Pride in our country and its British foundation will enthuse the delegation to acclaim modestly but fervently its faith in the future of the Commonwealth, and the necessity that it should be peopled by competent members of the British race.

– Archibald Gilchrist, Secretary of the New Settlers League and chairman of the Australian Scottish Delegation

On April 11, 1928, with a crowd of 8000 present, the T.S.S. Hobson’s Bay left Prince’s Pier in Melbourne for Scotland with over 600 Scots on board, who were taking part in a delegation and variously seeking to encourage others to migrate, to develop trade and commerce, and to holiday and visit family. The farewell was a thoroughly Caledonian affair. The Melbourne Highland Pipe Band and the Royal Caledonian Pipe Band attended and “in kilt and sporran, completed the Gaelic atmosphere.” The bands struck up versions of ‘Auld Lang Syne’ and ‘Pibroch O’Donaldhu’ and, “as the ship, festoons of streamers hanging from her side, moved into the channel the pipes were wailing ‘Will Ye No’ Come Back Again?’” It was said that the captain of the ship was a “braw hielanman from up beyond Inverness”, and that “practically every officer hails from the Land o’ Cakes and Cookies.” In a farewell speech, the chairperson of the delegation to Scotland, Archibald Gilchrist, told the crowd:
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In the Empire scheme of things we are still pioneers. We are pressing forward with determination, and the busy present is hurrying to a busier future. Inquiries regarding industries and land settlement have poured in of late years from all points of the world, and will do so to a greater extent after the mission has finished its job. An infectious spirit of optimism prevails, and faith in the future of the Commonwealth is unbounded. There are no croakers on the Hobson’s Bay.5

This article draws upon the Australian Scottish Delegation of 1928 as a case study to explore various facets of the migratory and commercial links forged between Scotland and Australia in the late 1920s and early 1930s. It examines the growth of commerce and trade between Scotland and Australia because of the delegation’s activities and additionally considers the maintenance and composition of migratory connections between the two countries in this period. More broadly, the article argues that the delegation represented a meeting of migratory and commercial ambitions that were couched in imperial rhetoric and this reflected both Australia’s orientation towards Britain and the Empire in the 1920s, as well as the preponderance of popular imperialism in middle-class expressions of Scottish culture in Australia. Overall, the article illustrates a further episode in Australian history where imperial aspirations were central to the way in which Scots imagined and managed their relationship with ‘home’. As such, there are three main historiographical themes touched upon with regard to the Scotland-Australia relationship: commerce, migration, and popular imperialism.

The literature on Scottish commerce and enterprise overseas is broad and offers many avenues for further exploration. Of Scottish foreign investment throughout the eighteenth, nineteenth, and early twentieth centuries, Tom Devine observes that in its commercial and trading endeavours, Scotland recorded a “colossal economic achievement” and gained a position of “global
pre-eminence." By the eve of the First World War, Scotland “was at the pinnacle of global prominence.” Central to this prominence was the British Empire. W. T. Jackson, Ian Donnachie, and others have noted that in the nineteenth century and earlier, the commercial middle class of Scotland saw the Empire as a place of great opportunity for enterprise; it was integral to the Scottish imperial mission was the presence of Scottish business in the colonies and in the commercial apparatus of the Empire. There have been a number of studies of Scottish commerce and enterprise in Australia, including various contributions from Eric Richards, David Macmillan, J. D. Bailey, and Malcolm Prentis, among others. The primary focus for studies of Scottish and Australian commercial connections has been, on the one hand, early Scottish investment and pastoral enterprise in the nineteenth century and, on the other hand, the over-representation and prominence of Scottish migrants in Australian business from European settlement until the present day. It is arguable that Australian-directed efforts to connect with Scotland, and Scottish-Australian links in the twentieth century more generally, deserve more attention. The 1928 delegation offers an exemplary focus for addressing these two themes.

The delegation also sought to stimulate migration to Australia from Scotland. Again, the literature is broad and there are many opportunities to confirm and challenge various understandings of the Scottish migrant experience in twentieth-century Australia. A case study of the delegation serves as an opportunity to illuminate a variety of aspects of migratory connections between Scotland and Australia in the early twentieth century. In particular, the delegation throws into focus the relationships between Australia’s post-First World War ambitions in the Empire and the immigration of Scots to the Antipodes. While studies from historians such as Marjory Harper make it clear that Empire destinations distinguished Scottish migration at this time, the ways in which peripheral, receiving countries such as Australia actively engaged and encouraged Scottish migration are also important. That is to say, while scholars such as Angela McCarthy have shed much light on the personal motivations behind Scottish migration during the inter-war period, a case study of the
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degression further illuminates the activities of Scots in destination countries, such as Australia, in attempting to attract migrants in the 1920s and 1930s. In particular, the delegation’s partnership with imperial youth migration schemes offers the chance to explore issues of class and race as they played out in the Scottish diaspora—who were the “right kinds of Scots?”

