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ABSTRACT

This thesis demonstrates the existence of a continuing relationship between Sydney and south China maintained by thousands of Sydney residents born in the districts of the Pearl River Delta, from the late nineteenth century to the middle of the twentieth century. It examines a broad range of the administrative files of the Immigration Restriction Act, supplemented by sources such as the evidence of the late nineteenth century ‘Royal Commission on Alleged Chinese Gambling’, the burial register of the Chinese section of Rookwood Cemetery and oral evidence provided by the descendants of these residents. From this evidence a picture is developed of a generation of people, referred to by the term ‘huaqiao’, whose links with their home villages are detailed from the perspective of their youth, through maturity to retirement and onto the next generation. Features of the links discussed include the importance of the districts of origin, the significance of restricted marriage choices and changing conditions in China, the maturing of a succeeding generation and the impact of the Immigration Restriction Act, 1901 and its administration. What emerges is a pattern of choices and activities over a lifetime dominated by the desire of the huaqiao to support their families in the home villages, villages that have a history of intimate links to Sydney and Australia that existed for at least half a century.
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INTRODUCTION ‘An Australian citizen apparently’

In the district of Zhongshan (中山), in the south China province of Guangdong, in a small village surrounded by rice fields, sits a rusting ‘Ajax’ safe bearing the seal ‘Anthony Hordern & Sons Ltd. Sydney’.\(^1\) In a nearby village, the local clinic is run by a doctor who recalls the original clinic established by her father with money earned from his Wollongong store.\(^2\) Displayed in a small district museum nearby is a medal awarded by Sun Yat-sen to an Australian resident for services to the Republic of China. Services that included collecting donations from other Australian residents to purchase aeroplanes for the Republic of China’s air force.\(^3\)

What is the connection between such objects, people, their villages and Australia? They are part of a relationship which puzzled Department of Immigration officials when, in 1955, they noted on the file of Sydney born John Louie Hoon, whose parents, one born in Australia, the other in south China, had both lived and died in Sydney, that he was ‘an Australian citizen apparently’.\(^4\)

From 1901 until well into the second half of the twentieth century, during the height of the White Australia policy, thousands of people of Chinese birth not only lived in Australia but maintained extensive links with their families and villages in south China. It is the aim of this thesis to examine the history of that generation of Sydney residents of Chinese origin who lived during the first half of the twentieth century, with particular attention being paid to those whose origin was the district of Zhongshan.\(^5\)

Writings on the Chinese in Australia up to the present time can be broadly divided into two categories. The first category includes studies on the origins and development of race relations and the administration of the White Australia Policy

---

\(^1\) See Figure 4, Chapter 2, p.48. For a discussion of Chinese romanisation, see Appendix I.

\(^2\) Interview with Professor Zhou Muheng (周慕珩), Long Tou Wan village, Zhongshan District, Guangdong Province, China, 15 January 1998.

\(^3\) Kan Yanxin 閆延鑫, “Cong Kaiping huaqiao bowuguan wenwu cangpin, kan huaqiao dui zuguo de gongxian” (From the collection of the Kaiping Museum to see the overseas Chinese contribution to the home country), Qiaoshi xuebao 僑史學報 (Journal of Overseas Chinese History), 1, 1987, p.44.

\(^4\) Australian Archives (NSW), SP1122/1; N1952/24/3951, John Louis (Louie) Hoon, file note, 11 July 1955.

\(^5\) See Map, Chapter 1, p.13.
that discuss the history of the Chinese in Australia as ‘victims’ or ‘antagonists’ within these issues. The second category of writings on the Chinese in Australia are regional and general histories which discuss the Chinese in their own terms, though sometimes only as an extension of Australia’s immigration history. Additionally, there are studies on related topics such as the history of labour importation from China, Australian/China trade relations, biographies of individual Australian-Chinese and studies of the ‘overseas Chinese’. This last area of research is the study of what has more recently become known as the ‘Chinese diaspora’.

The first ‘White Australia Policy’ study used parliamentary debates and contemporary newspaper sources to look at the thinking behind the laws and attitudes that characterised this policy. In this study Chinese people were alluded to only in so far as their presence and the reactions they invoked provided insight into Australian policies and attitudes. Subsequent studies, using the records of the administration of the Immigration Act, began to reveal more about how the Chinese community responded to these restrictions but little about their own intentions. Further research of the White Australia Policy’s origins, including a recent study of the international pressures placed on Australia because of this policy, also throw only an indirect light on the history of the Chinese in Australia.

Studies on the broader issue of racism have compared the restrictive immigration histories of Australia and the United States to reveal more about the Chinese in Australia. However, despite the range of sources used (only rarely are these Chinese), such studies continue to give a restricted view of the history of the Chinese

---

9 Charles Price, *The Great White Walls are Built: Restrictive Immigration to North America and Australasia, 1836-1888*, Australian Institute of International Affairs in association with Australian National University Press, Canberra, 1974; Andrew Markus, *Fear and Hatred: Purifying Australia and California 1850-1901*, Hale & Iremonger, Sydney, 1979. Using parliamentary committee reports and contemporary newspapers, both reveal details about the Chinese communities of NSW and Victoria, such as clan representation, the role of wealthy merchants, social organisations and the reality behind the many stereotypes held at the time. See for example, Price, op. cit., p.56, for a description of the ‘commuting system’ and p.218, for a discussion of visits to China.
in Australia by leaving the impression that the Chinese existed only to inspire racial hostility and the White Australia Policy. Studies around the same time by Huck and Choi used a sociological approach and statistical data to begin to ask questions about how the Chinese lived in Australia, how they responded in their own terms to racial hostility and the White Australia Policy, and how they survived and adapted, not only as immigrants, but as members of the broader society.  

The first truly historical study of the Chinese in Australia, that by Yong, used Chinese language newspapers and the records of Chinese organisations for the first time, as well as sources such as the ‘Royal Commission on alleged Chinese Gambling.’ Yong provides a history of the Chinese not only as they dealt with the White Australia Policy, but also how they conducted business, religion, education, family life and politics. A limitation of all these writings is that they generally only deal with residents of Sydney and Melbourne or perhaps NSW and Victoria.

There are a number of studies that go beyond Sydney and Melbourne such as Rolls which makes use of a range of often unsourced materials and Jupp, which ensures that something is said about Chinese migrants in every State. Two oral histories also range nationally. Loh’s investigation of the treatment by the defence forces of Chinese-Australians reveals new insights into their history through revealing details of family life and the personal impact of prejudice. Giese also uses oral history techniques to asks the question who are Chinese-Australians?

---


11 Report of the Royal Commission on alleged Chinese Gambling & Immorality and charges of bribery against members of the police force, Government Printer, Sydney, 1892.


14 Morag Jeanette Loh, *Dinky-di: the contributions of Chinese immigrants and Australians of Chinese descent to Australia’s defence forces and war efforts 1899-1988*, Australian Government Publishing Service, Canberra, 1989. The impact of peoples' attitudes in both re-enforcing and also subverting the intent of formal restrictions is interesting, as is the insight this gives into the lives and families of Chinese Australians, see for example, Loh’s interviews with Rosie Yuen and Yuen Hoy Poy in Loh, op. cit., pp.94-5 and p.101; Diana Giese, *Astronauts, Lost Souls & Dragons*, University of Queensland Press, St Lucia, 1997. See Giese, op. cit., pp.43-44, 137, 237 for examples. While interesting, a lack of critical framework limits the value of this work.
Research into the pre-gold rush and gold rush periods provides valuable information about the origins of the Chinese in Australia. Pre-gold rush Chinese people were usually contracted labourers and older studies on this topic referred to Australia only briefly. More recent studies, however, have examined the history of Chinese indenture and labour importation in Australia.\textsuperscript{15} For the gold rush period, researchers have used contemporary accounts in English to examine the origins of hostility to Chinese miners as well as the interaction between them and other miners. The difficulty of providing a Chinese perspective from largely European sources is acknowledged but again Chinese people tend to be presented merely as the victims of European hostility.\textsuperscript{16}

Works of regional Australian Chinese history dealing with Cairns, Perth, Darwin, Sydney and northern NSW are useful for the diversity of experiences that they reveal. The Chinese community of Cairns, for example, is seen to have been more tolerated by Europeans than Chinese communities elsewhere due to their greater economic strength.\textsuperscript{17} Darwin, with its proportionally larger Chinese population, has features not seen in histories based solely on Sydney or Melbourne.\textsuperscript{18} Research on the Chinese of Western Australia concludes that they were more isolated and scattered than elsewhere and so consequently had a very different history to those in

\textsuperscript{15} Huang Tsen-ming, \textit{The Legal Status of the Chinese Abroad: Overview of legal conditions in the US, British Empire, French and Dutch East Indies}, 2nd edn, China Cultural Service, Taipei, 1954; H. F. Macnair, \textit{The Chinese Abroad Their Position and Protection. A Study in International Law and Relations}, The Commercial Press, Shanghai, 1925; Chen Ta, \textit{Chinese Migrations, with Special Reference to Labour Conditions}, Washington Government Printing Office, 1923; Persia Crawford Campbell, \textit{Chinese Coolie Emigration to Countries Within the British Empire}, P.S. King & Sons, Westminster, 1923; Kay Saunders (ed.), \textit{Indentured Labour in the British Empire 1834-1920}, Croom Helm, Canberra, 1984. These studies all deal with the mechanics of Chinese emigration, detailing the legal aspects, the distinction between indenture and the credit-ticket system and give us a glimpse of the harsh conditions under which many Chinese immigrated. Sources include many government studies that investigated Chinese immigration in attempts to ensure that compulsion was not part of it. The specifically Australian studies are, Jan Ryan, \textit{Ancestors: Chinese in Colonial Australia}, Fremantle Arts Centre, Fremantle, 1995; Anne Atkinson, ‘Chinese labour in Western Australia’, \textit{Time Remembered}, 6, 1984, pp.164-178 and Darnell, Maxine, \textit{The Chinese Labour Trade to New South Wales 1783-1853}, PhD thesis, University of New England, 1997. The detail that Ryan has revealed based on material in Singapore might lead one to conclude that more can be found about this topic relating to Australia.


\textsuperscript{17} Cathie May, \textit{Topsawyers: the Chinese in Cairns 1870 to 1920}, James Cook University, Townsville, 1984. May’s use of sources, such as death and marriage registers, rate books, sugar mills records, school registers, oral accounts, the autobiographical writings of two Chinese merchants and even bank signature books, allows for the writing of a history of the Chinese of the Cairns district at a level quite different to any previous study.

the ‘Eastern States’. The most recent study of Sydney Chinese, using a wider range of sources than has been used previously, shows a community more integrated into the general life of the city than previous studies revealed. Finally, oral history research into the small towns of northern NSW reveals not only another variation on the theme of the Chinese in Australia in its discussion of the family stores networks of the region, but for the first time reveals in detail the role of the continuing links with the home villages for people of Chinese origin in Australia.

Other studies touching upon aspects of the Chinese in Australia include a small number of biographies of Chinese-Australians and some studies of Australian-China trade. The biographies have not generally been able to develop the context in which such men lived. While in the trade studies the details of how trade was carried out and the role of Chinese communities in Sydney, Melbourne or elsewhere are not touched upon. Chinese firms owned by businessmen who first developed their business skills operating stores in Sydney before founding large companies in Hong

---

19 Ryan, op. cit. Ryan builds up a picture of a more diverse group of people with limited district links in comparison to Eastern States’ Chinese communities. Ryan makes extensive use of police and court records as well as the indenture records of the Singapore based ‘coolie’ trade of the 19th century.


23 Some studies of overseas Chinese businesses have been undertaken, for example, Michael Godley, The Mandarin-capitalists from Nan-yang: overseas Chinese enterprise in the modernisation of China 1893-1911, Cambridge University Press, New York, 1981 and David Ch’ng, The Overseas Chinese Entrepreneurs in East Asia: background, business practices and international networks, Committee for Economic Development of Australia, Sydney, 1993. There would seem to be scope for similar studies in Australia and Wilton’s research on the networks in the New England district indicates that much could be revealed.
Kong and Shanghai have also been studied but surprisingly little has been revealed about the Australian contribution.\textsuperscript{24}

The research referred to above concerns the history of the Chinese in Australia but little is said in any of these studies concerning the principal context to this history, that is, the ‘overseas Chinese’. Many books have been written about the Chinese communities of the \textit{Nanyang} but these make few references to Chinese migration to Australia.\textsuperscript{25}

In the late 1980s, the first studies of the ‘overseas Chinese’ as such began in China and North America.\textsuperscript{26} These studies have begun to reveal much that could be characterised as a ‘Chinese migrant pattern’. The most interesting study proceeded from a joint Chinese/United States project concerning Taishan immigrants to the United States.\textsuperscript{27} Canada has also produced a number of studies that focus particularly on a single lineage. As well, a detailed study has been made of a Hong Kong village and its emigrants to Britain.\textsuperscript{28}

Research in China itself has focused either on the evaluation of various types of sources, such as the clan records, tomb inscriptions, clan and district publications, or on detailed analysis of the uses remittances were put to and the impact generally of overseas Chinese on the development of their villages and districts of origin. The perspective of Chinese scholars is very much that the overseas Chinese represent a social phenomena within China’s history and society and so their role in other countries is an aspect of China’s history, a history that stretches back to the 12\textsuperscript{th}

\textsuperscript{26} The first, that is, since the excellent and still valuable study by Chen Ta in the 1930s. Chen Ta, \textit{Emigrant Communities in South China: A Study of Overseas Migration and its influence on standards of living and social change}, 2nd edn, Institute of Pacific Relations, New York, 1940.
century and continues to the present day. These studies make few references to Australia although it is recognised that, after the Nanyang and North America, Chinese people emigrated most often to Australia. This was a very distant third, however, and no Chinese research has been directed to Australia specifically.

An element which neither North American and Chinese studies, nor Australian regional studies in have focused on, is the role of the district of origin. As one sinologist has put it, ‘We need to further disaggregate the Australian-China communities into their various ethnic and sub-ethnic groups.’ Additionally, ‘We need to place the Australian material into a Chinese cultural context. … the emigrant areas of south-east China.’ This thesis attempts to place the history of the generation under discussion into the context of south China and to take some tentative steps in the direction of disaggregation along the lines of districts of origin.

