

Would not this help your Federation?

17 February, 1890.
General Edwards, commanding at Hong Kong, writes to Sir Henry Parkes, as follows:—

Head-quarter House, Hong Kong, 24 January, 1890.
A PORTION of the Chinese Imperial Squadron is now at anchor under my windows, consisting of two magnificent ironclads of the newest type, and four very fine and heavily-armed cruisers, Admiral Ting in command. I have been urging him strongly to take his fleet and show his flag in foreign ports, especially in Australia; but he cannot go further this year than Singapore. Would not this help your Federation?

Admiral Ting never did visit Australia, but the effect upon Sir Henry Parkes and the Federation movement of a Chinese Imperial Squadron passing through Sydney Heads can perhaps be imagined.¹ The probable effect can be imagined all the more easily because we are already aware the impact several thousand Chinese market gardeners, miners, cabinet makers and a handful of merchants, without a single ironclad between them, had upon the Australian colonies and on those colonies' Federation movement. An impact culminating in the first major piece of legislation passed by the inaugural Commonwealth Parliament being the Immigration Restriction Act.

252

No. 17.

Immigration Restriction.

1901.

IMMIGRATION RESTRICTION.

No. 17 of 1901.

An Act to place certain restrictions on Immigration and to provide for the removal from the Commonwealth of prohibited Immigrants.

[Assented to 23rd December, 1901.]

The Immigration Restriction Act², unlike the colonial Acts restricting immigration that preceded it, did not mention the word China or the Chinese. This too can be seen as a reflection of that Imperial Squadron as the British had pressured the Colonies for sometime not to create difficulties with the Chinese government.³ Instead of directly naming races or nations to be excluded, the well known 'dictation test' was adopted as the mechanism of exclusion.

Less well known is that this Act also created tens of thousands of files, photographs, documents and investigations. Material that records not only the history of this Act and its administration but a great deal about the lives of ordinary people. People often neglected by historians because they usually leave so few records. In this case the details of individuals, market gardeners and labourers as well as merchants, are carefully preserved as they went about a normal part of their lives, travelling to and from families in China.⁴

A great deal about the administrative history of the White Australia Policy can be derived from these files, particularly respecting the gap between legislation and policy on the one hand and practical implementation on the other. However, it is what we can learn about Chinese Australian history in general and the individuals that made that history, that is the prime focus today. This paper intends to present an overview of the type of material that the Immigration Restriction Act generated and to give examples of the contribution that they can make to the research of Chinese Australian history.

It should be kept in mind that nearly all the material referred to in this paper is based on NSW derived archives located in Sydney. These differ from the more frequently accessed Canberra archives in being less concerned with policy and more with detailed day to day administration and individual cases.

After the Immigration Restriction Act was passed by the first Federal Parliament towards the end of 1901, an Australia wide co-ordination of the State Custom and Excise Offices was set up for the purpose of administering the Act under the Commonwealth.⁵ The Act created a class of people in the new Commonwealth who were entitled to remain living in it but who could not become citizens. Nor, with a few narrow, usually temporary exceptions, were members of their families able to join them in Australia. This group was characterised by being overwhelmingly Chinese, male and concentrated in relatively few occupations. It was also a group which, compared to the bulk of Australia's population, traveled a great deal outside Australia.


It is this group of non-citizen residents, often referred to by the Act's early administrators as 'domiciles', that make up the vast bulk of the files under the Immigration Restriction Act. This is because in the course of this Act's operation the 'domiciles' and others made, between 1902 and 1946, 61,668 trips under the Immigration Restriction Act.⁶ The administration of the Act required the Customs and Excise Office of each State (and later the Immigration Department) to issue a 'Certificate Exempting From Dictation Test' or CEDT and consequently to maintain a file each time a 'domicile' wished to travel outside Australia and to return.

From 1902 to 1959 a total of 27,654 people identified as 'Chinese' passed through Sydney on a CEDT. With many multiple journeys, it is difficult to determine how many Chinese residents made trips to China. As some people made only one or two trips, many four or five and some as many as ten, a simple calculation is not possible short of reviewing every file. If four to five trips per person are taken as an average, it can perhaps be stated that more than 6,000 individuals living in NSW, out of an initial population in 1901 of 10,000, made at least one China trip.⁷ This means that we have a great deal of information concerning more than half the Chinese residents of NSW during the first half of the 20th century.