Furthermore, although Harper has not made an extended study of it, she and Stephen Constantine have suggested that the 1928 delegation was an early form of “roots-tourism” or a “homecoming.” They observe, “visitors were often subjected to a round of official receptions, at which politicians and civic dignitaries waxed lyrical on the virtues of the imperial relationship.” Harper and Constantine view the delegation as a homecoming pilgrimage in the guise of an imperial trading and migration drive and note that as a kind of “heritage tourism,” the delegation demonstrates the importance of identity, even invented identity, to rootless or restless migrants. Indeed, roots tourism was arguably one aspect of the delegation’s activities. But it also remains true that, in reality, the delegates in 1928 did seek to extend direct trading to Scotland and to encourage immigration to Australia. Indeed, Richards has briefly contextualized the 1928 delegation as “the last hurrah” of Australia’s spirit of expansion and enthusiasm for immigration in the 1920s. He notes its relation to the “grand imperial intergovernmental project entailing the long-distance transfer of labour and capital” that was Australian immigration in the 1920s. From a migration perspective, the delegation encompassed aspects of both migration from Scotland, and return migration to Scotland. Therefore, it is better to understand such delegations holistically as combined commerce, migration, and roots tourism events, for none of these were mutually exclusive.

What both Harper and Richards draw attention to, furthermore, is the imperial rhetoric that was evident both throughout the delegation’s activities, but also in Australia more broadly during the 1920s. This reflected Australia’s orientation towards Britain and the Empire in the inter-war period, as well as the preponderance of popular imperialism in expressions of Scottish culture in Australia. As will be demonstrated, the latter
theme—popular imperialism—ties together the migratory and commercial ambitions of the delegation. What this article achieves is to demonstrate how this mentality was reflected in the rhetoric, and the aspirations, of the 1928 delegation to Scotland and those Scots who participated.

What follows is a brief overview of Australia’s economy and society in the 1920s, which provides helpful broader context for the activities of the 1928 delegation. After an introduction to the delegation itself, the discussion then focuses on two major themes. The first is commerce and migration, and the second is how the Scottish and Australian contexts affected the various activities and outcomes of the delegation. Threading through all of these discussions is the influence and role of both Australia’s imperial ambitions and the imperial mentality of Scottish migrants and people of Scottish descent in Australia during this period. Ultimately, in investigating the delegation’s promotion of commercial and migratory connections between Scotland and Australia, the goal of this article is to provide insights into the centrality of the Empire in this relationship and how imperial sentiment figures so prominently in the ways some Scots and Scottish Australians managed and imagined their relationship with Scotland during the interwar years.

“Men, money, and markets”
In the years following the First World War, Australia was active in seeking economic opportunities in the imperial sphere and embarked on a mission to revive its pre-1914 focus on Empire, geopolitical security, and economic expansion. It was within this context that Scots and Scottish-Australians played on a reputation as Empire builders and initiated a trade and migration delegation at the end of the 1920s. Prime Minister William ‘Billy’ Hughes sought a return to the immigration levels Australia had experienced before the war, in part to protect Australia from an increasingly powerful Japan, but also to stimulate economic development. He wrote to his deputy in November 1918, “If we are to hold Australia and develop its tremendous resources we must have numerous population.” Hughes’ first opportunity to revitalize immigration came after the war. Ex-servicemen in Britain were offered
assistance with passages and settlement in the Dominions between 1919 and 1922. Of all the Dominions, Australia received the largest proportion of assisted ex-servicemen and their families, at around 44 per cent of the total. Hughes continued his enthusiasm for immigration and in 1920 placed the administration of assisted migration into federal hands. The Commonwealth established migration offices in London and Melbourne, and agreed to pay at least one-third of the passages for migrants selected by agents in Britain or nominated by residents of Australia. Selectees were often farm labourers or domestic servants, while nominees were usually friends and family of migrants already living in Australia.

In 1921 Hughes negotiated a loan of 20 million pounds from London, and in return Australia would settle 20,000-25,000 British migrants and their families on the land. In November 1921, Hughes said that British labour and capital would provide Australia with the basis of a “great developmental policy for the building of railways, roads, the clearing of forests and bush, water conservation or irrigation.” A national consensus emerged in the early 1920s that saw immigration, land settlement, and overseas markets as integral to the economic development of Australia. Despite the ultimate failure of costly land settlement schemes, Hughes’ successor—Prime Minister Stanley Bruce—pursued British capital and promoted immigration with even greater determination.

Explaining his policy to an Imperial Conference in 1923, Bruce declared that his Australia was turning to Britain for “Men, money and markets.” Australia needed men from Britain, along with women and children, to make the land productive—overall, the British government financed more than 200,000 assisted migrants to Australia over the decade. In the same period, the Commonwealth and States borrowed over £300 million to support development projects and to expand the capacity of Australian producers. To make increased primary production profitable Australia needed markets, and Britain remained the main buyer of Australian wool, wheat, dairy, meat, fruit and sugar. The government founded its vision, labelled “Australia Unlimited,” on encouraging primary industries and stimulating rural growth. Immigration agents selected British migrants for their appropriateness to find employment in both agriculture and
industry. Around one-third of the migrants were skilled and in some cases were funneled into specific industries such as textiles in Victoria and coalmining in New South Wales.25 With the assistance of trade unions, a group of Scottish masons were contracted in 1926 for five years especially for the construction of the Sydney Harbour Bridge.26

