

EDWARD WILLIAM FOXALL: A CLASSICAL LIBERAL IN A RACIST AGE

The politics of early 20th century Australia defeated classical liberal objections to the White Australia Policy, explains **David Kemp**

The last years of the nineteenth century and the early years of the twentieth were tough years for those who believed that all men were born equal, and had been endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights. Nationalism was on the rise, class politics was gaining steam, and racial policies were seemingly being endorsed by science. In the face of the demands on loyalty by the three great collectivities of the age—nation, class and race—those who believed in the supreme dignity and freedom of the individual person were very much on the defensive. At no point was this to be seen in starker relief in Australia than in the debate on the *Immigration Restriction Bill* with which the new Commonwealth Parliament in 1901 opened its legislative program.

As Australia's political leaders, Edmund Barton, Alfred Deakin, George Reid, and John Christian Watson competed (and did deals) with each other in the rush to construct a white Australia, few in Parliament stood against the tide of race-based policy. Bruce Smith, author of *Liberty and Liberalism*, was one. Another was Edward Pulsford, NSW Senator and founder of the Free Trade and Liberal Association in 1885. Outside Parliament, liberal voices were equally scarce.

One whose voice rings down the years with eloquence, reason and passion was Edward William Foxall, a liberal intellectual and activist with literary, musical and political interests.

Foxall deserves to be remembered and honoured, if only for his brilliant polemic against the political leadership that he believed had betrayed the fundamental liberal principles on which Australia's democracy was supposedly based.

Foxall's book, *Colorphobia: An Exposure of the White Australia Fallacy* (1903), has claims to be considered one of Australia's liberal classics.¹ The fact that we can read it today over a century later and accept the vast majority of his judgments shows not only the continuing vitality of the political principles that moved him, but also the worth of the intellectual framework he brought to bear on the new nation's racial consensus.

Foxall's lonely voice stands as evidence of the survival of the sophisticated liberal consciousness in Australia in an age when illiberal ideas were increasingly fashionable. As such, it warrants some attention, if only to demonstrate that the concept of a universalist and principled liberalism was still alive and fighting at a time when Australia was moving sharply in another direction. Foxall's polemic also demonstrates that the political

David Kemp is a former federal minister and recently completed a term as state president of the Victorian division of the Liberal Party. He is researching 19th and early 20th century liberalism in Australia.

leaders made their choices in a context where alternative policies were available and articulated.

Colorphobia was written under a pseudonym (Gizen-No-Teki) and subsidised by Foxall's friend Bruce Smith. The term 'colorphobia' had been used by William Lloyd Garrison in the abolitionist essay 'American Colorphobia' in 1847 in the United States.

Establishment of a white Australia was the first major business considered by the new Commonwealth Parliament in 1901.

Foxall was born in England, educated at Sydney Grammar, and trained as an accountant with a business firm. He was an associate of John Farrell, who wrote regularly for *The Bulletin* from 1882.² Like Farrell, Foxall developed an interest in Henry George's single tax theories after the publication of George's *Progress and Poverty* in 1884. In 1886, Foxall compiled and edited a book of poems by Hector Stuart titled *South Sea Dreamer*. From 1900, he developed a close knowledge and understanding of Japan through his role as English Secretary to the Japanese Consul-General in Sydney.

The establishment of a white Australia was the first major business considered by the new Commonwealth Parliament in 1901, and the debate continued until December that year. Taking up some 600 pages of Hansard, the debate concerned a central aspect of national identity—who were to be the Australian people in the years ahead? The answer to the question, accepted by almost all the parliamentarians, was that the Australian people were to be simply an expansion and reinforcement of the Australian people of the present: the growing numbers of native born were to be supplemented by immigrants from Great Britain and complemented by a few from continental Europe (or the Americas). Not many disagreed.

There were many reasons why an overwhelming majority of the Parliament accepted the idea that Australia should develop

as a white nation, excluding coloured people (the Aborigines were excluded from citizenship and the enumeration of the population): protection against competition in the labour market, fear of the British character of the new nation being submerged, and ideas of racial superiority and fears of racial degradation. It was spoken of as an ideal worth pursuing, even by many of those who were conscious of its conflict with the principle of human equality.

The Liberal leaders had their own political motivations in seeking to win the support of those who held the balance of power, the Labor Party. The internationalists, who included people such as Smith, Pulsford and others (mainly free-traders who had had personal contact with Japan, China, and India), were appalled by the ignorance and prejudice voiced shamelessly in the debate.

