straight from the A.I.F. to Philadelphia 171 and
the Senate of Sydney University took the unprecedented step of
subsidising the publication of Holme's book on American Universities 172
by £145. 173

It would appear from the foregoing that this contradicts much
of that said in the introduction on the influence of the United
States on Australia. The United States was frequently appealed to
as a precedent by educational reformers in Australia. It was in fact
seen as a contrast to the old hide-bound British system from which
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Australia was trying to break away. It came nearer than any other country to providing universal education on all levels from kindergarten to University. Few people shared Knibbs' enthusiasm for the German system, because the social system to which it was tied was too alien to Australia.

Children

Responsibility to the welfare of children was far earlier accepted by Australian Governments than was responsibility for the welfare of adults. 174 This earlier development was also the case in the United States and Britain. 175 Long before the disappearance of the feeling that unemployment relief or government relief works were "pauperising", the welfare of neglected children was seen as a direct concern of the State. This movement in all English-speaking countries followed the movement for better and more universal education and was influenced by much the same humanitarian and utilitarian motives. The progress in Australia thus paralleled, and was even at times ahead of, a general movement in both the United Kingdom and the United States.

As early as 1872 South Australia began the system of boarding out in foster-homes children who were dependent on the State.

Although this move was undertaken partly as a measure of economy since indoor relief was more expensive, it was also due to the feeling that boarding out was better for the children and for society since a workhouse system was "not merely the refuge, but the nursery of pauperism". In 1886 despite some pitfalls over religion and an attempt by the Government to rid itself of all expense by having children adopted instead of placed in foster-homes, the Boarding-Out Society, set up in 1872 to supervise the welfare of boarded-out children, became the State Children's Council with supervisory powers over all State children, including those in reformatories. The last report of the Boarding-Out Society stated triumphantly that "Whatever theoretical objections have been made to the objects of the Boarding-Out Society, practical experience during fourteen years has satisfactorily proved that this is the best possible substitute for a respectable natural home and leads to the happiness and to the complete development of the child. With sufficient care in the selection of the homes, and efficient, but not vexatious, supervision, the failures are reduced to a minimum, far below that of the best managed industrial schools, while the cost to the country is always less. Over all the colonies the system has taken root beyond any chance of change as to principle, though there may still be improvements as to administration. It is gradually finding favour among the most conservative class in the
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world - the guardians of the English Unions - in spite of the fact that these have generally built at the cost of the rates great workhouse or district schools to hold all the children who fall under their care." 178

Thus South Australia which in its Destitute Board had had "a poor law based on the English principle that absolute destitution had a claim upon public charity," 179 to a greater degree than any other State, had in the interests of economy and humanitarianism rejected this British model. Boarding out had also been adopted in certain American States but this particular development appears to have been in Australia a response to Australian conditions.

Other States followed South Australia: New South Wales set up a State Children's Relief Board in 1881 and adopted boarding out. 180 Tasmania and Queensland followed suit. In Western Australia, the last state to achieve independence, children were dealt with institutionally until 1907. In Victoria by 1905, of 5,048 children under the care of the State Department for Neglected and Reformatory Children set up in 1890, 3,044 or about 66% were boarded out, 181 although in the pursuance of Victorian Government policy of working through subsidised charities, the destitute child was still not a State concern.
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In 1896 a further step in the care of the child was made in New South Wales by the extension of the subsidy for boarded-out children to those children living with widowed or deserted mothers, and Queensland followed suit. Other Acts such as the New South Wales Infants' Protection Act further extended State interest in the care of children; machinery was set up to prevent baby-farming and protect illegitimate children.

All Australian states by 1900 had to a greater extent than other English speaking countries with the exception of certain Canadian states set up centralised machinery to deal with neglected and/or destitute children, machinery mostly separated from other forms of poor relief. This was noted in the United Kingdom "In both Australasia and Canada child relief has, as already stated, obtained relatively far more attention than in the (United) States and there is a marked tendency to include the care of neglected children within the sphere of public assistance." 182

However certain New England and Mid-Western American States were ahead on one matter: the question of Children's Courts.

The South Australian Destitute Act Royal Commission of 1883-5 reported in favour of a system of Children's Courts as observed on a recent visit to Boston by an Australian Joseph Sturges. 183 In April

1890 a Children's Court was set up in a room in the State Children's Central Office building; until 1896 it was permissive only and children charged with felony as opposed to neglect or misdemeanor were still tried in police courts.\textsuperscript{184}

In 1891 regulations made in Victoria under the Neglected and Reformatory Children's Act gave permission for Children's Courts to be held in private if this should be asked for by police or charity workers, but this provision was rarely invoked.\textsuperscript{185}

In New South Wales, despite the opposition of a Comptroller-General of Prisons, George Miller, who argued that harsh prison treatment for first offenders\textsuperscript{186} would keep them from returning to crime,\textsuperscript{187} the movement for the separate trial and differential treatment of the child delinquent steadily gained ground. The \textit{Daily Telegraph} was consistent in its dislike of sending children to jail,\textsuperscript{188} while even the \textit{Sydney Morning Herald} by 1904 was advocating separate children's courts.\textsuperscript{189}

Strong recommendations were repeatedly made by the Comptroller-General of Prisons from 1896, Frederick Neitenstein, and by the President of the State Children's Relief Board until 1902, Sir Arthur Renwick, that

\textsuperscript{185} Charity Review, Vol. 1 No. 4 Dec. 1900 p5.
\textsuperscript{186} First Offenders under 26 years serving a sentence of less than twelve months spent most of their time in prison in solitary confinement on a bread and water diet.
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children's courts be set up. Renwick had visited the United States in 1893 and seen there Children's Courts in operation; he also advocated the "American system of releasing children on probation." 190

Renwick in fact went further than the question of Children's Courts, advocating the complete reorganisation of all Governmental bodies dealing with children, and even of all forms of charity under one State body. At this period some children were dealt with by the State Children's Relief Board, others by the New South Wales Director of Charities, while charitable work as a whole was spread over several agencies. The model proposed by Renwick was American. 191

"I believe that no better system can be introduced than that in operation in Massachusetts and in other parts of the United States where sociology has been treated more scientifically and where the well being of the aged and the young maintains its position as the primary object of charitable work." 192

Renwick's successor on the State Children's Relief Board, Sir Charles MacKellar, also desired Children's Courts and a system of release on probation, pointing out that probation had been used successfully in Massachusetts since 1879 as well as in Germany. 193
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Yet other private citizens could be found to advocate the system on American lines. 194

In 1902 MacKellar introduced an Infants' Protection Bill which would have provided among other things for children's courts. The Bill failed to pass as did another Bill in 1903 introduced by both Wise and MacKellar.

Another important stimulus to reform was the publication of a report on a visit to America and Europe by Frederick W. Neitenstein the Comptroller-General of Prisons since 1896. Neitenstein had carried out important reforms within the prisons, and had given his attention especially to the questions of the prevention of crime, and the reform, rather than mere punishment, of the criminal. In 1901 he joined the growing band of Australian public servants to travel overseas. He did this for his leave under the Public Service Act, but it is perhaps significant of increasing Governmental interest in overseas conditions that he should have been allowed £150 to allow him to extend his visit to cover not only the British Isles but also North America and Europe, more especially Boston, Elmira and Concord 195

Among the reforms recommended on his return were the

establishment of Children's Courts and probation for young offenders. His report was hailed with enthusiasm by most of the New South Wales Press.

In 1905 the Neglected Children and Juvenile Offenders Act was passed; by it control over all State children went to the State Children's Relief Board under the aegis of the Minister for Public Instruction: children's courts were set up with the power to release children on probation.

Sir Charles MacKellar later stated that this Bill was the most important Act ever introduced into New South Wales from a social point of view. Debates on the Bill referred to United States precedents, and to a lesser degree to South Australia but not to Great Britain, where children's courts were not introduced till 1908.

The Instructions to Honorary Probation Officers of 1909 show the acceptance of a twentieth century view of crime: the child was not to be treated as a criminal because he had broken the law since he was in fact the victim of an unfortunate environment.
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199. Probation Officers were voluntary and unpaid; they were drawn mainly from various charitable bodies.
1911 the St. Vincent de Paul Society, despite its initial dislike of
the State Children's Department had 280 out of the 1633 children on
probation in their care; the Salvation Army also helped. By 1917
there were 319 voluntary probation officers and 270 lady visitors to
boarded out children.

The spirit of these Children's Courts was part utilitarian in
the sense of protecting society from future crime. Neitenstein wrote
in 1909 "The establishment of Children's Courts, and of shelters,
the regulation of juvenile street hawkers, the provision for transfer
from one institution to another, for release on probation, for arousing
neglectful parents to a sense of their responsibilities etc. are all
part of a most humane and practical measure which will undoubtedly
stunt the growth of the criminal class in the future."

But there was also a strong egalitarian humanitarian element
in this concern for children: an historian of the development of
children's courts could write still in 1926 that the American and
English view of the child criminal differed in that the Americans
desired to correct, the English to punish, the child. On this analysis
the Australian view was obviously closer to the American than British
view. For instance Catherine Spence, one of the prime movers of children's
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welfare in South Australia, although always with an eye open to
economy, yet suggested throughout, like Neitenstein, that children
should be reformed not punished. 205

Mendelssohn sees the development of social services in Australia
as due to two main streams of thought: the general welfare or
utilitarian, held by the politically conservative and the humanitarian,
held by the socialists. 206 This is a convenient theory which does
not always hold water. In this matter of children's courts, MacKellar
and Renwick use both types of argument: but it becomes obvious that
to these political conservatives in fact the humanitarian is dominant:
while B.R. Wise, a political radical although not a socialist, could
argue in 1902 of destitute mothers who needed state subsidies to keep
their children with them "Let them get charity." 207

In Victoria the movement for Children's Courts owed even more
to private individuals and bodies than in New South Wales where
Neitenstein, MacKellar and Renwick were at least connected with
the Government. Children's Courts were recommended by the Conference
of Child-saving Societies held in Melbourne in 1891. 208 By 1900

206. R. Mendelssohn: Social Insurance in Australia, Past and Future;
meetings were held in Melbourne Town Hall by forty organisations interested in child welfare and representations in favour of Children's Courts were made to the Government.

Victoria eventually introduced Children's Courts only a few months after New South Wales; but the care of children was still left with a children's Council, semi-independent of the Government.

Queensland followed suit by the Children's Courts Act of 1907; and followed it up in 1911 by establishing a State Children's Department by the State Children Act. Western Australia also followed the example of the Eastern States. The existence of children's courts in the United States was recognised but it was to South Australia and Victoria that Western Australia looked for example. In his speech introducing the State Children Bill in 1907 the Premier, Moore, referred to New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia's examples but barely mentioned the United States.

The Handicapped

From the start, Australian Governments recognised their responsibility for the insane: in 1906 all insane apart from the inmates of three

211. W.A. Ass., Dec. 3, 1907, p173, Moore.
private mental institutions were in the care of the State in fact all State charitable institutions, apart from Western Australia's Government hospitals, and New South Wales's infirm asylums, were lunatic asylums and almost 90% of their revenue came from Governments, most of the rest being made up of fees.

But the problems of the feeble-minded, of epileptics, of the deaf, dumb and blind, and of other such handicapped people was almost entirely left to charities which were subsidised, but not controlled by Governments. In 1911 there were 3121 blind and 1831 deaf and dumb persons in Australia.

Certain of these charitable agencies kept in regular contact with overseas institutions in the United States of America and in Great Britain, and were aware of developments which were taking place overseas. In 1904 for example, Colonel Edward A. Kelley, a member of the State Board of Charities of Illinois, visited the Sydney Industrial Blind Institution, which trained and provided paid work for the adult blind. He wrote "This Institution turns out more and better work than any similar Institution in the United States which I have visited."

The New South Wales Institution for the Deaf, Dumb and Blind in 1898 received reports from twenty-three American institutions as compared with eight British, one Victorian, two South Australian and two Canadian.216 The proposal for the setting up by the Deaf, Dumb and Blind Institution of an institute for the adult deaf, a project supported by Sir Arthur Renwick,217 was also inspired by American and British examples,218 learnt of, presumably, from the reports they received.

In 1903 the Superintendent of this Institution, Samuel Watson, actually visited Great Britain and the United States of America, and returned greatly impressed by the work done overseas, especially in the realms of physical training, and convinced of the need for compulsory education for deaf and blind, as for normal, children.219 He was also greatly interested in the special college set up in Washington D.C. to train teachers for the deaf,220 projects which he suggested to the New South Wales Government. As a further result of the knowledge gained of United States success in the training of Helen Keller, the Institution decided to do the same with a similarly deaf and blind girl named Alice Mary Betteridge;221 an experiment which due to the
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devotion of the teacher and the intelligence of the pupil proved highly successful.

On the whole, however, most of these institutions, nourished in the British tradition of voluntary endowed charities, and with small financial resources and no trained social workers were less aware of developments in the United States of America than were men connected with Governmental agencies, or than politicians, and the amount of United States influence in this field is on the whole so small as to be negligible.

Medicine and the Hospitals

The importance of medical archives for the social historian can be very great, since they are an index not merely of the health of a population but also of its economic condition and social attitudes.  

One thing which must be emphasised is the overwhelmingly British orientation of the medical profession in Australia. Not only were many Australian doctors British trained, but the Australian medical schools, the first of which was set up in Melbourne in 1862, were run on British lines and staffed by British or Australian-trained men. Post-graduate experience sought abroad was almost always in Europe, principally in Britain or Germany. From 1900 there was not even

reciprocity of recognition of medical degrees between Australia and the United States of America, as there was between Britain and her possessions. 224

Compulsory registration of medical practitioners in most States in the 1890's or early 1900's put paid to the small number of American quacks who had been active previously in Australia, and left only the more respectable. In 1903 eighteen medical practitioners in New South Wales were listed as having American medical degrees, 225 a fairly small proportion.

The same applied in general to the structure of the hospital system in Australia, since despite the fact that hospitals were first set up by the Governments in Australia, the British system of public hospitals for the poor supported by the charitable soon grew up.

The first hospitals in Australia were Government institutions. Governor Phillip in 1788 recommended one as part of the civil administration, and a General Hospital of sorts was established in 1789 for the convicts. 226 The Hobart Hospital was founded in 1820 by the Governor.

It was not really until Darling's combination of the civil and military medical establishments in 1856 that there was a start to private medical practice. Hospitals grew up to supplement private practice for those who were poor: the Sydney Dispensary, later the

Sydney Hospital was founded in 1826.

After self-government medicine continued on typically British lines; the main emphasis from the Governmental point of view being on public health and quarantine. In 1881 a smallpox scare led to the formation of a Board of Advice but this had nothing to do with hospitals which were still financed by public subscriptions and by a pound for pound subsidy provided by the Government. Even the investigations of a New South Wales Royal Commission on Charities in 1897 did not attempt to change the system, and at the start of the twentieth century the great majority of hospitals in Australia were still charitable institutions for the relief only of the destitute: they were still regarded as places to die rather than to recover. In New South Wales the Government ran the Coast Hospital (later Prince Henry Hospital) as an isolation and leper institution, as part of its concern with public health, and in Western Australia the Royal Fremantle Hospital was a Government institution: but in Victoria for example the system meant that the Government though financially committed to helping hospitals had no real control over their management.

The system had defects apart from the usual financial worries. The Melbourne Hospital until 1911 elected the honorary physicians and surgeons not by merit, but by subscribers' votes, a system all to open to abuse. Dependence on Government assistance could also mean hardship: in 1902 the Victorian Government reduced by £20,000 227. K.S. Inglis: Hospital and Community, Melbourne, 1958 p141.
its grant to the Melbourne Hospital, a grant previously cut in 1895. The hospital was faced with the alternative of closing wards or losing money. To its credit, it chose the latter course. 228 The Prince Alfred in Sydney was unable to open all its new wards in the Queen Victoria pavilion completed in 1908 because the New South Wales Government refused a bed subsidy for them.

Hospitals were originally intended for the destitute, and as a result of this policy they spent a great deal of time and energy in determining the financial status of a patient before admitting him. On the other hand doctor's fees were little lower than they are to-day: daytime advice and visit within a mile of the doctor's surgery cost 10/6d. to £1.1.0 and an extra guinea was charged for each further mile the doctor had to travel: obstetric operations could cost from 10 guineas (New South Wales minimum) to 200 guineas, eye operations 25 guineas, a Caesarian section 50 guineas. 229 In those days when wages were lower this meant that there was a large class of people who normally earned enough to keep them, and thus were not destitute, but could not afford the high costs of private medical care.

Pressure was however put on hospitals by their subscribers and by medical practitioners to keep out those with any money. 230 The Royal Alexandra Hospital for Children in 1907 resolved that the hospital should admit no child whose parents were members of a Lodge.

or had an income of over £200 p.a. 231

Although "probably one third of the total population of the
Commonwealth comes either directly or indirectly under the influence
of Friendly Societies" 232 which gave members cash benefits in illness,
and there were in December 1906 3,948 such Lodges in Australia with
337,405 members, 233 there were still many people whom sudden illness
could reduce to poverty if not to complete destitution.

The development of private hospitals could do little to relieve
this situation: a demand grew for the admission of paying patients
to the public hospitals and the Melbourne Hospital actually did this
in 1899. 234 There were even those to be found to advocate the complete
nationalisation of hospitals. Pressure on the hospitals grew with
the improvement of facilities and the control of cross-infection,
reducing the reluctance of patients to enter institutions previously
regarded as places merely preliminary to the grave.

Various expedients were proposed. In 1908 Dr. Clubbe of the
Royal Alexandra said "It seems to me that the only way out of the
difficulty of finance if people will not voluntarily subscribe
sufficiently large amounts to keep up these institutions, is to put
on a hospital tax, then everyone would be compelled to pay according
to his rating, but this is a very wide question and cannot be settled
off hand without most serious consideration." 235 But in 1913 the
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secretary of the same hospital deplored the growing trend to resort to
State support since this would stunt charity and kill individual
responsibility.\textsuperscript{236} Despite the optimism of the Commonwealth statistician
who wrote "It \[the distribution of wealth in Australia \ldots\] works by
increasing\] on the one hand the number of people whose prosperity
enables them to relieve the indigent and by reducing on the other the
number who need assistance",\textsuperscript{237} the Melbourne Hospital pointed out that
all charities in Victoria (which included hospitals) were supported by
a mere 6,000 people and that there was a need for legislation to compel
the sharing of financial responsibility for these charities.\textsuperscript{238} Miss
C.H. Spence of South Australia advocated the nationalisation of health
in the interests of the community as a whole.\textsuperscript{239}

The Australian Labour Party at this period also displayed leaning\textsuperscript{5}
in this direction. Andrew Fisher stated, while Prime Minister, that
if the Commonwealth had powers to aid hospitals directly it would do
so at once.\textsuperscript{240} But, despite brave words, even the New South Wales
Labor Government did not implement such a policy, although it had
the power to do so. Perhaps it was prevented only by the war and
the later split in the party, for Fred Flowers while Vice-President
of the Council wrote of hospital nationalisation in an official
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publication, "this, after very careful attention, seems to be the only course fitted to meet the requirements of present and future generations in Australia." He saw the position as analogous to that of education and argued that the only criterion for hospital treatment should be illness.\textsuperscript{241}

"There has undoubtedly been a great change in public opinion in New South Wales at any rate, if not through the whole of Australia on the question of what should constitute the basis of our Hospital system. Following the system in Great Britain, where hospitals have developed from feudal and monastic institutions and where private beneficence has always provided the sinews of war, we have largely followed the traditional idea that the cost of the sick poor should be borne by the beneficence of the community. A moment's reflection will show this to be indefensible. There is no greater reason for the beneficent to provide for the upkeep of hospitals than for education, water and sewerage, railways, roads, harbours, asylums, prisons or other public services.

"It is surely the duty of the state to provide for the health of those who are sane equally with the health of those who have lost their mental balance."\textsuperscript{242} He rejected the British model on the grounds of the difference in Australian conditions.

\textsuperscript{241} Fred Flowers: A Pamphlet on the Hospital System in New South Wales, Government Printer, Sydney, 1912 p5.
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Other Labor members also supported this view. A motion was proposed in August 1912 by McGarry "That in the opinion of this House all hospitals whose doors are open to the sick poor free of charge should receive financial support from the State." This was a reference to the fact that certain hospitals run by religious bodies could run into sectarian difficulties in obtaining Government subsidies: in fact the motion was passed despite a certain amount of sectarian bickering. In the course of the debate McGowen said "I belong to a party who believe that, apart from the individuals who give voluntarily to support the work of these hospitals, it is incumbent on the Government to see that sick people have every possible hospital advantage, not so much, perhaps on the score of humanity as on the score of the preservation of human life." Yet another member suggested that the answer was not to subsidise more independent hospitals but to increase the number of Government hospitals.