A focus on the districts of origin also emphasises the fact that generalisations about Chinese people who came to Australia and about the history of Chinese in different parts of Australia should not be made too freely. Among people for whom dialect,

---

29 A few examples of this research are: Feng Yuan 馮元, “Luelun jiefang qian guangdongsheng huaqiao huikuan” 略論解放前廣東省華僑匯款 (A brief discussion of Guangdong overseas Chinese remittances before liberation), Qiaoshi xuebao 僑史學報 (Journal of Overseas Chinese History), 1, 1989, pp.31-40; Huang Chongyan 黃重言, “Yanjiu huaqiaoshi shang de jidian yijian” 研究華僑史上的幾點意見 (A few comments about researching overseas Chinese history), Huaqiao lunwen shi 華僑論文史 (Overseas Chinese History Thesis), No.1, April 1982, pp.24-28 and Huang Daoji 黃道記 & Liu Chongmin 劉重民, “Taishanren shewai jiaowang yu chuyang suyuan” 台山人涉外交往與出洋溯源 (The origin of Taishan people’s overseas migration and their links), Qiaoshi xuebao 僑史學報 (Journal of Overseas Chinese History), No.1, 1989, pp.7-8. The study by Elizabeth Sinn of Hong Kong’s regional associations and the role of the Tung Wah Hospital raises interesting possibilities for comparisons with similar societies in Australia and their links with this Hospital. See Elizabeth Sinn, ‘Xin Xi Guxiang: A Study of Regional Associations as a Bonding Mechanism in the Chinese Diaspora. The Hong Kong Experience’, Modern Asian Studies, 31, 2, 1997, pp. 375-397 and Power and Charity – The Early History of the Tung Wah Hospital, Hong Kong, Oxford University Press, Hong Kong, 1989.

30 That material relevant to Australia might be uncovered once research of Chinese sources is begun is suggested by a number of examples. The Kaiping Overseas Chinese Museum in 1985 collected over 400 items from families with overseas Chinese connections, in Kan Yanxin 闞延鑫, “Cong Kaiping huaqiao bowuguan wenwu cangpin, kan huaqiao dui zuguo de gongxian” 从開平華僑博物館文物藏品，看華僑對祖國的貢獻 (From the collection of the Kaiping Museum to see the overseas Chinese contribution to the home country), Qiaoshi xuebao 僑史學報 (Journal of Overseas Chinese History), 1, 1987, p.44; also a reference to donations to China from Australian huaqiao in support of a port strike in 1925, found in the strike committee report and a reference to Quong Tart in the Mei family records in Hong Kong, see Huang Daoji 黃道記 & Liu Chongmin 劉重民, “Taishanren shewai jiaowang yu chuyang suyuan” 台山人涉外交往與出洋溯源 (The origin of ‘Taishan people’s overseas migration and their links), Qiaoshi xuebao 僑史學報 (Journal of Overseas Chinese History), No.1, 1989, pp.7-8.

village and family groupings were considered of foremost importance, how accurate can labels such as ‘Chinese’ and the ‘Chinese community’ be? With this in mind, I will use the Chinese word *huaqiao* (›ªÇÈ) to refer to those people of Chinese origin who lived in Sydney in the late nineteenth to mid-twentieth centuries. *Huaqiao* literally means ‘Chinese who reside away from home’ and most closely corresponds to the English phrase ‘overseas Chinese’. *Huaqiao* is used in order to highlight both the dangers of ignoring Henry Chan’s ‘ethnic and sub-ethnic groups’ and to emphasise that continuing links with China for these long-term Sydney residents was crucial to their lives.33

The focus on Sydney is not only due to its role as the city with the largest *huaqiao* population, but also because it was the focal point of a network of *huaqiao* businesses and communications that stretched throughout New South Wales. This network gradually shrank as the century progressed until it was restricted to inner Sydney, some Sydney suburbs and NSW regions such as the northern Tablelands.34 Sydney is also interesting because it also had the largest Australian concentration of people from Zhongshan district, with approximately 40% of Sydney’s *huaqiao* originating from there.35

In researching the nature of the connection between Sydney’s *huaqiao* and their south China villages, the primary source was archival material from the administrative files of the Immigration Restriction Act, 1901. This material was augmented by oral evidence provided by current Sydney residents who are descendants of the *huaqiao* generation discussed in this thesis.36 Additional material was also obtained from sources such as the late nineteenth century ‘Royal Commission on Alleged Chinese Gambling’, the records of the Chinese Section of Rookwood Cemetery, NSW and Commonwealth Census data, shipping records and

---

32 Huang, op. cit., p.24. The translation is the writer.
33 Both *huaqiao* and ‘overseas Chinese’ have a variety of meanings with historical and political implications and the best discussion of the general history of the term *huaqiao* and its changing meanings is that by Wang Gungwu, ‘South China perspective’s on overseas Chinese’, *The Australian Journal of Chinese Affairs*, no.13, 1984, pp.69-84; see also, Fitzgerald, op. cit., pp.5-6, on defining ‘Chineseness’.
34 On northern NSW see, Wilton, op. cit., pp.4-5.
35 Price, op. cit., p.220, n.12, gives district proportions for Sydney’s *huaqiao* based on material drawn from files of the 1960s and 1970s. For a more detailed discussion of the evidence that proportions did change see, Appendix V.
36 See Appendix II for details of interviews.
material obtained during a field trip to Zhongshan district, south China in January 1998.

The Immigration Restriction Act required that non-Europeans who could prove residence in Australia before the Act’s commencement (effectively February, 1902) were eligible to remain in Australia and to re-enter should they care to leave. In the course of this Act’s operation over 61,668 such trips were taken between 1902 and 1946.37 The administration of this Act led the Customs and Excise Offices in each State (and later the Immigration Department) to maintain files on all non-European residents in Australia every time they applied for a ‘Certificate Exempting From Dictation Test’ or CEDT, in order to be allowed to re-enter Australia.38

Due to the relative intrusiveness of this Act and its administration much evidence from its files concerning the links between Australia and the villages of origin can be gained. This material was compiled when Sydney’s huaqiao were trying to maintain the links with their families and villages in the most tangible way. Additionally, while the Immigration Restriction Act and its ‘dictation’ test was primarily aimed at restricting the entry into Australia of Chinese and other non-European people, its provisions did allow for ways that people, not resident in Australia before 1901, could enter and remain in Australia. The files therefore also contain much detail on efforts to maintain and even extend the links through bringing in of wives and fellow villagers, on attempts to enter illegally, and concerning passing on the link to the next generation through sponsoring sons as assistants and students.

The approach taken in this thesis is that of tracing the huaqiao as they lived and matured, that is, from arrival to marriage to old age and onto the next generation. I have taken this approach because I believe that it allows the huaqiao’s own perspective’s to be presented. This is of especial importance in a thesis that relies so heavily on the evidence of Immigration Restriction Act files and in a field where the Chinese have all too often been seen as ‘victims’ and inspirers of hostility and little else. Chapter One, ‘Domiciled in the Commonwealth’ discusses how it was that so

37 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.
38 See Appendix IV for a general overview of the nature of these files; also Yarwood, op. cit., Chapter 3, pp.42-66; and Palfreeman, op. cit., pp.5-19 and Chapter 8, pp.81-101, for general discussion and administrative details.
many young male huaqiao became Sydney residents, were granted a limited right of ‘domicile’ by the first Federal Parliament in 1901, and why they spent many years living remitting money until they finally returned to the home village to marry. Chapter Two, ‘Holiday to his own native country to see his wife and family’ discusses the middle years of a Sydney huaqiao’s life, as the now married man strove to support a growing family, to buy land and perhaps improve his family’s prospects. The barriers to these aims, the paths taken by those who failed or chose to deviate from them, and the general circumstances of the wife and family in the home village are also considered. Chapter Three, ‘Apart from the native born, only the old and weak are left’, deals with the old age and retirement of Sydney’s huaqiao, and the impact on the links between Sydney and south China as the next generation took over.

The title of this thesis, ‘Brief Sojourn in your native land’ was taken from a testimonial signed by a number of Gundagai residents for Mark Loong on his departure for China in 1903, after 16 years in the district. This thesis concerns a relationship to which the concept of a person sojourning to his native land is central. This is also a reversal of the usual idea of Chinese migrants as sojourners. The topic has been chosen because most accounts of the Chinese in Australia have revealed little about an aspect of the life of these Sydney residents that it would be difficult to deny was of great significance to most Chinese people until at least the middle of the twentieth century. It is hoped that this research will contribute to a better understanding of the districts of origin, of the impact of the Immigration Restriction Act on the huaqiao and to how ‘apparently’ Australian history and south China are linked.

39 Australian Archives (NSW), SP42/1; C1903/875, Mark Loong, Testimonial, 9 January 1903.
CHAPTER 1  Domiciled in the Commonwealth

In 1901 the new Commonwealth Parliament passed the Immigration Restriction Act designed to make Australia a ‘white’ nation. This Act also granted some 30,000 people of Chinese birth the right of ‘domicile’ in Australia, including the right to leave and re-enter the Commonwealth. ‘Domiciled in the Commonwealth’\(^1\) examines how Sydney with its 3,500 huaqiao was a place where a young newly arrived ‘new chum’\(^2\) from one of the many villages of a south China district such as Zhongshan could expect to find numerous fellow villagers and speakers of his own dialect.\(^3\) He would also find stores and societies organised around the various south China districts of the Pearl River Delta that had the resources to help him find accommodation and work, as well as offering the important service of remitting money to maintain links with families and villages of origin until such time as they were able to make use of their ‘domicile’ rights to return to the villages and marry. These young huaqiao would also find Sydney the capital of a colony which, since 1888, had severely restricted the entry and re-entry of all people of his race,\(^4\) and where random and occasional systematic acts of discrimination and aggression against Chinese were common.\(^5\)

Chapter 1 begins with a description of the distribution by Pearl River Delta district of Sydney’s huaqiao at the end of the nineteenth century and a discussion of the evidence for the increasing concentration of the huaqiao of NSW in Sydney from that time until the middle of the twentieth century. The major characteristics of the

---

\(^1\) The quote is from the original Immigration Restriction Act, 1901, section 3, paragraph (n). This paragraph was deleted in 1905, but administrators continued to refer to ‘domiciles’ throughout the Immigration Restriction Act, and after 1912, the Immigration Act’s, existence until 1958.

\(^2\) ‘New chum’ was a common expression to refer to newly arrived Chinese and is an interesting equivlanr to the equally common Chinese expression, xinke, (新客) lit. ‘new guest’. Chen Ta, op. cit., p.22, n.20, says that new Chinese immigrants to Indonesia were called Singkeh.

\(^3\) For a general description and brief history of this district see, Choy op. cit., pp.69-75. Also, Char Tin-Yuke, The Sandalwood Mountains. Readings and Stories of the Early Chinese in Hawaii, The University Press of Hawaii, Honolulu, 1975, pp.20-23. The young huaqiao would have known his district as Heangshan (Xiangshan), its name was changed to Zhongshan in 1925 in honour of its favourite son, Sun Yat-sen.

\(^4\) The ‘Chinese Restriction and Regulation Act of 1888’, which defined ‘Chinese’ as, ‘Any person of the Chinese race’. All three NSW anti-Chinese Acts (1861, 1881 and 1888) used this definition. The Commonwealth’s Immigration Restriction Act, 1901 refers to no race.

**huaqiao** on their arrival in Sydney are examined including the significance of district of origin and dialect in the organisation of support networks. Following from this, the dependence of most **huaqiao** on the support of stores and societies, particularly in the maintenance of links with their home villages and families through regular remittances is discussed. As is the role of debt in the length of time spent in Sydney before a return trip to the village is made for marriage. ‘Domiciled in the Commonwealth’ concludes at the point the **huaqiao** are ready to use their domicile rights to maintain their links with families of their own.

The 3,500 **huaqiao** who were in Sydney at the time the Immigration Restriction Act was passed were from the districts of the Pearl River Delta, consisting of a small number of the Chinese Empire’s 1,500 districts.\(^6\) Two witnesses to the ‘Royal Commission on alleged Chinese Gambling’\(^7\) of 1890 provided lists of the ‘communities’ [districts] that were represented in Sydney around this time. Yuan Tak provided ‘Chang Sing, Toon Goon, Heong Shang, See Yip, Sam Yip, Har Kar, and Go You’. While Robert Lee Kam gave an even more detailed list, ‘There is the Chong Sing community, the Doon Goon community, the Hung Shang community, the Sun Wing community, the Sun Wiy community, the Hoy Ping community, the Ying Ping community, the Hock Sang community, the Go You community, the Go Ming community, the Sun On community, the Par Yoon community, the Sam Soon community; but there are very few individuals belonging to the last mentioned clan.’\(^8\) Allowing for variations in transcription all these communities, with the exception of the scattered ‘Har Kar’ (Hakka), can be identified with the districts surrounding the Pearl River Delta in southern China.\(^9\)

Sydney’s **huaqiao** has ample reasons to leave their villages in Zhongshan and other Pearl River Delta districts because, throughout the nineteenth century, these districts

---


\(^7\) Referred to as Royal Commission hereafter.

\(^8\) *Royal Commission*, op. cit., p.119, line, 4784 and p.145, line 5805. See Appendix I, Character Table for the modern renderings of these non-standard romanisations.

\(^9\) Compare the list made by Price based on 1960s Department of Immigration data, Price, op. cit., p.220, n.12, Zhongshan (40%), Gao Yao (24%), Dong Goon (20%), Sze Yap (10%), Sam Yap (3%) and non-Cantonese (2%). See also Appendix V, ‘District proportions in Sydney’ for a fuller discussion.
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suffered from famines, floods and civil disturbances that ranged from bandit attacks to open warfare. The alleviation of such problems by emigration was acceptable to those living in the Pearl River Delta region as districts near the southern coasts of China had a tradition of overseas emigration to South-East Asia that went back to the 12th century. Strong attachment to parents, along with that to the ancestral village, meant that this emigration did not occur lightly, even among families with a history of such movement. When, for example, Chang Yet, who had lived in NSW since 1898, was preparing to bring his son, Chang Gar Lock (Arthur Chang), to Australia in 1933, he first took him to the village temple, where a promise was made to the local goddess that his son would return to the village.

---

Huaqiao districts of origin, Pearl River Delta, south China.

---

10 Choy op. cit., p.60, refers to secret society revolts in the 1842-55 period; p.61, the Taiping rebellion in 1854; pp.142-3, to inter-family feuds as late as 1898-9; and Appendix 1, pp.490-92, gives a table of disasters, including floods, famines and bandit attacks. Similar reasons are also recorded in the ancestor records about clan members who emigrated, see, Zheng Shanyu, ‘Huaqiao yu hai shang sichou zhi lu - bufen qiaoxiang zupu zhong de haiwai yimin ziliao fenxi’ (Huaqiao and the Silk Road of the Sea - An analysis of overseas migration information of clan records in part of the emigrant communities), Huaqiao huaren lishi yanjiu (Overseas Chinese History Researches), no.1, 1991, pp.23-30 and in Zo Kil Young, ‘Emigrant Communities in China, Sze-Yap’, Asian Profile, vol.5, no.4, August, 1977, pp.313-23. In the 1930s, economic pressure was given as the principle cause of emigration in 70% of cases, Chen Ta, op. cit., pp.259-261, Table 26.


12 Interview with Arthur Gar Lock Chang, Sydney, 7 March 1998. (Tape 1, B, 9.00). See Appendix II for an explanation of citations to interview transcripts and a brief outline of those interviewed.