In the end, Australia Unlimited was little more than a pipe dream. The government’s plans were not suited to the realities of the market—including high post-war land values and a peak in export prices immediately after the war—and its inability to recognize rural decline led ultimately to hardship for the migrants and a failure to stimulate agricultural growth. By April 1924, nearly one-third of migrants had left their rural holdings, along with nearly half of the Australians working alongside them. Most migrants moved to the cities or never left them. Perhaps the greatest contribution made by British migrants to Australia’s economy between the wars was to provide labor and experience to its nascent urban industrial sector, rather than the rural agricultural industries that agents had selected them to work in. Ultimately, Richards notes that the “unhappy fate” of imperial commerce and migration schemes in the 1920s “caused deep pessimism at every level” and, in the final analysis, “was a comedy and tragedy of misplaced predictions and the powerlessness of a country to mould its own future.”27

In an effort to reduce the costs of Australian exports, the Bruce government turned on unions and workers, and sought to undercut wages through new industrial awards and by attempting to abolish Australia’s arbitration system. Backlash against these measures led ultimately to the election of James Scullin’s Labor government in 1929.28 Reacting to dropping export prices and the growing reluctance of British financiers to fund Australia Unlimited, Scullin promptly abolished the Development and Migration Commission (a governing body in Bruce’s program of British men, money, and markets) and minimized assisted migration. While Australia had promised to settle Britons in return for the generous loans London had provided throughout the 1920s, whatever animosity Scullin’s reversals might have stirred were soon made moot by the oncoming economic depression.29 Despite
the eventual collapse of Australia’s program of British men, money, and markets, pockets of enthusiastic support for imperial commerce and migration existed right up until the last days of the Bruce government in 1928 and 1929. Perhaps one of the last large-scale attempts to stimulate British labour and capital for Australian development was the Australian Scottish delegation of 1928. Combining Empire migration and imperial commerce, but focusing specifically on Scottish migrants and markets, the delegation was one final effort to revitalize a decade-long fixation on Britain for Australia’s sustenance—although they could not have foreseen the coming economic catastrophe.

The Australian Scottish Delegation, 1928
Because of the increasing number and diversity of Scottish ethnic and cultural organizations during the early twentieth century in Australia, a decline in older associations, and the need to share scarce resources, various umbrella organizations emerged across the country. This included the Victorian Scottish Union (VSU), established in 1905 to affiliate suburban and rural Caledonian societies and pipe bands, the members of which were a combination of Scottish-born and Australians of Scottish descent. Relations between the group and the government were usually amicable. In September 1919, a Horsham-based member had put forward a motion to make sure the VSU appropriately respected returning soldiers, and thanking Prime Minister Hughes for “the manner in which he represented Australians in England during the war.” In November 1919, the group received thanks from Hughes for the “appreciation by Scotsmen of his efforts at the Peace Conference.” When Prime Minister Bruce gave his 1925 re-election speech on the importance of imperialism to Australia, the VSU hosted his celebratory luncheon. Furthermore, prominent Nationalist politicians were members of the Victorian Scottish Union. At one event, William Plain, the founding president of the Nationalist party and a Victorian senator for many years, denounced a shipping strike in early 1925 to VSU members, and said, “If a man set about damaging the country in which he lived he certainly should be sent to a country where his ministrations would be welcomed. That country is not Australia.”
In line with its various political engagements, in the 1920s the VSU decided to form a delegation to Scotland to promote Bruce’s agenda of British men, money, and markets. As a contemporary observed in 1929, “the Scottish groups in Australia had no politics—their only policy was maintenance of the British Empire!”

In late-June, 1927, the *Sydney Morning Herald* announced that the VSU had made arrangements for an organized tour of Scotland by a large number of Scots and people of Scottish-descent living in Australia. The delegates, who applied to take part and paid their own way, represented the six states and the main primary and secondary industries of those states. The tour left Melbourne on April 11 and, sailing via Colombo, Suez, and Port Said, arrived in London on May 18. On May 23, the delegation left for Scotland, spent a week in Edinburgh, and another week in Glasgow from May 30 to June 5. After leaving Glasgow, the delegation visited Perth, Dundee, Aberdeen, and Inverness, where the tour ended on June 15. They were to organize special “Australia campaigns” in the main Scottish cities where literature and other information concerning industries “in all parts of the Commonwealth” was circulated. They also held small exhibitions of Australian products in smaller towns, and each delegate, it was intended, was to promise to sponsor a migrant.

The delegation aimed to promote trade between Scotland and Australia, and extend Scottish business networks within the Empire. The event was couched in the familiar rhetoric of Scotland’s imperial culture. The ‘Empire-builder’ trope was readily found in official propaganda for the tour:

Scotsmen, and, of course, Scots women, are great home-makers, and that quality, coupled with the other characteristics of our race, has enabled our sons and daughters to take a disproportionately large part in the pioneer work of empire-building. But it is equally true that the Scot abroad never loses his affection for his old “Home”, and in the Australian-Scottish Delegation we see a practical expression of the “homing” instinct. We are proud and happy to welcome our kinsmen, proud of their success in a far-off land, proud of the tie
that binds them to “their own, their native land.” Like them, we are anxious to strengthen and secure the bond by the increasing development of a mutually advantageous intercourse in trade and commerce of every kind.  