But although the Labor Government did carry out various reforms by the appointment of a Minister of Health, and of an Inspector General of Hospitals, by improving nursing conditions and by setting up in July 1912 a Tuberculosis Advisory Board and a Tuberculosis dispensary, yet no steps were taken over nationalisation. Moves in
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1915 on the part of the Liberal Party to set up a contributory sickness
insurance scheme came to nothing. The first Minister for Health was
George Black, who belonged to the more conservative section of the Labor
party. For example in 1922 Black vigorously defended the continued
existence of private hospitals.247

The diversions of attention from domestic matters caused by the
war and the split in the Labor party meant no more was done for some
years. In 1922-3 for the first time since 1906 State provision in
Australia for social amelioration actually fell.248 The New South
Wales Minister for Health in that year tightened up conditions for
Government aid in the building of hospitals.

It is also clear that the bulk of the medical profession, then
as now, opposed any further measure of State control.249 An attempt
in Tasmania to appoint paid medical staff to the hospitals there in
place of the honorary system aroused much hostility.250 On the other
hand the financial straits of most public hospitals were worsened by
the war and in practically every State in Australia there is some
evidence of an impending gradual or sudden revolution in the
management of hospitals. Some of the medical profession considered
that the answer lay in the provision of intermediate hospitals which
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would charge fees, though the fees would be much lower than those charged in private hospitals; the hospitals were to be owned by the medical profession. Such hospitals, apart from a few run by various religious bodies, failed to develop.

The twentieth century produced specialised medicine and only the large fully equipped hospitals could cope with the new techniques and afford the new equipment. The private hospitals were little more than nursing or convalescent homes. In New South Wales in 1916, or almost two-thirds, of the licensed private hospitals were maternity homes, almost five hundred had less than ten beds; 61.6% were run by nurses, 33.1% by unqualified persons and only 6.3% by qualified medical practitioners.

Thus by the 1920's the old hospital system based on the British system had proved inadequate for the needs of the Australian community, and something else had to be sought.

Eventually, although this development lies somewhat beyond our period, a system similar to that of the American "community hospital" was evolved; and the structure of public, intermediate and private wards within the one large hospital was evolved. The private and intermediate patients in effect helped to subsidise the public

    J.W. Barrett : The Significance of Intermediate Hospitals
patients, and in return they received the benefits of advanced medical techniques and equipment which only a large hospital could afford to supply.

Dr. William Mayo, of the famous American Mayo Clinic, visited Australia in 1926, and suggested that this system should be adopted. In 1926 also Malcolm McEachern, Vice-President of the American Medical Association visited Australia at the request of the Victorian government; he also visited New South Wales. He too reported in favour of a "community hospital" system, as well as the organisation of hospitals into regional groups. 253

Although this view was enthusiastically supported by Stanley Argyle, himself a medical man, and a member of the Victorian Cabinet, it was not in fact adopted until 1929. In that year in Victoria Government regulations were amended to allow public hospitals to treat other than "charity" patients without losing their government subsidy as charitable institutions. 254 About this time the same development took place in New South Wales, and by the second World War a system of hospitals similar in structure to those in the United States had developed.

In yet another field Australians had found the American model more suitable to Australian social, economic, and geographical circumstances than the traditional model which had been inherited from Great Britain.

Within the overall framework of the relations of hospitals and
governments rather more precise contacts and influences can be found
in the case of individual hospitals. Usually these are more on matters
of hospital administration than of medical or surgical techniques, for
the former was the field in which the United States of America was
making, so far, the most rapid progress.

Several of Melbourne Hospital's nineteenth century honoraries
had had American connections. Gilbee, one of the surgeons who came
to Melbourne in 1849, was infected by gold fever and spent some
time in California, returning in 1853, while R.R. Stowell visited the
United States as well as London. 255

The Queen Victoria Memorial Hospital in Melbourne was set up
exclusively by and for women. The moving force behind this hospital
was Constance Stone, 256 the first Australian woman to qualify as a
doctor. She began studying at the Women's Medical College at Philadelphia
in 1884 and later in Toronto 257 before Melbourne University admitted
women to its medical course. In 1889 she returned to Melbourne, and
in 1891 the first woman, Margaret Whyte, graduated in medicine from
Melbourne. They combined forces and, after operating for some time
as an outpatients department, the hospital opened with eight beds in
July 1899. 258
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But contacts were on the whole slight. Vast processions of honorary practitioners and surgeons from Australian hospitals are recorded as having visited Europe; few went to the United States. The same goes for the directors. The superiority of the Americans in catering for the comforts of life might be recognised by the Royal Alexandra Hospital for Children in its decision to buy laundry equipment from the United States, but little else was imported.

The Royal Prince Alfred Hospital, like the University of Sydney to which it was a teaching hospital, showed greater interest in American precedents in the field of hospital management than did most similar institutions.

In June 1901 the Matron, Miss McGahey spent eight months in Europe and North America and collected much information there. Not only did she revolutionise, on her return, the position of the nurses by introducing ward maids to do the heavy domestic work, but the ideas which she brought back from England and America helped in the alterations to the administration block and in the designing of the new Queen Victoria pavilions. Miss McGahey attended the International Council of Nurses at Buffalo as delegate from the Federated Australian nurses. The things which impressed her most were the better pay for nurses in the United States of America and
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the better hospital buildings. "In such a progressive and up-to-date country as America one expects to find the hospitals as modern in matters of construction and equipment as some of the other buildings. In this respect one's expectations are fully realised." When Miss McGahey retired in 1903 due to ill-health, applications were invited to fill her vacant post not merely as usual from Great Britain and Australia, but also from Canada and the United States. The Englishwoman, Miss Newell, who was selected to fill the post, travelled out via America in order to inspect the hospitals there.

In the meantime Professor Anderson Stuart, Professor of Anatomy and Physiology at the University of Sydney, where he had founded the Medical School, returned from a trip through Europe and America convinced that Australian hospitals could learn from overseas. The Prince Alfred Hospital's Secretary, William Epps, was in consequence granted six months leave of absence and £250 to travel overseas. On his return Epps made many recommendations some of which were carried out at once, others not for some time. Owing to the unavailability of his original reports it is difficult to determine from which country Epps derived which idea. The merging of the Casualty and Outpatients' Departments was a common-sense measure, while the introduction of card-indexing for inpatients and outpatients was copied from the larger

hospitals both in the United Kingdom and the United States although Epps was particularly impressed by the system in Detroit. The recommendations for the re-equipment of the Prince Alfred's laundry owed more to United States example, while some of the ideas for fund-raising show strong affinities with United States precedents.

Interest in overseas hospital administration was maintained by the Prince Alfred. Post-graduate students were admitted upon payment of fees "as is done in large hospitals in Europe and America." Christmas and Easter greetings stamps were sold to raise funds "as in Sweden and America." The Social Service Department, the forerunner of a proper Almoner's Office, which was set up in 1917, was new in Australia though it was recognised to be common in the United States of America. Miss M.A. Buisson, who took over the Department, had spent several years in America after her training in Sydney. In July 1919 a Hospital Auxiliary was formed on American lines to raise funds.

Thus on details of hospital administration such as laundry, nursing, buildings, some Australian hospitals, despite the overwhelmingly British orientation of hospitals and medicine in Australia were at least inclined to look to the United States of America rather than to any other foreign country.
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Public Health

There is some evidence of United States influence in the field of public health, not within the individual States, but in the development of Federal health services. The basic framework of public health in Australia was provided by the Public Health Acts of the various States, which were founded solidly upon the United Kingdom Public Health Act of 1875, but varied in details to meet specific Australian needs. Various other Acts were later added covering subjects from the supervision of dairies and meat, to the inspection of private hospitals. None of these State Acts, however, shows any influence apart from that of Britain, and of the indigenous circumstances which modified the British Acts.

Up till 1908 the Commonwealth showed little interest in public health matters; but the Quarantine Act of that year appeared to contemplate internal as well as marine quarantine. The later outbreak of smallpox, which, in a mild form, was pandemic in Australia’s Eastern States for some years from 1913 on, showed the difficulties of co-operation between States. It was, however, the problems created by the war which finally spurred the Commonwealth into action. The physical standard of recruits was unsatisfactory, while later the problems of rehabilitation of maimed men, and the re-introduction into Australia of men with tropical diseases such as malaria, together with the chaos associated with the appalling influenza epidemic of 1919 forced it into action.

In 1916 the Commonwealth Government, because, of the Reports of the Australian Institute of Tropical Medicine, asked the International Health Board of the Rockefeller Foundation to investigate the incidence of hookworm in Papua. Dr. J.H. Waite was sent from America to do this, first in Papua and later in Queensland under an agreement between Queensland and the International Health Board. This situation continued till October 1, 1919 when a full-scale campaign was organised under a new agreement between the Commonwealth, the I.H.B. and Queensland (other Australian states later came in too). An expenditure of £100,000 to be spread over 5 years was authorised: and intensive surveys were carried out in Queensland by field teams of from four to seven persons under the control of a doctor. An American, Dr. W.A. Sawyer, ran the campaign from its central office in Brisbane. In January 1924 the I.H.B. officers left and the Commonwealth took over on October 1, 1924 with a budget reduced to £8,000 p.a. of which the Commonwealth provided £4,000, Queensland £3,500 and New South Wales £500.

But the help of the Rockefeller Foundation did not stop there. In 1921 it offered four fellowships in Public Health for those proposing to enter the new Commonwealth Department of Health formed in 1921. As a result four Australians were selected for training in America.

whence they later returned to take up posts in Australia.

F.W. McCallum, M.B., B.S., D.P.H. went to John Hopkins School of Hygiene and Public Health in August 1922 to study epidemiology; H.H. Baldwin, M.B., B.S., D.P.H. also went to John Hopkins, his special field being Tropical Hygiene. A.G. Gutteridge, B.C.E. went to the Harvard School of Public Health to study for an M.Sc. in Sanitary Engineering, and then spent some time travelling in the United States, Canada and Britain. D.G. Robertson, M.D., D.P.H. studied at Harvard and then visited large industrial organisations in the United States of America, Britain, Belgium and Germany to study the latest developments in Industrial Hygiene.\(^{280}\) Nor was this all, since before leaving in January 1924, the Americans helped to organise the framework of the new Department. Dr. W.A. Sawyer not only ran the Hookworm Campaign, which he handed over in 1922 to Dr. W.E. Sweet, and helped organise the Public Health Association of Australia, but he also initiated surveys of malaria and filaria. Dr. A.J. Lanza organised the Division of Industrial Hygiene which was taken over by Robertson on his return, and Colonel F.F. Langley set up the framework of the Division of Sanitary Engineering.\(^{281}\)

Moreover Cumpston, the new Commonwealth Director of Public Health was invited to the United States by the Rockefeller Foundation in 1923.\(^{282}\) He spent some weeks in the United States, and after some
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three weeks in Europe returned again via America. The continuing international interests of the new Department are well exemplified by their enthusiasm for holding a Pacific Health Conference in Melbourne in December 1926: they issued the invitations through the British Government.

Charities

As one official publication stated in 1913, "Happily in this country we have no permanent pauper class, although we find cases of distress caused by illness, temporary unemployment and old age." It also claimed that although the different charities were maintained both by Government grants and by private subscriptions, there was in fact no difficulty in raising funds, and that there was in fact too many, not too few charities.

Some charitable bodies would have disagreed strongly as to the ease of raising funds. The Charity Review wrote in 1904, "It has been aptly said that the natural state of charities is debt, still an atmosphere of overdrafts is not invigorating, although both public and charities might possibly be enervated by a plethora of capital.

283. Health Vol. II No. 6 Nov. 1924 p182.
284. Health Vol. IV No. 6 Nov. 1926.
286. loc. cit.
It must be admitted that the constant effort to stave off financial disaster does not and cannot allow fair play to those who, whether paid or honorary workers, devote themselves heart and soul to social service in the hope of ameliorating the conditions of the poor." 287

It was certainly true that the efforts of charitable bodies tended to overlap. Despite the setting up of Royal Commissions in the 1890's in both Victoria and New South Wales on the subject of Charities, nothing was done to rationalise the situation. Turner's 1899 Bill in Victoria was doomed because of its unpopular financial provisions, which would have permitted municipal taxation on entertainment to support charities. The New South Wales Royal Commission did little except recommend the discontinuance of government subsidies to certain institutions. 288

Much indoor relief was carried out before 1900 for the aged and for children by Governments, though again this work was haphazard and scattered between various departments. This policy was modified by the system of boarding the children with foster parents, already mentioned, and by the introduction of Old Age Pensions, first by Victoria in 1900 and New South Wales in 1901, and later by the Commonwealth in 1908.

Old Age Pensions owed nothing to the United States, but much to local conditions and to the debates then proceeding on the subject in New Zealand and Britain. 289

Other forms of outdoor relief were carried out by the numerous bodies, Benevolent Societies, thoroughly British in origin and outlook, and by various soup kitchens and night refuges. Few charitable bodies had large endowments as many did in Britain, and State supervision was limited to inspection of accounts in the case of those bodies which received government subsidies. There was no unemployment insurance and in some States such as South Australia and Western Australia able-bodied adults were ineligible for any kind of State relief; in the other States relief was strictly limited usually to food.

Public hospitals which were also charities have already been discussed. Apart from the slight traces of American influence to be found in the development of the hospital structure, there is virtually no other trace of American influence in the charitable field, or even in the work of charities later taken over by governments, with one exception.

This was the Charity Organisation Society in Melbourne. It was born in 1887 after a man had died in a Melbourne cab from being refused admission to a public hospital. It was founded on the model of the London Charity Organisation Society which had been established by Charles Loch in 1869. Similar societies had since multiplied in both Britain and the United States of America. In Melbourne the prime mover was Professor Edward Morris; he was assisted by

Dr. Mannington Coffyn, a former member of the London Charity Organisation Society. Its aims were to prevent imposture by applicants for charity, to establish a central case register, and to co-ordinate the activities of charitable societies by referring applicants to the body best suited to deal with them. It was in fact, in Melbourne, as overseas, the embryonic beginning of modern social case-work.

The British strain was stronger than the American: in 1889 Professor Morris visited the United States, and, impressed by the holding there of annual conferences on charities, attempted to do the same in Australia. This attempt, unlike the foundation of the Society itself, failed. Two Conferences were held in Melbourne, in 1890 and 1891.

Despite a great deal of discussion there were no concrete achievements. At the first conference the New South Wales government was unrepresented, though there were seven private representatives: there were no Queensland or Western Australian members. At the Second Conference there were no members from South Australia.

No further conferences were held, partly because of intercolonial jealousies, partly because of the feeling that problems of charity

had little urgency in Australia. 293

From its inception, the Charity Organisation Society exhibited an international awareness, which, to judge from their records, was rare among charities of that period. Not only did it receive the reports of all other C.O.S. bodies, both English and American, but it corresponded with many.

It was often unpopular. Its operations were open to misunderstanding because it operated as a clearing house, not as a relief agency its expenditure on administration greatly exceeded that on relief, a point often adversely commented on. Its outlook was rational, not emotional; condemning strongly the Victorian view which regarded almsgiving as a salve rather for the donor's soul than for the recipient's body. 294

Its interests ranged widely over the whole field of social welfare, from the abolition of means tests on Old Age Pensions to the better care of epileptics, drunks and habitual criminals.

Many of its members, like Sir Charles Mackellar and Sir Arthur Renwick in New South Wales, were in favour of the "American" system of organisation or charities under stricter state supervision, feeling that the United States offered similar social conditions. 295

CHAPTER 8

THE CONSTITUTION
THE CONSTITUTION

This chapter does not purport to be a history either of the formation, or of the working and interpretation of the Australian Constitution. This has already been thoroughly investigated both from a legal and from an historical point of view.

It is intended rather as an essay on the areas of constitutional interpretation, and of political movements interested in constitutional change in which United States precedent played a significant part, and to determine the reasons why this should have been so.

It is universally acknowledged by writers on the subject that the Australian Constitution is based, so far as the constitution of a monarchy with responsible government can be based upon that of a republic, upon that of the United States. In other words instead of having a unitary system of government in which Parliament is supreme, and where there is no written constitution, as in the United Kingdom, there is a written constitution with a balance of powers between the central government which has competence to legislate for all its constituent


parts on certain subjects, and the separate States. Moreover in
Australia the system was to give a list of enumerated powers to the
central government, while the States were allotted the residuary
powers. This followed the practice of the United States; in Canada
an attempt was made to list the powers of both central government
and provinces, while leaving the unallotted powers to the centre.
This latter division tends to make for a stronger central government
than the former. Finally there is in Australia, as in most other
Federal systems, a Federal court which has the power of deciding,
in legal cases properly brought before it, whether legislation is
within the competence of either State or Federal parliaments, and thus
to determine the validity of laws. Such a provision is completely
alien to the practice of the United Kingdom, where in the absence of
a written constitution, there is no agency which can challenge the
will of Parliament.

Yet despite contemporary accusations that the Australian
constitution was a slavish copy of the American, defects and all, on
occasion by those who were later to oppose the interpretation of the
Constitution upon American lines, there were many departures from
the American constitution. For example there were modifications made
in order to secure responsible government on the lines on which it
had developed in England and the nineteenth century colonies where the

4. Age Apr. 17, 1898, Apr. 22, 1898, N.S.W.H. Ass. May 27, 1897,
Jennings p61.
W.M. Hughes and W.T. Dick: Federation, as Proposed by the Adelaide
Convention, set forth, discussed and illustrated. Sydney, n.d.
pp5, 5.
British settled. These included provisions that the ministers should sit in Parliament (Sec. 62), and the provision that the Senate or States' House should have no power to initiate or amend financial legislation although it could request the House of Representatives to make alterations or omissions (Sec. 53). Both these alterations from American precedent were opposed by Sir Samuel Griffith, later Chief Justice of the High Court of Australia, and an ardent advocate of the American model. The latter provision made for considerable heat between representatives of the small states (who opposed it as removing a safeguard to their interests) and those of the larger states. Further, the Senate was to be elected by popular vote instead of by the State Legislatures (Sec. 9) as in the United States, thus anticipating the Seventeenth Amendment in 1913 in the United States of America. Moreover, provision was made to allow for the breaking of a deadlock between the Senate and the House of Representatives by means of a double dissolution (Sec. 57); no provision was made for such a contingency in the United States of America.

As Hunt puts it, and as the Federal Convention Debates amply demonstrate, in all matters concerning the Senate American precedent was consulted. "Sometimes the influence was positive and the Australians found they could not do better than to adapt American practice; sometimes it was negative and led to an attempt to better American procedure, but seldom were American precedents forgotten.

6. Q.H. July 9, 1890, Griffith p195.
though occasionally they were not thoroughly understood.\footnote{9}{E.M. Hunt \textit{op. cit.} p167.}

On the question of the subjects on which legislative power was to be given to the Federal Parliament Hunt has traced a tendency from 1891 onwards to increase the list of powers to include topics additional to those awarded to the United States Congress. This was due to a desire to clarify provisions which had proved difficult of interpretation in the United States and to extend the powers of Government over social and industrial fields which had been undreamt of in 1789.\footnote{10}{Ibid pp172-184.} L.F. Crisp has attempted to analyse the clash of interests at the Federal Convention on several levels, that between the small and big colonies, that between Conservatives, Liberals and Radicals on social theory and the like, and warns against an over-simplified view of these conflicts.\footnote{11}{L.F. Crisp \textit{op. cit.} pp10-11.}

As he points out, in the absence of Labour representation at the Federal Conventions - only one Labour member, Trenwith of Victoria, was a member of the 1897-8 convention - it was the Radicals who spoke for social change and popular rights. Such men as Piddington, Isaacs, Higgins, Cockburn, Deakin and Kingston fought for modifications of the American list of powers such as the power to legislate on invalid and old age pensions (Sec. 51, xxiii), conciliation and arbitration for the prevention and settlement of industrial disputes extending beyond the limits of any one state (Sec. 51, xxxv) and bounties on the production or export of goods (Sec. 51, iii). As Crisp points out the power over the settlement of industrial disputes, which was to cause
more trouble than any other, was ignored by Quick and Garran (1901) as of little importance, while it appears certain that a wider power than that actually given was intended by the founders.

Other departures were in the direction of more closely defining the trade and commerce and navigation powers of the Commonwealth by including powers over telegraphic and telephonic communications (Sec. 51, v) lighthouses and buoys (Sec. 51, vi), astronomical and meteorological observations (Sec. 51, vii), quarantine (Sec. 51, viii), banking other than State banking (Sec. 51, xiii), insurance (Sec. 51, xiv), foreign corporations formed within the Commonwealth (Sec. 51, xx).

One thing which emerges clearly from the Convention debates is the general lack of interest in the question of the application of the American constitution to the changed economic and social conditions of the 1890's. Trouble was already being experienced in the United States with the growth of trusts and combines, yet this feature was barely mentioned in the Convention Debates. As Crisp points out the Constitution makers represented the Australian economy as it then was, there was a higher proportion of pastoralists than of farmers and manufacturers, while almost a third of the members in both the 1891 and the 1897-8 Conventions were lawyers. The Federal Constitution was in fact seen by some conservatives as a means of "preventing one or other of the colonies from jumping over to extreme socialism".

14. Ibid.
Bruce Smith, an extreme conservative, said of the newly-formed Labor Party "This growth can be removed for all time by the proposed Federation of the colonies." Crisp sees the division of the trade and commerce power, and of the power over conciliation and arbitration into inter-state (over which the Commonwealth had power) and intra-state (reserved to the States) as a triumph for the Conservatives, who also reserved all other industrial powers to the States. "Powers were divided so that socialism could be achieved completely neither through the States on the one hand nor the Commonwealth on the other ..."