Contract labourers, generally not from the Pearl River Delta districts, were the first Chinese people to come to Australia. It was the gold rushes of the 1850s, however, that brought the first significant migrations from the Pearl River Delta districts through the Port of Sydney. These arrivals created in Sydney the new phenomenon of ‘Chinatowns’, at first in the Rocks district near the wharves and later in the Haymarket area near the markets. These ‘Chinatowns’ were the obvious outward signs of huaqiao support for each other. The passing of the gold rushes in NSW and Victoria reduced the numbers of Chinese people in the Australian colonies, but new arrivals continued and numbers began increasing again after a time. The knowledge that more money was to be earned in the Australian colonies than was ever likely to be possible in their home villages and districts, combined with the support networks that were being developed by relatives and fellow villagers who had gone before, made Xin Jin Shan (新金山) or the New Gold Mountain, an accessible if not always a welcoming destination for the huaqiao. Most of the Sydney huaqiao whose rights of residence were given some recognition as ‘domiciles’ by the Immigration Restriction Act were in a sense the ‘second’ generation, those who had followed in the footsteps of the huaqiao of the ‘gold rush’.

By the end of the nineteenth century, Sydney found itself with a substantial Chinese population and the centre of a network of huaqiao connections spread throughout NSW. Approximately 34% of NSW’s Chinese residents lived in the then ‘metropolitan’ area, including most of the merchants and store owners who ran the

---

14 Choi, op. cit., pp.18-19; Price, op. cit., pp.76-89; and Fitzgerald, op. cit., pp.20-25. Just how early some Chinese were in Australia can be seen from the ‘Deaths of Centenarians’ tables which records, in 1911, the death at 105 of a Chinese born storekeeper of Gulgong who had been in Australia for 70 years, or since 1841; and in 1924 the death of a 127 year old Chinese gardener who had been in Australia 108 years, or since 1816. *Official Year Book of the Commonwealth of Australia*, no.6, 1901-1912, pp.217 & no.18, 1925, p.988.
15 See Table 1, Appendix IV. Appendix IV also explains the sampling methods used to obtain all figures and statistics used in the thesis. On the scale of arrivals in the gold fields, Price, op. cit., p.88.
17 The United States, or more specifically California, was know as Jiu Jin Shan (旧金山) or the ‘Old Gold Mountain’ and Australia (originally Victoria) was known as Xin Jin Shan (新金山) or the ‘New Gold Mountain’. Yong, op. cit., p.1.
18 This network of stores and societies is well illustrated in the *Royal Commission*, where there are numerous references scattered throughout the evidence to visits by the witnesses to such NSW towns as Hay, Hillston and Tingha and their Chinese ‘camps’. Way Kee is reported to have had four stores in Bourke, Bega, Stanthorpe and Hillston, *Royal Commission*, op. cit., p.47, lines, 1704-8, and to send subscription books around the ‘interior’, p.54, lines, 2056-83. See also Yong, op. cit., pp.39-41, for a discussion of the Chinese in the rural environment.
supporting networks of stores and societies. The Sydney stores of these merchants had links and shared partnerships with those in rural NSW and between them would pass remittances to the villages and imports from China such as birds’ nests, smoked duck, lychees and medicine herbs. These stores also provided a range of services including accommodation for huaqiao passing through Sydney, as the main port of NSW, to or from China.

The main occupations of Sydney’s huaqiao, as reported by the Chinese Gambling Commissioners were:

merchants, storekeepers, cabinet-making, market-gardeners, hawkers, and gamblers. It is only in cabinet-making and vegetable-growing, however, that they come into serious competition with European tradesmen.

Despite this perceived serious competition, the Commissioners observed that ‘in the cultivation of vegetables the Chinese are practically masters of the situation’ and this was thought to be ‘due to extreme frugality and unremitting toil’. For those huaqiao working in cabinet making, country stores, and the banana trade, however, such mastership was not to be, with huaqiao in all these fields experiencing racially based attacks during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

---

19 See Appendix IV, Table 1 and 2.
20 The Hong Sing firm of Reservior St, Surry Hills sold to stores in Tenterfield, Emmaville and Tingha, see, Australian Archives (NSW), SP1122/1; N57/2220, Chang Wai Sheu Sing. See also Wilton, op. cit., p.133, for details of northern NSW connections with Sydney. For details of imports see, Australian Archives (NSW), A1026, Correspondence in connection with Immigration Restriction Act 1904-12, vol. 3, report, ‘Check on importation of Chinese Goods’, Collector of Customs to the Comptroller-General, 5 June 1908.
21 Royal Commission, op. cit., p.115, lines, 4567-71, Sam Tin reported that as many as 50 stayed in his lodging house ‘when they have been going away to China, or going into the country’. Victor Gow remembers he and his father in the 1920s staying above the Kwong War Chong store, Dixon Street Sydney on buying trips from Wollongong. Interview with Victor Gow, 30 October 1997 (9).
22 Royal Commission, op. cit., p.27, ‘Callings and Occupations of the Chinese’. The ‘Chinese Gambling Commission’ was how the Royal Commissioners described themselves.
23 Royal Commission, op. cit., p.28. See ‘The Belmore Markets,’ Dalgety’s Weekly, 1 January 1902, p.85 for a description of Chinese in the markets; Yarwood, op. cit., p.117, thinks Chinese dominance is because such work was regarded as a, ‘special preserve of the Chinese’; Price, op. cit., p.224, refers to greater efficiency compared to European gardeners; and ‘Chinese in Sydney’, The Sydney Mail, 25 February 1903, p.482, describes a Chinese Garden as, ‘remarkable for the thorough manner in which it is worked. There is never a patch idle or weedy, …’
24 Yarwood, op. cit., pp.117-119, on the banana trade, greengrocers and furniture trade; Yong, op. cit., p.52, on restrictions placed on Chinese in the banana trade and pp.70-77, on the anti-Chinese stores movement; Wilton, op. cit., pp.98-101, discusses the campaign against Chinese country stores.
Such discriminatory attacks and pressures presumably contributed to the changes in both occupations and geographic locations of the NSW huaqiao that occurred during the first half of the twentieth century. Analysis of the Immigration Restriction Act files reveals that NSW huaqiao at the beginning of the century worked in a variety of occupations and in a number of NSW locations. Both of these gradually contracted over the first 20 to 30 years of the century, with market gardening and residence in Sydney coming to predominate. The occupations recorded were more varied than those listed by the Gambling Commissioners and include market gardener, labourer, grocery storekeeper, hawker, cook, carpenter, scrub cutter, cabinet maker, tobacco farmer, miner, draper, and bookkeeper. An occupation not mentioned, but which must have been of some importance to the huaqiao on occasions, is that of interpreter. Long Pen was one such interpreter who claimed that he charged, ‘a guinea a day’, which compared well to a market gardeners’ £1 per week.

Information from CEDT applications indicates a wide range of NSW locations initially but, in the later applications, it is Sydney and its suburbs that are listed more often. Census data confirms this evidence of changing settlement patterns. Sydney in 1901 had 34% of the NSW huaqiao population. By 1921 this had risen to around 40% and to over 50% by 1933. As a proportion of the Australian huaqiao population, Sydney also rose (as did NSW), from 11.8% in 1901 to 17.4% by 1933.

Regardless of occupation or where they lived, the most obvious feature of the huaqiao as a whole and one often commented on was that they were almost entirely men. Less obvious perhaps was that they were ‘nearly all farmers and labourers’
who had arrived in Sydney and other Australian ports as young men or even boys.\textsuperscript{29} The evidence of the CEDT applications is that \textit{huaqiao} of the ‘domicile’ generation were aged on average between 16 and 25 years when they left their villages.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{chart1.png}
\caption{An 11 year old boy and a 35 year old man represent the extremes of the files sampled.\textsuperscript{30}}
\end{figure}

The attitude of traditional Chinese culture to parents and related ideas about the function of marriage helps to explain why \textit{huaqiao} emigration before the twentieth century was predominantly male. It was the view that a woman’s role was not only to marry, but that as a wife, her role was to support her husband’s parents more than it was to take care of that husband.\textsuperscript{31} Arthur Chang illustrates an aspect of these attitudes when he reports attending a proxy marriage in his village in the 1920s where the groom was represented by a rooster. The son in this case was already married and living in Australia but his mother had insisted on a second wife to look after her in China.\textsuperscript{32}

\begin{flushleft}
\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{29} \textit{Royal Commission}, op. cit., p.57, line, 2220; Chen Ta, op. cit., p.131, referring to Southeast Asia states, ‘The emigrant, at the time when he is leaving home, usually is an adolescent or in the early years of manhood.’

\textsuperscript{30} See Appendix IV, Table 5.

\textsuperscript{31} Choi, op. cit., p.13, and Price, op. cit., p.55 also discuss this aspect; Wilton, op. cit., pp.172-4, also mentions the tradition of male migration and a preference to leave wives in China.

\textsuperscript{32} Interview with Arthur Gar Lock Chang, Sydney, 7 March 1998 (Tape 2, B, 14.30); Baker, op. cit., p.35, refers to a ‘white cockerel’ as the traditional groom substitute in such proxy marriages.
\end{flushleft}
Figure 1: Certificate Exempting From Dictation Test. The records of applications over half a century provide a wealth of statistics.\textsuperscript{33}

\textsuperscript{33} Australian Archives (NSW), ST84/1; Certificate Exempting From Dictation Test, 1904-1959.
On arrival in Sydney, these young men found associations and stores to assist them in various ways. Unlike Chinese cities, whose workers were organised around occupational guilds, the *huaqiao* in the cities of the Chinese diaspora, such as Sydney, relied on regional associations for social and political organisation. These *tongxian* (同係), or ‘same place’ societies, provided some of the support necessary for the *huaqiao* to survive and prosper in a city dominated by people of another culture. These societies, as the Chinese Gambling Commissioners described them, were ‘benevolent institutions, formed on the basis of ‘cousinship’, and displaying their charity in the transport of old men and the bones of their deceased countrymen to China’. The societies raised their money from members subscriptions with, according to Yuen Tak of the Koon Yee Tong, nobody being, ‘allowed to pay less than £1, but many of the merchants paid as much as £5, £10, and £50’. They also, according to a researcher of regional organisations in Hong Kong, played a significant role in ‘keeping *huaqiao* focused on their obligations to their families in the village’. This last was a factor of some importance, given the length of time many *huaqiao* were separated from their families.

These societies were run by the same merchants who owned the stores the average *huaqiao* used for support and assistance. This was part of a paternalism which, Ah Way explained to the Commissioners, was the basis of the role his grandfather, Way Kee, played in the Koon Yee Tong of the Doon Goon district people. It was not a question of his seeking election but, ‘on account of seeing that my grandfather was in such a larger way of business, and was trusted, these men would take their money to him to keep for them’. The men he was referring to were those principally in ‘the

---

34 Sinn, *Power and Charity*, op. cit., pp.55-6, contrasts the strength of the guild based structure of Hong Kong and Chinese cities generally with the importance of regional associations among the overseas Chinese.

35 *Royal Commission*, op. cit., p.28.

36 *Royal Commission*, op. cit., p.117, line, 4697.

37 According to Sinn, the purpose of such societies was also to express longing and to remind members of their obligations. Sinn, ‘*Xin Xi Guxiang*’, op. cit., p.375.

38 *Royal Commission*, op. cit., p.14, line, 402, ‘The principal stores would be the treasury’, and line, 404, ‘the principal storekeepers would hold the money’. Norman Lee’s father, Philip Lee Chun was the owner of the Kwong War Chong store and a founder of the Zhongshan society the Yum Duck Tong, interview with Norman Lee, Sydney, 25 September 1997 (11). Sinn, *Power and Charity*, op. cit., p.55, refers to the role of merchants in taking the place of the scholar elite in the circumstances of Hong Kong and p.60, discusses the characteristics of Chinese voluntary organisations.
gardening or hawking line’. 39 A man in Way Kee’s position was obliged to help others of his community. As Ah Way again explained, ‘if my grandfather did not go and bail them [Chinese arrested for gambling] out, being a leading man, it would not look well.’ 40

A prominent characteristic of people from the Pearl River Delta districts was their strong identification by district and dialect, and these affiliations were a significant factor in determining the profile of the societies and network of stores formed by the huaqiao in Sydney and elsewhere. 41 This was the ‘cousinship’ the Chinese Gambling Commissioners referred to as the basis of the societies they were investigating. Most Sydney huaqiao spoke the Yue dialect (Cantonese), but with variations that made the members of the different districts readily distinguishable. Some groups, such as the Hakka (客家) and people from the Long Dou (隆都) area within Zhongshan, spoke a non-Yue dialect that was unintelligible to the majority of Cantonese speakers. 42 Up to half of the Zhongshan people of Sydney were reported to be from this single Long Dou area and the people of this district felt an affinity with each other that extended beyond that of village and family. 43

Generally, each district had its own society, though some had more than one and some combined to form a single society, such as the Dong Guan and Zeng Cheng people did to form the Loong Yee Tong. 44 Why some districts had more than one society, whether this was because of different functions or because of differing groups within a district, is unclear. The Commissioners needed to have the ‘exclusiveness’ of the societies explained to them on a number of occasions, such as when Way Shong

---

40 Royal Commission, op. cit., p.52, line, 1946.
42 Moser, op. cit., p.208, discusses the arrival of the Hakka in South China, p.216, their dialect enclaves and p.199, the dialect enclave of Long Dou; Choy op. cit., p.95, mentions six Zhongshan dialects and p.114, Longhua (the Longdu dialect).
43 Interview with Donald Young, Sydney, 11 October 1997 (6) & Arthur Gar Lock Chang, 7 March 1998 (Tape 1, B, 0.84).
stated that, ‘Moy Ping is not of my community – he would not subscribe’, and when Sam Tin needed to explain that he was denying membership of the Loong Yee Tong, not because it was a gambling society but rather ‘as I do not belong to that part of the country they would not let me in it’.  

Apart from the district societies, the young *huaqiao* were assisted by stores also organised by district and patronised almost exclusively by customers of that district. People without a district related store of their own could use the services of other stores, but for sending remittances and other assistance relative to their own villages, they were not of great use. The role of these stores in linking Sydney’s *huaqiao* to the villages of their districts reached such a level that most things could be organised through them. The main Zhongshan firms, Wing On & Co., Onyik Lee & Co. and the Kwong War Chong, paid fares, purchased tickets, arranged Immigration Restriction Act related paper work, provided accommodation and even lent money for the first remittance home, including a letter written by the firm’s scribe if necessary. This last was referred to as ‘Returning Gold’ (回头金) and signalled safe arrival.