The optimistic Empire-building pioneers on board the *T.S.S. Hobson’s Bay* as it departed Melbourne on April 11 came from a range of backgrounds. Of the delegates, 352 were women and 251 were men. Many were business owners; Richard Pritchard from North Melbourne sold Aitken’s Wine Tonic, while Robert Walters managed a boot manufacturing company in Windsor, and Mrs E. C. Allan operated a confectionary business in Malvern, for example. From Sydney was Mr D. Oswald, who was a garage proprietor, and from Bondi came William Cowie, who was the managing director of Newtown Furnishing Company. The Queensland group included merchants, farmers, contractors, bankers, fruit growers and one W. B. Irvine, Esq., who listed his profession as ‘bushwhacker’. There was no lack of headmasters and teachers, and other professions such as nurses, hotel owners and skilled tradesmen were common from all states. A £200 fee paid by each delegate covered the cost a berth on the *Hobson’s Bay*, plus expenses in Scotland (but not the return fare to Australia), although a number of delegates were reportedly sponsored by Scottish associations.

When they arrived in Scottish cities, various civic officials and business leaders welcomed the delegates. In Perth, for instance, the General Assurance Corporation provided the reception. In a welcoming pamphlet for the delegates, Perth’s history concludes in a manner that tells us much about the commercial interests of the Scots. “Lastly,” it reads, “she has been the birthplace of a great Corporation, which, from its home office in Perth, has encircled the globe, and spread the Fair City’s name, not upon the label of a whisky bottle, but on a document possibly more beneficent and certainly more enduring—a policy of insurance.” The pamphlet further proclaims, “there is scarcely a civilized community in the world where the Company is not represented.” In Australia alone, between 1903 and 1928 the company had established offices in
Melbourne, Sydney, Brisbane, Adelaide, and Perth. By 1931 it had an Australian staff of 60, with a further 1,500 agents across the country.47 In an attempt to acquire the business of the visitors, the company reminds them that “Australia . . . has a population more British than Britain’s”, and that their money is better invested with the General Assurance Corporation because “all insurance is good, but some is better!” In a token of friendship, the company offered free accident insurance to all of the delegates for the remainder of their tour.48

White Horse Distillers in Glasgow provided a similar pamphlet; its title proudly reads Australian Scottish Delegation: Tour of the Motherland, 1928. Inside we find photographs of the delegates, dressed in kilts and tartan, enjoying the hospitality of the whisky company. Male delegates are pictured inspecting a consignment of White Horse whisky ready for dispatch to Sydney.49 Activities such as these perhaps reflected the eagerness of Scottish business to find markets in Australia—through the resources of the delegates—and complement the host of other events organized which, in turn, promoted Australian business in Scotland.

Imperial commerce and trade
As Ian Donnachie, Christopher Whatley, and others have noted, in the nineteenth century and earlier, the commercial middle class of Scotland considered the Empire as a place of great opportunity where they could exercise entrepreneurial dynamism and enterprise.50 Central to the Scottish imperial mission was the presence of Scottish business in the colonies and in the commercial apparatus of the Empire.51 We will now examine the growth of Scottish Australian trade in the context of 1920s and 1930s Australia, explore the people and politics behind moves to consolidate and increase trade between the two countries, and assesses the role of the Scottish diaspora in assisting what were ultimately drastic increases in direct trade between Australia and Scotland in the late 1920s and early 1930s.

The 1928 delegation had its precedents. In July 1896, James M. Sinclair, the representative in Britain of the Victorian Agricultural Department, travelled to Glasgow, Edinburgh,
Dundee, and Aberdeen with a view to encouraging direct trade with Scotland and Victoria. Upon his return, Sinclair claimed that he “succeeded in inducing several large firms, hitherto doing business chiefly with Denmark, the United States, and Canada to turn their attention to Victoria products.” Direct export to Scotland, however, depended on the extension of the monthly Gulf line steamer service from Melbourne north to Glasgow, rather than terminating at Manchester. This was conditional on a guaranteed minimum 100 tonnes of cargo being shipped to Glasgow from Victoria. Yet, while Canada established a direct shipping service with Glasgow in 1903, by the late 1920s Australia still had not fully exploited Scotland as a market for its exports. Indeed, even New Zealand exported approximately three times as much fruit, dairy, and meat to Scotland than Australia in the early twentieth century. Harold Ford, secretary of the Clyde Navigation Trust, said in 1928 that in Scotland “there are established markets which are literally starved of Australian commodities.” Within a year, nevertheless, direct trade with Scotland had begun to boom, largely thanks to the work of the delegation.

Measuring trade activity between Scotland and Australia can be a complex task, though there were dramatic increases in direct trade in the late 1920s and throughout the 1930s, and much of this had to do with the delegation’s activities in 1928. Archibald Gilchrist, the delegation’s chairperson, told the Advertiser in October 1928 that the “tour was an outstanding success, and resulted in an increased demand for Australian goods in Great Britain.”

A lack of direct shipping routes to Glasgow initially hampered trade between Australia and Scotland. It was not cost-effective to transport Australian products from the south and, despite the publicity, goods were simply not available in many parts of Scotland. Early in the tour, Australian exporters met with the leading Scottish distributor, Gowan’s, who claimed to have only one case of canned fruit, and that only a dozen cases were procurable. The products were “badly packed and were uneatable and half green.” Responding, one grower from Mildura told reporters: “It is scandalous. The Commonwealth Government and Australia House are to blame.” In April 1929, Harold Ford spoke
in Western Australia to the Perth Chamber of Commerce on behalf of the City Corporation of Glasgow, the Glasgow Chamber of Commerce, and the Clyde Navigation Trust. He told the audience, “Australian products were virtually being over-advertized in the northern markets of Britain, because these products could not be procured there.”60 In 1929 he remarked that “what we really want to see is Australia opening up a central depot here [in Scotland] for her products and really tackling the retail shopkeeper. Until this is done the Scottish housewife will remain in the hands of your foreign competitors.”61