However, the 'domiciles' were not the only people who came within the administration of the Act. The Act also allowed for a number of categories of people who could enter Australia on a temporary basis. These categories included students, wives of merchants, assistants and substitutes to those working in stores and market gardens and later those categorised as refugees. Such people would be issued with a 'Certificate of Exemption' for a specific period that could be renewed at the discretion of the administrators.


Various researchers have used this material to discuss administrative policy or to trace individuals as part of a general history. Little has been done, however, to use the information of the individual administrative files in the aggregate to provide statistical material to contribute to the history of the Chinese in Australia. Preliminary analysis based on the NSW archives has already revealed a great deal of interest.

The following are examples of what can be found based on the registers of the CEDTs and an analysis of approximately 130 individual files.⁸




Level of travel through Sydney to China

A register of all CEDTs issued gives the pattern of such trips over time through the Port of Sydney, including those who obtained these permission's to re-enter Australia but who did not use them.



Ages on arrival in Australia

Analysis of individual files indicates that the majority of people of Chinese background who came to Australia in the years before the Immigration Restriction Act were aged between 16 and 25 years of age but ages as young as 11 and as old as 35 are also recorded.



Dates of arrival in Australia

The dates of arrival in Australia can be seen, including the obvious peak just prior to the introduction of the 1888 restrictions.

Individual files also show that despite the NSW Chinese Restrictions Act, 1888, many Chinese people entered NSW through Queensland. After the imposition of a £100 Poll Tax on the entry of Chinese people into NSW, the land border with Queensland became significant. While the receipts of the poll tax show that only a handful of people supposedly entered NSW after 1888, the records of the Immigration Restriction Act indicate that a very much larger number actually did so.⁹ In 1947, in an interview with immigration officials on another matter with, Yum Leong described what could be described as an ‘underground’.¹⁰ A regular route seems to have been set up which saw the prospective New South Welshman arrive at Cooktown in northern Queensland and make his way from contact to contact overland and by coastal steamer to Brisbane. From there he could cross the NSW border at Stanthorpe and so to Sydney.

Much information can also be derived from these same files on locations, occupations and changes to these overtime. The length of time on average spent in Australia before the first trip back to the home villages and the average time spent in the village before returning to Australia can also be obtained from the same sources. Even average age at marriage and family sizes can be estimated.

The gathering of this information and much more is possible because the applications for a CEDT required that a range of personal information as well as photos and palm (later thumb) prints be supplied to an ever expanding bureaucratic file. Every person who applied for a CEDT had to provide such details as their name, birth date, date and port of arrival in Australia, occupations and places of residence.

Besides the information contained in individual files there are a many specific file collections of interest. These include:

Survey of aliens by Police district, 1939 (SP11/25)

In 1939, each police district in the Sydney Metropolitan and nearby areas was required to count all aliens, including Chinese residing within their districts. The returns are by nationality, age and sex and provide a snapshot of the distribution of all aliens, including Chinese in and around Sydney at that date.

A bundle of alien registrations also exists which focuses on rural NSW. While Sydney's Chinese population by 1939 included many new arrivals granted Certificates of Exemption such as seamen refusing to return to Japanese occupied ports. Rural NSW's Chinese people consisted mainly of those who had been living there for many years. These documents often contain rare candid shots of elderly men, some of whom appear to have been roused out of bed, in order to satisfy wartime requirements.

Copies of outward letters re: Immigration Act 1904-8, vol.1-vol.3 (A1026)

These volumes are copies of all outward correspondence and are a rich record of the early administration of the Act. Examples include letters of applications, queries concerning the operation of the Act, a detailed report on smuggling methods and in 1908, a report on whether Sydney's Chinese population was falling. This report took the form of a 'Check in importation of Chinese Goods'. It was reported that, 'so far at any rate as this test may be relied upon,.... The Chinese population of the State is certainly not on the increase'.¹¹

Certificates of Exemption under the Influx of Chinese Restriction Act 1881 (SP115/10)

This is a collection of certificates issued to Chinese residents of NSW granting them exemption from the 'Chinese Restriction Act of 1881'. It also includes two certificates and some receipts issued under the 1861 Act. These certificates not only reveal the administrative ancestry of the Federation Act of 1901 but also the similarity in Chinese responses to such laws in the use of agents, as revealed by the notations in Chinese on the back of many of the certificates.