This triumph was the more possible in the absence of Labor members of the Convention with the exception of Trenwith of Victoria in 1897-8. Labor, preoccupied with social conditions in Australia, was inclined to regard the state of industrial relations in the United States of America as highly unsatisfactory, a state due in no small part to the United States Constitution. The opposition of Labor leaders to the 1898 Bill can be seen in the letters of support sent to H.B. Higgins who opposed it on the grounds that it did not go far enough in the direction of democracy and unification.

16. Bruce Smith quoted loc. cit.
17. L.F. Crisp: op. cit. p13; Most historians have seen the Constitution as a conservative document. As a compromise between conflicting influences it could hardly have been otherwise. Few would agree, however, and even Crisp does not state categorically, that it was deliberately intended by the majority to be a safeguard for economic interests, but rather that the conservative composition and interests of most of the Constitution's framers naturally affected its bias.
18. e.g. letter Daniel Hamilton to H.B. Higgins June 8, 1898 (1057/35) letter Holman to Higgins Dec. 7, 1898 (1057/40) H.B. Higgins Papers A.N.L.
wrote in 1899, after the Federation Bill was passed in New South Wales, "Personally, (unless the Constitution can be immediately altered) I consider the 10th June the blackest day that has even dawned for Australian democracy." 19

It is to be emphasised that once the departures from American precedent outlined above had been made they provided no further questions of interest in the consideration of the interpretation of the Constitution upon American lines.

On the other hand, interpretation of those sections of the Constitution which followed American lines provide a strong current of reliance on United States precedent, especially in the decisions of the High Court of Australia. This Court was provided for in the Constitution (Sec. 71, 72), and, apart from having original jurisdiction in certain defined matters, especially those involving the interpretation of the Constitution, it is also a Court of Appeal from the State Courts. State Courts were vested with Federal jurisdiction in preference to setting up a separate structure of subordinate Federal Courts, on the American model. The Judiciary Act of 1903 constituted the High Court and the first three men appointed to it were Sir Samuel Griffith (C.J.), Sir Edmund Barton and R.E. O'Connor. All three had been members of the Federal Conventions of the 1890's, mostly on the "conservative" side and it appears certain that their views on the interpretation of the Constitution were already formed before they were appointed to the Bench.

Between 1904 and 1920 a line of judicial interpretation was followed, based closely on American precedents, which had the tendency to restrict Federal powers. This line of interpretation was not overthrown until 1920, when the original three Justices had died or retired from the Bench.

The American doctrine of "implied prohibitions", first enunciated by Marshall C.J. in *McCulloch v. Maryland* in 1819 to protect the United States Federal Government against encroachment by the States, was applied to the Australian Constitution. By this the exercise of powers apparently possessed by the Commonwealth was prohibited if, pressed to their logical extreme, they might interfere with powers possessed by the States, and *vice versa*. Thus it was intended to preserve the Federal compact as it had existed in 1900, and to maintain the existing balance of powers. Originally applied to prevent State interference with the Federal Government, this doctrine later invalidated much social and economic legislation of the Commonwealth on the grounds that such legislation might interfere with the residuary powers of the States.

That others than the Justices considered the interpretation of the Australian Constitution should follow United States lines is clear. Alfred Deakin in 1904 stated "I say with all respect that every member of the Convention will admit that American cases and the difficulties which they raised were in our minds at every turn ... let honourable members look at the Constitution with the most cursory eye, and they will be compelled to grant that four-fifths at least has been built out of materials quarried from American legislation."
and American decisions and requires to be interpreted on American
lines."\textsuperscript{20} R.E. O'Connor in Parliament before his appointment to the
High Court stated that "Very fortunately there is such a similarity
in the position and relation of the United States republic to the
individual States and in our relation as a Commonwealth to our several
States that the decisions of the great jurists of America have been
brought to bear and I hope for many years will continue to throw a
light upon many perplexing problems with which we have to deal.\textsuperscript{21}

The High Court also followed this line of thought. In 1902 the
Victorian Supreme Court in Wollaston's Case\textsuperscript{22} ruled that Doctor
Wollaston, Federal Comptroller General of the Customs Department, and
resident in Victoria, was liable to pay State income tax on his Federal
salary; holding that the American Chief Justice Marshall's decision
in McCulloch v. Maryland\textsuperscript{23} (1819) was not applicable and citing two
Canadian cases where Provincial laws prevailed over that of the
Dominion, Bank of Toronto v. Lambe (1887)\textsuperscript{24} and Citizens' Insurance
Company v. Parsons (1861).\textsuperscript{25}

In D'Emden versus Fedder (1904), the High Court of Australia
overruled this decision, ruling that a State stamp duty on the receipt
for his salary given by a Federal officer was an interference with
the unfettered exercise of Federal powers. They applied McCulloch

\textsuperscript{20} H. Repr. Apr. 19, 1904 Deakin p1050. Professor La Nauze points
out that Deakin regarded the High Court as vitally important to the
constitution, and that the passage of the Judiciary Bill of
1903 was one of his most "cherished measures": J.A. La Nauze:
Alfred Deakin pp265-6, pp287-96.

\textsuperscript{21} H. Sen. June 24, 1901, p1690.

\textsuperscript{22} The Commissioner of Taxes of Victoria v. Wollaston SV.L.R. 357.

\textsuperscript{23} 4 Wheat 316.

\textsuperscript{24} 12 A.C. 576. In this case the validity of a Quebec Act taxing
the paid up capital of every bank transacting business in Quebec
was upheld and McCulloch v. Maryland rejected: See Quick and
Garran; op. cit. pp553-4.

\textsuperscript{25} 7 A.C. 96.
v. Maryland, rejecting the contention that there was any substantial difference between the Australian and American constitutions and claiming that the similarities in wording of the two constitutions meant that like provisions should receive like interpretations. 26

The Victorian Supreme Court reaffirmed its decision in Webb v. Deakin (1904) 27; and was once again overruled by the High Court in Deakin v. Webb (1904). 28 In this case Griffith firmly rejected the Privy Council decision in Bank of Toronto v. Lambe as a precedent for interpreting State - Commonwealth relationships; and reiterated his conviction that the existence of monarchy made no difference to the distribution of powers. The claim that like provisions should receive like interpretation was repeated. In Webb v. Outtrim (1905) 29 the Victorian Supreme Court in yet another income tax case followed the High Court's decision, and the defendant obtained leave to appeal directly to the Privy Council, thus by-passing the High Court of Australia.

In Webb v. Outtrim (1906) 30 the Privy Council refused to follow the High Court decision in Deakin v. Webb claiming that there was no basic similarity between the Australian and American Constitutions. The High Court nevertheless, in 1907, in Baxter v. Commissioners of Taxation of New South Wales 31 reaffirmed its verdict in Deakin v. Webb, refusing to be bound by the Privy Council decision. Parliament, agreeing with the High Court, wrote into the Judiciary Act a provision which prevented direct appeal on a question involving State and

27. 29L.L.R. 748.
29. See 4 C.L.R. 556.
30. A.C. 81.
31. 4 C.L.R. 1087.
Federal powers inter se from a State Supreme Court to the Privy Council.

It is thus clear that the view put forward by Griffith, Barton and O'Connor concerning the applicability of the doctrines of *McCulloch v. Maryland* to Australian conditions passed by no means unchallenged in Australia. It was rejected by the Supreme Courts of both Victoria and Tasmania, as well as by the Privy Council.

It is true that Lord Halsbury's judgment in *Webb v. Cuttrim* (1907) revealed a basic misunderstanding of the role of the High Court in a Federal system; claiming that an Act of a State Parliament of Australia was supreme in the same fashion as one of the United Kingdom Parliament. "There is no such analogy between the two systems of jurisprudence [Australian and American] as the learned Chief Justice [Griffith] of the High Court suggested. No State of the Australian Commonwealth has the power of independent legislation possessed by the States of the American Union. Every Act of the Victorian Council and Assembly requires the assent of the Crown, but when it is assented to, it becomes an Act of Parliament as much as any Imperial Act, though the elements by which it is authorised are different ... The American Union, on the other hand, has erected a tribunal which possesses jurisdiction to annul a Statute upon the ground that it is unconstitutional." This comment was not merely dubious law, but revealed a fundamental misconception of the role of the American Supreme Court, which has no power to annul a Statute, but only to

32. *Judiciary Act* 1907.
33. *A.C. 81* in *4 C.L.R. 356.*
34. *A.C. 81* in *4 C.L.R. 355,* at pp558-9 per Lord Halsbury: this view was still held by Halsbury, then 50 years old, in 1907; see *R.R. Garran op. cit.* (note 2) p171.
rule on whether or not it is authorised by the Constitution.

It drew a sharp retort from Sir Samuel Griffith that "The Supreme Court of the United States was created by a provision in the American Constitution identical with that by which the High Court was created ...".

Littleton Groom, Attorney General for the Commonwealth in the Deakin Government, appearing in Baxter's Case, affirmed that, "The Constitution should not be construed as a mere Act of Parliament but as an instrument of government drawn up by the States to form the basis of a permanent union between themselves... As in the United States of America the High scheme of government necessitated making the Court the arbiter and protector of the Constitution." 36

In the course of D'Esmen v. Pedder Griffith made it clear that he considered American decisions applicable to the interpretation of the Australian constitution. During the arguments he asked "The framers of the Australian Constitution had before them decided cases in which certain provisions of the United States Constitution had received definite and settled interpretations. With these cases before them they used in many of the sections of our own Constitution almost identical language. Does not this raise a strong presumption that they intended the same interpretation to be placed upon similar words in our Constitution?" 37 He said further, "We are not of course bound by the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States. But we all think that it would need some courage for any Judge at the present day to decline to accept the interpretation placed upon

35. 4 C.L.R. 1087 at pl109.
36. 4 C.L.R. 1087 at pl1093.
37. 1 C.L.R. 91 at pl105.
the United States Constitution by so great a judge so long ago as 1819, and followed up to the present day by the succession of great jurists who have since adorned the Bench of the Supreme Court at Washington. So far therefore as the United States Constitution and the Constitution of the Commonwealth are similar, the construction put upon the former by the Supreme Court of the United States may well be regarded by us in construing the Constitution of the Commonwealth, not as an infallible guide, but as a most welcome aid and assistance.

"There is indeed another consideration which gives additional weight to the authority of the United States decision with regard to matters in which the two constitutions are similar. We have already, in discussing the language of Sec. 51 of the Constitution, referred to the inference to be drawn from a fact that a legislature has deliberately adopted in its legislation a form of words which has already received authoritative interpretation ... When ... we find embodied in the Constitution provisions undistinguishable in substance, though varied in form, from provisions of the United States Constitution which had long since been interpreted by the Supreme Court of that Republic, it is a not unreasonable inference that its framers intended that like provisions should receive like interpretation.

"We should be prepared therefore, if it were necessary and if we found ourselves unable otherwise to come to a clear conclusion, to accept the doctrines laid down in the judgment of the Supreme Court... delivered by Marshall C.J. in McCulloch's Case...as applicable to the interpretation of the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Australia."38

38. 1 C.L.R. 91 at pl12.
O'Connor added, "The principles governing the relations of Federation and States in the United States have been laid down by great jurists. Are not the Constitutions sufficiently similar in their language to justify the inference that the same principles apply?"

The doctrine that the formation of the Australian Commonwealth on American lines implied the adoption of principles of interpretation used in the United States was yet more strongly stated in Baxter's Case by Griffith, Barton and O'Connor. "In fashioning the Constitution of a Federated Commonwealth the framers might assuredly be expected to consider the constitutions and history of other federations, old and new. According to the recognised canons of construction they must be taken to have been familiar with them, and the application of this doctrine is not excluded or weakened by the notorious historical truth as to the members of the Convention. Now at the end of the nineteenth century there were in actual operation three great federal systems of Government - the two great English-speaking federations of the United States of America and Canada and the Swiss Confederation. We may assume that the relative advantages and disadvantages of these several systems were weighed by the framers of the Constitution. If it is suggested that the Constitution is to be construed merely by the aid of a dictionary as by an astral intelligence, and as a mere decree of the Imperial Parliament without reference to history, we answer that that argument, if relevant, is negated by the preamble 39. 1 C.I.R. 94 at p106."
to the Act itself which has been already quoted." 40 They also stated that, "as the scheme of the Australian Constitution was in this respect practically identical with that of the United States of America which had long been interpreted by the Supreme Court of that Republic in a long series of cases familiar to the Australian publicists by whom the Australian Constitution was framed, it ought to be inferred that the intention of the framers was that like provisions should receive like interpretations. This is a well recognised rule of construction and its application is not limited to Statutes of the same legislature." 41 Finally "For these reasons we are of the opinion that the implication of a prohibition of mutual interference is as necessary in the case of the Australian Constitution as in that of the United States of America, and that the doctrine laid down in D'Emden v. Pedder ... should be once more affirmed by this Court notwithstanding the opinion of the Judicial Committee in Webb v. Outtrim." 42

In 1906 the rule of non-interference laid down in D'Emden v. Pedder was held to apply not only to State interference with Commonwealth operations, but vice versa. In the Railway Servants' Case 43 (1906) it was held that the Commonwealth had no power to control the conditions of employment on State railways, which were a State instrumentality.

In 1908 in Barger's Case 44 Griffith, Barton and O'Connor held that

40. 4 C.L.R. 1087 at p1109.
41. Ibid at p1122.
42. Ibid at p1132.
44. The King v. Barger 6 C.L.R. 41.
the Excise Tariff Act of 1906 was invalid. This Act was part of the
New Protection Legislation supported by the Australian Labor Party
and introduced by Deakin. Customs duties had been imposed on the
import of agricultural machinery: the Excise Tariff Act imposed
excise duties on articles manufactured in Australia, duties which would
not apply to machinery manufactured under certain specified conditions
of employment. The three senior justices held that the Act was not
an exercise of the taxing power, but an attempt to regulate the
conditions of labor, and that therefore under the principles laid
down in D'Eanden v. Pedder and the Railway Servants Case, it was
invalid.

To reach this conclusion they relied on both Canadian Privy Council
and American cases which laid down that in determining the validity of
laws what counted was not the literal intent but the substance.
Attorney-General for Quebec v. Queen Insurance Co. (3A. C.1090)

In the Union Label Case (1906),45 Part VII of the Commonwealth
Trade Marks Act of 1905 was held invalid. This section authorised
the registration as a trademark of a Union Label, a pet project of
the Labor Party, modelled on American precedents, which certified that
a product so marked had been produced by union labor under approved
conditions of employment. Once again Griffith, Barton and O'Connor
held that this was an attempt to regulate conditions of labor, a
power reserved to the States, and the Act was therefore invalid.

45. The Attorney-General of New South Wales v. the Brewery Employees
Union of New South Wales 6 C.L.R., 469.
Even powers which the Federal Government was sure it possessed, such as that over corporations (Sec. 51, xx) were attacked. In Huddart Parker v. Moorehead (1909) \textsuperscript{46} Sections 5 and 8 of the Australian Industries Preservation Act of 1906 were declared invalid insofar as they interfered with the operation of foreign corporations formed under State laws and operating within the limits of a State.

The line of interpretation thus laid down by Griffith, Barton and O'Connor did not pass unchallenged even in the High Court. In 1906 Isaac Isaacs and Henry Bournes Higgins were appointed to the High Court as additional justices. Higgins had already stated that "I venture to think that the introduction of powers by implication, of prohibitions by implication cannot legitimately be carried so far - at least under modern British law. Judges in interpreting and applying the law have no right to assume the functions of legislators. The justification for judges introducing words that have been expressed must rest on logical necessity, not upon political expediency. The implications must be necessary, not conjectural or argumentative." \textsuperscript{47}

In Berger's Case Isaacs relied on Nicols v. Ames (1898), \textsuperscript{48} a much later American case than that of McCulloch v. Maryland, to show that the construction of the power to tax must be a wide one and claimed that in over one hundred and twenty years no United States

\textsuperscript{46} Huddart Parker Co. Ltd. v. Moorehead \& C.L.R. 330.
\textsuperscript{48} 173 U.S. 506.
case had given the narrow construction of the Federal taxing power claimed by Griffith, Barton and O'Connor. 49 "To those who have hitherto thought that the Australian Constitution was at least as national in character as the American constitution, this will come as a revelation."

"For nearly one and a quarter centuries the Supreme Court of the United States has acted upon the opposite doctrine, and consistently repressed all action on the part of the States even when otherwise fully authorised by their Constitutions - if that action in any way amounted to interference with federal exclusive power such as Excise duties are ..." 50

"The unlimited character of federal power, once it attaches to a subject, is strikingly exemplified in the most recent of the great constitutional decisions of the American Supreme Court. In what is known as the Employers' Liability Cases (207 U.S. 403) decided last January, that tribunal had to consider the validity of an Act of Congress which provided that inter-State carriers should be liable to the personal representative of an employee who died from injuries resulting from the negligence of the employer or his servants or from negligent defects in the plant or works ... To accept the defendants' arguments here appears to me to do violence to the plain words of the Constitution and to recede altogether from the accepted

50. ibid at p101.
notion of federal powers in America, on the Constitution of which our
own was supposed to be based, and to judicially limit, rather than
interpret, the grant of national powers." 51

Thus Isaacs was not so much questioning the importation of American
precedents into the interpretation of the Australian constitution:
rather he was attacking the conception of the American constitution
held by Griffith, Barton and O'Connor and implying that they had
failed to take into account the later interpretation of that Constitution.

In Vardon v. O'Loughlin Isaacs suggested the literal interpretation
as by an astral intelligence approach to the Constitution ridiculed by
Griffith in Baxter's Case, 52 "Perhaps the safest rule of interpretation
after all will be found to be to look to the nature and objects of the
particular powers, duties and rights with all the side lights of
contemporary history; and to give to the words of each just such
operation and force consistent with their legitimate meaning, as may
fairly secure and attain the ends proposed." 53

In Baxter's Case Higgins said "It is true that I have held and
still hold a strong opinion with regard to the judgment of Marshall
C.J. in McCulloch v. Maryland, the judgment on which Deakin v. Webb
was based - although I utter the opinion with a feeling that it will
be regarded by some as blasphemy. I regard it as being the utterance

52. Baxter v. Commissioner of Taxation of New South Wales, 4 C.L.R.
1087 at p1109.
53. Vardon v. O'Loughlin 5 C.L.R. 201 at p215: he was quoting Story
rather of the Statesman than of the lawyer. I think that the
doctrine of logical implication was pressed beyond the logical limits
recognised by British law. 54

Nor was the Bar by any means in unanimous agreement with the
views of Griffith, Barton and O'Connor: in fact Isaacs' dissent from
their opinions was often supported by many members of the Bar. 55

said, "the learned Judges of the High Court seem to have gone too far
in two directions. In the contest which must ever continue between
Commonwealth and State rights, it may be expected that the High Court
will be inclined to maintain Commonwealth rights where there may be
doubt, and so in such cases, of which the above are two, the judgments
are fairly open to honest criticism. The Rule was laid down by the
High Court in D'Emden v. Pedder that Federal instruments are not
subject to State taxation and that where a tax minimises the
recompense allotted by the Commonwealth to its officers a Federal
instrumentality is interfered with. This rule was taken from the
well-known American case, McCulloch v. Maryland, hastily accepted
as applicable to the conditions which spring from the relation of
States and Commonwealth, a relation which differs to a great extent
from that which exists between the United States and each of its

54. Baxter v. Commissioner of Taxation of New South Wales
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States." 57

This division of opinion on the High Court Bench has its origins in the Federation period of Australian history. All five Justices had taken part in the Federal Conventions, and Griffith, Barton and O'Connor had had a large part in drafting the Commonwealth Bill. Phillips speaks of "the spirit of Federalism which burdened the conscience of those who had fought to establish the national structure, just as it enlivened the suspicions of those who had opposed the movement." 58 Crisp points out that "No man finds it easy to destroy his or turn his back on something to which he has given years of life." 59

It is thus necessary to examine the backgrounds of each of these five Justices and their views as expressed in the Federal Convention Debates in order to see the continuity of their thinking on the question of the interpretation of State and Commonwealth powers, and on their views of the American Constitution.

Sir Samuel Griffith was born in Merthyr Tydfil, Wales, on June 21, 1845, the second son of a Congregational minister. In October 1853 the family left London for Queensland, where they arrived early in 1854. Most of Griffith's education was received at a High School in Maitland from 1856 on. In 1860 at the age of fifteen he became one of the thirty or so students at Sydney University, where his

59. L.F. Crisp op. cit. p27.
studies were financed by a series of scholarships and where he won many prizes and first-class honours in Classics, Mathematics and natural science.

His father having now moved from Maitland to Brisbane, Griffith became apprenticed to a Brisbane solicitor, Arthur Macalister, M.L.A. Between October 1865 and February 1867 Griffith travelled in Europe on a scholarship awarded by the University of Sydney. After passing the bar examinations he was admitted to the Bar on October 14, 1867.