The parliamentary debate

Throughout the debate, there was overwhelming support for restricting the immigration of non-Europeans. Most favoured complete exclusion, some favoured exceptions on economic grounds, and only a few, while supporting exclusion on economic or cultural grounds, rejected the racial reason. They were prepared to accept limited immigration of non-Europeans who had the level of education and understanding of Australia's culture to allow them to be participating members of the new democracy.

Neither the economic nor the cultural arguments for immigration restriction, such as they were, could be used to logically justify the *total* exclusion of Asians and Pacific Islanders. Plainly there could be immigrants of Asian and Pacific background who could fit readily into Australian society. There were indeed many Indians already in British schools and universities. The argument that a white Australia would reduce competition in the labour market contained the logical difficulty that such an argument could apply to all immigrants, regardless of race, and that governments could regulate wage and working conditions for all workplaces and all employees, whatever the race of workers. Ultimately, the *total* exclusion necessary to build a *white* Australia could only be justified on the basis of race or ethnicity.

Although all were clear that the real intent of the legislation was to secure a white Australia, the government found itself in a difficult position because of the attitude of Britain, which had recently concluded a treaty with Japan, and had made clear to the Australian government that it did not want any explicit racial exclusion that would offend the Japanese. Prime Minister Edmund Barton informed Parliament of the view of Joseph Chamberlain, then British Secretary of State for the Colonies, that any explicit disqualification on the grounds of race or colour would not only be ‘offensive to a friendly power [Japan], but contrary to the general conceptions of equality which have been the guiding principle of British rule throughout the Empire.’

The legislation therefore resorted to the device of a dictation test that made no mention of the racial background of those to whom it would be administered.

The nature of the dictation test, contained in Clause 4(a) of the *Immigration Restriction Bill*—and the hypocrisy and subterfuge involved in it, as some members claimed—came to be the focus of much of the debate.

Clause 4(a) defined a ‘prohibited immigrant’ as:

Any person who when asked to do so by an officer fails to write out and sign in the presence of the officer, a passage of 50 words in length in the English language dictated by the officer.

‘Superior’ and ‘inferior’ races

In accepting the substance of the racial discrimination intended by the dictation test, the Liberal Protectionists, led by Barton and Deakin, had been influenced by the views of Charles Henry Pearson, the Victorian Liberal intellectual and parliamentarian, and mentor of Deakin, who had achieved an international reputation through his futurist book *National Life and Character: A Forecast*. The authority of Pearson helped popularise among the Liberals the language of ‘superior,’ ‘higher,’ and ‘inferior’ races, and a formulation of the issue that was to provide the more ‘civilised’ case for a ‘white’ Australia. Pearson had written:

We are guarding the last part of the world in which the higher races can live and increase freely for the higher civilization. We are denying the yellow race nothing but what it can find in the home of its birth, or in countries like the Indian archipelago, where the white man can never live except as an exotic.³

It was a language that Alfred Deakin felt comfortable using. At the 1890 Melbourne Conference on the Constitution, he had seen the issue of Asian immigration as one that provided a positive argument for a national government. One government could deal with the matter most efficiently on behalf of all the colonies:

United Australia will be called upon to face the largest problems. One has been in some measure already dealt with, but not yet finally solved: that of the influx of inferior races into the northern parts of the continent. There are questions arising with the Chinese Government which yet remain for final settlement; and in regard to which it is necessary that the peoples of these colonies should be able, through some recognised body, to speedily and effectually express their will. They must be prepared to support that will by united action when necessary.⁴

What had eroded the belief in human equality among the educated liberals in Australia?

How had this happened? What had eroded the belief in human equality among the educated liberals in Australia? The intellectual fashions were certainly against the equality of all human beings. By 1901, the world of ideas and science had become fascinated by the idea of race, and there were active proponents of the concept of European superiority on purportedly ‘scientific’ grounds. It was widely believed, though by no means universally accepted, that science

(and the achievements of the century just past) had demonstrated not only the superiority of the European races, but even the biological distinctiveness of the large racial groups.

Backed by Pearson, the pseudo-science of racial differences provided convenient arguments to wheel out, just as the dictates of parliamentary, and the temptations of electoral, politics drove the Protectionist Liberals towards policies based on race.

The American example

At first glance, the support for a white Australia among the Free Trade Liberals seems more difficult to understand, for the essence of free-trade liberalism was its belief in an economic system that was open to the world; in general, the free-trade leaders prized a principled intellectual consistency. Many of the supporters of free trade were themselves involved in international commerce, and knew from personal experience the culture and qualities of the educated Japanese, Chinese and Indians. This liberal tradition, represented to the world by the British Liberal Party, disowned racism. Moreover, the free trade case shared none of the incipient isolationism seen in many of the protectionist statements.