The practical details of how the Immigration Restriction Act operated and how these requirements impacted upon individuals is the most obvious element to be derived from these essentially administrative files. However, space and time do not permit such a detailed examination of this aspect. Instead a number of individual examples will be given to illustrate some aspects of the administration and the people involved. It should also be remembered that the Act was amended many times, usually to extend the powers of its administrators and practices evolved overtime.

Australian Archive (NSW), SP1122/1; N52/24/3951, John Louis (Louie) Hoon

This file dates from 1916 to 1955 and includes Police reports, photos at various ages, hand and thumb prints, John Louie Hoon's name in Chinese characters, character references, departmental memos and handwritten comments. A police report gives a summary history of John Louie Hoon's father, Louie Hoon, dating back to his arrival in Australia in 1884. The file gives us a picture of John Louie Hoon that involved extended periods of time living in both Sydney and China, a wife and at least two sons in the town of Shekki, Zhongshan district, Guangdong province, China. Other information includes occupations, addresses and general physical description.

According to this file John Louie Hoon was born 26th June 1908 in Sydney. He is described as 'half-caste', his mother 'deserting' when he was 7 years old. He first traveled to China in March 1916 aged 7, accompanied by his father who planned to send him to 'college'. He returned to Sydney in 1924 aged 16 and a file note states that his father 'died 3 years ago'. Numerous trips were made to China during subsequent years, including between 1940 and 1946. The final file entry is in 1955 when John Louie Hoon is reported to be working as a gardener.

The file makes no mention of daughters and this reminds us of the essential limitation of such administrative sources. They can only tell us what has been put in them for strictly limited purposes. The file does not tell us that John Louie Hoon's family name is 'Louie' or 'Lei' and that his village of Du Tou has sent many of its members to NSW. It does not say that his family nearly starved during the years of Japanese occupation, that they survived by collecting and selling grass, nor that John Louie Hoon was well known for his smartness of dress or that he was treated for TB. John Louie Hoon himself died in 1985 not long after he was reunited with one of his daughters in the early 1980s when she was assisted to migrate to Australia by a leading member of the Chinese Masonic Society. The life of John Louie Hoon is just one of thousands of individual stories that can be found in these administrative files and which, when added to the memories of those who knew them, enables us to get beyond stereotypes to the individuals that make up Chinese Australian history.

While the bulk of Chinese people who wished apparently were able to do so, the opportunity to visit their home village, or anywhere else, could be refused individuals on the basis of their 'character'. To assist in making this judgement amendments to the Act in 1905 saw the 'Certificate of Domicile' replaced with the 'Certificate Exempting From Dictation Test' (CEDT), which required applicants to supply at least two written references. Kee Sun, for example, was refused a certificate because his Pitt St Tobacconist Shop was a well known gambling establishment.¹² While She Jin was also refused on the 'grounds of bad character and misstatements as to how he had been employed', he was eventually granted a certificate, however, 'in view of further representations'.¹³

People could also be refused entry on their return to Sydney. Harry Chun Fook, known as 'K.M.T. basher', was refused re-entry on the suspicion that he had originally entered illegally. When he was allowed to enter, he not only faced prosecution as a 'prohibited migrant' but the burden of proof lay with him to demonstrate that he was not one. The charges were dropped partly because the 'fact that the man has a white wife and a child here would create difficulties in the way of deporting him...'¹⁴

Aside from character, people could also be refused re-entry on such grounds as in Yet Hing's case, that his photo did not look like him. 'Identification' was the key, as William Ah Ping discovered when doubt was expressed about his being the age shown on his NSW Birth Certificate. As an experiment William Ah Ping found himself being X-rayed to determine his age by the 'condition of ossification' of his bones. The experiment cost NSW Customs £3/3/0 and was not attempted again.¹⁵