These Sydney based stores were able to provide services that reached back to the villages because they were part of a network of stores related by ownership in Hong Kong and the home districts. The ‘General Merchants’ firm of Sun Sam Choy, for example, had 25 partners, only five of whom were in Sydney itself, nine were in Newcastle (where there was perhaps a branch store), one in Glenn Innes, eight in Hong Kong and a further two in Canton. In the Zhongshan district capital, Shekki, (石岐, Shiqi), the Kwong War Fong (光和丰) was the branch firm of the Kwong War Chong (光和昌) of Sydney. Kwong War Chong & Co. was typical of many *huaqiao* businesses in being founded by numerous partners, in this case seven, all holding equal

---

44 Royal Commission, op. cit., p.146, lines, 5871-2.
45 Royal Commission, op. cit., p.69, line, 2697 and p.117, line, 4665.
46 Royal Commission, op. cit., p.115, as San Tin reported of his Lodging House, ‘only friends and countrymen [district] stop there’. Yong, op. cit., p.46, discusses this feature of the stores.
47 Interview with Arthur Gar Lock Chang, Sydney, 7 March 1998 (Tape 2, B, 0.00).
48 Interview with Arthur Gar Lock Chang, Sydney, 7 March 1998 (Tape 2, B, 0.75) & Victor Gow, 30 October 1997 (9).
49 Yong, op. cit., p.46, considers that some were established with Hong Kong capital.
50 Australian Archives (NSW), SP42/1: C29/48, Ping Fun, Certificate of Registration of a firm with the Registrar-General, Sun Sam Choy – General Merchants, no.3, 694, 5 June 1906.
51 高民川, Gao Minchuan, 中山市华侨大事记 ‘Zhongshanshi huaqiao dashiqi’ (Record of major events of Zhongshan City overseas Chinese), 中山文史 Zhongshan Wenshi (Zhongshan Cultural History), 1990, p.11; and interview with Norman Lee, 25 September 1997 (2).
shares. All the partners, except one, arrived in Sydney before 1902 and all, except the Australian-born sons of one of the partners, had returned to China by the 1930s.\textsuperscript{52}

The dependence of the \textit{huaqiao} on stores such as the Kwong War Chong was high. Life in Sydney for the average \textit{huaqiao} meant living in a land dominated by people whose culture and habits they considered inferior, whose language they did not speak or did not speak well, and who were not only prejudiced against Chinese as a race but had the power to act upon that prejudice.\textsuperscript{53} Circumstances such as these, combined with the strong district orientation and local self-support character of the \textit{huaqiao}s cultural background, made a high level of group self-sufficiency among Sydney’s \textit{huaqiao} natural.\textsuperscript{54}

One of the manners of this co-operation and support was noted in the common perception and complaint against Chinese people by Europeans around the turn of the century that they worked for less and so under cut other workers.\textsuperscript{55} A police report in 1916 described the practical basis of this in that ‘the keeper of every cabinetmaker’s shop, produce, fruit and grocery store, employ large numbers of chinese [sic] (aliens) who are paid a weekly wage, and are provided with accommodation for their services’.\textsuperscript{56} These wages were significantly lower than the average, with cabinet

\textsuperscript{52} Australian Archives (NSW), SP42/1; N59/3386 Kwong War Chong & Co., ‘Particulars form’, 30 October 1951.


\textsuperscript{54} Sinn, \textit{Power & Charity}, op. cit., p.14, on the wide role played in social organisation of the ‘family, clan, and village’. Fitzgerald, op. cit., p.67, makes the point that such co-operation did not necessarily mean that no one found themselves without support.

\textsuperscript{55} See, ‘Chinese Merchants reply’, \textit{Sydney Morning Herald}, 22 August 1904, p.12, for a refutation of these claims against stores made by the Anti-Chinese and Asiatic League, including a table of typical expenses for a Chinese and European store in which the inclusion of boarding costs makes the Chinese store more expensive to operate.

\textsuperscript{56} Australian Archives (NSW), SP11/16; Aliens Registration 1916-21, Item no. 2, No.2 Police Station, Regents St, Sydney to Department of Defence, 8 December 1916. Also Fitzgerald, op. cit., p.84, for a discussion of Ah Toy’s workshop. Not that Chinese were the only workers to accept board, Thomas Smith, \textit{Royal Commission}, op. cit., p.420, lines, 15635-15639, gave evidence of paying his two European workers 18s plus board while his Chinese worker received 26s without board.
makers in 1899 recorded as being paid an average wage of £2/8/-, while Chinese cabinet makers received £1/11/6. Similarly, cooks were recorded as averaging £2 per week, while Chinese cooks earned only £1/2/-.  

While most huaqiao were working at these occupations they also presumably wished to see again the families they had left at such a young age and which they may have been helping to support. Figures derived from the CEDT records suggest that while most huaqiao made such a trip, they waited a considerable length of time before they did so. Sydney’s share of the total NSW huaqiao population of 10,000 in 1901 was only about 3,500, yet from 1902 to 1959 a total of 27,654 people identified as ‘Chinese’ passed through Sydney on CEDTs. With many multiple journeys, it is difficult to determine how many huaqiao actually returned to the home village, or at least to China, and how many did not. As some huaqiao 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 is taken as an average, it can perhaps be stated that more than 6,000 individual huaqiao living in NSW, out of an initial population in 1901 of 10,000, made at least one China trip.  

Of those that did make such a trip, some spent from 10 to 20, and in many cases, 30 to 40 years, working, remitting and living a ‘bachelor’ life in Australia before seeing their families and villages again.

---

57 T. A. Coghlan, *NSW Statistical Register for 1899 and Previous Years*, Government Printer, Sydney, 1900, p.994, Part XIV, Industrial Wages, Table no. 7, and p.1004, Table no. 11. Though the rate for cooks in 1912 was reported as 30s per week and that for ‘Chinese Cooks’ as 40s! *NSW Statistical Register, 1919-20*, no.51, ‘Average Rate of Wages in Misc. Industries, 1912.‘ p.486.

58 Australian Archives (NSW), SP726/1; Particulars of Applications for CEDTs, vol.1- vol.6. Sydney figures cannot be isolated, as people throughout NSW needed to pass through Sydney Port. The use of Brisbane and Melbourne by huaqiao living in NSW makes even trying to isolate NSW highly problematic. See Table 9, Appendix IV.
The major reason such lengthy periods were spent working alone in a foreign land would appear to be that for cash-poor peasants the cost of a passage to Sydney was too great. ‘Some said that they did not even have the half dollar to pay the boat fare from the mainland to Hong Kong.’ In order for huaqiao to get to Sydney at all, it was often necessary to become indebted to those, such as an agent operating through Hong Kong or a relative who had sufficient money after his own sojourn, who would pay for their passage.

This method of migration was known as the ‘credit-ticket’ system and required the young huaqiao to repay the debt incurred in buying his passage before anything else. ‘For each tael I must repay two taels.’ Referring to the cabinet-making industry the Chinese Gambling Commissioners described the system as ‘indentures under which new arrivals were compelled to work for certain periods at excessively low rates’.

The Commissioners also had described to them how a Dr On Lee brought in 30

---

59 See Appendix IV, Table 6.
60 Fitzgerald, op. cit., p.26, and a discussion of ticket arrangements in the 1880s.
61 This method has been described by many researchers, see Huck, op. cit., pp.3-4; Choi, op. cit., p.14; Price, op. cit., p.58; Yong, op. cit., p.1, quotes a 1857 Victorian parliamentary committee report that estimated two-thirds of the Chinese migrants of the time had arrived by this method.
62 Fitzgerald, op. cit., p.27.
immigrants, paid the £100 poll tax on them and then deducted this from their wages. The agreement was that they would work in his gardens for five years. After paying such debts, the huaqiao were free to save to purchase a share in a market garden or other business, and remit what they could to their parents in the village. It was only when these parents announced they had saved sufficient to arrange a suitable marriage, or if this became increasingly unlikely, saved sufficient himself, could the huaqiao finally return to begin to raise a family of his own.

For the huaqiao, it was essential that the family in the village was supported and even a small amount of money in Sydney went a long way in a south China village. Despite their lower wages, the lower living costs due to the provision of board and lodging and having no family to support in Sydney meant that it was possible to remit money to the village. According to the rough estimate of the Chinese Gold Commissioners, based on what they were told by Quain Young, it cost ‘four times as much to feed a man here’, while wages were, ‘20 times as great’. It was in their assistance with this purpose that the stores played a crucial role in the life of Sydney’s huaqiao. Over time a reliable system developed for remitting money through those stores with branches or connections in Hong Kong, and from there back to the districts and villages. How this system of store-based remittances came about is described by Way Kee when he explained to the Commissioners that ‘he sent home in the same box [as his £10,000] some money from Chinamen here who wished to send to their parents or friends in China’. Such remittances were known as ‘se ling dan’ (司令单) or sterling because English pounds were used as the currency of exchange due to their stability.

63 Royal Commission, op. cit., p.27.
64 Royal Commission, op. cit., p.160, lines, 6420-35. The Poll Tax was introduced under the ‘Chinese Restriction and Regulation Act of 1888’. Price op cit. p.271, summaries this Act’s impact and those of the other colonies at this time.
65 Chen Ta, op. cit., p.131, reports that an emigrant would, ‘remain single, especially if they have failed to improve their economic status’ and p.135, that higher betrothal payments were expected of emigrant sons.
66 Royal Commission, op. cit., p.419, lines, 15566-70. This was in the late nineteenth century, by the 1930s the gap had widened even more when according to, Chen Hen-Seng, Landlord and Peasant in China – A Study of the Agrarian crisis in South China, 2nd edn, Hyperion Press, Westport, Connecticut, 1973, p.103, it took a labourer 5 days in the 1930s to earn the price of a mu of land [rice field measure] in Canada compared to 8 years in Guangdong Province.
67 Royal Commission, op. cit., p.55, line, 2126; Fitzgerald, op. cit., p. 47, refers to an early mishap which may have encouraged the use of a safer system.
68 Interview with Arthur Gar Lock Chang, 7 March 1998 (Tape 1, B, 3.33); Yong, op. cit., pp.46-7, quotes an example from the Chinese Australian Herald of these services provided by the store On Yik & Lee.
The Kwong War Chong was the Zhongshan store most used by market gardeners. It was established in 1883 in Campbell St by several partners, including Phillip Lee Chun who had come to Australia in 1874. The store moved to 84 Dixon St in 1910, where it operated as a general store and trading company until 1987. The store stocked everything the huaqiao might need, especially the type of goods they might want to take back with them to the village, such as boiled lollies, Arnott’s biscuits (Scotch Fingers and Arrowroots, rather than creams), and umbrellas. The Kwong War Chong was also a major remittance centre for Zhongshan huaqiao, though stores such as Wing On & Co. also remitted.

Nineteenth century remittances may have been taken in the form of gold, as Way Kee described, and during World War One it was the opinion of the Comptroller-General of Trade & Customs, when gold exports were limited to £50 per person, that ‘particular note of them [Chinese passengers] should be taken’. By the 1930s, bank drafts were more common and in this case a store collected the individual remittances from its customers and a standard letter was written to the family, usually by the store’s clerk as ‘they were not much letter writers’, to accompany the payment. The store charged a small commission on each remittance and consolidated all the monies into a single draft drawn on the English, Scottish and Australian Bank in pounds sterling. The draft was then sent to the Hong Kong branch of the Kwong War Chong, where it was converted to Hong Kong dollars and then into Chinese dollars for the money to be sent to Shekki. The store’s branch in Shekki then distributed the money to the families, either by their collecting it or it being delivered to the village by the firm’s clerks. A receipt, which included a letter back to the huaqiao in Sydney, would

69 Interview with Norman Lee, Sydney, 25 September 1997 (1 & 10) and Australian Archives (NSW), SP42/1; N59/3386, Kwong War Chong & Co., ‘Particulars form’, 30 October 1951.
70 The Kwong War Chong was used, for example, by Victor Gow and his father. Interview with Victor Gow, Sydney, 30 October 1997 (9). Wing On & Co. was used by Lee Man Dick, Cliff Lee’s father. Interview with Cliff Lee, Sydney, 28 September 1997 (1 & 6).
71 Australian Archives (NSW), C4203/1; Department of Custom & Excise, NSW, Boarding Branch Records of Files & Orders, 1914-31, vol.1, p.35, memo, Comptroller-General, Department of Trade & Customs to Collector of Customs, 3 March 1916.
72 Interview with Norman Lee, Sydney, 25 September 1997 (2). When the Bank of China began to take over all remittances it issued a standard letter form to accompany remittances that may well have been modelled on that created by the stores’ scribes. Such a letter had 5 points: best wishes, write more often, let me know when received, have received your letter and tell how to spend the money in another letter. Mar Letters, no.264, Bank of China notice, 5 June 1944.
be signed and returned to the shop in Dixon St, where it was set up on a rack in the front window for people to collect.\footnote{Interview with Norman Lee, Sydney, 25 September 1997 (2,3 &4).}

This remittance system was not based on contractual or legally enforceable arrangements and such informal procedures had their risks. Once a remittance customer complained that his family had not gotten their money and accused Phillip Lee Chun, Manager of the Kwong War Chong, of stealing the remittance. Phillip Lee Chun was sitting outside his shop in Dixon St one evening, ‘taking the air’ when, according to his son Norman Lee, he was suddenly struck on the head by a piece of ‘two by four’. The man later apologised when his family sent word that they had received the money.\footnote{Interview with Norman Lee, Sydney, 25 September 1997 (5).}

The amount of money remitted naturally varied with the earnings of the individual. In 1891, Chow Kum, a carpenter and furniture maker, stated that he sent £20 per year to his wife.\footnote{Royal Commission, op. cit., p.395, lines, 14333-14337.} For the family of Lee Man Dick, a Rockdale storekeeper and market garden owner, it was considered enough for his family in China to live on.\footnote{Interview with Cliff Lee, 28 September 1997 (1).} While for the family of Chang Yet, a carpenter, the income from the land of his grandmother was also necessary to make the family comfortable.\footnote{Arthur Gar Lock Chang, 7 March 1998 (Tape 1, A, 9.30).} John Louie Hoon’s family, on the other hand, was not able to buy any land with his remittances earned as a market gardener.\footnote{Interview with Billy Gay, 19 March 1998 (Tape 1, B, 200).} While Joe Wah Gow, a Wollongong store owner, was able to retire on 600 \textit{mu}, compared to Chang Yet’s 50 \textit{mu} of rice land.\footnote{Interview with Victor Gow, 30 October 1997 (5) and Arthur Gar Lock Chang, 7 March 1998 (Tape 1, A, 9.30).}

Initially remittances were sent to a \textit{huaqiao} s parents because, while district and dialect was significant to the \textit{huaqiao} in Sydney, it was fidelity to family and especially to parents that provided the most important attachment to the home village.