After refusing one invitation to enter politics in 1871 Griffith in 1872 stood for election to Queensland's Legislative Assembly on the anti-squatter platform then gaining ground in Queensland, and won.

His achievements in this first Parliament were minor but full of promise, and he was returned in 1873 unopposed, as a member of the Liberal Party opposed to the squatters. He continued with law reforms and in August 1874 became Attorney General. He was largely responsible for the 1875 State Education Act which provided for free, compulsory, primary education between the ages of six and fourteen years: he was, though not Prime Minister, the most powerful figure in the Government, and when it was overthrown in 1878 he became the leader of the opposition.

In 1883 the Liberals won the elections largely on the White Australia platform and Griffith became Premier. In 1884 he started a series of legislation which provided for the end of the importation of Kanakas to work on Queensland's sugar plantations, and the restriction
of Chinese and Indian immigration. He also passed land legislation to reduce the power of the squatters and to prevent the alienation of Crown land, and was responsible for the opening of over 1,000 miles of rail track between 1883 and 1888.

At this period he showed sympathy towards workers, and even made moves in the direction of employers' liability and attempted to pass an Eight Hours' Bill. He was hailed by William Lane as champion of the workers.

Yet in 1890 he joined his opponent McLwraith as Premier in a coalition Government and in 1890-1 at the time of the great strikes he imported armed strike-breakers from Victoria. In 1892 he made provision for the continuance of Kanaka labor in Queensland, which was due to come to an end in 1893, for a further ten years.  

A fully adequate biography of Griffith still remains to be published, but this volte-face in 1890-2 appears to end the "radical" phase in Griffith's life. The reversal of policy on the Kanaka problem Griffith claimed to be based on economic necessity, since there was insufficient white labor available to work the cane-fields in Queensland, an explanation accepted by his biographers. The use of force against the strikers is excused by his dislike of militant resistance by the shearsers, and his preference for gradual reform.

There is, regrettably, nothing in Griffith's papers in the Mitchell Library which can fully explain whether these actions represent a basic change in political philosophy or were mere actions of political necessity in particular circumstances.

In the Federal Convention at Sydney in 1891 Griffith was not only a member for his own colony, but Vice-President and, with Barton, Kingston and Inglis Clarke, a member of the Drafting Committee which produced the 1891 Bill. He showed much less popular sympathy than the other "radical" members. He opposed for instance the reference of issues to the people. 63

Griffith also demonstrated himself to be one of the group of "States rights" men who wished to reserve as much power as possible to the States. As Crisp puts it "United States precedents were the stock - in-trade of the 'States Rights' men." 64 Piddington many years later claimed that Griffith came to the 1891 Convention with a draft already prepared on the United States model. 65 He was prepared in 1891 to go so far as to abandon the principle of responsible government in favour of an independent executive on American lines. 66 He also opposed the docking of the States House or Senate of powers to challenge financial legislation, and at the least wanted it to be allowed to reject financial legislation. 67 He declared himself as specifically opposed to unification 68 while Crisp records that although

64. L.F. Crisp op. cit. p26.
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he was absent from the 1897-8 Convention he was opposed to the inclusion of the conciliation and arbitration clause. 69

It is thus clear that he was, from the start, closely attached to the principles of the American Constitution and that he was also inclined towards the States Rights view and little interested in the possibility of giving power over social questions to the Federal Parliament.

In 1893 he became Chief Justice of Queensland, a circumstance which precluded his attendance at the 1897-8 Convention. He played no further part in politics, but was offered in 1903 the Chief Justiceship.

Sir Edmund Barton was born on January 18, 1849 at Glebe, Sydney, the second youngest of the eleven children of William Barton, a Sydney merchant of English birth, and of his wife Louisa. He attended Fort Street School, and from 1857 the newly re-opened Sydney Grammar School. In 1866 he went to Sydney University where he studied Classics under Professor Badham, winning First Class Honours in 1868. He became apprenticed to first a Sydney solicitor and then a barrister and was admitted to the New South Wales Bar in 1872.

In 1879 he was elected to the Legislative Assembly of New South Wales, after a previous defeat in 1877, and became a supporter of the Parkes-Robertson Government. His conservative tendencies can be seen in his defence of the nominee Legislative Council against an attempt by Parkes to deprive it of power to amend money bills, 70 and in his support for the provision to allow clergy to visit State schools to

70. N.S.W.H. Ass. Apr. 7, 1880 Barton p1856.
give religious teaching. In 1885 he became Speaker, a position from which he resigned in 1887, and Parkes appointed him to the nominee Legislative Council.

After the defeat of Parkes' Government in 1892, by the defection of the thirty-six Labor members elected in 1891 for the first time, Barton joined the new protectionist Dibbs Ministry as Attorney-General, becoming acting Premier during Dibbs' absence in 1892, during the financial crisis. He was forced to resign by a scandal in 1893 caused by his retention, after his appointment as Attorney-General, of a brief for a firm of railway contractors who were involved in litigation with the Railway Commissioners.

Barton became one of the earliest supporters of Sir Henry Parkes' proposal for Federation; and collaborated closely with him in 1890-1. In 1891 he attended the Sydney Federal Convention where he was a member of the drafting committee, and on Sir Henry Parkes' defeat in 1891 he assumed the leadership of the Federal movement; although due to Sir George Dibbs' hostility to Federalism and the financial crisis, little progress was made in his home state. He was active in forming Federation Leagues, Border Federation Leagues, and in promoting the popular Corowa Conference of 1893. In 1897 Barton was returned at the top of the New South Wales poll for the Federal Convention of 1897-8.

Wise records the Barton expressed preference for the United States Constitution over the Canadian one in 1891. He also declared his adherence to the 1891 Bill he had helped to draft and which was based on the American Constitution, and defended the powers of the United States Senate. On the other hand he favoured a government responsible to one house only, though he supported the idea of a strong senate.

In 1897 at Adelaide Barton was delegated to draft and submit resolutions similar to those presented by Parkes in 1891. He repeated his belief in equal representation in a "States House" though he considered this should be popularly elected. After the debate on his resolutions Barton was appointed Chairman of the Committee on Constitutional Machinery to which the other Committees on finance and the judiciary were to report.

Barton was reluctant to accept adult suffrage: he opposed the granting of the power over conciliation and arbitration to the Federal Parliament. His attitude towards the power to grant invalid and old age pensions was that, while he was dubious about the whole question, it was certainly a matter for State not Federal action.

Once Federation had been passed, Barton became the first Federal Prime Minister.
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The first Parliament dealt with the Tariff, the White Australia policy and the question of naval defence. The strain of this busy session told on his health and in 1903 he became one of the first Justices of the High Court, giving the position of Chief Justice, which he could have had for himself, to Griffith.

A letter in Barton's papers foreshadows the view of the Constitution he was to take on the Bench. Referring to his refusal to accept Kingston's inclusion of merchant seamen in the Conciliation and Arbitration Bill he wrote "I shall never, I hope, be found abandoning the principles on which the battle of Federation was fought. It would be a deserting of one of the greatest of them to consent to a proposal which impairs the whole basis of the Federation as a Union of States giving plenary powers to the Commonwealth for National self-governing purposes, but preserving at the same time the continuance and the individuality of the States in their own great sphere. In short I am for 'an indestructible Union of indestructible States'."

R.E. O'Connor was born on August 4, 1851, Sydney, the son of Richard O'Connor, Clerk of Parliament in New South Wales. His career ran very closely parallel to that of Barton. He attended first Lyndhurst College, and then Sydney Grammar School. In 1871 he gained
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his B.A. at the University of Sydney, in 1873 his M.A. After being apprenticed to Frederick Darley he was admitted to the Bar in 1876. He also acted as clerk to the Legislative Council during his University career, and wrote for the Sydney Echo. In 1887 he was appointed to the New South Wales Legislative Council, by Parkes: from 1891 to 1893 he was Minister for Justice in the Dibbs Government in which Barton also served, and was forced to resign for the same reason, that he too had retained a brief for a firm of railway contractors engaged in litigation against the Railway Commissioners.

In 1897 he was elected as one of the Federal Convention members for New South Wales, and was, with Barton, a member of the Committee on Constitutional Machinery which drafted the Constitution.

O'Connor supported the United States form of Federation against the Canadian. He was reluctant to accept the use of the referendum and unenthusiastic about the conciliation and arbitration power.

In the first Commonwealth Parliament he was elected to the Senate, and as Vice-President of the Executive Council was responsible for the exposition of Government policy there.

Henry Bournes Higgins was born in 1851 in County Down, Ireland, the son of a Methodist minister, and was educated at home till 1861 when he was sent as a boarder to the Wesleyan Connexional School in Dublin.
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He left in 1865 because of bad health. In 1866 he went to work in a draper's warehouse in Belfast; and later he worked in a furniture warehouse in Dublin. Finally in 1869 the family decided for health reasons to emigrate to Australia, arriving in Melbourne in February 1870. In Melbourne he taught by day and studied for matriculation in the evenings, and he supported himself through his B.A. at Melbourne University by teaching and coaching.

He visited Europe in 1885 on a scholarship and returned to Australia via the United States of America in 1887. In 1890 he refused an appointment to the Victorian Supreme Court. In 1894 he was elected to the Legislative Assembly where he supported the reforms of the Turner Government on the Tariff, the Shops and Factories Acts and the like. Higgins found such questions deeply interesting and was influenced by such people as Sydney and Beatrice Webb, who visited Australia in 1898, and Chief Justice Higginsbotham who supported the strikers in the Maritime Strike of 1890.

In 1897 he was elected to the Federal Convention where he became recognised as an expert on social questions. He opposed equal State representation in the Senate. In 1897 he fought in the Victorian Assembly for proportional representation in the Senate and only just lost. He was unwilling to give any financial power to the

he supported the referendum in case of a deadlock between the houses. He supported Turner's proposal that Constitutional amendment should be by simple Parliamentary majority followed by reference to the people.

In the end he decided he must oppose the proposed Bill as it emerged from the Federal Convention because of its inclusion of equal State representation; and its lack of unity: he still believed he had been right many years later.

Higgins became President of the Commonwealth Court of Conciliation and Arbitration in 1905. His growing interest in social questions can be illustrated by the change in his reading, from the Shakespeare and Bacon, the Thucydides, Sallust, Rousseau and Goethe of his youth to the works of Jules Simon, Auguste Comte, Thomas Jefferson, Sydney and Beatrice Webb, John Pym, Cromwell, Ireton etc. of the 1900's. He read widely on social problems in America; Woodrow Wilson's "Congressional Government", Norman Angell in the periodical "New Republic", H.D. Lloyd and Henry George were familiar to him.

As early as 1904 he was writing for the Political Science Quarterly of Columbia University on "Our Rigid Constitution", while following his second visit to the United States of America in 1914 he was...
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constantly pressed to write for such journals as the _Yale Law Review_.

Of his visit to the United States of America his biographer wrote that it had a profound effect: he found that men there were struggling to cope with social and economic problems familiar to him in Australia, while despite his disappointment in Woodrow Wilson himself, he found kindred spirits in Felix Frankfurter, then Professor in the Harvard Law School, and Louis Brandeis who was soon to become a Supreme Court Justice.

Yet this man, who of all the Justices of the High Court of Australia was probably the most familiar with the pattern of social and economic development in the United States of America, was the most steadfast opponent of the importation of United States precedents into the interpretation of the Australian Constitution.

_Isaac Isaacs_ was born in Melbourne on August 6, 1855, the eldest child of Alfred Isaacs, a Jewish tailor from Poland and of his wife Rebecca who had arrived in Australia in September 1854. From 1858 the family lived in Yackandah in north-eastern Victoria and Isaacs attended school there and later at Beechworth Grammar School from 1869. In 1870 he became a teacher with the Victorian Education Department, but resigned in 1875 after a dispute over fees.

He was appointed to a clerical position in the Crown Law Department, and worked from 1876 as a part-time student at the University of Melbourne where he graduated LL.M. in 1880. In 1880 he was admitted to the Victorian Bar, where his practice grew slowly but steadily.

---

93. e.g. Letter Wilson J. Colvers to Higgins Apr. 10, 1923 in _Higgins Papers MS 1057/487 A.N.L._
94. N. Palmer: _op. cit._ p255.
95. _ibid_ p262.
96. _ibid_ p257.
In 1892 at the time of the financial crisis in Australia he was elected to the Victorian Legislative Assembly for Bogong, a constituency in the north-eastern part of the State where he had lived in his youth. In his pre-election speeches he favoured Federation as a means of making Australia a nation. He was also in favour of free, compulsory and secular education, of direct income tax as opposed to indirect taxation and of a court of conciliation and arbitration.\textsuperscript{97} In January 1893 after eight months in Parliament he became Solicitor General in William Patterson's Ministry, from which he resigned over a matter of principle in May 1893 because of the Government's refusal to prosecute the Directors of the Mercantile Bank for fraud. He was immediately re-elected unopposed to Parliament, and in 1894 became Attorney-General in Sir William Turner's reforming ministry on the fall of Patterson. The legislation passed by this Ministry included old age pensions, factory reforms, wages boards and the like; Isaacs himself was especially concerned with the amendment of the Company Law.

Isaacs in 1897 became one of the Victorian members of the Federal Convention. There he was defeated in the ballot for members of the Constitutional Committee. Deakin, while paying tribute to Isaacs' ability,\textsuperscript{98} attributes his defeat to personal motives,\textsuperscript{99} due partly to
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dislike of his personality and partly to the dislike of the
Conservative majority for the radicalism of the whole Victorian
delegation.

In the convention Isaacs, like Higgins, supported the idea of
including conciliation and arbitration among the powers to be given
to the Commonwealth Parliament; while he opposed on principle equal
State representation in the Senate; and supported popular election
of Senators. He went so far as to propose at Adelaide that deadlocks
between House and Senate should be solved by referendum, a proposal
which he repeated at Sydney, where he went so far as to claim that
the American Constitution was inadequate for new conditions and thus
unsuitable for Australia. Like Higgins again he wished to simplify
the procedure for constitutional amendment.

Nevertheless unlike Higgins he decided, though reluctantly, to
support the Bill.

Basic similarities are discernible in the backgrounds of Barton
and O'Connor, sons of the comfortably off New South Wales middle
class; their education and political careers ran on closely parallel
lines, and neither displayed any great concern with the matters of
social and economic reform which were pressed increasingly by the
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Debs. Melbourne 1898 p2172, 2180, 2213 where he claimed that the
American Constitution was not basically democratic, and that the
United States of America was now moving towards the British type
of Cabinet Government.
Labor party from 1891 on. There are also similarities in the antecedents of Isaacs and Higgins, one an immigrant, the other the son of immigrants, both of whom had to struggle to finance themselves through their legal studies. Isaacs and Higgins were also associated in the Turner ministry which was associated with social reform, and both displayed concern with social questions.

The early career of Sir Samuel Griffith as an immigrant with his own career to make, bears greater similarities to those of Isaacs and Higgins, with whom he constantly disagreed on the High Court Bench than to Barton and O'Connor: he was in his early political career very distinctly reformist: nevertheless his views on politics appear to have undergone a change towards a more conservative outlook in 1890-1, a period which coincides with his participation in the Convention of 1891.

The three Justices who were later to restrict by judicial interpretation the extent of Federal powers, declared themselves favourable in the Conventions to the preservation of States Rights particularly through the means of the Senate, whose powers they wished to make extensive; they opposed the referring of the Constitution to the people, either to pass the Bill, to amend the constitution, or to break deadlocks. They also opposed the extension of Commonwealth powers to cover industrial or social matters.

In all these points the views of Higgins and Isaacs were almost diametrically opposed.
Political Implications

Thus by 1909 the interpretation of the Australian Constitution as regards the relation between Federal and State powers had been established by Griffith, Barton and O'Connor on the basis of the American doctrine of implied prohibitions. The fact that so many of the decisions impugned powers either previously held part of the Commonwealth grant, or concerned progressive social and economic legislation considered vital by the Labor Party brought the whole question into the political arena.

The Labor party, previously hostile to the Federal Constitution, partly because of its non-existent part in its formation, and partly because of its implications as an anti-Labor device, had its worst suspicions confirmed by the interpretation given to the Constitution by the High Court. On the other hand Labor had realised the possibilities offered for a greater extension of social and economic reform offered by a Federal Parliament elected on universal suffrage, and unhampered by reactionary Upper Chambers as were the Legislatures of many of the States.

The typically British view that any Federal Constitution must be only an imperfect first step towards unitary government on the British system finds expression in the Governor-General's despatches of the period. 106 From this point of view Dudley pointed out that a

Labor Government would not necessarily be a disaster" ... I fear that there is but little prospect of much improvement in the jealousies between the Federal and State Governments so long as a Conservative Liberal Government remains in power. For such a Government derives the powers largely from the class of people who are the champions of State rights, and therefore it is not likely to do anything which will alienate that support. The Labor party on the other hand is composed of men who do not care twopence for State rights, whose desire on the contrary is to strengthen or rationalise the Federal Parliament because, in their opinion, by doing so their class will exercise a greater power throughout Australia generally and will no longer be hampered by the varying conditions and regulations of Labor in different States.

"That fact I am convinced is really at the bottom of nearly all these instances of State jealousy. The Tory and moderate Liberal parties are the principal supporters of State rights because they fear the possible power of the Federal Parliament whereas the Labor Party see very clearly that in order to achieve the objects which they have at heart it would be much simpler to unify Australia and then to capture the unified Parliament than to carry on a bitter and strenuous struggle in six different States.

"The Labor Party then, is the party that is most likely to press forwards towards the abolition of State pretensions and I believe that in such an aim they have a majority of Australians behind them."107

In the elections of 1910 the Labor party was returned to power in the Federal elections. One of its first moves was to frame referendum proposals to change the powers of the Commonwealth so as to include powers over trade, commerce and industrial conditions ruled unlawful by the High Court in the original state of the constitution.

Conrad Joyner has traced the development of these proposals and their subsequent watering down in the later referenda of 1913 and 1919. The proposals of the 1911 referendum were in fact more comprehensive and more sweeping than those of later years.

On October 18, 1910, introducing the second reading of the Constitution Alteration (Legislative Powers) Bill Hughes attempted to prove that there was no essential connection between Federalism and the Federal System as it existed in the United States. Equal State representation in the Senate and the existence of a High Court to protect the Constitution, were, he claimed, no fundamental part of such a system, since Switzerland and Germany had both dispensed with them. The main essential was merely to preserve to both central and provincial governments the powers allotted to them. "As to the scope of our own powers, we have followed with too slavish and almost fatal imitation, the model of the American Constitution, particularly in regard to the trade, commerce and industry powers which are daily becoming more important."108 The examples of Canada and Germany showed that the federal government could deal with intra-State trade and industry without destroying the Federal basis of their government.

He claimed that the Federal Government was something more than a Customs or defence union. "A National Parliament ought to deal with national matters. If our ambition aims merely at a glorified town council uttering and re-uttering pious ejaculations concerning national sentiments, such as that we are to have one flag and one destiny, no doubt the Constitution clothes us with enough powers. But I take it that our desires lie in quite another direction. We desire to give legislative and administrative effect to the national demands of the people of the Commonwealth ... Was this Federation created merely as a Customs Union or as a means for defence? ... We have a right to claim that we should be permitted to exercise in reality the powers which we thought we possessed to the full when we entered Federation, but which experience and the decisions of the High Court have shown that we do not possess. ... We need to have in regard to trade and commerce the power that the Canadian Parliament has." 109

These words summarise the main attitudes of the Labor party.

There is firstly the rejection of the American constitutional model in favour of the more tightly knit Canadian or German one, which was in fact expressed by many Labor men in 1897-8. 110 There is the insistence that the national government has national interests beyond the common commercial and defence interests which boosted Federation.

Finally there is resentment at the interpretation of the Constitution given by the High Court, and the claim that it had in fact reduced the powers which the people believed had been given to the central government.

Other Labor members also emphasised that the Bills were necessary since the restrictive decisions of the High Court based upon American lines had denied the exercise of many powers which the Commonwealth had been believed to have. Yet others, less tactful than Hughes of offending "federal" opinion, declared that unification would not be a bad thing and praised the Canadian example as opposed to that of the United States of America.

It fell to Deakin to state the opposition's case against the Bills. Deakin's position was difficult; as the Government General put it in reference to the next referendum proposals put forward by Labor in 1912: "Mr. Deakin as leader of the Opposition occupies a position of considerable difficulty. When in office, he was largely dependent on the votes of the Labor party, and partly on this account, and partly, no doubt owing to the naturally progressive character of his views, he has at one time or another advocated proposals not easily distinguishable in principle from many of those now put forward by the Government. On the other hand, among his present political
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associates are many men of a genuinely conservative temper, whose past record enables them to offer a much more whole-hearted opposition to the labor policy and disposed them to cavil at Mr. Deakin's leadership. 115

Nevertheless he put forward the classic conservative case for the retention of the unaltered federal constitution, a point of view characterised by the Bulletin as "Tory - not the worst kind who wants to go back to the Middle Ages, but the ordinary kind who wants to stay where he is." 116 He emphasised that the Constitution-Framers had had the example of all existing federations before them but had deliberately chosen the 1900 constitution as the best for Australia, while the Labor proposals would lead to unification not Federation.