The China born children of Chinese residents in Australia had no right to enter Australia except under temporary entry for purposes such as study. Despite being refused twice, Ah Wang was granted permission in January 1909, for his son his son Yut Ming aged 14, to study for two years in Australia after entering a £100 bond. When a local police report stated that Yut Ming was not attending school at Eugowra, his Certificate of Exemption was cancelled. Ah Wang wrote to explain that his son had been 'disobedient' but with more English he was now willing to go to school. A delay in the police delivering the deportation order due to 'droving stolen sheep' and the intervention of a local MP resulted in a six month postponement in the decision to deport. Regular police reports confirming that Yut Ming was at school and well behaved led to his certificate being extended. Yut Ming finally sailed for China on the *Eastern*, in May 1911.¹⁶

The advantage Yut Ming derived from his schooling in Australia and whether this was all his father hoped, cannot be gathered from the file itself. However, in an interview with a resident of the village of Long Tou Wan, which also sent many of its members to NSW, Chang She May, aged 88, tells that her also father studied in Sydney as a student from about age 10 at a similar time to Yut Ming. As a result of this experience he spoke excellent English which enabled him to be a teacher in Hong Kong and later to make many trips to Australia for the purpose of buying wool and other commodities for the department store that he owned in the district town of Shekki.¹⁷

Under the Immigration Restriction Act, a person could also enter Australia either as a 'substitute' for a 'domiciled' person who was returning for a long period or permanently, or as an 'assistant' to help in a recognised 'Chinese' occupation such as a market garden or Chinese store. Occupations that were not seen as 'Chinese', or

where competition with 'white' businesses occurred, such as cabinet making, were not able to bring in replacements. Exemptions for market gardeners, on the other hand, became easier as it was recognised that most of Sydney's vegetables were grown by Chinese people and that this was endangered by their aging. The NSW Chamber of Fruit and Vegetable Industries supported the transfer in status of Cliff Lee from student to assistant because,

As you know, this Chamber is very concerned at the low production of vegetables and is anxious to do anything it can to improve the supply, and therefore supports the application ...to enable the youth to be employed in the garden.¹⁸

This link between eligibility to remain in Australia and employment meant that many of those who entered Australia under 'Certificates of Exemption' after 1901 were little better than bonded employees vulnerable to exploitation. The freedom to travel was much less than that enjoyed by those with 'domicile' rights and even less if the employment was not secure. Yuk Kwan's employment history illustrates both the greater restrictions faced by those on Certificates of Exemption and the changing administration of the Act in the years during and after World War Two.

Yuk Kwan came to Australia in 1926 to work for the Chinese language newspaper the *Chinese Republican News*, as a compositor. In 1934, his employers wrote to the Collector of Customs that it was 'our intention to dispense with his services', and a week later that they 'will make arrangements for him to leave Australia by the *S.S. Nankin*'. A few days after this the Collector discovered that Yuk Kwan did not intend leaving quietly when the solicitors, 'Pigott, Stinson, Macgregor and Palmer', informed him that a writ had been served on the paper claiming £745/11/-, and requesting, as the court case was some months away, that an extension be granted. Yuk Kwan was given a four month extension and in that time was able to find a job with the Chinese Masonic Society newspaper, the *Chinese World News*, where he replaced Yuen Yet Choy, who was returning to China. By April 1935, Yuk Kwan was again in (bonded) employment.

This was not the end of Yuk Kwan's difficulties and several years later, in 1942, the *Chinese World News* ceased publication and Yuk Kwan needed to find another job. By this time manpower shortages meant that, for the first time since his arrival in Australia 16 years previously, Yut Kwan could take any employment he wished, finding a position with the engineering department of Airlines of Australia. In 1947, with the war over and labour shortages ended, Yuk Kwan was told that as he was 'not eligible to remain in Australia to continue in his present occupation, arrangements should be made for him to leave the Commonwealth by the first available vessel'. Yuk Kwan showed similar resourcefulness when faced with deportation a second time and his case appeared prominently in the newspapers. This publicity did not alter the decision to deport but he was granted a six month extension to stay in Australia in order to 'find suitable employment'. This Yuk Kwan was able to do, becoming a waiter and later a supervisor and partner in the Taiping Cafe.