The solution came with the realization of an agreement between the Victorian Government and the Clyde Navigation Trust, which advanced a policy of developing trade between Glasgow and the colonies.62 The agreement, sketched out by the delegation and officials of the Clyde Trust in June 1928 while the delegates were touring the Clyde River, opened Bristol, Manchester and Glasgow—“the gateway of the north”—to Australian trade and produce.63 This was perhaps the most important practical achievement of the Australian Scottish Delegation. In the years following, direct trading between Glasgow and Australia increased greatly and, in 1932, traders on the Clyde had reported a 300 per cent increase in imports from Australia and New Zealand to Scotland since 1929.64 In the same year, arrangements between the Clyde Trust and shipping company Alfred Holt & Co. would establish, for the first time, refrigerated trade between Australia and Glasgow. This meant that Australian primary producers could sell their apples, pears, butter, cheese and meat directly in Scottish markets; previously, refrigerated trade had been limited to London and Liverpool.65 This coincided with the opening of the King George V dock on the Clyde in 1930; the first completed segment of the dock was set aside especially for Holt & Co.’s Blue Funnel refrigerated shipping service from Australia.66 In late-1932, Scottish importers announced that storage facilities for holding Australia’s refrigerated cargo were to be opened on the Clyde by Clan, Shire, Federal, and Blue Funnel lines of steamships.67

In 1933, Ford gloated, “we have increased our trade between Australia and Glasgow from 22 vessels to 43, and the imports of Australian products from 44,000 to 110,000 tons per
annum, and I am looking for a still greater increase in the coming year.”

Indeed, by that year Australia’s high-grade butter and dairy products began to dominate Scotland’s market at the expense of butter imports from Denmark, while Australian dried fruit and eggs had also become popular imports. The Director of Trade Publicity in Britain, A. H. Hyland, observed that “the improved trade outlook for Scotland was a striking illustration of the value of organized publicity.”

In 1934, it was argued that Scotland would be the solution to a glut of Australian produce in London, which had rendered Australian products “unsaleable and certainly unprofitable to men on the land.”

The *Morwell Advertiser* observed that if trade with Scotland continued to increase, “there should be no glut on the London market and dairymen would receive something more than 6d or 7d per lb for their butter fat.” Indeed, enthusiasm for Scottish markets spread to Queensland, where a former president of the state’s Chamber of Commerce, J. E. Plumridge, argued in 1934 that “there would be unbounded opportunities for thriving trade between Queensland and Scotland when the State Government decided to establish direct contact with the commercial community in Scotland.”

The Premier of New South Wales visited Scotland in June 1936 and said he was “most impressed with the possibilities of increasing Australia’s trade with Scotland,” and that he intended “placing the views of Glasgow importers before New South Wales exporters on his return.” The Commonwealth government also promoted imperial trade with Scotland. On a trip to Scotland in 1935, the Prime Minister Joseph Lyons responded to calls from Alexander Swan, the Lord Provost of Glasgow, for more Australian imports, saying:

> I am delighted to know that Glasgow is willing to encourage the expansion of Australian trade. It is essential for the future of the empire that Australia should continue its balanced development. . . . We in Australia are your people and it is important for the Empire that we should prosper equally as much as it is that you should prosper.”
Between 1929 and 1934, trade in Australian products had increased annually, and trebled from 1933 to 1934. In the five years since the delegation, approximately 50 direct business links had been established by Australian producers and merchant and traders on Scottish markets. Between 1935 and 1936, in his report to the Trade Development Department of the Clyde Navigation Trustees, Harold Ford recorded the appreciable progress made in Scotland’s imperial trade. A total of 135 vessels representing a tonnage of over 1.3 million tons entered the Clyde, with cargoes of 262,616 tons. Australian imports of flour and grain dropped, but cargoes of meat, dairy produce, eggs, and fruit increased, bringing higher dues and a higher tonnage of ships. Ford noted, however, that “the over concentration of supplies in London acts unfavourably in the interests of the Australian producers and on the port and trading interests of Glasgow.”

In 1936, after retiring as Agent-General for Victoria in Britain, Richard Linton, gave a speech to the Melbourne Scots—a social organisation for wealthy urban Scots of which he was president of at one time. In that speech, Linton emphasized the importance of Scotland as a market for Australian products, and reminded the audience that of Victoria’s fifteen Agents-General, thirteen had been Scots. His colleagues claimed that, through his efforts and those of the Australian Scottish delegation, Australian produce was favourably known in Britain, “particularly the most important portion—the north.” Regarding the prospects for developing more trade with Scotland, Linton stated that Australia had merely scratched the surface, but that “throughout Scotland there was a spirit of Empire fellowship, and the Scots would buy Empire goods in preference to those from foreign countries.”