In actual fact Deakin had approved criticisms of the limited nature of Federal powers in the fields of trade and commerce and of industrial conciliation and arbitration, made by his Attorney General Littleton Groom in 1908. 117 In 1908 too, a proposal was drawn up to confer on the Federal Government power to legislate on wages and hours, but it was not sufficiently wide to please the Labor party. 118 The campaign was really fought on political grounds, not constitutional, that the Bills were a mere attempt to further the ends of the Labor party.

Glynn argued that the wide application of the trade and commerce

power in the United States of America meant that in fact the Commonwealth already had enough power to deal with monopolies under the existing constitution. Sir John Quick stated "I think I can say that if these amendments are carried they will mark the beginning of the end of the Commonwealth of Australia as a union of States."

In actual fact the question of American influence on the formation and interpretation of the Australian constitution was submerged in specifically Australian political issues. Few Australian newspapers saw the struggle otherwise than as one between Labor and anti-Labor forces. The Bulletin for example, one of the few major papers which supported the referendum proposals, ignored constitutional niceties whether American or Canadian, concentrating rather on personal and political issues, such as the revolt of the New South Wales Political Labor League against the Commonwealth proposals. Its view was that the powers asked for by the Federal Government rested ultimately with the people, whether exercised by the Commonwealth or the States, while the Federal Parliament's laws would be uniform and unburdened by reactionary second chambers as were some of the States.

Most of the metropolitan dailies opposed the extension of Federal powers. The Sydney Morning Herald saw it purely as a party issue, and declared that New South Wales would never have joined the Federal
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compact if the proposed powers now asked had been suggested.\textsuperscript{123} It consistently put the anti-Referendum case,\textsuperscript{124} showing considerable animus against the Labor party in general and Hughes in particular. The referendum, it declared "was never meant to be used as a burglar's jemmy in the hands of men like Mr. Hughes."\textsuperscript{125} It supported the Federal Convention's choice of the United States of America as a model for Australia,\textsuperscript{126} and denied that that Convention had been unaware of the problem of trusts in the United States.\textsuperscript{127}

The Argus was even more inclined to suspect the Labor party's motives, and even less inclined to consider the question of American influence and its significance in the Australian Constitution.\textsuperscript{128}

According to Joyner this was true of the whole of the Press with the exception of the Labor papers and the Bulletin; they saw it as a party issue, in which they were solidly opposed to the Labor party.\textsuperscript{129}

Joyner, in analysing the groups on either side in the Referendum campaign of 1911, finds that industrial labor was solidly behind the referendum proposals as were political labor parties in all states save New South Wales.\textsuperscript{130} So were prominent members of the Roman
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Catholic hierarchy, and some of the Catholic Press.  

On the "No" side were interest groups representing farmers and manufacturers who feared nationalisation, municipal councils, women's organisations, and the Temperance Alliance and the Australian Natives Association in Victoria. There were also sections of the Labor party who advocated a "No" vote in the States where Labor was not still in opposition, in Western Australia, and particularly in New South Wales.

Yet despite the split in the campaigning on Labor versus anti-Labor lines, the voting showed that some twenty-four electorates which had returned Labor members in the 1910 elections, voted "No" in the referendum while no Liberal constituency in the 1910 elections voted "Yes" in 1911. Half the electorates which changed sides were in New South Wales where the overall percentage poll was the lowest in Australia, a result which was probably partly due to bewilderment amongst Labor voters at the Labor split in that State.

But the other feature which almost all the electorates which changed sides had in common was that with the exception of Brisbane and Adelaide they were rural seats. Joyner claims that though the bulk of the voters probably voted on traditional party lines, the
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percentage which switched to protect their socio-economic interests, together with those who were bewildered by the Labor split, actually provided the swing which defeated the referendum proposals. 135

Thus in the 1911 campaign the question of the American or Canadian form of Constitution as stated by the Labor party in Parliament was little discussed in the press, and probably even less by the electors, who voted for other political, social or economic reasons. The opposition of the Canadian and American forms of federation as stated by Hughes was in fact purely a rationalisation rather than a reason for Labor's desire to expand the power of the Federal government. To them from 1897 on the American type of division of powers represented a weak form of government incapable of carrying out their desired reforms fully on either State or Federal levels.

The antipathy felt by many Labor men for the United States of America as the land of trusts and combines is a partial explanation for this, since they feared that under a similar type of constitution Australia might prove similarly incapable of dealing adequately with such conditions. By 1911 all Australian Labor parliamentarians were aware of this problem in the United States of America. 136 Nevertheless all political innovations from the United States were not necessarily suspect: the initiative and referendum adopted in Switzerland and in some states of the United States of America was included in the

136. See Chapter 1.
1908 Federal Conference platform and it was actively championed by members such as W.R.N. Maloney. The fact, however, that Labor won the 1910 elections and control of the Federal Parliament reduced interest in such a mechanism and it was not included in the 1912 fighting platform. The recall of members by dissatisfied constituents was even less popular, not even reaching the A.L.P. general platform in 1912. In 1915 the Initiative and Referendum went on to the fighting platform, but the recall was rejected.

It is thus clear that constitutional innovations from America could be imported by the Labor party when it suited their political purposes. In the 1911 Referendum the attack on the American form of the constitution was rather a focus or symbol of political aims than a pure expression of hostility to the United States form of government. Yet it is nevertheless significant that for the Labor party the United States as a whole was a symbol not of democracy but of triumphant capitalism, while even the parliamentary opposition to the Bills stressed the differences between the Australian and American Constitutions rather than their similarities.

The 1913 referendum was very similar to that of 1911, but the proposals were presented separately; trade on state railways and the control of municipal corporations etc.

Fisher, introducing the Bills in Parliament in 1912 stated the

140. Ibid pp24-5.
Labor case thus "Our Constitution is based on that of the United States. When it was adopted, and for about a quarter of a century before, the people of the world had turned their attention to the development of that country; and the public men of Australia looked to that country as a guide for the framing of our Constitution. They ignored the fact that our Sister Dominion of Canada, after eighty years experience of the United States Constitution, adopted a different form of government altogether. The Canadian people were more likely to be fully acquainted with the value of the United States Constitution than we were; they were near neighbours of the United States, and had a country larger in area than Australia with approximately 3,000 miles of border line alongside the great Democratic Republic. They realised the advantages and also the disadvantages of the form of government adopted there, and Canada federated more boldly than did the United States and more boldly than did the statesmen who drew up the draft Constitution of the Commonwealth. ... It is only fair to the men who drew up the draft Constitution of Australia to say that they had not before them the facts that we have in regard to the working of the United States Constitution. The trusts and combines in America were then in their infancy; that country was prosperous and 'triumphant democracy' was - shall I say - the catch-word of the political world. Into this trend of opinion the framers of our constitution were swept: but within a few years we found the Government of the United States rent asunder because of its impotency to protect
their own people - the very people that the Constitution had been brought into existence to protect and secure against monopolies inside or out, and enemies of the country whether at home or abroad ... That is the working of a constitution of a people, not second in intelligence and education to any other in the world - people better trained in Democratic institutions than those of any other country. This is a position that honourable members opposite are defending and trying to justify. In my opinion that is not only a wrong but a suicidal course. 141

Much of the Labor attack was concentrated on the question of trusts and monopolies and the position that these had achieved in the United States of America: 142 anxiety was sharpened by the recent revelations that the American Beef Trust appeared to be taking an interest in Australia as a field for operations. 143

Yet, as Fitzhardinge points out, Hughes' campaign was based not on the United States failure to "bust" the trusts under the Constitution but upon the decisions of the High Court in the Sugar 144 and Vend 145 cases. This Fitzhardinge sees as partly due to Hughes' desire to nationalise rather than break monopolies, a policy which was

143. See also S.M.H. Apr. 30, 1913, May 3, 1913 for Hughes views of trusts in the United States.
likely to be less popular. Hughes even went so far as to deny the
Opposition's contention that under the 1910 Australian Industries
Preservation legislation, the Government had the power to break the
trusts anyway, by the blatant untruth that these cases had been
decided under the 1910 legislation. In actual fact they were
determined under the 1906 Australian Industries Preservation Act,
which made combination in restraint of trade illegal only when
it was intended to be against the public interest, whereas the
1910 Act made any combination in restraint of trade illegal.

The Press divided on much the same lines as in 1911, the big
dailies being against the proposal: the Argus claimed the Australian
Constitution could not be condemned by the failure of the American as
Fisher claimed; the Australian document was better and more democratic,
and its only failure was the fact that the Senate acted as a party,
not a State, house; it also condemned the Labor party's insistence
on the trust issue as inconsistent and insincere.

Joyner once again attributes the defeat in 1913 to the same
reasons as that in 1911: the lack of opposition from the New South
Wales Labor politicians was counterbalanced by the improved organisation
of the Liberal party. The higher vote (800,000 more voted than in

146. For an account of this incident in which Hughes simply mis-stated
the whole position on the Vend case, and got away with it by
sheer contradiction see L.F. Fitzhardinge: William Morris Hughes,
pp.287-288.

147. Argus Jan. 4, 1913.

1911 a total of some 2,000,000) was probably due to the holding of Parliamentary elections simultaneously with the vote on the referendum proposals. The extension of powers to cover trusts and monopolies was defeated by only some 8,500 votes, or some 0.425% of the total vote and even the largest "No" majority on the extension of the trade and commerce power was only by some 25,000 votes or 1.25% of the total vote. Only some seven electorates returning Labor members voted "No" to the referendum proposals three of them in New South Wales country districts. 149

Meanwhile, as political attempts to reform the Constitution by referendum had failed, the interpretation of the Constitution by the Justices themselves was undergoing change.

This was partly due to a change in personnel. In 1912 Mr. Justice O'Connor died; as a result of this and of the Judiciary Act of 1912 which increased the number of Justices from five to seven, there were three appointments to be filled.

It was obvious to all concerned that the personality and views of the Justices had played a considerable part in their interpretation of the Constitution. The Governor General pointed out "It is obvious that ... an alteration of the personnel of the High Court might have important consequences upon the attitude of that body towards the constitutional questions which it is called upon to decide and it 149. C. Joyner op. cit. pp43-51."
is possible that this consideration might influence ministers in filling a vacancy in the Court."\textsuperscript{150}

With this in mind, Hughes, who had a fairly restricted field of choice, made an unexceptionable appointment; that of Frank Gavan Duffy, K.C. one of the leading figures of the Victorian Bar, who had appeared for the Commonwealth in the Sugar Case.\textsuperscript{151} His other two appointments were more controversial, Charles Powers, Commonwealth Crown Solicitors since 1903 and formerly of Queensland where he had been also an M.L.A., Postmaster-General and leader of the Opposition. He was thus expected at least to be aware of, and probably sympathetic to, the case for greater Commonwealth powers. This choice was criticised because Powers was a solicitor not a barrister, but he nevertheless was appointed.

The third appointment was that of A.B. Piddington, a Sydney barrister whose progress in his career had not accorded with his early academic brilliance, and who had been one of the leading New South Wales opponents of the Federation Bill of 1897-8. Hughes was hesitant: Piddington had been overseas for a year and Hughes wrote to his brother-in-law "I want to put Piddington on the High Court Bench. But before doing so I must be satisfied that he is not a rabid States Rights champion. I should never be forgiven if I made myself responsible for such an act as that, and as I think quite to


\textsuperscript{151} L.F. Fitzhardinge op. cit. (note 142) p273.
properly. In consequence a cable was sent to Piddington who replied that he was in favour of the supremacy of Commonwealth powers. The matter of the propriety of Hughes' action is not here in question; it was indiscreet but in the view of his biographer constitutional enough. What did matter was the storm of abuse which broke over Piddington's head when he returned, mostly on the ground of professional mediocrity. The Victorian and New South Wales Bars refused to extend the customary congratulations to Powers and Piddington. Powers ignored the abuse, but the more thin-skinned Piddington decided to refuse the appointment.

He was replaced by Hughes by George Rich, a Sydney K.C. and a "lawyer's lawyer with no interest in politics."

Biographical material on the new Justices is scant but they had certain significant points in common. None of them had taken part as politicians in the drafting of the Australian Constitution. Only one had previous political experience. Thus they had no deeply ingrained views on the Constitution.

The results of these new appointments to the Bench were obscured by war-time conditions, when even Griffith and Barton put the widest possible interpretation upon the Commonwealth's defence power in time of war. The reserved power of the States over

152. Quoted ibid p276-7.
155. L.F. Fitzhardinge op. cit. (note 142) p283.
inter-State trade was, in *Favey v. Burnett*, held not to apply to the Commonwealth's fixing of the price of flour or bread. The only dissentients were, in this case, Gavan Duffy and Rich. Griffith and Barton in a sense were not departing from their earlier views: again they relied heavily on *McCulloch v. Maryland*; holding that the Act was a valid exercise of the defence power and that what was necessary for the exercise of the defence power was for Parliament and not the Courts to decide. *Isaacs also claimed that it was a valid exercise of a Commonwealth power* while Higgins claimed that this was no question of implied prohibitions but of the exercise of an express power.

Gavan Duffy and Rich dissented on the grounds that the legislation was not necessary for the exercise of the defence power.

On the other hand despite Sec. 92 of the Constitution which provides that trade, commerce and intercourse between the States shall be absolutely free, State Acts providing for the acquisition of wheat and of meat were held to be valid, a result which equally threatened the Federal balance.

But once the war was over the personnel of the Court changed yet again. In 1919 Griffith retired and in January 1920 Barton died. (Sir) Adrian Knox, a Sydney barrister, who had spent four years in the

---

156. (1916) 21 C.L.R. 433.
157. 21 C.L.R. at 433 pp442-4 per Griffith C.J. per Barton J.
158. per Isaacs J. 21 C.L.R. 433 at pp452-5.
159. per Higgins J. 21 C.L.R. at pp457-60.
New South Wales Legislative Assembly in the 1890's was made Chief Justice and in 1920 the "first chapter" in the interpretation of the Australian Constitution was over. In the historic Engineers' Case the High Court rejected the doctrine of implied prohibitions introduced from the United States of America.

The right of the Commonwealth Court of Conciliation and arbitration to make an award binding on a State as employer when it was carrying on an industry was in question. Isaacs delivered the verdict for himself, Knox, Rich and Starke. "But we conclude," he said, "that American authorities, however illustrious the tribunals may be are not a secure basis on which to build fundamentally with regard to our own Constitution. While in secondary and subsidiary matters they may, and sometimes do, afford considerable light and assistance, they cannot, for reasons we are about to state, be recognised as standards whereby to measure the respective rights of the Commonwealth and States under the Australian Constitution. For the proper construction of the Australian Constitution it is essential to bear in mind two cardinal features of our political system which are interwoven in its texture and notwithstanding considerable similarity of structural design, including the depositary of the residual powers, radically distinguish it from the American Constitution. Pervading the instrument they must be taken into account in determining the meaning.

of its language. One is the common sovereignty of all parts of the British Empire; the other is the principle of responsible government.\(^\text{163}\)

It was declared that the Constitution must speak for itself without implications or qualifications, an approach which while it gave greater power to the Commonwealth also meant that much of the next twenty years was spent in arguments as to the meaning of "trade, commerce and intercourse ... shall be absolutely free." in Sec. 92.

**Conclusions**

The years of Federation, the 1890's, officially lie outside the period of this study. Nevertheless it is, as Griffith said, a "notorious truth" that the framers of the Australian Constitution based it very closely upon the American model, with little regard for the world-wide social and economic changes which had taken place since 1789. At the Federal Conventions the distinction in attitude towards the United States between conservative and radical referred to in Chapter 1, is evident. Political conservatives such as Griffith (from 1890), Barton and O'Connor showed a greater admiration for, and a greater readiness to accept without modification, the American Constitution. Political radicals such as Higgins, felt that it was in fact a conservative document belonging to a conservative country. A further study of this period is obviously necessary to establish why the United States, the hope of Anglo-Saxon liberals in the

\(^{163}\) 28 C.L.R. 129 at p. 146
eighteen-sixties, had come to present a conservative image to progressive social thinkers by the 1890's.164 Probably the immense growth of industry and the violence of labor-management clashes, the increasing tales of political and judicial corruption from the period of Grant's presidency in the 1870's, the growth of trusts and monopolies, the increasing tide of "muck-raking" journalism and novels, all helped to convince those in search of Utopia, that wherever it was to be found, it would not be discovered in the United States.

Of the first three Justices of the High Court set up in 1903, Griffith dominated Barton and O'Connor. An Equity barrister once said rather tartly that Barton represented the concurrent jurisdiction and O'Connor the auxiliary jurisdiction.165 All three, however agreed with the constitutional interpretation on the lines of the American doctrine of implied prohibitions. All three had similarly been intimately concerned with the drafting of the Australian Constitution on American lines. Their subsequent reliance upon American precedents to interpret that Constitution is thus both logical and entirely consistent.

The result of the doctrine of implied prohibitions was to limit severely the powers of the Commonwealth rather than those of the States. This is turn led to the further alienation from the American model of the Australian Labor Party, never over-enthusiastic for the form of

164. I understand that a study on United States - Australian relations in the later nineteenth century has recently been commenced at the University of Queensland by Mr. Gordon Kidd.
the Australian Constitution. Particularly after it gained power in the Australian Federal Parliament Labor became anxious to extend the powers of the central government and to move closer to a unitary rather than a federal form of government. Thus the issue of the alteration of the constitution became a political issue, helping to crystallise the distinction at this period between Labor and anti-Labor parties.

This interpretation on the lines of implied prohibitions did not go unchallenged, both on the High Court Bench from 1906 and elsewhere. Higgins' and Isaacs' views of the Commonwealth powers accord with what they fought for in 1897-8 - greater democratic control of the machinery of government, and the power to deal with social and economic problems.

It was not until the changed climate of opinion after the war more favourable to the Commonwealth power that the American interpretation was rejected. Of more importance, however, was the death or retirement of Griffith, Barton and O'Connor and their replacement by men unconcerned with the drafting of the Constitution, and with fewer pre-conceived ideas about it.

It is to be observed, of course, that Higgins and Isaacs objected to American precedents on different grounds: Higgins for example whose personal as opposed to legal knowledge of the United States was the greatest was the least inclined to accept American precedent as valid for Australia.