Yuk Kwan, now referred to in the file as Ken Wong, was finally granted permanent residence in 1959, after various friends certified (as administrators required) that he was 'a very good type' and 'has adopted the Australian way of life'. Ken Wong married an Australian-born Chinese person, Edith Olive Edna Quay, and applied for and was granted citizenship in 1960. The final entries in his file report the couple planning a honeymoon to Hong Kong, Japan, France and England, which would have been Yuk Kwan's first trip out of Australia since his arrival 34 years earlier.¹⁹ Ken Wong and his family are also well remembered in Sydney today.

Aside from files on people legally able to enter Australia, the most common files are those associated with various aspects of illegal entry such as searching for stowaways and prosecuting suspected illegal entrants. The most infamous aspect of the Immigration Restriction Act associated with keeping people out rather than letting them in is of course the so called 'Dictation Test'. The test could be given on attempted entry or to anyone considered a prohibited immigrant who administrators wished to deport. Lee Fook deserted his ship in 1916 only to be caught in 1930 along with another illegal entrant, Lum Bow. Both were working in a market garden when Customs Officers, 'acting on certain information', detained them. They were both given the Dictation Test at the Customs House, Sydney and deported. Their 'tests' are

blank, apart from their signatures located after a space left for the dictation they never attempted to write.²⁰

The Dictation Test, due to successful legal challenges, needed to be carefully administered. A 1927 instruction²¹ explained:

NOTE: The question has been raised as to whether it would be allowable to abandon the application of a dictation test before completing the fifty words and to choose a fresh passage in another language, in any case where an immigrant, after admitting inability to write in the language first chosen, commences to write in such a manner as to indicate the likelihood of his passing the test. The Crown Law authorities, however, definitely advise that once the test has been started it should be gone on with and carried to completion. It is therefore desirable that every possible precaution should be taken beforehand in doubtful cases to ascertain whether the person concerned is likely to be able to write in the language chosen.

While some people may have been discouraged by such requirements, others were prepared to defy it entirely. The method that seems to have added to Sydney's Chinese population more than any other in the early years of Federation was the smuggling of people on board ships. These were usually part of an organised effort that included crew members and the planning of people in both Hong Kong and Sydney. The stowaways were concealed in such places as coal bunkers and water tanks and, as these last were inside the 'Chinese passengers quarters', returning Chinese residents presumably knew all about this alternative method of migration. They were not very comfortable alternatives, with some stowaways being reported, 'too weak to leave' the ship and others found dead in their suffocating hiding places.²²

In 1908, the Revenue Detective Inspector submitted to the Acting Collector of Customs, NSW, a detailed report, 'relative to the evasion of the Act by the connivance of the crews of vessels' concerning, 'some of the methods adopted in the past'. The report explains the rise in numbers of people engaged in 'the business' as due to past success and that the £80 cost was divided between the 'shipper' in Hong Kong and the 'assistant' in Australia. The report also describes the crews of the 'E.&A. line' as the worst who had at one time built a space in the 'Melbourne cargo' to conceal stowaways. As to payment, 'half the amount chargeable is paid to the crew upon leaving Hong Kong: the balance when the stowaways are landed'. The stowaway on

landing signed a note which is 'stamped by the storekeeper to whom the stowaway is taken', this is then 'presented in Hong Kong when the balance of the money is paid'. Competition among the various 'syndicates' for the limited places on ships and price cutting led to rivalry and, 'accounts for the letters (anonymous) which have been sent to the Department'.²³

Those that were caught were not abandoned or ignored by those in Sydney. Stowaways, deserters and other 'prohibited immigrants' who were caught faced gaol terms before they were deported unless someone was willing to go surety until they embarked on a ship back to Hong Kong. This was common with, for example, George Gay and Lee Bung Yee in 1923 doing so for 20 deportees at £50 each for a total of £1,000. The usual bond was £100, but as the number in this case was so large a discount must have applied.²⁴