The support for a white Australia among the Free Trade Liberals seems more difficult to understand.

George Reid, leader of the Free Trade Liberals, was a believer in immigration. He rejected the ambivalence of the labour movement to growing the nation through immigration. Competition in the labour market was not something to be feared. It was a part of the openness he espoused, and which he believed was necessary to the development of the continent. Yet on the matter of establishing a racial basis for that immigration, no one was to take a stronger stand than Reid. He claimed, in fact, to be the originator of the idea of a purely 'white' Australia, and came to the parliamentary debate with his NSW Immigration Act figuratively in his pocket.

Some, like Foxall, suspected that this was an example of Reid's pandering to the prejudices of

the Labor Party and its union base to win their support. It seems likely, however, that Reid, like Deakin, was also anxious to avoid in Australia the disastrous situation that had developed in the United States after the Civil War with Lincoln's emancipation of the slaves.

The *Immigration Restriction Bill* was being debated not long after the declaration by the US Supreme Court in *Plessy v. Ferguson* (1896) of the 'separate but equal' doctrine—the foundation of a policy of racial segregation that was to last in America for more than 50 years. Reid, like Deakin, did not want to see such a situation in Australia. Deakin's justification of the bill was that it would avoid the situation that had arisen in the United States, where the freed African slave population, despite whatever 'splendid' qualities it may have, was not being assimilated, 'and apparently is never to be assimilated in the nation of which they are politically and nominally a part.'⁵

The influence of the Labor Party

The white Australia policy was ultimately not determined, however, by the logic of the arguments that could be mounted in its favour. There were rational arguments that could be, and were, mounted against it. Bruce Smith made them in Parliament and others like Foxall outside it. The policy was driven by the way the Australian democratic political system had translated into political power the attitudes and values of the voters, as interpreted by party leaders.

The essential feature of the political alignment in 1901 that led to the adoption of the white Australia policy was the positioning of the Australian Labor Party, which on the key issue dividing the free-trade and protectionist Liberals held the balance of power in the House of Representatives. In their battle with each other over the basis of the commercial relationship of Australia with the rest of the world, the two wings of Australian Liberalism were desperate for Labor's support, and in 1901 Labor's support for free trade or protection still seemed open. Barton, Deakin and Reid were openly competing for the crucial votes.

Reid was a brilliant political tactician—so much so that to some his tactics at times

seemed to overwhelm his principles, but there was no doubting the sincerity and depth of his dedication to the policy of free trade. He knew that Labor's base was strongly and narrowly nationalistic (including, at least among the activists, a heavy dose of anti-English sentiment), and above all, passionately antagonistic to coloured immigration.

In Reid's view, a simple exclusion on racial grounds might be objectionable in terms of strict liberal principle, but it was much the lesser of two evils, since a failure to exclude could lead to racial conflict within Australia, and an immigration restriction harmed no individual in itself (other than preventing entry to Australia). Those excluded (mainly Chinese and Japanese) themselves belonged to nations that followed exclusionary policies. The prize Reid hoped to win by supporting racial exclusion was to detach from Labor its free trade members in support of the battle against protection. He ran the risk of splitting his own party, but the weight of opinion on the issue was such that, while he angered some, a split was never a real possibility.

Reid's assessment that Labor's base was generally racist was fully justified by the contributions of the Labor party leaders to the debate on a white Australia. After the *Immigration Restriction Act* had been passed, indeed, Labor's union base would return again and again in election campaigns to raise the bogey of coloured immigration against the Liberals. Nevertheless, the debate uncovered the decisive erosion of universalist liberal principles among the Liberals themselves. Their contributions to the debate were awkward, embarrassing and worse.

Barton, for example, professing to be a believer in the doctrine of human equality, and arguing that the bill did not exclude people on grounds of race, but according the dictation test, was conscious of the difficulty of reconciling the bill's underlying philosophy of total exclusion with this central idea. Quoting Pearson, he explicitly read the doctrine of human equality down on racist grounds:

I do not think either that the doctrine of the equality of man was really ever

intended to include racial equality. There is no racial equality. There is basic inequality. These races are, in comparison with white races—I think no one wants convincing of this fact—unequal and inferior. The doctrine of the quality of man was never intended to apply to the equality of the Englishman and the Chinaman.⁶

Deakin, Attorney-General in the Barton government, pointed out in phrases that may chill some modern readers what the policy of a 'white Australia' meant:

[It] means the prohibition of all alien coloured immigration, and more, it means at the earliest time, by reasonable and just means, the deportation or reduction of the number of aliens now in our midst. The two things go hand in hand, and are the necessary complement of a single policy—the policy of securing a 'white Australia.'⁷

The Labor leadership was less sensitive to the presentation of the racial basis of the policy.