Overall, between 1928 and 1939, a four-fold increase in the quantity of goods imported to the Clyde from Australia occurred. The tonnage of shipping increased from 300,000 tons in 1928 to over one million tonnes in 1935, which was a more distinct increase than the broader expansion of shipping on the Clyde in the 1920s and 1930s. The delegation’s aims of increasing imperial trade activity between Australia and Scotland had surely succeeded.
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Tourism, migration, and the ‘right kind’ of Scots

The mixture of business people, single women, and families indicates other motivations for visiting Scotland in addition to the delegation’s intentions to encourage commerce. The entire group included 151 single women, and many of these listed their occupation as domestic or home duties, teachers, or clerks. It seems that many single sisters joined the delegation: Catherine and Isobel Knight from Burnley, Rebecca and Alice Neil from Middle Brighton, the Arnott sisters from Horsham, and Helen and Margaret Cowie from Ballarat, to name a small number of those who travelled to Scotland together. The lists compiled by Archibald Gilchrist, the delegation’s manager and secretary of the New Settlers’ League of Australia, also show that numerous family units took part. John McCrae, from Jung in Victoria’s north-west, took his three daughters May, Jean and Margaret, to Scotland with him, for example, and there were many married couples with a young Master or Miss in tow.

Returning ‘home’ was a theme present in coverage of the delegation. At a farewell luncheon held in Launceston for six women who were leaving on the tour, a reporter in attendance observed: “We who are Tasmanians born and bred, and who possess an inborn love of our native country, which nothing can ever dim, can imagine the feelings of excitement with which many of these persons will shortly commence their voyage home . . . people who have never seen its rugged shores . . . who have a strong desire to visit their ancestral homes.” While ‘home’ was important for the delegates, a condition of participating was that they would purchase a return fare, thus reducing the likelihood that delegates would use the trip to return permanently. Nevertheless, anecdotes such as that given above shine light on the delegation’s additional function to provide, perhaps informally, a medium for heritage or roots tourism. Indeed, as Harper and Constantine suggested, the 1928 delegation may also be understood in the context of “genealogical pilgrimages to ancestral homelands,” which were one of the many facets of Scottish return migration in the early twentieth century. One newspaper ventured to suggest that the delegation was “primarily intended as a Back to Scotland picnic.” Undeniably, delegates took the opportunity to both see
the country and their old friends and families after the tour broke up in Inverness:

Many of the party stayed on for some days after the delegation as a whole was disbanded, and many made trips to many places that did not come within the official programme. Although the delegation has been disbanded, sections of it are still doing all they can in the interests of trade with Australia and migration. Many of the party remained in Scotland to visit relatives and friends in parts which were not included in the official programme. Others have come south, and are in small parties visiting various places in England, whilst others are spending a season in the Empire’s metropolis, London, which is now in the height of its season for visitors. 86

Along with goals of stimulating trade with Australia, heritage and tourism activities were significant aspect of the delegation. Archibald Gilchrist told papers, “we are out for a picnic—a thoroughly enjoyable holiday—and at the same time we are going to boost Australia.” 87 From their arrival in London on May 18 until the tour’s end in Inverness on June 15, the delegates were to “adhere to a strict programme”, but afterwards they were “able to go where they [chose].” 88 There is little evidence of where individual delegates might have visited after the official tour, but between attempts to ‘boost Australia’ the delegation visited, among other sites of historical significance, Balmoral Castle, Sterling, Loch Lomond, and the field of Bannockburn. 89

More widely reported upon—and perhaps more controversial—were the activities of the delegates with regard to increasing Scottish immigration to Australia; in the 1920s scheme of Australian expansion, along with British money and markets, of course, came British labour. While the delegation is an important case study in twentieth-century Scotland-Australia commercial links, it also offers an insight into issues of class and race in the Scottish diaspora.

An important aim of the VSU for the 1928 delegation was
that each delegate would pledge to nominate and sponsor a young Scottish migrant who would be able to work in Australia. Gilchrist told newspapers that his delegation would endeavour to “obtain at least 500 migrants for the Commonwealth.”

This took place in the context of much broader child migration movements in Australia, and numerous organized developed schemes designed to bring young British migrants to Australia were in operation during the interwar years. These organizations were closely linked to Australian and British imperial interests, and in the interwar years were leading proponents of another core ideological theme of popular imperialism, the superiority of the British race.

Richard Linton, the son of a Scottish importer in New Zealand who we met previously as the retiring Agent-General for Victoria, established one such program in Australia in 1924—the Big Brother Movement. A member of the Victorian state Nationalist party, Linton was concerned with increasing numbers of non-British migrants, contending that their presence undermined the wages scale. “It is our duty as a Parliament to encourage our own people to come from the Old Land”, he said in his maiden speech to parliament in 1927, “God help this country if we continue to allow foreigners to come into it.”

Linton intended his Big Brother Movement to combine loyalty to Empire with Australian idealisations of life on the land. The movement promoted the migration of “Little Brothers” to work Australia’s rural sector, although urban employment for British boys was common. On arrival in Australia, each became the responsibility of an Australian “Big Brother,” who provided initial accommodation and maintained contact with the youth after he had found employment. A memorandum to Australia House in London claimed, “I don’t think that there will be much difficulty in securing the 10,000 Big Brothers, from which [Richard Linton] aims as a preliminary.” By September 1928, the scheme had brought 868 Little Brothers to Victoria, 522 to New South Wales and 125 to Western Australia. Overall, between 1922 and 1927, youth migration schemes brought a total of 14,000 boys and 2000 girls to Australia, and the channelling of young men from Britain to rural properties in Australia accounted for 10 per cent of all assisted immigration in the 1920s.
Youth migration movements formed an integral part of the imperial propaganda directed at young British males in the interwar years. Empire migration schemes were particularly anxious to “acquire” middle and upper class youths, and the Big Brother Movement reflected this consciousness of Empire and social standing.98 As Richard Linton said, “it is essential for the future success of our Movement and to retain enthusiasm of our members, that boys of a high standard, morally, physically, and of education in accordance with our schedule, should only be sent under our auspices.”99 The movement’s official magazine, New Australian, told readers that young boys “are more resourceful and courageous than older people, and when they are shifted they have not to sever long-established habits and associations.”100