The files occasionally contain personal letters and other interesting items of correspondence. Sometimes such letters have been confiscated by officials searching for illegal immigrants such as the 1916 letter of a father to his sons requesting money for a village watchtower and complaining that 'people of the New Gold Mountain do not treat it seriously' or a set of sheet music.²⁵ Another interesting example is a letter written in 1903 by Philip Lee Chun²⁶, a well known Sydney merchant, who carefully and in rare detail explained to the officials of the Act how:

I can readily understand that the Chinese system of nomenclature is rather bewildering to a European. But I think I can explain thoroughly,

The Act continued to issue CEDT's until 1958 when it was replaced with a new system that abolished the Dictation Test. Those that continued to apply for CEDTs in the 1950s used them as *de facto* visa's to enable them to enter Hong Kong from where many slipped across the border to retire in their villages. Lee Man Dick returned in 1956 aged 69, dying in that same year in his family village.²⁷ Young Sing, who had been working in Australia since 1895 and made eight sojourns and fathered three

children, made his final trip back to the village aged 75 in 1955.²⁸ Perhaps the last person to return, recorded by the old methods before the abolition of the Dictation test, was Sun Lee aged 77, who departed in 1958 on a Qantas flight, having been in Australia since 1898.²⁹

This paper has been based almost entirely on files located in Sydney and generated by the NSW Customs Office and later the NSW section of the Immigration Department. The need for similar research into the files of other states before an Australia wide picture of the Act's files can be obtained is obvious. A brief look at the Queensland Archives reveals that the administrative and filing methods varied widely from NSW and so the details of procedures cannot be assumed to have been the same in each State. To be of value to those researching family histories or searching for specific individuals, guides to this material would have to be written separately for each state. Nevertheless such guides are possible and a preliminary guide to the Sydney archives has been drafted and a copy is available to those who wish to use it. The copying of the CEDT registrars of each State (the key to accessing these files) and locating a set in each capital city would be of great value.

In addition to family research, these archives of the Immigration Restriction Act can contribute much concerning administrative history. The relationship between bureaucracy and legislation over the course of the White Australia Policy's existence, including the issue of defining citizenship, is an obvious field of research that is taken up by at least two of the papers at this conference. An investigation as to the reasons behind the dramatic change in tone that takes place between the relatively easy going Customs Office (in NSW anyway) and the apparently more racist and aggressive Immigration Department would be another interesting study.

However, it is in their contribution to the history of the Chinese in Australia that these archives are of most value. The two most valuable contributions being their making possible research into people whose lives are so often neglected by historians and in the related ability to assist in eliminating stereotypes. Despite their narrow construction for the purposes of enforcing the Immigration Restriction Act, the information collected and preserved in these files, particularly if combined with other

material, can contribute a great deal of valuable and interesting material to future research.

This paper began by linking the enactment of the Immigration Restriction Act and Federation with a Chinese Imperial Squadron. The link was originally made by the commander of British forces in Hong Kong who, however facetious he may have been in sending the note to the NSW Premier, understood that Chinese people were playing a significant role in the movement towards Federation. That role did not stop with Federation itself. I would therefore like to leave this preliminary examination of the archives of the Immigration Restriction Act with a question regarding further research and use of this material: Would not this help our Federation?

¹ NSW State Records Office, Colonial Secretaries correspondence, 2/8095B.2.

² The Immigration Restriction Act became the Immigration Act after amendments in 1912.

³ See Foreign Office Confidential Print 6018, Dec 1890. For more detail see, A. T. Yarwood, *Asian migration to Australia: the background to exclusion, 1896-1923*, Melbourne, MUP, 1964, pp.1-16.

⁴ Much of the research in this paper is to be found in my Brief Sojourn in Your Native Land, M.Litt UNE 1998.

⁵ Various Commonwealth Department's performed this role: Department of External Affairs 1903-1916, Department of Home and Territories 1916-1928, Department of Home Affairs 1928-1932 and Department of the Interior 1932-1947; after 1947 the Department of Immigration was formed and responsibility for immigration at all levels was taken over by that Department from the Customs Offices.

⁶ Barry York, *Admissions and Exclusions: 'Asiatics' and 'other coloured races' in Australia: 1901 to 1946*, Centre for Immigration & Multicultural Studies, Australian National University, 1995, Table 1.1, p.3.