The Labor leadership, knowing the less ambivalent prejudices of its base, was less sensitive than Deakin to the presentation of the racial basis of the policy. Watson confirmed that Labor was perfectly comfortable with a straight racist argument. His speech showed that he was influenced by theories of eugenics and racial improvement, or decline, which were believed to be related to racial purity:

[T]he objection I have to the mixing of these coloured people with the white people of Australia ... lies in the main with the possibility and probability of racial contamination ...

I think we should gauge this matter, not alone by the abstract possibilities of the case, but by those considerations

which appeal to our ordinary human weaknesses and prejudices.

[We] should be foolish in the extreme if we did not exhaust every means of preventing them from coming to this land, which we have made out own. The racial aspect of this question, in my opinion, is the larger and more important one; but the industrial aspect also has to be considered.⁸

Foxall's book was a scathing criticism of the Liberal leaders for their unwillingness to defend basic principles of human freedom and equality.

The classical liberal response

Despite the consensus in favour of racial exclusion by one mechanism or another, there were members of the parliament who were deeply uncomfortable with both the bill and the racist tone of the debate. Bruce Smith, stated that he believed that the 'foundation of the bill is racial prejudice,' and for many, fear.⁹ The public 'ought to know how far this legislation is founded on hysteria, and how far it is founded on good sense and good reasons.'¹⁰

[T]he whole thing is a bogey, a scarecrow. I venture to say that a large part of the scare is founded upon a desire to make political capital by appealing to some of the worst instincts of the more credulous of the people.¹¹

NSW Senator Edward Pulsford, a founder of the Free Trade and Liberal Association in 1885, and organiser of the Intercolonial Free Trade Conference in Sydney in 1900, spoke strongly against the bill. As far back as 1888, he had objected to Parkes' prohibitive poll-tax on Chinese, which he had criticised as 'a brutal disregard for the susceptibilities of other nations.'¹² He had objected to Reid's NSW Immigration Act, principally on the grounds of his concern for Australia's relations with Japan

and China. He repeated this idea in the debate on the *Immigration Restriction Bill*:

I look upon the whole of the inhabitants of Asia as my friends. I am perfectly willing that they should be called my friends, and I hope so long as God gives me breath, I shall have the courage to stand up for what I consider to be right for them, as I shall stand up for what I consider to be right for myself and for any other person.¹³

Colorphobia

Foxall's book was a scathing criticism of the Liberal leaders Barton, Deakin and Reid for their unwillingness to defend basic principles of human freedom and equality, and for their (inevitable) failure to mount reasoned and logical cases for their positions. He offered a passionate but rational defence of policies based on the characteristics of individual people, not their race, language or nation.

Like Bruce Smith, Foxall believed that the arguments for the bill had amounted to nothing more than prejudice. No speaker had made an attempt to justify the actuality of any threat (indeed, Smith had demonstrated that there had been no significant influx of people from Asia for some years), and the arguments about excluding the Japanese because of their virtues, Foxall wrote, were laughably illogical and humiliating.

Racial prejudice is no more to be excused than national prejudice, or religious prejudice, or class prejudice. If one prejudice may find expression in our Statute Book, another may, and surely will. It is simply opening the way for a saturnalia of degrading sectional legislation, leading back to the tyranny and ignorance that prevailed in the past and disgraced our history.¹⁴

Freedom is a condition in which the equal rights of all are equally respected, and any limitation of the doctrine of equal rights is an invasion of the

principle of liberty, which only requires time and circumstance to be productive of disaster.¹⁵

Perhaps with Deakin in mind, Foxall argued that Australia had imported its ‘colorphobia’ from the United States, whose prejudice against, and treatment of, the freed Negro slaves had entered the Australian mind. In drawing a racist conclusion from the American experience, Australians had made a fundamental mistake.

They have confounded Slavery and Color, for no other reason than because the American slaves were colored; and they point to the trouble presented by the negro problem in American as a thing to be avoided in Australia by keeping all coloured people out of the country. The ignorance displayed by this attitude is as pitiable as its consequences are likely to be disastrous...