\footnote{Interview with Norman Lee, Sydney, 25 September 1997 (2,3 &4). Miao Wenyue & 高焕章 Gao Huanzhang, 石岐银业的同 乙 ‘Shiqi Yinyin de Huiyi’ (Recollections of the Shiqi silver industry), 中山文史 Zhongshan Wenshi (Zhongshan Cultural History), 1962-5, reprint, Special collection, 5.10.1989, pp.88-90, discusses the commissions earned between Shiqi and Hong Kong. Compare the similar descriptions of remittance services in Hawaii, Char, op. cit., p127; and Chen Ta, op. cit., p.79, the \textit{nanyang}. The Tiy Loy & Co. of the Gao Yao people in Sussex St. Sydney still has such a letter rack, though now used only for correspondence.}

\footnote{Interview with Norman Lee, Sydney, 25 September 1997 (5).}

\footnote{Royal Commission, op. cit., p.395, lines, 14333-14337.}

\footnote{Interview with Cliff Lee, 28 September 1997 (1).}

\footnote{Arthur Gar Lock Chang, 7 March 1998 (Tape 1, A, 9.30).}

\footnote{Interview with Billy Gay, 19 March 1998 (Tape 1, B, 200).}

\footnote{Interview with Victor Gow, 30 October 1997 (5) and Arthur Gar Lock Chang, 7 March 1998 (Tape 1, A, 9.30).}
The significance of parents in traditional Chinese culture is illustrated in the explanation the manager of Onyik & Lee Co. gave in 1902, to the NSW Collector of Customs as to why Tommy Way, among others, left Sydney without the Certificate authorising their return. Tommy Way, ‘like many Chinese were forced to go to their native country to visit their parents’. Numerous written references supplied by huaqiao with their applications for Certificates of Exemption from the Dictation Test (CEDT) throughout the early part of the twentieth century, refer to visiting parents as the reason for the trip.

References only later in a huaqiao’s life refer to wife and family rather than parents. Nevertheless, that it was usually after the first trip back to the home village that most Sydney huaqiao married can be surmised from the CEDT applications. Questions about a person’s family appeared from 1902 to 1905, then were removed and did not reappear on CEDT applications again until 1930. A comparison of the answers to these questions, including files that cover both these periods, reveals that 75% of huaqiao reported that they had married after their first sojourn to the village. Or to put it another way, they made their first trip back when they were ready to marry.

The decision of so many huaqiao to marry in the village was not only the result of custom and parental wish but also because of limited choice. The great imbalance between the sexes, whether created by Chinese cultural norms or European legal restrictions, imposed a basic restriction on the choices available to the huaqiao. The Commonwealth Census of 1911 records 801 Chinese out of a total male population of 21,032, living with wives in Australia and a further 6,714 were recorded to have wives in China. The places of birth of the Australian based wives were recorded as, ‘China born’ - 181, ‘England’ - 63, ‘Scot’ - 15, ‘Ireland’ – 22 and ‘Australia born’ –

---


81 Numerous references found in Australian Archives (NSW), SP42/1. As the century progresses mention of visits to parents are replaced by those to wife and family but seemingly only after the parents had died.

82 See Appendix IV, Table 7. Also, Choi, op. cit., pp.48-49, discusses marriages in Australia and China.
This last group are assumed to be ‘Chinese or mixed’, though on what basis is unclear.  

For the 13,000 in Australia and proportionally 1,900 Sydney huaqiao who were unmarried, the choice, for those who hoped to do so, was to wait until they returned to the village or to marry in Australia. Those marrying in China could leave the wife in the village or attempt to bring her to Australia. Those marrying in Australia could seek to marry one of the few Chinese or Chinese descended women in Australia, or they could marry a non-Chinese woman. There is evidence that each of these alternatives had their takers but the proportion of huaqiao that may have taken each path is difficult to determine. The majority of huaqiao had neither the status nor the money necessary to bring their wives to Australia, or were held to the traditional role of the wife as support for their own parents. For them, as the large number of wives in China show, the choice was limited to a village marriage and to maintaining that wife and the resulting family in the village.

The option to bring a wife to Australia was also limited by the 1901 Immigration Restriction Act which restricted the entry of wives to ‘merchants’ and after 1905 further reduced this option to a temporary entry only. However, this legal restriction acted more to reinforce an already existing pattern than to impose any great change. The Chinese Gambling Commissioners were told that ‘the majority of them who come here are too poor to pay the passage money for their wives’, and even Way Kee, a rich merchant, waited 22 years before bringing his wife to Sydney. Being well established first was a significant factor, as Chow Kum explained, ‘now that my business is established I would [bring his wife out] … but at the time the poll tax was low I could not afford to bring her out’.

83 Official Year Book of the Commonwealth of Australia, Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics, Melbourne, 1925, Table 10, no.18, p.956.
84 Joe Wah Gow even managed to marry an Australian born Chinese girl that he met in China, interview with Victor Gow, 30 October 1997 (3).
85 Choi, op. cit., p.49, ‘The traditional commuting system, plus the restrictive legislation, virtually forced single Chinese men wishing to marry Chinese women to return to their places of origin to marry.’
86 See, Yarwood, op. cit., pp.79-81 for a discussion of these amendments and their reasons.
87 Royal Commission, op. cit., p.58, lines, 2239–40 and p.57, line 2213.
88 Royal Commission, op. cit., p.396, line, 14400.
Those huaqiao most independent of traditional culture were also those given the most leeway by the restrictive legislation. Thus when after 1905 only the wives of merchants could enter Australia temporarily, extensions were sought to try and convert a temporary stay into a permanent one.\footnote{Wilton, op cit. pp.174-7, gives examples of strategies used to extend short-term visits for wives.} This was done in the case of Chang Wai Sheu Sing whose wife, Chun Sue Moy, entered Sydney on a temporary Certificate of Exemption in February 1927.\footnote{A ‘Certificate of Exemption’ should not be confused with a ‘Certificate Exempting from the Dictation Test’ or CEDT which was given to pre-1901 domiciles only. See Appendix III, C.} Through numerous extensions and the judicious building up of a trading firm, the couple were able to remain long enough in Sydney to be among the first Chinese to take up the right of Australian Citizenship when this was finally granted to Chinese people in 1958.\footnote{Australian Archives (NSW), SP1122/1; N57/2220, Chang Wau Sheu Sing.}

Those huaqiao that did marry in Australia, whether to Chinese, non-Chinese or women of mixed parentage, did not have the same incentive to return to the village as those with wives there. A factor that may have contributed to the choice to marry in Australia and/or not to return was that a huaqiao’s parents may have already died or contact with them lost. Sun War Hop insisted he would ‘go home to see my old father and mother’, even though with a wife and business in Sydney he would not, as the Commissioners put it, ‘give up this country’.\footnote{Royal Commission, op. cit., p.397, lines, 14424-29.} Louie Gay, a well-to-do market gardener, who married Ada, an Australian born Chinese of mixed parentage, never returned to the village despite owning land there, assisting his brothers to come to Australia and even sending one of his sons to live there for three years.\footnote{Interview with Billy Gay, 19 March 1998 (Tape 1, A, 70 & 210).} Philip Lee Chun, the manager of the Kwong War Chong, once he brought his wife to Sydney in 1903, did not return to China again until, in his 70s, he travelled to Hong Kong in 1932, where he died and from where his body was transported back to his village by junk.\footnote{Interview with Norman Lee, 25 September 1997 (1).}

Despite their greater chances of bringing a wife from China, merchants and storekeepers were also more likely to marry the few Chinese or part-Chinese women who were in Australia. While poorer huaqiao were more likely to marry, or at least live, with non-Chinese women. Perhaps because they were ‘so lonely they married
Australian girls’, as one explanation has it. The ‘intermarriage’ option was one that was disagreeable to both Chinese and European cultures throughout the period though as, the 1911 census figures indicate, a number did take this option.

Two or more wives were also possible given the Chinese tradition of wives and concubines. Just how common this practice may have been is impossible to say. The Chinese Gambling Commissioners were told that ‘Yuan Tak has two Chinese wives and children living on the rocks [sic] in great style.’ While Way Shong explained that he has one wife in China and one here because, ‘the old wife sent this one out, so that I might have children. That is the usual custom in China.’ Young Sow reported to Immigration officials in 1963 that he had three wives, one in Sydney and two in Hong Kong, a revelation noted without comment by the officials. While in 1956, William Bun applied for the admission into Australia of his wife in China soon after his Australian born wife had died.

A final ‘choice’ that an indeterminate number of huaqiao made was to neither marry nor return. Many village members who left for Australia simply ‘disappeared’ as far as their village was concerned. Sometimes family in the village might make an effort to contact them but this could easily be ignored. A rough estimate of the proportion that might fall into this category was four to five percent of the huaqiao population.

There could be many reasons why this path was taken. When Chow Kum, for example, was asked why the old don’t go back to China he replied, ‘Because they have no money. As a general rule their money has all gone in opium-smoking and gambling, and they have become too old to do anything to make any more.’ Chow Kum applied the same thinking to himself, ‘Of course if I could not make enough

---

95 Interview with Norman Lee, 25 September 1997 (7).
96 The census was recording formal marriages only. On the question of attitudes to marriage and intermarriage see, Price, op. cit., pp.108-9 & 249; and Wilton, op. cit., p.164. For a case of a Chinese father’s opposition to his daughter marrying a ‘white,’ that was well publicised in 1946, see, Australian Archives (NSW), SP1655; N54/24/3362, Gwenda Yee.
97 Concubinage was legally ended only after 1930, Choi, op. cit., p.37.
98 Royal Commission, op. cit., p.481, Appendix C.
99 Royal Commission, op. cit., p.74, lines, 2933-36.
100 Australian Archives (NSW), SP1122/1; 53/24/3495, Chan Young Sow, memo 5 June 1963.
101 Australian Archives (NSW), SP1122/1; N56/818, Yee Bun War (William Bun), application, 17 May 1956.
102 Interview with Cliff Lee, 28 September 1997 (8) & Norman Lee 25 September 1997 (7). Fitzgerald, op. cit., p.164, discusses the ‘old men’ in the 1950s and 60s, and quotes King Fong, ‘Some of the old men sold peanuts at Randwick races, in baskets once used for vegies’.
money I should have to remain here’.\textsuperscript{103} To return without money would be an admission of failure and some chose to cut all ties to the family and village rather than do so.\textsuperscript{104} For those who could not face cutting the links with their family, there was no choice other than to keep working, to repay their debts, to remit money and to await the right time to marry.

Thus far a pattern of living for the majority of huaqiao in Sydney has been identified that involved frugal living, dependence and co-operation on district stores and societies, regular remittance of savings, a long initial period in Australia, and the need to return to the village to marry. The limited recognition of rights of residence extended by the Immigration Restriction Act in 1901, in conjunction with support networks within the district communities, saw the huaqiao of Sydney in a reasonable position to return to their villages. Once, that is, hard work and thrift had enabled them to gradually save towards the point at which they could return home and marry. The following chapter will discuss how the huaqiao continued to rely on these networks as they worked and remitted money to support a wife and growing family.

\textsuperscript{103} Royal Commission, op. cit., p.395, lines, 14347-57; Yong, op. cit., Chapter 10, pp. 171-72, discusses the effect of the lack of family life; and Wilton, op. cit., pp.142-6, discusses opium and gambling in the ‘Bachelor Society’ of northern NSW.

CHAPTER 2   Holiday to his own native country to see his wife and family

Once married, free of debt and perhaps with a share in a market garden, the huaqiao were in a position to greatly increase their links with the home village. The most obvious way to do this was to visit the village, to take a ‘holiday to his own native country to see his wife and family’, ¹ as one non-Chinese individual perhaps rather innocently put it. The increased trips of the huaqiao to visit their growing family, despite the restrictions imposed by the Immigration Restriction Act, is the major feature of their middle years. The family and villages of the huaqiao are not only influenced by these visits, as China’s deteriorating political and social conditions, ranging from the threat of attacks by bandits to both civil and international war also have their effect. Efforts by the huaqiao of Sydney to bring more people into Australia, including illegal ones, are part of the developing relationship, as is a sharp decline in overall numbers. The effect of the discriminatory laws in re-enforcing some existing patterns and slowing change is seen again in the continued dependency of the huaqiao on the stores and the merchants who run them.

Chapter 2 begins by discussing the evidence for the increased frequency of trips and of the various barriers to these trips raised by the administration of the Immigration Restriction Act. These barriers are seen to range from minor bureaucratic procedures to those necessitating dependence upon the district stores and possibly, to those that effectively break the links with China for some huaqiao. The ‘illegal’ element in the links between Sydney and the villages is also examined. That side of the relationship represented by the ‘wife and family’ in the ‘native country’ is considered, including the purposes that the remittances are put to, the role of the wife in the family and the impact of the huaqiao on the village through donations. The background of social and political disruption is illustrated and the hazards for huaqiao on ‘holiday’, including bandits, are seen. Finally, alternatives that some huaqiao took, such as ceasing to travel or moving the family to Hong Kong are discussed.

¹ Australian Archives (NSW), SP1122/1; N53/24/2293, Foo Chong, reference 28 June 1924.
The average time many *huaqiao* spent in Sydney before their first trip home to the village was 10 to 20 years.\(^2\) Once this initial trip back was made, however, subsequent trips became more frequent, roughly every two to three years and lasting an average of 12 to 18 months. Occasionally, a stay in China of 7 to 10 years occurred but the frequency and length of the sojourns was generally uniform.\(^3\) One reason for the narrow range of periods spent in China was probably the fact that to stay more than 36 months required an extension to the CEDT.

In the 1930s, Billy Gay, whose father owned a large market garden on the then western edge of Sydney at Granville, knew many *huaqiao* who would, ‘go back for 12 months’ whenever they had saved £100.\(^5\) Lee Man Dick was typical of a well-to-do *huaqiao* in his sojourning. He was 11 years in Australia before his first trip back

\(^2\) See Chapter 1, Chart 2, p.24.

\(^3\) Norman Lee confirms this general pattern, interview with Norman Lee, 25 September 1997 (7). Price, op. cit., p.218, also considers 1-2 years an average stay. That such a pattern was typical of *huaqiao* elsewhere is confirmed by a description of the sojourning of the *huaqiao* of Hawaii, who also came largely from Zhongshan district. ‘Some [Chinese farmers], after a stay in their native land, returned to Hawaii, earned more money and again went home. Others took trips to China every two to three years, going back five or six times before their final return to their homeland.’ ‘They wanted to earn as much money as they could as quickly as possible and return to their native land, either to invest or to spend it…’ Char, op. cit., p.95.

\(^4\) See Appendix IV, Table 9.

\(^5\) Interview with Billy Gay, 19 March 1998 (Tape 2, A 115).
to his ‘native land’ in 1912. Thereafter he made 10 trips to his village of Jin Huan (金环), before his retirement trip in 1956, aged 75. Lee Man Dick usually stayed in the village between one and a half to two and a half years, and for slightly longer periods in his Rockdale fruit and vegetable shop.\(^6\)

![Figure 2: Lee Man Dick, a well-to-do huaqiao and his two wives. The wives remained in the village to look after the children and the land.\(^7\)](image)

*Huaqiao* such as Lee Man Dick were required to comply with the various restrictions of the Immigration Restriction Act in order to maintain links with their home villages. The consequences of these restrictions ranged from maintaining *huaqiao* dependence upon their district stores, to the possible prevention of any links when denied CEDTs before leaving or on their attempt to re-enter Australia.