The movement played on national sentiments, and called on Scots to adopt one of their “ain folk.”102 On the other hand, MacInnes later told the Australian Press Association in Edinburgh that the delegation was not explicitly searching for migrants, but would never fail to boost Australia from the migration point of view. “I will always tell the people that hard-workers are needed,” he said, “I am a supporter of the Big Brother movement . . . [but] I have told delegates that indiscriminate talk regarding migration is most unwise. The real object of the delegation is to increase the sale of Australian products.”103

Indeed, at a farewell reception in the Melbourne Botanic Gardens, a member of the federal parliament “asked members of the party to tell people in Scotland the real position regarding the Commonwealth . . . Australia did not want more migrants to overcrowd still more the already overcrowded labour market. The delegation should tell intending migrants that if they left for Australia they would only encounter unemployment.”104 During 1928, unemployment levels were edging higher, and had raised from 4.23 per cent in 1926 to 11.94 per cent by 1929.105 Opposition to using the delegation as a means of increasing Scottish migration to Australia was the exception, however, despite the condition of
Australia’s labour market. Delegates themselves expressed the opinion that the role of the tour was to stimulate both trade and immigration. One traveller, P. E. Potts, said retrospectively “the object of the delegation’s visit was to develop trade relations between Great Britain and Australia, and at every meeting attended by the delegates emphasis was placed on the necessity for stimulating immigration.”\textsuperscript{106}

The \textit{Argus} commented shortly after the delegation tour that, in view of concerns over unemployment in Australian cities, “it may have been deemed desirable to make no public speeches on migration in Scotland, but members of the delegation went with the avowed object of selecting likely men with or without capital and inviting them to come to Australia.”\textsuperscript{107} The \textit{Argus} further reported that, when advised to approach matters of migration with caution, the delegates said “We will not be gagged, not even by Mr. Bruce!”\textsuperscript{108} MacInnes stated—despite his earlier comments—“it amazes me and the majority of the delegates that anyone should try to curtail the migration of Britons when Australia’s paltry population affords too tempting a bait to foreign peoples.”\textsuperscript{109}

Most parties expressed approval of the prospect of receiving “Little Brothers” from Scotland. A member of the federal opposition present at the botanical gardens farewell, Sir William MacPherson—the son of a prosperous Scottish-born merchant—stated that there was “room for millions of people in the open space of the Commonwealth.” He said that, although there had been complaints about “certain migrants,” the solution to the difficulty lies “in Australia obtaining migrants of her own kith and kin.”\textsuperscript{110} Moderator of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of Australia, the Rt. Rev. Robert Scott West, gave a farewell sermon to the delegates at St. Stephen’s Church in Sydney on April 1, 1928. He suggested that the Scottish delegation should take the slogan “White men for a white Australia” as their motto, and told the assembly that Australia “wanted the sort of clean, brave, patriotic men and women who had been hardened and softened by the great struggle in which the soil of Scotland had involved its children.”\textsuperscript{111}

Although the federal government offered no financial assistance to the delegation, the Prime Minister offered his
approval. “The Government is pleased to learn of the success which has attended the efforts to organize a visit by a Scottish delegation to the United Kingdom”, wrote Bruce.\textsuperscript{112} He was confident that “as a result of the visit and the close personal relations which the delegation will be able to establish, Empire trade will be assisted and migration to Australia stimulated.”\textsuperscript{113} Despite claims that Bruce had advised the delegation to remain quiet on matters of migration, the prime minister told Parliament that no official instructions had been given to the members, and that they “were private citizens and it was entirely their own affair if they encouraged people to come to Australia.”\textsuperscript{114}

While the Scots did not form the majority of Big Brother migrants, they were certainly a desirable ‘type’. The Honorary Secretary of the Movement in New South Wales wrote that the Scottish delegation would benefit the Commonwealth because “as with the parents [who would secure commercial ties with Australia] there are sure to be quite a number of good Scottish youths, whom experience shows make excellent, careful, and thrifty settlers.”\textsuperscript{115} In reference to his activities with the movement in Scotland in 1925, Linton regarded the boys he had selected for migration under the scheme as “a splendid type, and the conditions of their acceptances themselves require a superior type of boy.”\textsuperscript{116} Indeed, the image circulated by the Bruce government in the 1920s was of a “clean, white, cheerful and resolute country,” and Australia became increasingly protective of its British heritage. The government deported undesirable aliens, and imposed restrictions on Australian nationality in 1920. The immigration departments introduced a system of racial and national classification, which affected flows of immigration and procedures naturalization. Entry quotas were introduced for southern Europeans and other “undesirable immigrants.”\textsuperscript{117} Australia had to remain British, even at the risk of a clogged labour market at a time when Australian exports were slowly decreasing as Britain slipped from its place as the financial centre of the world.