Isaacs attacked the doctrine of implied prohibitions on the ground that Griffith was applying it to Australia in the 1900's as Marshall
to the United States of America in the 1820's, regardless of the changes in Constitutional interpretation which had taken place since then, and the tendency to interpret the United States trade and commerce power as widely as possible.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Exports £000</th>
<th>Imports £000</th>
<th>Total £000</th>
<th>Value per inhabitant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Exports £ s d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>36,043</td>
<td>37,711</td>
<td>73,754</td>
<td>11. 5. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>33,370</td>
<td>30,107</td>
<td>63,477</td>
<td>10. 3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893</td>
<td>33,335</td>
<td>23,765</td>
<td>57,090</td>
<td>9.19. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894</td>
<td>32,131</td>
<td>21,897</td>
<td>54,028</td>
<td>9. 9. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896</td>
<td>32,964</td>
<td>29,658</td>
<td>62,622</td>
<td>9. 7. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
<td>37,783</td>
<td>31,958</td>
<td>69,741</td>
<td>10.10. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1898</td>
<td>40,165</td>
<td>31,481</td>
<td>71,646</td>
<td>11. 0. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899</td>
<td>48,599</td>
<td>34,330</td>
<td>82,929</td>
<td>13. 3. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>45,957</td>
<td>42,358</td>
<td>88,315</td>
<td>12. 5. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>49,696</td>
<td>42,434</td>
<td>92,130</td>
<td>13. 2. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td>43,915</td>
<td>40,676</td>
<td>84,591</td>
<td>11. 8. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>48,250</td>
<td>37,811</td>
<td>86,061</td>
<td>12. 7.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>57,486</td>
<td>37,021</td>
<td>94,507</td>
<td>14.11. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>56,841</td>
<td>38,347</td>
<td>95,188</td>
<td>14. 4. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>69,738</td>
<td>44,745</td>
<td>114,483</td>
<td>17. 3. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>72,824</td>
<td>52,809</td>
<td>124,633</td>
<td>17.13. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>64,311</td>
<td>49,799</td>
<td>114,110</td>
<td>15. 6. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>65,319</td>
<td>51,172</td>
<td>116,491</td>
<td>15. 5. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>74,491</td>
<td>60,014</td>
<td>134,505</td>
<td>17. 0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>79,482</td>
<td>66,968</td>
<td>146,450</td>
<td>17.14. 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>79,096</td>
<td>78,159</td>
<td>157,255</td>
<td>17. 0. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>78,572</td>
<td>79,749</td>
<td>158,321</td>
<td>16. 7. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>37,930</td>
<td>39,777</td>
<td>77,707</td>
<td>7.15. 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-June</td>
<td>60,593</td>
<td>64,432</td>
<td>125,025</td>
<td>12. 5. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915-6</td>
<td>74,778</td>
<td>77,745</td>
<td>152,523</td>
<td>15. 3. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916-7</td>
<td>97,955</td>
<td>76,229</td>
<td>174,184</td>
<td>20. 1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917-8</td>
<td>81,429</td>
<td>62,335</td>
<td>143,764</td>
<td>16.10. 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918-9</td>
<td>113,964</td>
<td>102,335</td>
<td>216,299</td>
<td>22.13. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919-20</td>
<td>114,824</td>
<td>98,974</td>
<td>213,798</td>
<td>28.11. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920-1</td>
<td>132,159</td>
<td>163,802</td>
<td>295,961</td>
<td>24.14. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921-2</td>
<td>127,847</td>
<td>103,066</td>
<td>230,913</td>
<td>23. 4. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922-3</td>
<td>117,870</td>
<td>131,758</td>
<td>249,628</td>
<td>20.18. 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE:** Commonwealth Year Book, 1908 - 1924
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Imports into Australia from U.S.A.</th>
<th></th>
<th>Australian Exports to U.S.A.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>According to country of origin</td>
<td>According to country of shipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value £</td>
<td>% of total imports</td>
<td>Value £</td>
<td>% of total imports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>2,558,320</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>2,754,053</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>5,854,239</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>5,373,876</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td>4,999,406</td>
<td>12.29</td>
<td>2,714,424</td>
<td>6.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>6,368,532</td>
<td>16.61</td>
<td>2,625,399</td>
<td>5.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>4,591,935</td>
<td>12.40</td>
<td>2,228,843</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>5,005,387</td>
<td>13.05</td>
<td>4,486,904</td>
<td>11.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>5,605,612</td>
<td>12.54</td>
<td>4,633,753</td>
<td>10.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>6,765,182</td>
<td>13.06</td>
<td>5,869,099</td>
<td>11.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>6,581,846</td>
<td>13.22</td>
<td>6,039,753</td>
<td>12.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>5,935,740</td>
<td>11.60</td>
<td>5,003,130</td>
<td>9.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>7,659,150</td>
<td>12.76</td>
<td>6,494,629</td>
<td>10.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>9,007,657</td>
<td>13.45</td>
<td>7,147,991</td>
<td>11.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>10,764,257</td>
<td>13.77</td>
<td>9,449,553</td>
<td>12.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>10,908,653</td>
<td>13.68</td>
<td>9,522,704</td>
<td>11.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914-5</td>
<td>10,871,298</td>
<td>15.89</td>
<td>9,589,617</td>
<td>14.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915-6</td>
<td>15,864,516</td>
<td>20.45</td>
<td>15,360,690</td>
<td>19.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916-7</td>
<td>15,876,010</td>
<td>20.83</td>
<td>15,528,311</td>
<td>20.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917-8</td>
<td>15,456,002</td>
<td>25.41</td>
<td>15,195,463</td>
<td>24.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918-9</td>
<td>27,183,792</td>
<td>26.57</td>
<td>27,930,085</td>
<td>27.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919-20</td>
<td>23,826,313</td>
<td>24.07</td>
<td>23,768,030</td>
<td>24.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920-1</td>
<td>36,113,477</td>
<td>22.05</td>
<td>35,601,735</td>
<td>21.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921-2</td>
<td>18,823,113</td>
<td>18.27</td>
<td>8,34,386</td>
<td>6.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922-3</td>
<td>24,851,303</td>
<td>18.87</td>
<td>9,630,770</td>
<td>8.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources:** Trade and Customs and Excise Revenue of the Commonwealth of Australia, 1903-1923.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>52.99</td>
<td>60.17</td>
<td>13.57</td>
<td>14.04</td>
<td>66.56</td>
<td>74.21</td>
<td>13.05</td>
<td>11.70</td>
<td>7.89</td>
<td>6.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>51.21</td>
<td>59.42</td>
<td>14.66</td>
<td>15.06</td>
<td>65.87</td>
<td>74.48</td>
<td>12.54</td>
<td>10.36</td>
<td>8.78</td>
<td>7.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>51.81</td>
<td>61.50</td>
<td>12.56</td>
<td>12.93</td>
<td>64.37</td>
<td>74.43</td>
<td>13.06</td>
<td>11.38</td>
<td>8.92</td>
<td>6.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>50.75</td>
<td>60.10</td>
<td>12.51</td>
<td>12.83</td>
<td>63.26</td>
<td>72.93</td>
<td>12.22</td>
<td>12.13</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>7.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>50.54</td>
<td>60.92</td>
<td>12.98</td>
<td>13.45</td>
<td>63.52</td>
<td>74.37</td>
<td>11.60</td>
<td>9.78</td>
<td>8.87</td>
<td>6.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>50.69</td>
<td>61.06</td>
<td>12.61</td>
<td>13.11</td>
<td>63.30</td>
<td>74.17</td>
<td>12.76</td>
<td>10.32</td>
<td>8.69</td>
<td>6.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>48.88</td>
<td>58.98</td>
<td>11.85</td>
<td>12.86</td>
<td>60.73</td>
<td>71.84</td>
<td>13.45</td>
<td>11.57</td>
<td>9.52</td>
<td>6.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>50.06</td>
<td>68.76</td>
<td>11.07</td>
<td>12.26</td>
<td>61.13</td>
<td>81.02</td>
<td>13.77</td>
<td>12.09</td>
<td>9.15</td>
<td>6.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>51.82</td>
<td>59.70</td>
<td>11.25</td>
<td>12.42</td>
<td>63.08</td>
<td>72.12</td>
<td>13.88</td>
<td>11.54</td>
<td>8.52</td>
<td>6.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914-5</td>
<td>50.43</td>
<td>58.82</td>
<td>13.37</td>
<td>14.64</td>
<td>63.80</td>
<td>73.46</td>
<td>16.89</td>
<td>14.89</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915-6</td>
<td>45.34</td>
<td>51.25</td>
<td>15.16</td>
<td>16.38</td>
<td>60.50</td>
<td>67.63</td>
<td>20.45</td>
<td>19.82</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916-7</td>
<td>47.55</td>
<td>52.47</td>
<td>16.03</td>
<td>14.44</td>
<td>63.59</td>
<td>66.91</td>
<td>20.53</td>
<td>20.37</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917-8</td>
<td>36.29</td>
<td>40.89</td>
<td>18.45</td>
<td>20.13</td>
<td>54.74</td>
<td>61.07</td>
<td>25.41</td>
<td>24.98</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918-9</td>
<td>33.80</td>
<td>37.10</td>
<td>21.91</td>
<td>22.15</td>
<td>55.71</td>
<td>59.25</td>
<td>26.57</td>
<td>27.29</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919-20</td>
<td>38.92</td>
<td>43.56</td>
<td>15.39</td>
<td>16.46</td>
<td>54.31</td>
<td>60.02</td>
<td>24.07</td>
<td>24.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920-1</td>
<td>46.92</td>
<td>52.24</td>
<td>11.25</td>
<td>11.06</td>
<td>58.17</td>
<td>63.32</td>
<td>22.05</td>
<td>21.74</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921-2</td>
<td>51.43</td>
<td>62.62</td>
<td>12.62</td>
<td>64.05</td>
<td>18.27</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>13.92</td>
<td>38.23</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922-3</td>
<td>51.90</td>
<td>61.87</td>
<td>11.87</td>
<td>63.77</td>
<td>18.87</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Figures before 1905 are not included since they do not give figures according to origin.