The Immigration Restriction Act, as with most laws and regulations, required people to adapt or appear to adapt, their behaviour. The earliest example of such adaptations occurred when those administering the legislation began by interpreting the ‘domicile’ requirement as ‘intention to establish a permanent home’ rather than evidence of pre-1901 domicile, leading as a result to a number of early refusals to

---

\(^6\) Australian Archives (NSW), SP1122/1; N53/24/2504, Lee Man Dick (Man Duck) and interview with Cliff Lee, 28 September 1997 (1).

\(^7\) Photo in possession of the writer. Taken with the permission of Cliff Lee, Jin Huan village, Zhongshan January 1998.
grant Certificates of Domicile. William Wong Gip was refused a certificate in June 1902 because he ‘has a wife and son in China and therefore does not come within the lines laid down to qualify him for a Certificate of Domicile’. This interpretation quickly became known among the *huaqiao* and by May 1902 ‘it was understood that permits would not be granted to Chinese gardeners’. However, this interpretation on the part of officials and its even more extreme interpretation among *huaqiao* gardeners themselves, seems to have rapidly altered. In November 1902, a Department of External Affairs minute referred to 5 years residence and a settled business as a ‘general rule’. Complaints by the shipping companies at the loss of passengers and protests by the *huaqiao* themselves may have influenced this decision. Whatever the reason, by February 1903, War Sing, a cook with substantial liquid assets but no property, was granted a certificate even before his efforts to purchase property had been made known to the Collector of Customs through his solicitor.

Within a few years of the Act’s commencement this interpretation had relaxed to the extent that Tommy Way, who had no CEDT, could be granted ‘admission on being identified’. Ah Way, a Fairfield market gardener, was also permitted to return without a Certificate of Domicile after an absence of eight years when Joe Que wrote

---

8 Yarwood says this is because the Immigration Restriction Act had always been designed to be based on ‘administrative techniques’ and this required the administrators to look to the debates rather than the wording of the Act itself. In addition, the ALP used its influence to ensure that administration of the Act was tight. See, Yarwood, op. cit., pp.22-3, and pp.68-70, where he discusses the early interpretation of the Act. See also Appendix III, C for a summary of the basic CEDT procedures.

9 Australian Archives (NSW), SP42/1; C1902/4116, William Wong Gip, report by J. T. T. Donohoe, 13 June 1902.

10 Australian Archives (NSW), SP42/1; C1903/5280, Tommy Way, letter, manager Onyik Lee & Co. to Collector of Customs, 25 May 1902. Tommy Way was applying to re-enter Australia without a Certificate of Domicile and the manager of Onyik Lee & Co. wrote a letter explaining why he, and others, had not applied on departure.

11 Australian Archives (ACT), A1; 1903/3081, Instructions re: Certificate of Domiciles, minute, 26 November 1902.

12 See, ‘Chinese delegation to the Prime Minister’, *Daily Telegraph*, 30 December 1902, for an example of this. Yarwood, op. cit., pp.69-70, considers the March 1903 suspension of the wives exemption to have allowed a more relaxed attitude to the domiciles.

13 Australian Archives (NSW), SP42/1; C1903/903, War Sing, letter, Braye & Cohen to Collector of Customs, 6 February 1903.
on his behalf to explain that ‘he was unfortunately unaware how to obtain the permit to allow him to return’.15 A relatively relaxed attitude to such matters was essential if the links with the home villages were to be maintained and the huaqiao were not forced to choose between the income they could earn and their families in China.16

The small amount of leeway allowed by the administrators of the Act was contingent, as far as ‘White Australia’ was concerned, upon the total Chinese population of Australia falling. The status quo, which included huaqiao travelling, created by the Act and its administrators was dependent on such a fall being the case. In 1908, the Act’s administrators, concerned to know whether Sydney’s Chinese population was falling, undertook a ‘Check on importation of Chinese Goods’. It was reported that, ‘so far at any rate as this test may be relied upon, … the Chinese population of this State is certainly not on the increase’.17 Similarly, the 1925 Commonwealth Year Book contained a special section on the ‘Chinese in Australia’ which reported with satisfaction that, ‘as only 2,026 of the 17,157 Chinese recorded in 1921 were born in this country, the decrease is likely to continue’.18

While the bulk of huaqiao who wished to apparently were able to do so, the

---

14 Australian Archives (NSW), SP42/1; C1903/5280, Tommy Way, letter, manager Onyik Lee & Co. to Collector of Customs, 25 May 1902.
15 Australian Archives (NSW), SP42/1; C31/1130, Ah Way, letter, Joe Que to Collector of Customs, 6 November 1910.
16 Not that the administrators of the Immigration Restriction Act did not continue to be zealous in their work. When a ship’s crewman suffered a mental illness and was placed in Callen Park Hospital it was considered, ‘desirable to issue a Certificate of Exemption, which may be renewed from time to time, so that in the event of the patient recovering he may be required to leave the Commonwealth’. Australian Archives (NSW), A1026; Correspondence re Immigration Act 1904-12, vol. 2, p.34, letter Acting Collector of Customs to Master of Lunacy, Supreme Court, 22 January 1907.
17 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 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)’.
18 Official Year Book of the Commonwealth of Australia, no.18, 1925, Section 14, ‘Chinese in Australia’, pp.951-956. See Appendix 1, Table 1 for figures from the nineteenth century to 1947.
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.\textsuperscript{19} Kee Sun, for example, was refused a certificate because his Pitt St Tobacconist Shop was a well known gambling establishment.\textsuperscript{20} 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’.\textsuperscript{21} It was presumably the assumption that \textit{huaqiao} with such undesirable characters would wish to leave Australia eventually and should not be able to return. It was just as likely, perhaps, that settlement in Australia was encouraged by weakening the links \textit{huaqiao} such as Kee Sun or She Jin had with their home districts.

The link could be more directly broken by a \textit{huaqiao} being refused entry on return to Sydney. Harry Chun Fook, known as ‘K.M.T. basher’,\textsuperscript{22} 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…’\textsuperscript{23} Chong Dye also had a non-Chinese wife in Australia when he was refused both re-entry and permission to land. The reason for the refusal was

\textsuperscript{19} Palfreeman, op. cit., p.6, refers to the removal of ‘statutory sanctions’ in 1905 and the continuance of domicile returns without them.
\textsuperscript{20} Australian Archives (NSW), SP42/1; C1903/1577, Kee Sun, report, 28 February 1903.
\textsuperscript{21} 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.
\textsuperscript{22} ‘He has assaulted by means of a knuckle duster, other Chinese who held opposite political views to those of the Kuo Ming Tang.’ Australian Archives (NSW), SP1122/1; C33/7368, Harry Chun Fook, report, Investigating Officer to Boarding Inspector, 19 September 1933.
\textsuperscript{23} Australian Archives (NSW), SP1122/1; C33/7368, Harry Chun Fook, letter, Secretary to Collector of Customs, 4 September 1933.
coyly explained to the Rev T. O. Todd, who had written a letter of support, to be ‘owing to the unsatisfactory nature’ of his calling.24

People could also be refused re-entry and their chances of earning money to support their families lost on such grounds as in Yet Hing’s case, that his photo did not look like him, or Yook Fong’s, when all references by Chinese people as to his identity were refused.25 ‘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.26 Identification was even more difficult when the only picture available was of a huaqiao as a baby. In the case of 18 year old Norman Charles Aubrey Mar Young, it took the combined statutory declarations of his father, several friends and finally his grandmother, who was European, before he was allowed to enter free of a £100 bond.27

A further restriction to a huaqiao’s ‘holiday’ was the limited validity of the CEDT. While the 36 month limit to the CEDT was more generous than the nine months granted under NSW’s 1881 Act, the limitation still caused difficulties when a sojourn was prolonged by the illness or death of parents or other circumstances.28 Ah Yaut or Jow Kue29 needed to apply for re-entry into Australia in 1907 after having been away five years. Ah Yaut did what many thousands of huaqiao did subsequently, he wrote to a store in Sydney, in this case Ben Hing & Co., and requested the manager to

---

24 Australian Archives (NSW), A1026; Correspondence re Immigration Act 1904-12, vol.1, p.67, letter, Collector of Customs to Rev T.O. Todd, 7 February 1906.
25 Australian Archives (NSW), SP42/1; C11/1113, Yet Hing & C1913/7010, Yook Fong.
26 Australian Archives (NSW), SP42/1; C19/7011, William Ah Ping, memo, 8 September 1919.
27 Australian Archives (NSW), SP42/1; C20/1147, Norman Charles Aubrey Mar Young.
28 ‘The Influx of Chinese Restriction Act of 1881’. See, Australian Archives (NSW), SP115/10; Certificates of Residence 1862-1886, Ung Hoe 1885 (1002), for a certificate issued under this Act.
29 See Appendix I regarding Chinese names.
negotiate with NSW Customs on his behalf. A request was made for further evidence and Ah Yaut wrote explaining how his father, then mother became ill, then how his father died and finally his mother. Ah Yaut was given a letter, via Ben Hing & Co., to enable him to purchase his steamer ticket in Hong Kong and then to land in Sydney, where he would be identified and a CEDT extension granted retrospectively. The issue of such letters and retrospective CEDT’s became standard practice by the 1920s, while requests for further evidence were dispensed with.

Such administrative procedures seemingly did no more than impose on people the necessity for much letter writing, waiting and a re-enforced dependence upon their district stores. It is not known, however, how many huaqiao were discouraged from applying at all, nor what anxiety or hardship was caused. Also, since the evidence about extensions is from the files of those who continued to travel between Australia and China, it must underestimate the numbers of those who were denied extensions while making it seem that all requests for extensions were granted. Without a record of rejections, for which therefore no file was created, it is impossible to estimate how many people were denied re-entry.

---

30 Australian Archives SP42/1; C29/40, Jow Kue, Ah Yaut, letter, Ben Hing to the Collector of Customs, 12 May 1907. It was a common practice for Chinese firms to sign a letter with the company name regardless of the name of the actual manager writing the letter.

31 Australian Archives (NSW), SP42/1; C29/40, Jow Kue, Ah Yaut.
Figure 3: Ah Yaut obtained one of the first Certificates of Domicile issued in 1903 in Sydney. These were replaced around 1907 with CEDTs (see p.18).  

While some people may have been discouraged by the Act’s requirements, others were prepared to defy it entirely. Officials were more concerned with this perspective and it was their belief that not only had people entered Australia illegally but that they would try to pass themselves off as pre-1901 ‘domiciles’, even to the
extent of attempting a return visit to China. Officials were warned that, ‘Particular care is desirable when comparatively young looking Chinese (who may claim to be over 40, but look younger) state that they have been in Australia since prior to December, 1901 and have not since been absent.’

When Ah Moy and Yum Leong applied to make their first trips back to China after 31 and 46 years respectively in Australia, officials suspected that they had entered illegally after 1901 and were posing as ‘domiciles’. Whatever the reasons that made each wish to go to China after such a long period, they were urgent enough that both left without CEDTs. Both, however, returned and were able to convince officials that they were in fact pre-1901 ‘domiciles’ and allowed to re-enter. Whether or not illegal entrants would have dared to take such risks is difficult to say, but that officials believed some huaqiao might try is demonstrated by their behaviour in these cases.

The purchase of false Naturalisations and CEDTs was one of many illegal methods used to enter Australia as, for example, when Ah Shing confessed to paying £25 in Hong Kong to purchase NSW Naturalisation papers. Corrupt officials supplying false identification as a returned domicile was another method. More common, however, were deserters, such as Jee Kwong, who left his ship and was caught and deported in 1903, or Lois Poy who received 8 weeks gaol for desertion plus one week as an illegal immigrant before being deported in 1911. Chan Chee was perhaps too determined. He was caught and returned to his ship from which he, ‘jumped

---

32 Australian Archives (NSW), SP42/1; C29/40 Jow Kue.
33 Australian Archives (NSW), C4203/1; Boarding Branch Records, 1914-1931, vol.2, p.353, Circular, Secretary to Collector of Customs, 25 February 1924.
34 Australian Archives (NSW), SP1122/1; N52/24/314, Ah Moy (Mhoy) and SP42/1; C47/2468, Yum Leong.
35 Australian Archives (NSW), SP42/1; C13/1663, statement and papers in case of five people rejected for entry, record of interview of Ah Shing, 31 March 1913.
36 Australian Archives (NSW), SP1122/1; N53/24/2343, Ah Tom, memo re number of blank CEDTs stolen by Departmental Officer, 3 August 1953; also Yarwood, op. cit., p.62, refers to evidence of Customs officials involvement in illegal entry.
37 Australian Archives (NSW), SP42/1; C1903/1980, Jee Kwong & C11/703, Lois Poy. According to Yarwood, op. cit., p.54, NSW was a ‘haven’ for Chinese deserters, and pp.56-57, gives figures for 1914 that 77 of 81 deserters were in NSW due to ships staying longer in Sydney and the greater number of Chinese there making hiding easier.
overboard, the *St. Albans* being then about 1 mile from Sydney Heads, and it is believed was drowned’. 38

The method that seems to have added to Sydney’s *huaqiao* population more than any other was the smuggling of people on board ships.39 These were usually part of an organised effort that included crew members and the planning of people in both Hong Kong and Sydney. The prospective *huaqiao* were concealed in such places as coal bunkers and water tanks, and as these last were inside the ‘Chinese passengers quarters’, returning *huaqiao* presumably knew all about this alternative method of emigration.40 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.41

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, that the £80 cost was divided between the ‘shipper’ in Hong Kong and the ‘assistant’ in Australia, and how the crews of the ‘E.&A.line’42 were the worst and had at one time built a space in the ‘Melbourne cargo’ to conceal stowaways. Payment methods were, ‘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

38  Australian Archives (NSW), SP42/1; C11/392, Crew Muster Report, memo, Boarding Inspector to Collector of Customs, Brisbane, 21 January 1911.
39  Between 1926 and 1929, 400 people were deported as stowaways, Fitzgerald, op. cit., p.32.
40  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.
41  Australian Archives (NSW), A1026; Correspondence re Immigration Act 1904-12, vol. 3, p.347, report, ‘Chinese Goods - Check on Importations’, Revenue Detective Inspector to the Acting Collector of Customs, 5 June 1908; Yarwood, op. cit., pp.56-62, also details efforts to catch stowaways.
42  The Eastern and Australiasian Line.
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’. All this was in 1906-8, but stowaways were still being reported arriving in Sydney in the 1950s and 1960s off ships such as the Changsha.

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.

Getting caught was usually a matter of being informed on. 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 they were detained by Customs Officers, ‘acting on certain information’. They were both given the Dictation Test at the Customs House, Sydney and deported. Their ‘tests’ were blank, apart from their signatures. The informer in this case needed to write to the Collector of Customs.