Yet, Australians on both sides of politics still had to face a rising tide of working class British migrants.\textsuperscript{118} The decline of British industry, especially Scottish staples of textiles, coal, and steel, provided a surplus of tradesmen. Mineworkers, engineers,
textile workers, and their families formed the majority of British migrants in the 1920s. Scotland’s heavy industries were in decline, and farmers and agricultural workers were scarce in comparison to the relative glut of industrial workers—land settlement schemes and farm apprenticeships were often failures due to the lack of experience of the migrants. Part of the reason for this scarcity of rural workers from Scotland was that the share of migrants from agricultural areas in the 1920s gave way to a higher percentage of families who were young, urban, literate and industrially skilled. The regional origin of Scottish migrants to Australia was increasingly focused on the industrial central Lowlands—Glasgow and surrounds, the Lothians, Dundee and Fife.

Thus, a high percentage of new migrants were from the urban working class. Uninhibited immigration seemed to present a threat, but targeted migration schemes offered the possibility of counteracting the political ramifications of working-class influxes. Captain Marshall Wood, an assistant to the British Government Representative in Australia, told officials in Whitehall that one of the aims of the Big Brother Movement was to counter the effects of British working-class migration, which he believed would only strengthen the Australian Labor Party and the labour movement. Wood said that migration from Britain “continued on the present basis may eventually give to one political party an overwhelming majority, a position which should not be lost sight from an Empire point of view.” Targeted migration of the sort the delegation attempted might have offered a counter to fears of a working class influx, and as the Big Brother literature claimed, an “English, Scottish or Irish boy can be quickly converted into a good Australian.”

The labour conditions in Scotland meant that many Scots who wished to migrate were not of the background or age desired by the delegation or the Bruce government. Well before the delegation had departed in July 1927, members of the House of Commons in London were enthused by the idea of a Scottish delegation and made the suggestion that it “visit overcrowded districts of the Clyde, where unemployment was rife, instead of the Highlands, where further depopulation was undesirable.” Yet it
seems the delegation had no intentions of taking on Scotland’s unemployed masses. In June 1928, as the delegation was preparing to leave Glasgow, newspapers reported that delegates had agreed to employ at least 50 young Scottish boys who would sail in December unaided. Additionally, “numerous applications had been received from factory girls desiring to migrate,” and “about 100 unemployed” were interested in finding employment through the delegates—but the unemployed were told that they would not find work in Australia. The Scottish workers refused assistance by the delegates told the Australian Press Association that they “deplored the rumour that the Australian Labor Party did not want their kinsfolk.”

Far from a rumour, it was the new Scullin Labor government’s stated intention to minimize assisted migration from Britain and elsewhere. For the Big Brother Movement itself, data exists on 962 Little Brothers sent to Victoria, New South Wales and South Australia between 1925 and 1927, and 765 sent to New South Wales from 1925 to 1930. The records show that over half of the 1,718 youths came from London and southeast England. Sixty percent of the boys had received secondary education at a time when approximately two percent of the English population had received public school education and less than twelve percent of the male population had gone to a secondary school. Geoffrey Sherington’s study of the Little Brothers suggests that most “came principally and disproportionately from the reasonable comfort of middle-class homes.” Hence, the migrants selected by the Scottish delegation—young, urban, and middle class—were of the same type as Richard Linton’s Little Brothers. Genuine concerns about the ability of migrants to find employment in Australia may have driven the delegation to its choices regarding unemployed Clydesiders, yet frequent allusions to acquiring a “superior type” of migrant and stemming the influx of working class Britons suggest that merely being Scottish was not enough to justify nomination. Despite few of the prospective migrants having farm skills an “attractive feature were the number of small capitalists interested.” As has been demonstrated elsewhere, the construction of an “ideal Scot” by this segment of the diaspora in Australia faced challenges from new waves of migrants who brought with them new ideologies and beliefs from a Scotland that
was becoming increasingly dissimilar to the nation remembered and celebrated by the older generation.130

Conclusion
Before the Australian Scottish delegation departed, its president proclaimed, “We stand for Scotland but we stand for Australia!”131 Indeed, the delegation of 1928 serves as an excellent illustration of both the 1920s spirit of expansion in Australia and the idealization of Scots as Empire builders. The delegation saw in Scotland the labour, capital and markets required for the economic development of the nation, and was a final effort to enforce Stanley Bruce’s program of British men, money, and markets before Labor and the Great Depression brought an end to high immigration and costly land settlement schemes. This episode in Australian commercial and migration history was a uniquely Scottish microcosm of a broader movement in Australia to revitalise imperial links during the interwar years. In the commercial sphere, at the very least, the Scottish delegation evidently succeeded in boosting imperial trade between Australia and Scotland.

The imperial rhetoric surrounding trade and commerce and the selection of migrants of the “right type,” indicated the kinds of individuals who delegates understood as belonging properly to the Scottish diaspora in Australia; Scots were middle-class, British patriots and loyal to the Empire. With the tartan paraphernalia and ephemera of the tour included, this reflected an understanding of Scotland and Scots as embodied in three core elements: Highland symbolism, intrinsically Scottish characteristics (such as thrift, respectability, independence temperance, work ethic, and meritocracy), and an understanding that the British Empire was a stage upon which the credibility and authenticity of these symbols and values could be asserted.132 Such imperial aspirations and images of national character were central to the way in which these Scots imagined and managed their relationship with ‘home’ and thus defined their identities. These were the core strands weaving through the fabric of popular Scottishness in early-twentieth century Australia.
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