But to take the bald facts that some Americans hate those whom they (or their forefathers) have injured, and that this hatred has in many cases led to reprisals ... and, ignoring all circumstances, coolly blame the whole resultant trouble on the *color* of the wronged people, is a piece of superlative impudence and ignorance for which it would be hard to find an historical parallel.¹⁶

Having drawn the wrong conclusion from the American experience, some Australians extended it to all people of colour, whose national characteristics varied greatly from each other. The fallacy of the arguments used to justify a white Australia was especially obvious in the case of the Japanese.

Foxall, who had regular contact with Japanese officials in Sydney, and spoke from personal knowledge, asserted that the Japanese, who had been identified as the main target for the legislation by speakers in the debate, ‘are a nation whose progress and development during the last half-century should teach every thinking

Caucasian a valuable lesson on the folly of racial conceit ... The Japanese are nationally, and socially, our equals...’¹⁷ Moreover, he strongly asserted that every other racial group, including the Australian Aborigines, was the equal of Europeans once provided with equal opportunities and institutions.¹⁸

A driving emotion of Foxall’s book, however, was the despair of the radical free trader at the apostasy of Reid who, in his view, had opened the door in NSW to the emergence of the Labor Party and its blatant appeal to prejudice.

Foxall strongly asserted that every racial group was the equal of Europeans once provided with equal opportunities and institutions.

‘It is clear,’ Foxall wrote, ‘that the *Immigration Restriction Act* owes its existence to the triangularity of Australian politics,’ and to the susceptibility of Labor to the appeals of racial prejudice.

Foxall believed, almost certainly unrealistically, that Reid could have successfully achieved a federation that preserved NSW’s policy of free trade, the example of which would ultimately have forced the other colonies to abandon protection. This might have delayed federation, but it would have led to a nation that was consistent in its internal and external policies. Reid’s reputation, he thought, hard-earned in the 1890s, would not recover from the damage it had suffered, if his future efforts ‘continue to be accompanied by such lapses from liberal principle as were displayed in his speech on the *Immigration Restriction Bill*.’¹⁹

Reid had described the government’s preferred English dictation test as ‘flaunting the whole of Europe in contemptuous fashion,’ and a test in any European language had been suggested. Foxall asked, logically:

If the English test would flaunt the whole of Europe in contemptuous fashion, does not the European test flaunt the whole of Asia and Africa in contemptuous fashion?²⁰

And as Reid had voted for Watson's amendment that would have explicitly excluded people on the basis of their colour, 'the only question at issue, according to Mr. Reid, appeared to be one of the manner in which certain people should be insulted and flaunted.'²¹ Moreover, 'no attempt was made to show the necessity of insulting anyone.'²²

The reason the Labor Party had emphasised the appeal to prejudice to the exclusion of almost any other argument, however, was that it was keen to get the support of the Free Traders. If it had relied on the economic claim that restriction was necessary to protect workers against low wages, it knew that it would have lost the support of the more economically sophisticated free-traders, who would have rejected the argument outright.

Presciently, Foxall argued that the effort to reduce wage competition would inexorably lead to opposition to immigration itself, just as (in his view) it had led to restrictive laws against the employment of women and children. Low immigration was to be a Labor shibboleth throughout the period between the two world wars.

Far from differences in racial characteristics being hereditary, human nature is essentially the same the world over.

A common human nature

Foxall confronted directly the argument attributed to Pearson, which had so influenced Barton and Deakin, that racial groups were possessed of some inherent 'national character.' The problem, he said, with arguments based on some concept of uniform national character was that no people, not the English, nor any European people, nor any Asian people, were uniform:

[T]he more one thinks upon the question, the greater the difficulty of typifying national character becomes, and the nearer one approaches to the conclusion that character is a purely individual and personal attribute, and

only national in so far as the legislation of any particular country may tend to foster or discourage any particular individual proclivities.²³

In fact, it was policy and circumstances that produced the so-called national characters of people, not inherent racial differences. Far from differences in racial characteristics being hereditary, human nature is essentially the same the world over. Institutions and laws differ, and it is they that create the differences in behaviour, and in habits, that were often described as 'national' character. If Australians were not careful, their exclusionary laws would place them on the same level as other countries with similar laws.