---

44 Australian Archives (NSW), C3939/2; N1962/75101, ‘Summary and statistics of activities associated with illegals or prohibited Chinese immigrants in NSW’.
45 Australian Archives (NSW), SP740/1; NN George Gay & Lee Bung Yee, bonds, 15 March 1923.
46 Whatever the reason for informers, if discovered it would be unlikely they would be welcomed. Certainly George Mook considered it ‘a serious thing’ when Leong Hoi Cheng, a deportee he interpreted for, accused him of being one. Australian Archives, (NSW), SP1122/1; C47/2352, Leong Hoi Cheng, letter, George Mook to the Collector of Customs, Newcastle, 14 December 1944.
47 The Dictation Test, due to successful legal challenges, needed to be carefully administered. A 1927 instruction explained such details as the use of an interpreter to explain what was required, the possibility of authorising an outside person to give the test in the language chosen, the necessity of reading the whole passage at dictation speed even if the person makes no attempt to write, and the fact that it was not allowable to abandon a test started in a language that the person unexpectedly looked like passing. Australian Archives (NSW), C4203/1; Boarding Branch
twice in order to claim her £10 reward per person. Kwok Yen Fong was similarly informed on after successfully remaining in Australia from 1915 to 1933 and having, ‘deliberately scarred the tips of his fingers’ to escape identification. He continued to show a high level of determination to remain in Australia and managed to escape the Customs Officers. As his file ends at this point, it can only be assumed that Kwok Yen Fong was able to remain in Australia.

The organisation of the various methods of illegal entry, the assistance for those who were caught and the silence of those who knew are all elements of the link between Sydney and south China. A link that was stronger than fears of the legal, and in some cases personal, risks.

Sydney’s role as the main access point for illegal entrants emphasises the fact that it was a port and that the Sydney – south China connection at this time was dependent on shipping. Throughout the period, the journeys between Sydney and South China were usually provided by two companies which operated two ships each between Sydney and ‘all ports’ to either Hong Kong or Yokohama. This meant an average of two ships per month and a trip of about three weeks between Sydney and Hong Kong. For Zhongshan huaqiao at least, the rest of the journey was relatively short, by smaller craft across the Pearl River Delta and then by boat or on foot to and from their villages.

At the beginning of the century, shipping companies such as the Eastern and Orient Line and the Taishan Maru operated the St Albans and The Empire. Later, the Japanese line was replaced by the Eastern and Australian Steamship Co. and the huaqiao continued their journeys on ships such as the Taiping, the Tanda and the Changte. These ships were much smaller than those used on the European routes.

---

48 Australian Archives (NSW), SP42/1; C33/6955, Lum Bow, Lee Fook.
49 Australian Archives (NSW), SP42/1; C33/7556, Kwok Yen Fong, memo, Detective Inspector to Boarding Inspector, 15 August 1933.
50 See Appendix IV, Table 11 for ship departures from Sydney for 1929.
One of the larger ships on the run, the *Tanda* was 6956 tons and was licensed to carry 258 passengers. In comparison, the *Orion*, which went to Europe via the Suez Canal, was 23,371 tons and carried over 400 passengers.\(^{51}\)

In 1921, the ‘Deck class passage money’ on an Eastern and Australian Steamship Co. ship to Hong Kong was £5/10/-\(^{52}\). In addition to the cost of passage, the CEDT itself cost £1. For a market gardener this was about 3 weeks’ wages for the ticket, and at least half a week’s wage for the CEDT.\(^{53}\) Including the loss of income while away, this meant that these journeys were an expensive, though necessary, activity for the *huaqiao* if links to the family and village were to be established and maintained.

*Huaqiao* usually travelled third class or steerage, though 2nd class passage was purchased by merchants and wealthier market gardeners and those travelling with wives and children. People of Chinese origin rarely travelled 1st class in the first half of the twentieth century in these European run ships.\(^{54}\) In ships such as the *Changte*, ‘steerage’ was literally the cargo hold,\(^{55}\) while in the *Nanjing*, ‘Special attention will be paid to the accommodation for the Chinese third-class passengers, which will .... [have] full provision for ventilation and electric fans.’\(^{56}\) All Chinese travelling together did have the advantage at least that the meals served would be Chinese.\(^{57}\)

The purchase of steamship tickets was another matter handled by the stores, not only in Sydney but also Hong Kong.\(^{58}\) In this, as in so many matters, the average *huaqiao* had little choice. Shipping agents at the end of the nineteenth century such as Mr Alfred Low preferred not to have to deal with the *huaqiao* directly. He agreed with

---

51 Australian Archives (NSW), SP1148/2; Passenger lists, Outgoing 1929 & 1939.
52 Australian Archives (NSW), SP42/1; C33/7574, Ah Lee, letter, Eastern and Australian Steamship Co. to the Collector of Customs, 30 June 1921.
53 Billy Gay estimated that £1 per week in the 1930s was a ‘good wage’ for a market gardener. Interview with Billy Gay, 19 March 1998 (Tape 2, A, 115).
54 Australian Archives (NSW), SP1148/2; Passenger lists, Outward 1902, 1929 & 1939.
55 Interview with Arthur Gar Lock Chang, Sydney, 7 March 1998 (Tape 2, B, 150).
56 Noel Butlin Archives Centre (ANU); Deposit E217/628, Shipowners Chamber, Newspaper cuttings, p.142, Age clipping, 25 February 1931.
57 Interview with Arthur Gar Lock Chang, Sydney, 7 March 1998 (Tape 2, B, 9.00).
58 Interview with Billy Gay, Sydney, 19 March 1998 (Tape 1, B, 200) & Arthur Gar Lock Chang.
the Chinese Gambling Commissioners that ‘if an ordinary Chinamen came to book a passage they would refuse to take his money; he would have to book through a Chinese merchant’.59

The Immigration Restriction Act continued this approach and extended it to Hong Kong and beyond. It did this was by fining a Shipping Company £100 for every illegal immigrant carried to an Australia port. The result was that Chinese people in Hong Kong could not purchase a ticket to Australia without either a valid CEDT or a letter from the Collector of Customs stating that they would be admitted, ‘on being satisfactorily identified’. Ah Tong, when he reported that his CEDT had been stolen, needed such a letter before he could return to Sydney, all negotiated via a Sydney store.60

Arrangements necessary to comply with these restrictions appears in the practice, of Zhongshan huaqiao at least, of surrendering their CEDTs so that agents could purchase steamer tickets for them. Nearly all the third class passengers on the Arafura when it steamed into Sydney in May 1929 had their CEDTs marked 雪梨 [Sydney] on the back, along with the name of the store or agent who arranged the passage, such as 光和丰 (Kwong War Fong) the Hong Kong branch of Philip Lee Chun’s Kwong War Chong of Dixon St Sydney.61

The stores were able to play this role in buying tickets due to their knowledge of European ways, their ability to communicate in English and the capacity of the managers and merchant’s class position to override, to some extent at least, racial bias. The huaqiao continued therefore to be dependent upon the stores for all aspects of their dealings with the Act, including filling in forms and answering questions.

59 Royal Commission, op. cit., p.99, lines, 3982-83.
60 Australian Archives (NSW), SP42/1; C11/1161, Ah Tong.
61 Australian Archives (NSW), SP115/1; Taiping 2/6/29 & Arafura 30/5/29. Huaqiao from districts other than Zhongshan did not necessarily operate in the same manner. When the Taiping arrived in Sydney in August 1929, the CEDTs of its 29 huaqiao steerage passengers were unmarked, by Chinese characters or anything else, Australian Archives (NSW), SP115/1; Taiping, 4/8/29.
When Tarm Hew, a vegetable hawker of Botany, was questioned on a discrepancy in his applications, he could only plead that the ‘person who filled in my present application … must have misunderstood me’.  

Despite the various difficulties and costs created by the Act, tens of thousands of huaqiao trips were made and those who returned to their villages were expected to bring gifts and to display some of the success they were experiencing in foreign lands. A shopping visit to a local trading store such as the Kwong War Chong or to Anthony Horden & Sons, was therefore necessary before taking ship. Items purchased included such gifts as Arnott’s biscuits and boiled lollies, and necessities such as guns, leather shoes and in at least one instance, an Ajax safe. Arthur Chang remembers the ‘biscuits from the new gold mountain’ bought at Anthony Horden and a bird cage his father made from a tea chest in order to hold a rosella he brought back from Australia.

![Figure 4: Safe sitting abandoned in a corner of Lee Man Dicks house. One of many items huaqiao regularly brought with them to the villages. On the name plate can be read where it was purchased.](image)

Sojourns home often resulted in gifts to the family of another kind - children. An event most huaqiao would hear about only after they had returned to Sydney. The new child would not usually see its father until it was a few years old and this delay

---

62 Australian Archives (NSW), SP42/1; C13/639, Tarm Hew, note of interview, 7 February 1913.
63 Interview with Cliff Lee, 28 September 1997 (3).
64 Interview with Arthur Chang, 7 March 1998 (Tape 2, A, 3.22) & Cliff Lee, 28 September 1997 (7).
65 Photo in possession of the writer. Taken with permission of Cliff Lee, Jin Huan village, Zhongshan, January 1998.
was common enough to have produced, in one Zhongshan village at least, a ‘tradition’ that on the father’s return to the village the ‘unmet’ child was hidden until everyone else had been greeted and only then introduced.\footnote{Interview with Arthur Gar Lock Chang, 7 March 1998 (Tape 1, A, 4.00)} The coinciding of a sojourn in the village with the birth of a child was so common that officials would request the date of all trips or query ‘Was he in China about the time of birth,’ before proceeding with an application that involved sponsoring children such as that for a student exemption.\footnote{Australian Archives (NSW), SP42/1; C31/980, Wong Yong, file note, 2 January 1930.}

The links with the family and village of the huaqiao throughout the middle years of their life involved more than purchasing a steamer ticket once every so many years and visiting with gifts or conceiving children. The presence and contribution of the huaqiao extended beyond the times when they were physically ‘holidaying’ in the village. This was because the underpinning of the relationship between Sydney and the villages was the capacity to earn more money in Australia than was possible in the villages or in China generally. The money sent back and the uses to which it was put were material evidence of their hard working contribution to the family and the village.

Life in Australia for those huaqiao with continuing links was therefore about earning money and to the majority of rice farming huaqiao this meant buying land, considered the most prestigious way to hold wealth. The exchange value between what could be earned in Australia and purchased in south China meant that a relatively poor market gardener in Sydney could purchase sufficient land in his village to make his family very well off.\footnote{See Chapter 1, p.25 and n.66 for a comparison of earnings in Sydney, Canada and China about 1890 and 1930.} The proportion of huaqiao who were successful in buying land and the proportion who, like John Louie Hoon, were unable to provide for their families in this way, is not possible to determine from Australian sources alone. However a survey of south China villages taken in the 1930s found up to 90% of farmers to be

\footnotetext[66]{Interview with Arthur Gar Lock Chang, 7 March 1998 (Tape 1, A, 4.00)}
\footnotetext[67]{Australian Archives (NSW), SP42/1; C31/980, Wong Yong, file note, 2 January 1930.}
\footnotetext[68]{See Chapter 1, p.25 and n.66 for a comparison of earnings in Sydney, Canada and China about 1890 and 1930.}
tenants and that one impact of huqiao remittances was to increase land prices as the huqiao bought more land. The huqiao's large scale investment in land contributed to a spiral of rising land prices and rents which in turn led to debts and the loss of land for those, including presumably poorer huqiao, who could not keep up.69

The land purchased was not farmed by the family directly but instead was rented out, possibly to relatives and certainly to fellow villagers.70 Rent could be paid in cash or as a share of the rice crop and then sold on the highly speculative rice market.71 Arthur Chang’s grandmother received her rent in traditional silver cash, while Cliff Lee’s mother collected her rent in kind.72 The handling of the family’s affairs, such as deposits on land, rent collection and payment of taxes, was usually in the hands of the wife.73

Life in the village for the wife and family could be harsh, with health hazards such as the plague, smallpox and cholera being common well into the twentieth century.74 Opium, prostitution, gambling and syphilis were also part of village life and according to some researchers more likely to be present due to huqiao remittances. Analysis of the role of clan elite’s has revealed that they attempted to gather some of the remittance money of the huqiao by demanding money for ‘protection’ and controlling gambling, opium houses and prostitution.75

---

69 Chen Hen-Seng, op. cit., p.3, 18 & 62, for the impact on land prices of overseas remittances and pp.87-96, on peasant loss of land due to debt. Also Chen Ta, op. cit., p.18, 62, 67 & pp.84-5.
70 Chen Hen-Seng, op. cit., pp.22, 47-8, on the higher incidence of sub-renting in Chungshan (Zhongshan) and other districts; Faure, op. cit., p.205, discusses the complexities of the landlord/tenant relationships.
71 Chen Hen-Seng, op. cit., p.48, on speculation in rice.
72 Interview with Arthur Gar Lock Chang, 28 October 1997 (Tape 1, A, 12.00) & Cliff Lee, Zhongshan, 7 January 1998; Chen Hen-Seng, op. cit., p.54, reports that cash rents were more common in Zhongshan than most other districts.
73 Chen Ta, op. cit., p.121, gives examples of families and the role of the wife ‘acting head of the family’ while the husband was overseas; Chen Hen-Seng, op. cit., pp.46-8, on leasing details, such as deposits and sub-tenants.
74 Chen Ta, op. cit., pp.175-182, analyses the prevalence of these diseases in the villages of south China.
75 Chen Ta, op. cit., pp.187-192 describes the relationship of these habits with ‘emigrant communities’; Zheng Dehua, Shijiu shiji mo Taishan qiaoxiang de xingcheng ji qi pouxi (A analysis of the formation of ‘Shijiu shiji mo Taishan qiaoxiang de xingcheng ji qi pouxi’) (A analysis of the formation of...
Nevertheless, for those with land, life in the village could be comfortable. Not all, however, owned land or could save sufficient from their remittances to purchase it. Many families were dependent on remittances for their basic survival and they had little left over for improving their status or long-term prospects. By the 1930s, dependence on remittances seems to have been high in the villages of south China, with the money being spent on food, home, education and ancestors, in that order.76

A high level of dependence meant that if the flow of remittances to the family was threatened or broken the result could be the destruction of the family in China or the isolation of the individual in Australia. Chang Yet lost his left thumb when working as a Cabinet maker in 1925, resulting in remittances to his family ceasing for many months and his family fearing the worst. He was fortunate in that he received £25 compensation and was able to continue to earn a living.77 How many were not so fortunate is difficult to know.