2. Records according to country of shipment were discontinued in 1921-1922.

**SOURCE:** Commonwealth Year Book, 1908-1924; Trade and Customs and Excise Revenue of the Commonwealth of Australia, 1920-1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Textiles and Apparel</th>
<th>Arms &amp; Explosives</th>
<th>Boots &amp; Shoes</th>
<th>Clocks &amp; Watches</th>
<th>Railway &amp; Material</th>
<th>Resin</th>
<th>Timber</th>
<th>Tobacco</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td>178,648</td>
<td>87,310</td>
<td>121,770</td>
<td>37,974</td>
<td>200,079</td>
<td>25,932</td>
<td>415,446</td>
<td>432,439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>134,245</td>
<td>65,978</td>
<td>78,708</td>
<td>28,775</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>23,739</td>
<td>475,026</td>
<td>446,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>110,913</td>
<td>49,585</td>
<td>63,158</td>
<td>30,828</td>
<td>21,073</td>
<td>44,369</td>
<td>596,270</td>
<td>371,151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>131,405</td>
<td>86,508</td>
<td>47,194</td>
<td>31,315</td>
<td>52,983</td>
<td>41,391</td>
<td>377,931</td>
<td>310,735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>164,266</td>
<td>112,094</td>
<td>42,895</td>
<td>36,471</td>
<td>74,548</td>
<td>44,604</td>
<td>606,663</td>
<td>312,266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>272,162</td>
<td>63,969</td>
<td>44,542</td>
<td>64,119</td>
<td>101,920</td>
<td>72,340</td>
<td>719,619</td>
<td>461,799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>288,593</td>
<td>39,986</td>
<td>56,729</td>
<td>59,119</td>
<td>171,996</td>
<td>78,891</td>
<td>886,810</td>
<td>557,603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>251,147</td>
<td>57,425</td>
<td>54,278</td>
<td>60,193</td>
<td>140,300</td>
<td>28,919</td>
<td>594,141</td>
<td>433,718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>406,657</td>
<td>55,950</td>
<td>73,831</td>
<td>68,169</td>
<td>571,561</td>
<td>35,688</td>
<td>928,622</td>
<td>579,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>407,073</td>
<td>107,837</td>
<td>92,087</td>
<td>90,994</td>
<td>309,576</td>
<td>67,198</td>
<td>1,095,430</td>
<td>642,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>473,668</td>
<td>121,594</td>
<td>138,915</td>
<td>106,836</td>
<td>214,852</td>
<td>63,221</td>
<td>1,314,321</td>
<td>759,213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>488,367</td>
<td>101,754</td>
<td>135,906</td>
<td>90,221</td>
<td>168,030</td>
<td>70,865</td>
<td>1,511,692</td>
<td>802,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914-5</td>
<td>585,948</td>
<td>97,097</td>
<td>111,053</td>
<td>80,899</td>
<td>176,601</td>
<td>23,750</td>
<td>1,021,150</td>
<td>673,773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915-6</td>
<td>1,165,657</td>
<td>234,913</td>
<td>63,116</td>
<td>107,284</td>
<td>167,470</td>
<td>73,721</td>
<td>858,771</td>
<td>743,233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916-7</td>
<td>1,583,840</td>
<td>139,733</td>
<td>135,854</td>
<td>81,701</td>
<td>48,931</td>
<td>74,802</td>
<td>725,218</td>
<td>870,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917-8</td>
<td>1,586,102</td>
<td>209,300</td>
<td>63,658</td>
<td>86,228</td>
<td>5,283</td>
<td>145,167</td>
<td>679,871</td>
<td>436,944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918-9</td>
<td>4,181,087</td>
<td>355,958</td>
<td>75,373</td>
<td>130,205</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>120,639</td>
<td>1,056,108</td>
<td>1,527,927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919-20</td>
<td>2,950,227</td>
<td>330,845</td>
<td>83,338</td>
<td>125,252</td>
<td>923</td>
<td>194,183</td>
<td>1,129,010</td>
<td>2,459,191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920-1</td>
<td>1,657,927</td>
<td>286,860</td>
<td>50,339</td>
<td>176,950</td>
<td>26,518</td>
<td>176,506</td>
<td>2,196,341</td>
<td>3,362,399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921-2</td>
<td>4,125,344</td>
<td>31,409</td>
<td>19,077</td>
<td>156,864</td>
<td>21,476</td>
<td>52,778</td>
<td>1,109,634</td>
<td>2,196,951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922-3</td>
<td>2,432,296</td>
<td>118,770</td>
<td>57,539</td>
<td>151,031</td>
<td>3,656</td>
<td>45,621</td>
<td>1,842,344</td>
<td>1,873,078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Tools of Trade</td>
<td>Machinery</td>
<td>Mfrs. of Metal</td>
<td>Kerosene</td>
<td>Other Oils</td>
<td>Paper</td>
<td>Wicker &amp; Wood</td>
<td>Paraffin Wax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td>146,613</td>
<td>472,309</td>
<td>240,856</td>
<td>119,439</td>
<td>272,862</td>
<td>84,627</td>
<td>44,384</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>118,554</td>
<td>464,446</td>
<td>355,310</td>
<td>129,343</td>
<td>314,010</td>
<td>45,437</td>
<td>48,701</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>116,677</td>
<td>412,296</td>
<td>399,224</td>
<td>126,205</td>
<td>273,610</td>
<td>64,190</td>
<td>9,368</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>123,572</td>
<td>500,410</td>
<td>386,906</td>
<td>104,370</td>
<td>289,665</td>
<td>79,052</td>
<td>25,129</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>140,480</td>
<td>392,057</td>
<td>408,062</td>
<td>408,462</td>
<td>129,631</td>
<td>250,276</td>
<td>56,714</td>
<td>35,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>216,335</td>
<td>725,450</td>
<td>322,437</td>
<td>422,437</td>
<td>148,626</td>
<td>222,277</td>
<td>87,025</td>
<td>40,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>272,109</td>
<td>720,764</td>
<td>259,087</td>
<td>435,942</td>
<td>125,222</td>
<td>215,483</td>
<td>120,535</td>
<td>15,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>159,531</td>
<td>661,865</td>
<td>251,360</td>
<td>577,602</td>
<td>150,341</td>
<td>164,563</td>
<td>80,114</td>
<td>25,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>215,275</td>
<td>832,694</td>
<td>356,632</td>
<td>598,104</td>
<td>167,024</td>
<td>189,038</td>
<td>99,717</td>
<td>37,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>285,247</td>
<td>1,093,910</td>
<td>458,999</td>
<td>472,390</td>
<td>203,147</td>
<td>199,414</td>
<td>113,255</td>
<td>17,337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>304,893</td>
<td>1,315,327</td>
<td>549,800</td>
<td>610,262</td>
<td>402,346</td>
<td>260,277</td>
<td>114,226</td>
<td>25,471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>293,024</td>
<td>1,232,143</td>
<td>576,431</td>
<td>502,186</td>
<td>458,497</td>
<td>284,679</td>
<td>105,793</td>
<td>19,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914-5</td>
<td>250,339</td>
<td>1,307,450</td>
<td>704,675</td>
<td>534,613</td>
<td>430,723</td>
<td>323,934</td>
<td>112,631</td>
<td>15,338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915-6</td>
<td>238,384</td>
<td>1,233,306</td>
<td>885,335</td>
<td>619,514</td>
<td>662,229</td>
<td>271,006</td>
<td>101,488</td>
<td>51,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916-7</td>
<td>254,568</td>
<td>1,442,503</td>
<td>1,157,976</td>
<td>625,973</td>
<td>1,137,282</td>
<td>681,719</td>
<td>83,720</td>
<td>39,694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917-8</td>
<td>235,667</td>
<td>1,160,590</td>
<td>1,221,849</td>
<td>404,964</td>
<td>1,170,290</td>
<td>694,380</td>
<td>72,590</td>
<td>21,853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918-9</td>
<td>438,505</td>
<td>1,809,587</td>
<td>1,553,128</td>
<td>658,818</td>
<td>1,583,949</td>
<td>951,127</td>
<td>113,620</td>
<td>33,579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919-20</td>
<td>403,634</td>
<td>1,956,288</td>
<td>1,446,446</td>
<td>638,308</td>
<td>1,131,849</td>
<td>951,088</td>
<td>168,373</td>
<td>24,884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920-1</td>
<td>295,496</td>
<td>3,351,058</td>
<td>5,686,135</td>
<td>1,270,909</td>
<td>2,916,730</td>
<td>903,956</td>
<td>376,362</td>
<td>13,646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921-2</td>
<td>617,293</td>
<td>2,826,223</td>
<td>1,339,622</td>
<td>705,720</td>
<td>1,881,191</td>
<td>504,358</td>
<td>93,580</td>
<td>6,582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922-3</td>
<td>403,020</td>
<td>3,225,190</td>
<td>1,069,193</td>
<td>690,917</td>
<td>2,353,865</td>
<td>235,316</td>
<td>151,444</td>
<td>26,409</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Not available.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Glass etc.</th>
<th>Turpentine</th>
<th>Vehicles &amp; Bicycles</th>
<th>Drugs &amp; Chemicals</th>
<th>Preserved Fish</th>
<th>Furniture</th>
<th>Agric. Machinery &amp; Implements</th>
<th>Iron &amp; Steel</th>
<th>Leather</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td>26,263</td>
<td>21,479</td>
<td>109,230</td>
<td>79,873</td>
<td>85,607</td>
<td>52,826</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>166,671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>29,086</td>
<td>28,379</td>
<td>139,563</td>
<td>75,635</td>
<td>60,819</td>
<td>42,993</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>116,078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>27,283</td>
<td>53,862</td>
<td>86,956</td>
<td>69,567</td>
<td>70,989</td>
<td>47,571</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>87,922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>26,408</td>
<td>39,672</td>
<td>100,002</td>
<td>82,051</td>
<td>109,231</td>
<td>57,842</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>66,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>59,268</td>
<td>73,515</td>
<td>65,801</td>
<td>104,013</td>
<td>46,583</td>
<td>182,264</td>
<td>106,949</td>
<td>84,791</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>46,633</td>
<td>61,628</td>
<td>113,573</td>
<td>49,136</td>
<td>96,083</td>
<td>78,590</td>
<td>239,941</td>
<td>381,892</td>
<td>90,706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>26,814</td>
<td>48,282</td>
<td>173,018</td>
<td>78,707</td>
<td>174,986</td>
<td>52,604</td>
<td>164,501</td>
<td>400,023</td>
<td>108,189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>28,843</td>
<td>37,516</td>
<td>100,327</td>
<td>72,372</td>
<td>130,466</td>
<td>45,722</td>
<td>158,166</td>
<td>409,618</td>
<td>252,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>39,738</td>
<td>57,831</td>
<td>186,783</td>
<td>78,717</td>
<td>165,603</td>
<td>54,763</td>
<td>242,995</td>
<td>484,609</td>
<td>263,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>40,331</td>
<td>137,729</td>
<td>375,165</td>
<td>84,951</td>
<td>151,124</td>
<td>77,146</td>
<td>266,488</td>
<td>670,314</td>
<td>253,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>43,981</td>
<td>66,772</td>
<td>592,832</td>
<td>91,045</td>
<td>240,028</td>
<td>121,650</td>
<td>192,335</td>
<td>836,280</td>
<td>359,995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>33,646</td>
<td>50,637</td>
<td>599,392</td>
<td>97,434</td>
<td>201,415</td>
<td>114,953</td>
<td>202,766</td>
<td>586,210</td>
<td>309,532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914-5</td>
<td>87,866</td>
<td>51,343</td>
<td>652,423</td>
<td>303,530</td>
<td>210,574</td>
<td>76,935</td>
<td>188,355</td>
<td>700,295</td>
<td>317,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915-6</td>
<td>180,261</td>
<td>98,642</td>
<td>1,336,862</td>
<td>414,288</td>
<td>370,669</td>
<td>56,109</td>
<td>230,301</td>
<td>1,387,391</td>
<td>293,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916-7</td>
<td>230,745</td>
<td>94,327</td>
<td>1,301,576</td>
<td>471,224</td>
<td>263,760</td>
<td>32,015</td>
<td>226,904</td>
<td>1,244,755</td>
<td>561,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917-8</td>
<td>169,662</td>
<td>91,747</td>
<td>1,257,701</td>
<td>646,498</td>
<td>424,849</td>
<td>23,624</td>
<td>238,131</td>
<td>1,429,178</td>
<td>373,409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918-9</td>
<td>477,029</td>
<td>115,362</td>
<td>1,572,334</td>
<td>1,284,596</td>
<td>106,790</td>
<td>39,447</td>
<td>284,757</td>
<td>2,376,346</td>
<td>458,971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919-20</td>
<td>193,176</td>
<td>182,031</td>
<td>2,480,561</td>
<td>878,436</td>
<td>263,889</td>
<td>37,133</td>
<td>155,896</td>
<td>1,700,953</td>
<td>546,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920-1</td>
<td>249,435</td>
<td>332,317</td>
<td>3,095,238</td>
<td>1,243,037</td>
<td>82,249</td>
<td>61,565</td>
<td>379,709</td>
<td>1,964,753</td>
<td>545,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921-2</td>
<td>100,340</td>
<td>131,072</td>
<td>1,601,327</td>
<td>619,594</td>
<td>217,219</td>
<td>24,904</td>
<td>242,069</td>
<td>735,058</td>
<td>201,469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922-3</td>
<td>115,732</td>
<td>194,926</td>
<td>3,007,989</td>
<td>586,548</td>
<td>154,173</td>
<td>45,167</td>
<td>162,987</td>
<td>975,335</td>
<td>378,585</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Not available.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Rubber</th>
<th>Meats</th>
<th>Oats</th>
<th>Wheat</th>
<th>Fodder</th>
<th>Hops</th>
<th>Butter</th>
<th>Milk</th>
<th>Instruments</th>
<th>Soap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td>18,076</td>
<td>21,554</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>8,383</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,008</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,756</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>27,749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>21,451</td>
<td>78,286</td>
<td>2,673</td>
<td>1,139,930</td>
<td></td>
<td>11,147</td>
<td></td>
<td>441</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>30,692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>21,275</td>
<td>10,602</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10,668</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>363</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>21,323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>28,210</td>
<td>10,599</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17,660</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,897</td>
<td>43,372</td>
<td>31,303</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>27,647</td>
<td>52,155</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>16,251</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>862</td>
<td>47,145</td>
<td>33,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>35,869</td>
<td>41,031</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18,289</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>338</td>
<td>47,693</td>
<td>49,837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>27,284</td>
<td>52,141</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13,305</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34,624</td>
<td>32,619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>27,954</td>
<td>50,139</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11,313</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>532</td>
<td>27,379</td>
<td>33,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>42,692</td>
<td>76,372</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15,196</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43,724</td>
<td>49,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>70,585</td>
<td>75,327</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15,443</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>45,082</td>
<td>51,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>113,484</td>
<td>93,037</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34,520</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>57,058</td>
<td>68,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>125,539</td>
<td>87,014</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>42,952</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>59,439</td>
<td>63,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914-5</td>
<td>126,175</td>
<td>73,172</td>
<td>40,653</td>
<td>147,447</td>
<td></td>
<td>27,023</td>
<td>12,851</td>
<td></td>
<td>69,551</td>
<td>79,859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915-6</td>
<td>489,262</td>
<td>85,600</td>
<td>196,128</td>
<td>954,441</td>
<td>86,333</td>
<td>26,476</td>
<td>190,622</td>
<td>19,841</td>
<td>157,599</td>
<td>63,350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1916-7| 417,212| 71,530 |    - |        | 20,690| 2,618 | 3,617 | 210,993| 26,027\n| 1917-8| 391,376| 104,929|    - |        | 312   |        | -34   | 279,240| 2,239\n| 1918-9| 550,431| 97,107 |    - |        | 19,837| 159 | 159    | 305,887| 26,062\n| 1919-20| 519,100| 126,838|    - |        | 9,205 | 16,558| 16,558| 329,641| 62,286\n| 1920-1| 768,578| 211,606|    - |        | 180,755| 15,187| 608 | 681,182| 63,607\n| 1921-2| 314,430| 389,302|    - |        | 48,502| 608 | 15,187 | 280,786| 31,904\n| 1922-3| 773,308| 190,956|    - |        | 27,809| 1,394| 1,354 | 424,251|    -\n
* Not available
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Stationery</th>
<th>Electrical</th>
<th>Ships</th>
<th>Paints &amp; Varnishes</th>
<th>Jewell. &amp; Equip.</th>
<th>Stones &amp; Films</th>
<th>Confectionery</th>
<th>Fancy Goods</th>
<th>Glucose</th>
<th>Fruit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td>20,928</td>
<td>94,951</td>
<td>55,211</td>
<td>31,184</td>
<td>8,217</td>
<td>10,268</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>17,186</td>
<td>14,366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>18,240</td>
<td>109,034</td>
<td>35,676</td>
<td>28,428</td>
<td>7,998</td>
<td>7,831</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>21,683</td>
<td>18,549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>21,975</td>
<td>33,945</td>
<td>14,994</td>
<td>34,585</td>
<td>12,223</td>
<td>10,430</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>17,525</td>
<td>14,154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>53,352</td>
<td>13,778</td>
<td>22,118</td>
<td>51,946</td>
<td>10,021</td>
<td>15,789</td>
<td>14,202</td>
<td>22,906</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>52,960</td>
<td>25,733</td>
<td>19,219</td>
<td>36,088</td>
<td>12,918</td>
<td>16,962</td>
<td>17,575</td>
<td>28,143</td>
<td>28,202</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>65,503</td>
<td>27,267</td>
<td>34,173</td>
<td>59,231</td>
<td>16,074</td>
<td>13,411</td>
<td>32,276</td>
<td>31,603</td>
<td>20,879</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>76,943</td>
<td>88,738</td>
<td>23,682</td>
<td>52,530</td>
<td>5,832</td>
<td>9,715</td>
<td>27,250</td>
<td>25,733</td>
<td>36,230</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>66,652</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10,967</td>
<td>54,714</td>
<td>4,293</td>
<td>9,409</td>
<td>32,639</td>
<td>35,626</td>
<td>24,458</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>86,143</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9,643</td>
<td>68,969</td>
<td>5,390</td>
<td>10,451</td>
<td>59,647</td>
<td>33,048</td>
<td>23,683</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>103,601</td>
<td>8,892</td>
<td>18,476</td>
<td>77,710</td>
<td>7,159</td>
<td>14,473</td>
<td>104,619</td>
<td>33,997</td>
<td>27,512</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>106,987</td>
<td>23,547</td>
<td>14,695</td>
<td>96,025</td>
<td>8,969</td>
<td>17,349</td>
<td>118,754</td>
<td>42,485</td>
<td>60,114</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>119,000</td>
<td>5,898</td>
<td>31,788</td>
<td>80,986</td>
<td>8,328</td>
<td>29,789</td>
<td>38,416</td>
<td>46,822</td>
<td>118,032</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914-5</td>
<td>121,232</td>
<td>57,180</td>
<td>33,937</td>
<td>95,855</td>
<td>14,931</td>
<td>49,204</td>
<td>36,066</td>
<td>13,227</td>
<td>104,039</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915-6</td>
<td>130,384</td>
<td>10,467</td>
<td>64,407</td>
<td>120,580</td>
<td>32,078</td>
<td>36,755</td>
<td>48,663</td>
<td>9,573</td>
<td>194,104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916-7</td>
<td>104,061</td>
<td>74,710</td>
<td>134,804</td>
<td>48,812</td>
<td>221,427</td>
<td>48,967</td>
<td>52,408</td>
<td>2,356</td>
<td>118,356</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917-8</td>
<td>184,696</td>
<td>96,927</td>
<td>218,614</td>
<td>63,355</td>
<td>269,213</td>
<td>28,135</td>
<td>55,697</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>75,757</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918-9</td>
<td>320,427</td>
<td>346,876</td>
<td>417,399</td>
<td>326,615</td>
<td>57,244</td>
<td>163,537</td>
<td>79,161</td>
<td>69,061</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919-20</td>
<td>336,810</td>
<td>166,214</td>
<td>150,682</td>
<td>36,832</td>
<td>211,544</td>
<td>36,026</td>
<td>76,915</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100,442</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920-1</td>
<td>384,661</td>
<td>173,025</td>
<td>70,701</td>
<td>184,698</td>
<td>42,670</td>
<td>38,232</td>
<td>108,325</td>
<td>7,615</td>
<td>71,525</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921-2</td>
<td>234,690</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>136,211</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>87,564</td>
<td>24,656</td>
<td>52,009</td>
<td>7,460</td>
<td>46,625</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922-3</td>
<td>395,551</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>111,267</td>
<td>6,394</td>
<td>15,276</td>
<td>98,915</td>
<td>10,635</td>
<td>99,405</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Not available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Wool</th>
<th>Coconut Oil</th>
<th>Meats</th>
<th>Butter</th>
<th>Zinc Concentrates</th>
<th>Copra</th>
<th>Hair</th>
<th>Sausage Casings</th>
<th>Eucalyptus Oil</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td>198,588</td>
<td>24,635</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>5,138</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>388,247</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3,661</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>783,998</td>
<td>6,907</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>1,213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>647,296</td>
<td>2,067</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>912,769</td>
<td>6,569</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>1,458</td>
<td>691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>815,259</td>
<td>22,030</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,393</td>
<td>1,505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>861,172</td>
<td>5,868</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>1,391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>1,694,389</td>
<td>3,708</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>881</td>
<td>1,639</td>
<td>2,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>580,000</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,127</td>
<td>2,273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>500,015</td>
<td>1,094</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>4,039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>460,275</td>
<td>8,101</td>
<td>1,151</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>1,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913-14</td>
<td>745,354</td>
<td>11,005</td>
<td>123,473</td>
<td>18,961</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>6,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915-16</td>
<td>3,110,301</td>
<td>1,562</td>
<td>312,027</td>
<td>15,440</td>
<td>243,114</td>
<td>3,738</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>30,270</td>
<td>3,776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916-17</td>
<td>8,381,302</td>
<td>9,803</td>
<td>44,173</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>757,867</td>
<td>30,166</td>
<td>5,063</td>
<td>44,173</td>
<td>9,551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917-18</td>
<td>13,513</td>
<td>34,927</td>
<td>9,479</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>307,658</td>
<td>76,982</td>
<td>7,587</td>
<td>63,106</td>
<td>25,093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918-19</td>
<td>4,389,755</td>
<td>80,209</td>
<td>17,122</td>
<td>63,327</td>
<td>69,096</td>
<td>204,588</td>
<td>9,010</td>
<td>65,181</td>
<td>16,763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919-20</td>
<td>4,982,056</td>
<td>63,533</td>
<td>2,711</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>452,752</td>
<td>7,593</td>
<td>151,550</td>
<td>6,942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920-21</td>
<td>2,516,142</td>
<td>7,089</td>
<td>25,325</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>45,933</td>
<td>71,895</td>
<td>9,260</td>
<td>299,236</td>
<td>29,838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921-22</td>
<td>3,836,987</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26,384</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>357,610</td>
<td>1,099</td>
<td>133,195</td>
<td>22,792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922-23</td>
<td>4,347,360</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34,951</td>
<td>133,858</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25,942</td>
<td>4,217</td>
<td>231,666</td>
<td>10,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923-24</td>
<td>5,618,652</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30,829</td>
<td>6,536</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8,359</td>
<td>5,770</td>
<td>389,657</td>
<td>13,622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Coal</td>
<td>Copper</td>
<td>Gold</td>
<td>Gold specie</td>
<td>Ores</td>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>Pearlshell</td>
<td>Skins</td>
<td>Tin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td>100,734</td>
<td>449,555</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14,053</td>
<td>274,828</td>
<td>9,584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>162,220</td>
<td>375,468</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,802</td>
<td>118,495</td>
<td>33,109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>78,074</td>
<td>1,268</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>126,594</td>
<td>28,453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>42,921</td>
<td>5,987</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>241,702</td>
<td>49,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>36,032</td>
<td>545,940</td>
<td>144,157</td>
<td>2,195,000</td>
<td>10,260</td>
<td>39,410</td>
<td>4,487</td>
<td>313,318</td>
<td>87,172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>265,993</td>
<td>700,509</td>
<td>239,714</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,111</td>
<td>39,134</td>
<td>3,325</td>
<td>219,551</td>
<td>32,609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>102,477</td>
<td>476,897</td>
<td>1,331,347</td>
<td>300,699</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20,627</td>
<td>30,985</td>
<td>170,666</td>
<td>18,913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>57,430</td>
<td>238,306</td>
<td>35,969</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28,765</td>
<td>78,361</td>
<td>363,776</td>
<td>8,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>111,115</td>
<td>252,872</td>
<td>56,353</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>32,582</td>
<td>112,151</td>
<td>309,370</td>
<td>69,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>98,201</td>
<td>271,167</td>
<td>53,199</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14,355</td>
<td>166,143</td>
<td>244,082</td>
<td>34,967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>55,580</td>
<td>686,683</td>
<td>143,337</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,477</td>
<td>24,627</td>
<td>95,155</td>
<td>458,935</td>
<td>33,828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>50,559</td>
<td>710,086</td>
<td>138,704</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,232</td>
<td>23,464</td>
<td>51,371</td>
<td>622,759</td>
<td>24,829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914-5</td>
<td>51,627</td>
<td>32,400</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>210,000</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17,027</td>
<td>802,620</td>
<td>14,611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915-6</td>
<td>22,567</td>
<td>16,805</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>7,504,512</td>
<td>3,949</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>115,938</td>
<td>625,708</td>
<td>37,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916-7</td>
<td>2,390</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,500,000</td>
<td>882</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>245,791</td>
<td>702,844</td>
<td>314,409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917-8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>286,376</td>
<td>1,531,916</td>
<td>957,196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918-9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>126,145</td>
<td>989,959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919-20</td>
<td>18,840</td>
<td>1,901</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>265,353</td>
<td>532,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920-1</td>
<td>29,865</td>
<td>202,166</td>
<td>8,290</td>
<td>3,183,340</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2,123</td>
<td>100,087</td>
<td>878,839</td>
<td>114,596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921-2</td>
<td>89,567</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,676,513</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>243,554</td>
<td>990,032</td>
<td>79,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922-3</td>
<td>134,351</td>
<td>66,270</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>262,332</td>
<td>24,586</td>
<td>2,763,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Timber</td>
<td>Leather</td>
<td>Jams &amp; Jellies</td>
<td>Tallow</td>
<td>Vessels</td>
<td>Shell Eggs</td>
<td>Dried Fruit</td>
<td>Iron &amp; Steel</td>
<td>Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td>1,906</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>1,881</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>2,912</td>
<td>821</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>5,354</td>
<td>7,949</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>5,444</td>
<td>1,878</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,776</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>7,301</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>3,831</td>
<td>1,803</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,379</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>7,705</td>
<td>4,779</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,314</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>12,693</td>
<td>5,459</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>25,032</td>
<td>3,949</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>11,182</td>
<td>3,437</td>
<td>1,137</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>13,996</td>
<td>5,169</td>
<td>9,492</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,224</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>3,891</td>
<td>2,561</td>
<td>7,282</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915–6</td>
<td>6,826</td>
<td>14,129</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916–7</td>
<td>21,562</td>
<td>157,330</td>
<td>8,703</td>
<td>2,281</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,512</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917–8</td>
<td>75,674</td>
<td>92,609</td>
<td>266,667</td>
<td>30,513</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,073</td>
<td>9,789</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918–9</td>
<td>41,867</td>
<td>11,553</td>
<td>335,434</td>
<td>10,939</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7,652</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919–20</td>
<td>6,588</td>
<td>95,630</td>
<td>208,338</td>
<td>106,247</td>
<td>123,378</td>
<td>12,768</td>
<td>8,980</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18,303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920–1</td>
<td>17,466</td>
<td>13,748</td>
<td>113,242</td>
<td>6,981</td>
<td>98,287</td>
<td>21,958</td>
<td>100,033</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>66,391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921–2</td>
<td>12,550</td>
<td>61,144</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>1,068</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10,969</td>
<td>10,325</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922–3</td>
<td>11,166</td>
<td>41,303</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13,552</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,667</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30,860</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE:** Trade and Customs and Excise Revenue of the Commonwealth of Australia, 1902 – 1923
### TABLE 6 - TRADE OF AUSTRALIA WITH THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>IMPORTS According to country of origin</th>
<th>EXPORTS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value % of total</td>
<td>Value % of total</td>
<td>Value % of total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>96,261</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>302,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>61,645</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>232,313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>75,604</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>281,624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>49,451</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>297,299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>80,127</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>76,803</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>93,851</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>89,840</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>101,399</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>95,587</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>88,937</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>83,601</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>95,508</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>90,817</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>110,105</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>106,227</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>112,046</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>107,454</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>145,562</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>136,197</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>131,578</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>125,036</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914-5</td>
<td>104,599</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>102,722</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915-6</td>
<td>178,719</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>178,077</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916-7</td>
<td>143,711</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>142,731</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917-8</td>
<td>277,653</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>273,653</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918-9</td>
<td>113,997</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>110,500</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919-20</td>
<td>204,958</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>202,476</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920-1</td>
<td>209,170</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>202,898</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921-2</td>
<td>151,106</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922-3</td>
<td>168,742</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not available*

**SOURCE:** Trade and Customs and Excise Revenue of the Commonwealth of Australia, 1902 - 1922/3
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>British</th>
<th>French</th>
<th>German</th>
<th>Scandinavian</th>
<th>U.S.A.</th>
<th>Japanese</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7,560,057</td>
<td>45,670</td>
<td>119,142</td>
<td>55,311</td>
<td>231,828</td>
<td>2,8</td>
<td>97,916</td>
<td>1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14,087,459</td>
<td>591,524</td>
<td>843,652</td>
<td>292,071</td>
<td>296,096</td>
<td>1,8</td>
<td>124,401</td>
<td>0,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,313,535</td>
<td>702,416</td>
<td>1,482,581</td>
<td>312,588</td>
<td>580,507</td>
<td>2,3</td>
<td>468,516</td>
<td>2,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22,356,652</td>
<td>654,475</td>
<td>1,771,945</td>
<td>390,040</td>
<td>529,705</td>
<td>2,0</td>
<td>541,619</td>
<td>2,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22,680,040</td>
<td>683,317</td>
<td>2,052,267</td>
<td>302,281</td>
<td>409,815</td>
<td>1,5</td>
<td>312,880</td>
<td>1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23,085,924</td>
<td>893,693</td>
<td>1,900,546</td>
<td>381,716</td>
<td>1,4</td>
<td>338,505</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td>274,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,635,022</td>
<td>299,479</td>
<td>577,795</td>
<td>280,198</td>
<td>4,2</td>
<td>14,981</td>
<td>0,2</td>
<td>633,511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,635,022</td>
<td>577,795</td>
<td>577,795</td>
<td>280,198</td>
<td>4,2</td>
<td>14,981</td>
<td>0,2</td>
<td>633,511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,09,592</td>
<td>475,389</td>
<td>831,793</td>
<td>268,289</td>
<td>1,6</td>
<td>237,212</td>
<td>2,9</td>
<td>7,444,417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,40,384</td>
<td>893,437</td>
<td>1,735,588</td>
<td>825,282</td>
<td>2,6</td>
<td>61,054</td>
<td>0,8</td>
<td>243,634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,11,632</td>
<td>810,289</td>
<td>1,068,888</td>
<td>825,282</td>
<td>2,6</td>
<td>61,054</td>
<td>0,8</td>
<td>243,634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,58,496</td>
<td>845,758</td>
<td>1,164,817</td>
<td>548,148</td>
<td>0,7</td>
<td>58,200</td>
<td>1,0</td>
<td>548,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,89,062</td>
<td>868,263</td>
<td>1,487,637</td>
<td>524,877</td>
<td>0,5</td>
<td>89,188</td>
<td>0,9</td>
<td>487,637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,74,075</td>
<td>1,005,986</td>
<td>582,322</td>
<td>67,745</td>
<td>0,4</td>
<td>58,047</td>
<td>1,6</td>
<td>339,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,714,225</td>
<td>1,211,738</td>
<td>527,121</td>
<td>92,805</td>
<td>6,9</td>
<td>252,081</td>
<td>2,5</td>
<td>312,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,71,096</td>
<td>1,214,404</td>
<td>471,914</td>
<td>154,486</td>
<td>1,5</td>
<td>224,293</td>
<td>2,1</td>
<td>669,419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,70,645</td>
<td>1,737,679</td>
<td>178,620</td>
<td>2,1</td>
<td>257,701</td>
<td>3,0</td>
<td>401,249</td>
<td>4,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,98,148</td>
<td>100,144</td>
<td>173,343</td>
<td>2,4</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>173,343</td>
<td>2,4</td>
<td>173,343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,77,791</td>
<td>120,269</td>
<td>424,528</td>
<td>4,6</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>120,269</td>
<td>1,5</td>
<td>424,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,825,612</td>
<td>111,753</td>
<td>6,2</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>111,753</td>
<td>6,2</td>
<td>111,753</td>
<td>6,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,877,542</td>
<td>130,064</td>
<td>344,795</td>
<td>5,6</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>130,064</td>
<td>2,6</td>
<td>344,795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,30,997</td>
<td>475,500</td>
<td>7,2</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>475,500</td>
<td>7,2</td>
<td>475,500</td>
<td>7,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,63,148</td>
<td>232,029</td>
<td>518,828</td>
<td>5,8</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>232,029</td>
<td>2,7</td>
<td>518,828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,63,813</td>
<td>69,033</td>
<td>1,7</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>69,033</td>
<td>1,7</td>
<td>69,033</td>
<td>1,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,34,217</td>
<td>44,666</td>
<td>2,1</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>44,666</td>
<td>2,1</td>
<td>44,666</td>
<td>2,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,34,217</td>
<td>148,873</td>
<td>94,180</td>
<td>4,1</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>148,873</td>
<td>3,1</td>
<td>94,180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Figures available only for tonnage entered.
* not available

1. From 1906 on these figures refer only to Norwegian shipping.
2. Figures before those from 1904 suffer from multiple entry by the various States and are not strictly comparable.