Prejudice based on grouping people into races, classes or religions, Foxall wrote, leads to the internal corruption of a nation. Ultimately, the only response to such expressions of prejudice must be an individual one. The individual must ask 'whether the liberties he himself enjoys, and for which he may feel personally thankful, are shared by the rest of his countrymen; or whether he is but one of a favoured few, playing a more or less involuntary part in the enslavement and degradation of his fellows. When once this stage is reached, the sense of individual responsibility is aroused ...'²⁴

The logic of Foxall's argument was clear. Australia needed to be more open, not more restrictive and closed; more concerned with its relations with peoples of other nations and cultures, not less; more rational in its policies, not more prejudiced. But he overestimated the time frame within which the policies of exclusion, restriction and group prejudice would begin to wreak damage on the new Commonwealth. The first Parliament was to show the time frame to be a short one. Walls against the world could be erected quickly, and circumstances would soon lead to the exaggeration of internal hatreds as well. The overt abandonment of ideas of human equality and acceptance of differences were to have severe unintended consequences.

The restrictive and isolationist character of the white Australia policy came quite quickly

to be paralleled in attitudes to immigration more broadly, and in ever more restrictive protectionist policies on trade and commerce. Fueled by the extreme socialists, the intensity of class warfare rhetoric mounted, and by the 1920s, religious hatreds had become intensified by the conscription debates. The leading economic historian E.O. Shann felt able to write that Australia was becoming a 'hermit nation.'²⁵ Internal conflicts justified by class and religious prejudice were to be of growing significance, and when the nation faced a military attack by Japan in 1942, it did so as a nation with deeply eroded levels of social trust.

Foxall was quickly proven right in his criticism of the European language test. The final decision of the parliament to have the dictation test administered in any European language was regarded by Japan as an offensive discrimination, since it distinguished between Japan and the European nations with which Japan felt it was rightly comparable. Japan would have been less offended by an English test, which applied equally to Europe and Japan.

With the concept of Christian equality before God in his mind, Foxall bitingly concluded:

[T]here is not a professing Christian anywhere, but must admit the inclusion of 'the heathen of every tribe and nation' in the gospel plan of salvation. Which brings us to the remarkable position, that the alien may enter Heaven, but may not enter Australia!

Truly, the logic of this wonderful 'White Australia' business leads us to some strange conclusions! Good enough to dwell for all eternity in Paradise with God Almighty, the archangels, the cherubim and seraphim, the spirits of just men made perfect, the glorious company of the apostles and the noble army of martyrs—but *not* good enough to dwell on the same continent with Mr. J. C. Watson and the Australian labor party!²⁶

Edward Foxall died on 24 May 1926 in Sydney, survived by his wife and his five

children, three sons and two daughters. He was buried in Rookwood Cemetery, Sydney. Those attending his funeral included the Japanese Consul-General and a number of members of the Japanese community.²⁷

Endnotes

- 1 Gizen-no-teki (Edward William Foxall), *Colorphobia: An Exposure of the White Australia Fallacy* (Sydney: R.T. Kelly, 1903).
- 2 B.G. Andrews, 'John Farrell: *Australian Dictionary of Biography* 4 (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1972), 156.
- 3 Charles Henry Pearson, *National Life and Character: A Forecast* (London: Macmillan, 1893 (repr. 1913), 17.
- 4 *Melbourne Conference (preceding the First Constitutional Convention)* (10 February 1890).
- 5 John Andrew La Nauze, *Alfred Deakin: A Biography* Vol. 1 (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1965), 279.
- 6 Commonwealth Parliamentary Debates (26 September 1901), 5233.
- 7 Commonwealth Parliamentary Debates (12 September 1901), 4805–4806.
- 8 Commonwealth Parliamentary Debates (6 September 1901), 4633.
- 9 Commonwealth Parliamentary Debates (25 September 1901), 5157.
- 10 As above, 5158.
- 11 As above, 5165.
- 12 W.G. McMinn, 'Edward Pulsford: *Australian Dictionary of Biography* 11 (Melbourne University Press, 1988), 307.
- 13 Commonwealth Parliamentary Debates (13 November 1901), 1756.
- 14 As above, 176–177.
- 15 Gizen-No-Teki [Foxhall], *Colorphobia*, as above, 96–97.
- 16 As above, 60.
- 17 As above, 182.
- 18 As above, 202.
- 19 As above, 145.
- 20 As above, 151.
- 21 As above, 151.
- 22 As above, 152.
- 23 As above, 186.
- 24 As above, 192.
- 25 Edward Shann, *An Economic History of Australia* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1938), viii–xi.
- 26 As above, 236.
- 27 *The Sydney Morning Herald* (26 May 1926), 12.