⁷ These calculations are based on material to be found in Australian Archives (NSW), SP726/1; Particulars of Applications for CEDTs, vol.1- vol.6.

⁸ These files are to be found in AA (NSW), SP42/1; Correspondence of the Collector of Customs relating to Immigration Restrictions and Passports, 1898-1948.

⁹ See the NSW Statistical Register for 1899, Sydney, 1900, Table No. 30, Movement of Chinese Population 1890-1899.

¹⁰ SP42/1, C47/2468, record of interview with Yum Leong, 1947. He arrived in 1900.

¹¹ Australian Archives (NSW), A1026; Correspondence re Immigration Act 1904-12, vol. 3, p.341, report, 'Chinese Goods - Check on Importations', the Acting Collector of Customs to the Comptroller-General, 5 June 1908. In 1962, a similar check of statistics was done by the administrators of immigration at that time to ensure that modifications in policy had not resulted in a major change in Chinese numbers, see Australian Archives (ACT), A6980/T1; S250386, 'Non European Policy Review 1962'. One difference between the check of 1908 and that of 1962 was that the later file was marked 'Secret (To be passed by Hand)'.

¹² Australian Archives (NSW), SP42/1; C1903/1577, Kee Sun, report, 28 February 1903.

¹³ Australian Archives (NSW), SP42/1; C1916/4346, She Jin, memo, 22 July 1914 and letter, Atlee Hunt Secretary, Department of External Affairs, to Collector of Customs, 1916.

¹⁴ Australian Archives (NSW), SP1122/1; C33/7368, Harry Chun Fook, letter, Secretary to Collector of Customs, 4 September 1933.

¹⁵ Australian Archives (NSW), SP42/1; C19/7011, William Ah Ping, memo, 8 September 1919.

¹⁶ Australian Archives (NSW), SP42/1; C11/2756, Yut Ming.

¹⁷ Interview with Chang She May, 21/5/00, Long Tou Wan, Zhongshan District, Guangdong Province, China.

-
- ¹⁸ Australian Archives (NSW), SP1122/1; N65/3278, Lee Bing Hoong (Lee Bing Hong), letter, NSW Chamber of Fruit and Vegetable Industries to Commonwealth Migration Officer, Department of Immigration, 20 May 1952.
- ¹⁹ Australian Archives (NSW), SP11/12; Yuk Kwan, Tai Moon, & others, 1926-47 and SP1122/1; N56/6446, Yuk Kwan Wong.
- ²⁰ Australian Archives (NSW), SP42/1; C33/6955, Lum Bow, Lee Fook.
- ²¹ Australian Archives (NSW), C4203/1; Boarding Branch Records, 1914-1931, vol.2, p.460, circular, Assistant Secretary to Collector of Customs, 4 March 1927.
- ²² Australian Archives (NSW), A1026; Correspondence re Immigration Act 1904-12, vol. 1, p.12, letter, the Collector of Customs to Manager, Burns Philp & Co., 10 January 1906 & vol. 3, p.328, memo, Detective Inspector to Boarding Inspector, 23 March 1908.
- ²³ Australian Archives (NSW), A1026; Correspondence re Immigration Act 1904-12, vol. 3, p.347, report, 'Chinese Goods - Check on Importation's', Revenue Detective Inspector to the Acting Collector of Customs, 15 April 1908.
- ²⁴ Australian Archives (NSW), SP740/1; NN George Gay & Lee Bung Yee, bonds, 15 March 1923.
- ²⁵ Australian Archives (ACT), A1/15, 35/7020.
- ²⁶ Australian Archives (NSW), SP42/1; C36/813, Philip Lee Chun to Collector of Customs, Sydney, 1/2/1915.
- ²⁷ Interview, Cliff Lee, 28 September 1997 (4) & Australian Archives (NSW), SP1122/1; N1953/24/2504, Lee Man Dick (Man Duck).
- ²⁸ Australian Archives (NSW), SP1122/1; N52/24/1534, Young Sing.
- ²⁹ Australian Archives (NSW), SP1122/1; N58/4695, Sun Lee.