Sources: Commonwealth Year Books, 1901-1924; T.A. Coghill: The Seven Colonies of Australasia. 1851-1940.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>U.S. Cleared</th>
<th>Australian Cleared</th>
<th>Other British Cleared</th>
<th>U.S. Cleared from U.S.</th>
<th>German Freighter Cleared</th>
<th>French Freighter Cleared</th>
<th>Norwegian Freighter Cleared</th>
<th>Japanese Freighter Cleared</th>
<th>Dutch Freighter Cleared</th>
<th>Total Cleared from U.S.</th>
<th>Total Cleared for U.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tons</td>
<td>tons</td>
<td>tons</td>
<td>tons</td>
<td>tons</td>
<td>tons</td>
<td>tons</td>
<td>tons</td>
<td>tons</td>
<td>tons</td>
<td>tons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>230,130</td>
<td>35,700</td>
<td>1,147</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,095</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>112,759</td>
<td>96,514</td>
<td>19,919</td>
<td>3,153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>208,974</td>
<td>39,832</td>
<td>5,292</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>1,047</td>
<td>1,798</td>
<td>102,217</td>
<td>72,895</td>
<td>11,922</td>
<td>1,060</td>
<td>38,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>209,675</td>
<td>20,320</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,211</td>
<td>1,170</td>
<td>82,921</td>
<td>63,116</td>
<td>3,366</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>264,803</td>
<td>170,392</td>
<td>1,254</td>
<td>5,286</td>
<td>4,384</td>
<td>5,066</td>
<td>69,066</td>
<td>68,526</td>
<td>26,909</td>
<td>11,210</td>
<td>25,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>245,935</td>
<td>62,937</td>
<td>2,759</td>
<td>7,388</td>
<td>6,226</td>
<td>2,351</td>
<td>16,295</td>
<td>42,051</td>
<td>36,004</td>
<td>1,630</td>
<td>27,393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>179,333</td>
<td>20,833</td>
<td>6,459</td>
<td>4,628</td>
<td>3,971</td>
<td>3,428</td>
<td>17,928</td>
<td>42,051</td>
<td>36,713</td>
<td>5,244</td>
<td>30,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>217,706</td>
<td>57,806</td>
<td>3,096</td>
<td>6,772</td>
<td>12,921</td>
<td>9,246</td>
<td>22,176</td>
<td>21,264</td>
<td>33,949</td>
<td>5,270</td>
<td>22,932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>260,445</td>
<td>59,676</td>
<td>1,380</td>
<td>8,017</td>
<td>10,955</td>
<td>24,359</td>
<td>31,396</td>
<td>46,803</td>
<td>16,637</td>
<td>41,280</td>
<td>33,128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>236,193</td>
<td>27,899</td>
<td>1,380</td>
<td>48,001</td>
<td>52,279</td>
<td>33,639</td>
<td>47,950</td>
<td>62,722</td>
<td>4,022</td>
<td>27,382</td>
<td>8,464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>257,973</td>
<td>22,959</td>
<td>7,479</td>
<td>4,352</td>
<td>46,226</td>
<td>38,871</td>
<td>74,173</td>
<td>74,716</td>
<td>62,721</td>
<td>3,725</td>
<td>9,664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914-5</td>
<td>243,011</td>
<td>69,543</td>
<td>13,695</td>
<td>7,946</td>
<td>36,330</td>
<td>46,406</td>
<td>77,721</td>
<td>69,235</td>
<td>9,920</td>
<td>12,668</td>
<td>27,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915-6</td>
<td>257,362</td>
<td>103,154</td>
<td>18,648</td>
<td>10,715</td>
<td>12,614</td>
<td>12,997</td>
<td>182,140</td>
<td>159,416</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27,701</td>
<td>7,869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916-7</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>201,196</td>
<td>137,966</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917-8</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>151,365</td>
<td>124,911</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28,379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918-9</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>157,215</td>
<td>123,451</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919-20</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>156,197</td>
<td>167,333</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920-1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>208,757</td>
<td>139,091</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921-2</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>129,073</td>
<td>117,654</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922-3</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>175,800</td>
<td>134,325</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Figures not available.

### TABLE 9 - COUNTRY OF ORIGIN OF VOYAGE OF U.S. SHIPS ENTERING AUSTRALIA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>West Coast 1</th>
<th>U.S.A.</th>
<th>CANADA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no.</td>
<td>tons</td>
<td>no.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904 with cargo</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>107,748</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in ballast</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5,011</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905 with cargo</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>105,489</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in ballast</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,728</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906 with cargo</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>82,921</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in ballast</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29,611</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907 with cargo</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>39,457</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in ballast</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908 with cargo</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16,255</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in ballast</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909 with cargo</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17,928</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in ballast</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910 with cargo</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22,176</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in ballast</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911 with cargo</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24,359</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in ballast</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912 with cargo</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36,637</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in ballast</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913 with cargo</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>74,143</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in ballast</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914 with cargo</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>77,721</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in ballast</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915 with cargo</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>170,550</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-6 in ballast</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916-72</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>201,186</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917-82</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>151,365</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918-92</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>157,215</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919-202</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>156,197</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920-12</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>208,757</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921-22</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>129,073</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922-32</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>175,800</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Figures not available.
1. Figures distinguishing between East and West Coasts available only 1912-1915/6.
2. Figures distinguishing between ships with cargo and ships in ballast not available.
3. Includes Mexico.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>NEW ZEALAND no. tons</th>
<th>Philippines no. tons</th>
<th>OTHER PACIFIC IS. no. tons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1904 with cargo</td>
<td>1 1,494</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in ballast</td>
<td>1 654</td>
<td>2 3,282</td>
<td>1 1,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905 with cargo</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in ballast</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3 5,778</td>
<td>4 6,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906 with cargo</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in ballast</td>
<td>2 3,534</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907 with cargo</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in ballast</td>
<td>1 653</td>
<td>1 1,993</td>
<td>6 7,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908 with cargo</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in ballast</td>
<td>1 1,012</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909 with cargo</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in ballast</td>
<td>1 924</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910 with cargo</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in ballast</td>
<td>1 902</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911 with cargo</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in ballast</td>
<td>3 3,121</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912 with cargo</td>
<td>1 1,103</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in ballast</td>
<td>2 1,465</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3 2,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913 with cargo</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in ballast</td>
<td>1 1,062</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914-5 with cargo</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in ballast</td>
<td>4 2,082</td>
<td>9 9,768</td>
<td>1 822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915-6 with cargo</td>
<td>1 545</td>
<td>1 796</td>
<td>5 8,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in ballast</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4 4,762</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Figures not available

Note 2: See previous page.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>AFRICA</th>
<th></th>
<th>SOUTH AMERICA</th>
<th></th>
<th>OTHER</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>tons</td>
<td>no.</td>
<td>tons</td>
<td>no.</td>
<td>tons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904 with cargo</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18,962</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,319</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in ballast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905 with cargo</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8,911</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6,976</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in ballast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906 with cargo</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9,681</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,453</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in ballast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907 with cargo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,976</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8,344</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in ballast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908 with cargo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,728</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27,076</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in ballast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909 with cargo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,458</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,671</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in ballast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910 with cargo</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5,337</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in ballast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911 with cargo</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4,378</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in ballast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912 with cargo</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in ballast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913 with cargo</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in ballast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914-5 with cargo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,933</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in ballast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915-6 with cargo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>923</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in ballast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916-7</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>923</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917-8</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>861</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918-9</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2,994</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2,994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919-20</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2,804</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1,105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920-1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>11,705</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>14,986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921-2</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2,565</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2,701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922-3</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>14,521</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Figures not available.

Note 2: See previous page.

Source: Shipping and Oversea Migration of the Commonwealth of Australia, 1904-1915/6; Commonwealth Year Book 1916-1921.
### TABLE 10 - DESTINATIONS OF SHIPS OF U.S. NATIONALITY CLEARING AUSTRALIA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>U.S.A.</th>
<th></th>
<th>Canada</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Coast</td>
<td>East Coast</td>
<td>West Coast</td>
<td>East Coast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>96,514</td>
<td>no.</td>
<td>tons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>72,865</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>63,116</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>68,526</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>42,051</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22,264</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19,782</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31,396</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>47,950</td>
<td>no.</td>
<td>tons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>74,716</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914-5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>65,233</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3,902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915-6</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>133,926</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916-7</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>137,966</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2,264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917-8</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>124,911</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918-9</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>123,451</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1,105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919-20</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>107,333</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920-1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>139,091</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>3,761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921-2</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>117,651</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922-3</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>134,325</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 10 (CONT.) - DESTINATIONS OF SHIPS OF U.S. NATIONALITY CLEARING AUSTRALIA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>South-Central America</th>
<th>Pacific Islands</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>4,280</td>
<td>36,674²</td>
<td>1,289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8,328</td>
<td>49,555²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28,693</td>
<td>23,869³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,834</td>
<td>11,336³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,142</td>
<td>8,324³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4,453</td>
<td>2,036³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,743³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,939³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,545³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,257²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914-5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>13,842⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915-6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11,062</td>
<td>27,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916-7</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>42,624</td>
<td>23,518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917-8</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>7,466</td>
<td>19,368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918-9</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>6,205</td>
<td>29,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919-20</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>10,484</td>
<td>43,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920-1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>64,296</td>
<td>24,046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921-2</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>5,115</td>
<td>8,268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922-3</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>18,816</td>
<td>2,404</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Figures not available.

**SOURCES:** Shipping and Oversea Migration of the Commonwealth of Australia, 1904-1915/6; Commonwealth Year Book, 1917-1924.

1. The distinction between West and East Coasts was made only from 1912 to 1915-6.
2. Mostly for Hawaii.
3. All for Hawaii.
4. Includes 10 vessels totalling 10,602 tons for the Philippines.
5. To Cape Colony and Dutch East Indies.
6. For New Zealand.
7. For Straits Settlements.
8. For Japan.
9. Includes Mexico.
10. For U.S., New Zealand and France.
11. About a third for New Zealand and a third for Africa.
12. For various countries in Asia and Europe.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>A.W.P.</th>
<th>Colonial Mutual</th>
<th>Equivalent of New York</th>
<th>No. of Policies Assured</th>
<th>Annual Premium Income</th>
<th>No. of Policies Assured</th>
<th>Annual Premium Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>115,232</td>
<td>39,331,071</td>
<td>1,289,519</td>
<td>38,400</td>
<td>6,426,976</td>
<td>32,966</td>
<td>6,426,976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>123,752</td>
<td>41,634,568</td>
<td>1,305,361</td>
<td>38,226</td>
<td>6,703,376</td>
<td>32,560</td>
<td>6,703,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>134,343</td>
<td>49,889,032</td>
<td>1,365,354</td>
<td>38,226</td>
<td>6,703,376</td>
<td>32,560</td>
<td>6,703,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>151,150</td>
<td>54,363,823</td>
<td>1,449,416</td>
<td>38,226</td>
<td>6,703,376</td>
<td>32,560</td>
<td>6,703,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>163,150</td>
<td>59,005,363</td>
<td>1,562,243</td>
<td>38,226</td>
<td>6,703,376</td>
<td>32,560</td>
<td>6,703,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>176,000</td>
<td>62,763,392</td>
<td>1,715,697</td>
<td>38,226</td>
<td>6,703,376</td>
<td>32,560</td>
<td>6,703,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>182,000</td>
<td>65,721,512</td>
<td>1,864,599</td>
<td>38,226</td>
<td>6,703,376</td>
<td>32,560</td>
<td>6,703,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>191,000</td>
<td>68,468,732</td>
<td>1,969,160</td>
<td>38,226</td>
<td>6,703,376</td>
<td>32,560</td>
<td>6,703,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>203,000</td>
<td>71,872,871</td>
<td>2,069,832</td>
<td>38,226</td>
<td>6,703,376</td>
<td>32,560</td>
<td>6,703,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>217,000</td>
<td>75,655,703</td>
<td>2,189,503</td>
<td>38,226</td>
<td>6,703,376</td>
<td>32,560</td>
<td>6,703,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>233,000</td>
<td>79,438,045</td>
<td>2,317,160</td>
<td>38,226</td>
<td>6,703,376</td>
<td>32,560</td>
<td>6,703,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>253,000</td>
<td>83,366,460</td>
<td>2,464,232</td>
<td>38,226</td>
<td>6,703,376</td>
<td>32,560</td>
<td>6,703,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>275,000</td>
<td>87,565,796</td>
<td>2,617,544</td>
<td>38,226</td>
<td>6,703,376</td>
<td>32,560</td>
<td>6,703,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>92,072,800</td>
<td>2,772,832</td>
<td>38,226</td>
<td>6,703,376</td>
<td>32,560</td>
<td>6,703,376</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 11** - Operations of Insurance Companies in Australasia

**Notes:**
- The whole period is not covered since for the 1890's available, the U.S. companies had virtual operations with New Zealand figures prior to 1890's refer to Australia alone.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of Policies Assured</td>
<td>No. of Policies Assured</td>
<td>No. of Policies Assured</td>
<td>No. of Policies Assured</td>
<td>No. of Policies Assured</td>
<td>No. of Policies Assured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,468</td>
<td>1,160,366</td>
<td>48,322</td>
<td>2,169</td>
<td>1,643,535</td>
<td>94,954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,971</td>
<td>1,366,680</td>
<td>57,098</td>
<td>2,615</td>
<td>1,658,000</td>
<td>92,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,212</td>
<td>1,403,785</td>
<td>60,763</td>
<td>2,932</td>
<td>1,733,773</td>
<td>97,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,063</td>
<td>1,623,954</td>
<td>63,638</td>
<td>4,477</td>
<td>2,008,582</td>
<td>88,127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,778</td>
<td>1,860,500</td>
<td>76,279</td>
<td>5,755</td>
<td>2,330,404</td>
<td>101,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,400</td>
<td>2,017,141</td>
<td>77,649</td>
<td>6,511</td>
<td>2,472,534</td>
<td>109,356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,939</td>
<td>2,178,376</td>
<td>83,405</td>
<td>7,003</td>
<td>2,710,564</td>
<td>117,949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,305</td>
<td>2,169,155</td>
<td>52,403</td>
<td>8,261</td>
<td>3,175,444</td>
<td>124,749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,350</td>
<td>2,169,155</td>
<td>52,403</td>
<td>6,647</td>
<td>2,514,637</td>
<td>98,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,421</td>
<td>1,778,998</td>
<td>65,540</td>
<td>6,262</td>
<td>2,382,620</td>
<td>85,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,238</td>
<td>1,669,522</td>
<td>58,478</td>
<td>5,958</td>
<td>2,281,704</td>
<td>81,454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,121</td>
<td>1,602,582</td>
<td>53,531</td>
<td>5,769</td>
<td>2,211,868</td>
<td>77,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,028</td>
<td>1,561,808</td>
<td>51,065</td>
<td>5,673</td>
<td>2,191,551</td>
<td>78,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,843</td>
<td>1,492,161</td>
<td>47,466</td>
<td>5,407</td>
<td>2,111,080</td>
<td>77,046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,689</td>
<td>1,417,462</td>
<td>43,763</td>
<td>5,309</td>
<td>2,092,375</td>
<td>77,686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,302</td>
<td>1,251,596</td>
<td>36,872</td>
<td>4,964</td>
<td>3,056,868</td>
<td>73,756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,107</td>
<td>1,170,355</td>
<td>33,263</td>
<td>4,767</td>
<td>2,045,512</td>
<td>72,673</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ Not available.

**Source:** T.A. Coghlan: *The Seven Colonies of Australasia, 1890-1904*; *Commonwealth Year Book, 1901 - 1922/3.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>AUSTRALIAN (films only) Ft.</th>
<th>Value £</th>
<th>U.K. (films only) Ft.</th>
<th>Value £</th>
<th>CANADIAN (films only) Ft.</th>
<th>Value £</th>
<th>NEW ZEALAND (films only) Ft.</th>
<th>Value £</th>
<th>FRENCH (films only) Ft.</th>
<th>Value £</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>363</td>
<td></td>
<td>50,229</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38,410</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914-5</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td></td>
<td>77,349</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>393</td>
<td>12,669</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915-6</td>
<td>210</td>
<td></td>
<td>89,979</td>
<td></td>
<td>113</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>14,762</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916-7</td>
<td>11,141</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>3,230,963</td>
<td>50,170</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>18,431</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>174,804</td>
<td>3,642</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>equipment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>924</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917-8</td>
<td>18,060</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>1,653,622</td>
<td>23,821</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>86,024</td>
<td>1,666</td>
<td>153</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>equipment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918-9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>650,116</td>
<td>9,089</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>2,260</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>59,933</td>
<td>1,025</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>equipment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919-20</td>
<td>15,100</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>1,135,892</td>
<td>17,853</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>173,001</td>
<td>3,071</td>
<td>105,813</td>
<td>1,539</td>
<td>747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>equipment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,347</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920-1</td>
<td>59,110</td>
<td>1,308</td>
<td>1,546,264</td>
<td>22,020</td>
<td>1,547</td>
<td>12,822</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>156,918</td>
<td>2,151</td>
<td>1,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>equipment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921-2 (f)</td>
<td>56,387</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>1,269,089</td>
<td>18,780</td>
<td>1,049</td>
<td>25,746</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>589,174</td>
<td>7,149</td>
<td>1,569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>equipment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,238</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922-3</td>
<td>36,550</td>
<td>5,916</td>
<td>619,870</td>
<td>7,419</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>216,365</td>
<td>2,807</td>
<td>2,656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Germany Films Value</td>
<td>Italy Films Value</td>
<td>Scandinavian Films Value</td>
<td>U.S. Films Value</td>
<td>Other Films Value</td>
<td>Total Value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(£ only)</td>
<td>(£ only)</td>
<td>(£ only)</td>
<td>(£ only)</td>
<td>(£ only)</td>
<td>(£ only)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>8,177</td>
<td>6,260</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>108,417</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>212,732</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914-5</td>
<td>1,863</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,063</td>
<td>93,599</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>191,528</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915-6</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>2,507</td>
<td>1,542</td>
<td>92,214</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>201,740</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916-7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13,147</td>
<td>5,002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>films</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29,983</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>28,430</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>217,931</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>equipment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,496</td>
<td>614</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917-8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16,207</td>
<td>292,080</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>films</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21,352</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>264,942</td>
<td>9,422</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>equipment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,271</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918-9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,069</td>
<td>5,057</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>films</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8,934</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>4,746</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>163,196</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>equipment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7,954</td>
<td>7,582</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919-20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15,420</td>
<td>236,493</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>films</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>211,544</td>
<td>29,870</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>equipment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16,934,496</td>
<td>15,256</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15,256</td>
<td>234,854</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>films</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>127,817</td>
<td>1,572</td>
<td>16,717</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>17,278,866</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>equipment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>205,851</td>
<td>874</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12,087</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>films</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>197,417</td>
<td>2,225</td>
<td>77,861</td>
<td>859</td>
<td>22,992,847</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>equipment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>257,742</td>
<td>548</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12,433</td>
<td>21,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>films</td>
<td>59,163</td>
<td>955</td>
<td>81,715</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>241,073</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>equipment</td>
<td>1,344</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26,778</td>
<td>1,344</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prior to 1913, Films and Film Equipment were not recorded separately but were included with other categories. From 1913–1915/6 they were lumped together.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>U.K.</th>
<th>New Zealand</th>
<th>Germany</th>
<th>U.S.A.</th>
<th>France</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>397,339</td>
<td>2,662</td>
<td>5,556</td>
<td>17,496</td>
<td>924</td>
<td>427,036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>412,883</td>
<td>1,939</td>
<td>6,140</td>
<td>26,673</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>449,734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td>398,523</td>
<td>2,383</td>
<td>4,641</td>
<td>28,353</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>436,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>368,900</td>
<td>2,966</td>
<td>5,812</td>
<td>26,948</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>406,694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>422,898</td>
<td>5,332</td>
<td>5,634</td>
<td>18,067</td>
<td>896</td>
<td>454,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>405,510</td>
<td>3,462</td>
<td>5,995</td>
<td>28,967</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>445,286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>416,523</td>
<td>3,295</td>
<td>7,781</td>
<td>22,943</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>452,687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>424,045</td>
<td>2,690</td>
<td>5,852</td>
<td>30,690</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>465,991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>421,458</td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>7,383</td>
<td>37,950</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>472,866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>465,719</td>
<td>3,975</td>
<td>7,396</td>
<td>34,567</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>515,495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>501,495</td>
<td>2,978</td>
<td>9,493</td>
<td>47,036</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>564,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>618,043</td>
<td>4,948</td>
<td>12,204</td>
<td>53,668</td>
<td>1,114</td>
<td>693,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>614,702</td>
<td>6,300</td>
<td>10,887</td>
<td>52,476</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>689,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>598,838</td>
<td>4,927</td>
<td>9,968</td>
<td>61,799</td>
<td>1,588</td>
<td>680,718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914-5</td>
<td>531,828</td>
<td>4,294</td>
<td>7,038</td>
<td>64,271</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>610,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915-6</td>
<td>530,999</td>
<td>3,353</td>
<td>1,077</td>
<td>60,393</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>599,567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916-7</td>
<td>499,694</td>
<td>2,869</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>60,727</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>568,734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917-8</td>
<td>459,341</td>
<td>2,986</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>82,760</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>549,724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918-9</td>
<td>558,920</td>
<td>3,024</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>103,697</td>
<td>1,317</td>
<td>669,811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919-20</td>
<td>603,446</td>
<td>3,305</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>156,689</td>
<td>4,179</td>
<td>773,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920-1</td>
<td>859,391</td>
<td>9,524</td>
<td>1,294</td>
<td>150,934</td>
<td>2,421</td>
<td>1,032,935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921-2</td>
<td>784,794</td>
<td>10,919</td>
<td>2,086</td>
<td>99,202</td>
<td>3,593</td>
<td>911,229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922-3</td>
<td>978,367</td>
<td>6,088</td>
<td>2,860</td>
<td>119,335</td>
<td>3,192</td>
<td>1,118,721</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Figures available only according to country of shipment.

Source: Trade and Customs and Excise Revenue: 1902 - 1922/3