The regular flow of remittances into those villages with a significant huaqiao element was the norm, however, and the most conspicuous impact on such villages was the building of new and bigger houses by the huahu.78 Such a house might include a distinctive ‘tower’,79 such as Lee Man Dick and many huaqiao built as an

---

76 Chen Ta, op. cit., Table 5, pp.82-85, shows among a survey of emigrant families that 75% to 85% of family income was from remittances. Also 林美枝 Lin Qinzhi, 从族群资料看闽粤人民移居海外的活动及其对家乡的贡献‘Cong zupu ziliao kan min yue renmin yiju haiwai de huodong ji qi dui jiaxiang de gongxian’ (A look at clan records to see the overseas activities of Fujian and Guangdong people and their contribution to their hometowns), 华侨华人历史研究 Huaqiao huaren lishi yanjiu (Overseas Chinese history researches), no.1, 1991, pp.16-21. It should be remembered that the huaqiao and emigration were not the concern of the majority of the population of Guangdong, Chen Hen-Seng, op. cit., pp.110-111, has calculated that in the 1920s and 30s more peasants left their villages to join the 19th Route Army than emigrated.

77 Interview with Arthur Gar Lock Chang, Sydney, 7 March 1998 (Tape 1, A, 14.00).

78 华户, the families of huaqiao in the villages.

79 See Figure 6, p.57.
addition to a more traditional house, or a totally ‘foreign’ house built by wealthy
huaqiao like the Kwoks or Joe Wah Gow.\textsuperscript{80} In either case, the contrast with the
smaller and more traditional houses in a village was unmistakable.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{image}
\caption{Joe Wah Gow’s house clearly dominates his village of Long Tou Wan.\textsuperscript{81}}
\end{figure}

Village and clan loyalty demanded that more be done than just support the immediate
family and as huaqiao successfully established businesses and became more financially
comfortable, their donations to the villages played an important role in huaqiao
districts.\textsuperscript{82} The impact of huaqiao donations on Long Tou Wan (長頭灣), the village
of Joe Wah Gow, included the building of the ‘Joe Song’ school with donations from
Joe Song, an American huaqiao (responsible for the ‘Dollar’ stores in North
America), as well as donations from Joe Wah Gow and others.\textsuperscript{83} Apart from schools,
Long Tou Wang was considered exceptional in having electricity derived from the

\textsuperscript{80} The Kwoks established the now multinational Wing On Co.
\textsuperscript{81} Photo courtesy of Victor Gow. Taken in the 1960s, Long Tou Wan village, Zhongshan.
\textsuperscript{82} Chen Ta, op. cit., pp.46-49, on donations, and pp.192-4, refers to the impact of the huaqiao in
terms of ideas and innovations, particularly in such areas as education and the adoption of sports
such as soccer.
\textsuperscript{83} Victor Gow, 30 October 1997 (4). Chen Ta, op. cit., pp.149-60, on the importance and role of
education & pp.162-166, on the financial arrangements of huaqiao organised schools; Choy, op.
cit., pp.257-60, on the history of one huaqiao clan’s support for schools from the mid-19th century
and the tendency of their educated members to go into business rather than complete their degrees
in the 19th century; and Yu Renqiu, ‘Chinese American Contributions to the Educational
Development of Toisan 1910-1940’, Amerasia Journal 10/1, 1983, pp.47-72, for an overview of
Taishan huaqiao s contribution to their districts education.
rice mill generator which ran an electric water pump. The village also had a covered canal for drainage and a free medical clinic started by Joe Wah Gow and funded with the donations of other *huaqiao*. Arthur Chang remembers a tree being cut down to build a school in his village of Long Hee (隆圩), made possible largely with donations from *huaqiao* in Hawaii. Norman Lee remembers his father donating money for a village bridge. The village of Zhuxiu Yuan (竹秀园), from which the founders of Wing On Company came, was well known to have had running water before most.

Donations successfully established schools and other village infrastructure. Money in the form of business investments in the home districts was not always so successful. The Kwong War Chong’s branches in both Hong Kong and Shekki are examples of some degree of financial success. In 1924 two Sydney *huaqiao* established the Xiangshan Bank in Shekki which collapsed after two years operation. Lee Yip Fay returned to Sydney in 1928 after a lengthy time spent trying to, ‘float The Chosen Co. of Hongkong, Canton and Shakee [Shekki], General Importers and Exporters’ of which he was the Manager of the ‘Shakee Branch’. Lee Yip Fay reported in words that convey a sense of the personal hardships some *huaqiao* endured that, ‘our Chinese internal trouble caused us no end of worry and suffered heavy losses and was continually harassed in business and my ambitions were scattered, so much so, ….

---

84 Victor Gow, 30 October 1997 (4). One of Joe Wah Gow’s daughters became a doctor and she and her doctor husband currently run a weekend clinic in the village. They plan to convert the house built by Joe Wah Gow into a new clinic for the village.
85 Interview with Arthur Gar Lock Chang, 7 March 1998 (Tape 1, B, 9.00).
86 Interview with Norman Lee, 25 September 1997 (13).
87 Interview with Cliff Lee, 28 September 1997 (7).
88 茅文蔚 & 高焕章《石岐银业的回忆‘Shiqi Yinye de Huiyi’ (Recollections of the Shiqi silver industry), 中山文史Zhongshan Wenshi (Zhongshan Cultural History), 1990, p.19, mentions support from Philip Kwok, the Wing On founder, to his home village in 1921. 茅文蔚 & 高焕章《石岐银业的回忆‘Shiqi Yinye de Huiyi’ (Recollections of the Shiqi silver industry), 中山文史Zhongshan Wenshi (Zhongshan Cultural History), 1989, p.93 and 高民川 Gao Minchuan, op. cit., p.21.
amounted to an ordeal …\textsuperscript{89} The impact of the success of such investments on the links between Sydney and south China, had economic and political circumstances been more congenial, can only be a matter of speculation. Lee Yip Fay was trying to encourage officials to make his temporary admission to Australia permanent, nevertheless, he may not have been exaggerating too much when he wrote, ‘had my plans succeeded, I am confident that I would have been instrumental in opening up new avenues for the exchange of trade with Australia …’\textsuperscript{90}

The social disorder in Zhongshan district alluded to by Lee Yip Fay not only limited economic opportunities but was a dramatic background to the life of the ‘wife and family’ in the ‘native country’. In the late nineteenth century and through the first half of the twentieth century these social disorders included numerous attempted anti-Qing Dynasty and republican uprisings, disputes with the Portuguese enclave of Macao, the destruction of tax offices, communist uprisings, land reform movements, provincial border wars, and most commonly and most likely to impact upon even the most isolated villages, bandit attacks.\textsuperscript{91}

The threat of ‘bandits’, usually landless peasants and former soldiers living in the hills

\textsuperscript{89} Australian Archives (NSW), SP42/1; C31/135, Lee Yip Fay, letter, Lee Yip Fay to Collector of Customs, 15 May 1928; Chen Ta, op. cit., p.20, quotes a report on the increase in \textit{nanyang huaqiao} investment in their home districts after 1911 and the general failure of these investments due to ‘disturbances’, and pp.75-76, on the later preference for keeping capital elsewhere due to China’s instability.

\textsuperscript{90} Australian Archives (NSW), SP42/1; C31/135, Lee Yip Fay, letter, Lee Yip Fay to Collector of Customs, 15 May 1928.

\textsuperscript{91} See Rhoads, op. cit., p.40, for the 1895 republican uprising in Zhongshan involving Sun Yat-sen, pp.146-7, for the 1905-10 dispute with Macao, p.176, for the 1910 riot and destruction of a tax office in Shekki and pp.257-61, for the 1912-13 land equalisation reform in Guangdong and its suppression; Chen Ta, op. cit., p.162, on the military conflict in 1923 between Guangdong and Fujian provinces and p.224, on bandits and communist uprisings generally; Choi, op. cit., p.8, for the ‘Farmer’s Movement’ in the 1920s; Helen Siu, ‘Subverting Lineage Power, op. cit., p.195, for attacks on Shekki by bandit ‘fleets’ in 1915 and 1922; Chen Hen-Seng, op. cit., pp.xiii-ix, on military based landlords and the rise in taxes, rents and land prices in the 1920-30s.
and mountains, was a perennial one in Chinese history.\textsuperscript{92} However, after the collapse of the Qing Dynasty and the failure of the new Republic to maintain law and order, the threat from bandits greatly increased.\textsuperscript{93} Those who lost their land were often forced into banditry and kidnapping to survive. Kidnappings and other more subtle means of gathering money from \textit{huahu} often left them little better off despite years of remittances.\textsuperscript{94} Taxes were also levied on \textit{huahu} for the building of watch towers, the payment of guards and ‘black-ticket fees’. This last referred to money paid to local ‘bosses’ which if not paid led to a ‘black-ticket’ being issued that would prevent crops being either sown or harvested.\textsuperscript{95} Bandits and revolutionaries resulted in similar kinds of disruption for the \textit{huaqiao}, such as during the 1925 Communist attempt to take over Guangdong province, when Arthur Chang’s family was forced to flee to the county capital of Shekki. Many Long Dou \textit{huahu} preferred to remain in Shekki after this and generally settled in the suburb of Long On Lee. The Changs however chose to return to their village.\textsuperscript{96}

As the warlord period merged into the anti-Japanese War, governmental order in Zhongshan further collapsed and villages and districts came under the control of local bandit bosses or \textit{Datiener (大天二)},\textsuperscript{97} who fought each other for control of territory and the right to levy taxes.\textsuperscript{98} A cousin of Arthur Chang’s who was a minor such

\textsuperscript{92} ‘Banditti’ are mentioned in \textit{Hagshen} (Zhongshan) in 1832, \textit{Chinese Repository}, vol. 1, no.1, May, 1832, p.80.
\textsuperscript{93} Especially after the ‘peoples’ armies’ that had helped win the republican cause in Guangdong province were disbanded during 1912-13, Rhoads, op. cit., pp.239-40; Helen F. Sui, \textit{Agents and Victims in South China – Accomplices in Rural Revolution}, Yale University Press, New Haven & London, 1989, pp.88-115, discusses how the Republicans by-passed the traditional town elites, giving rise to local strongmen; see also Wilton, op. cit., p.216, for some personal accounts of bandit attacks.
\textsuperscript{94} Helen Siu, ‘Subverting Lineage Power’, op. cit., pp.188-9 & p.195.
\textsuperscript{95} Chen, op. cit., pp. 81, 96 & 104-5.
\textsuperscript{96} Interview with Arthur Gar Lock Chang, 7 March 1998 (Tape 1, B, 14.00).
\textsuperscript{97} Helen Siu, ‘Subverting Lineage Power’, in Faure & Siu, op. cit., p.195.
\textsuperscript{98} See Helen Siu, ‘Subverting Lineage Power’, op. cit., p.195, on the breaking of lineage power in Zhongshan as local bosses linked to warlords directly levied taxes and Helen Sui, \textit{Agents and Victims}, op. cit., pp.88-96, on the reign of the local bosses, tax collection and black & red tickets.
bandit, was regarded as a protector of the village. Another Datiener, known as ‘Big Gall Bladder’ Hoon, received his name for attending a gathering known to be an ambush, he arrived without bodyguards or weapons with the effect that no one dared to attack him. Such stories repeated 50 years later have a romantic flavour; for Sydney’s huaqiao and their families in the villages at the time, they must have been merely terrifying.

To protect themselves from these dangers the huahu and their neighbours needed to rely on themselves as it was customary for Chinese villages and towns to provide their own security. The villages of Zhongshan varied greatly in size, which meant that they also varied in their capacity to defend themselves. Larger villages, such as Joe Wah Gow’s Long Tou Wan, which had a population of 4,000, would protect itself from bandits by electing a ‘marshal’, surrounding the village with guard towers supplied with ‘cannon’ and posting four regular guards. Chang Yet’s village of Long Hee was also protected by village ‘forts’. Smaller villages, such as Lee Man Dick’s Jin Huan, relied on the protection of ‘tower’ houses built by each huahu. While Zhuxiu Yuan, the village of the Wing On & Co. founders, being close to the city of Shekki had no need of tower houses or other protective measures. By the time even Shekki came under attack, wealthy families such as the Kwok’s of Wing On & Co., had moved to Hong Kong.

---

99 Interview with Arthur Gar Lock Chang, 7 March 1998 (Tape 1, B, 15.00). See also, Helen Siu, ‘Subverting Lineage Power’, in Faure & Siu, op. cit., pp.191-2, on the role of the local bosses between the Japanese and Nationalists.
100 Interview with Arthur Gar Lock Chang, 7 March 1998 (Tape 1, B, 18.00)
101 Chen Ta, op. cit., pp.197-201, on the huaqiao contribution to village defence. Sinn, Power and Charity, p.27, refers to Chinese communities providing their own police as customary.
102 Victor Gow, 30 October 1997 (13).
103 Interview with Arthur Gar Lock Chang, 28 October 1997 (12). Chen Hen-Seng, op. cit., p.81, refers to special taxes for building of watch-towers.
104 Interview with Cliff Lee, 28 September 1997 (2).
105 Interview with Cliff Lee, Jan 1998, Zhongshan City.
106 Australian Archives (NSW), SP1122/1; N67/4101, Kwok Pearl (Mrs).
Figure 6: A typical tower house built by huaqiao for security from bandits. Note the gun holes beside the upper windows.\textsuperscript{107}

One common method of coping with the threat from bandits was the building of what are known as ‘tower houses’ (碉楼).\textsuperscript{108} Traditional village houses in south China are single story buildings with, at most, a high roof for storage. Travellers today in the huaqiao districts of Zhongshan and the Sze Yap will see numerous villages with many two to three storey ‘towers’ incorporated into the traditional houses. These towers had gun holes for defence and internal iron barred doors to prevent intruders reaching the upper floors. When not being used for defence they contained bedrooms and served a routine role in the family home.\textsuperscript{109}

\textsuperscript{107} Photo in possession of the writer. Taken in Jin Huan Village, Zhongshan, January 1998.

\textsuperscript{108} Diaolou, or literally ‘fort building’.

Despite these hazards of life in the village, for those who sojourned regularly and who did not wish to or could not change the location of the family, there must have been a constant dilemma about whether to remain in the village or to return to Australia? Chang Yet at one point decided not to return to Australia, or even apply for a CEDT until he was convinced by a family friend that he had 13 mouths to feed and ‘anything’ could happen. The Great Depression did happen and ensured Chang Yet’s return in 1933, this time bringing his son Chang Gar Lock (Arthur Chang) with him.\(^{110}\) A significant minority of huaqiao sought written references, applied for their Certificate exempting them from the operation of the Dictation Test and paid their £1 in order to ensure that they could return, but did not in fact do so.

Chart 4: The number of huaqiao making trips dramatically declined after about 1926 along with their numbers, while the proportion of non-returns increased. At this point the ‘domicile’ generation are at least 50 years or older.\(^{111}\)

Those that did not return may have obtained the CEDT’s as insurance just in case all was not well at home. The prevalence of disease and other hazards for the increasingly older men is another possible explanation.\(^{112}\) The CEDT could also

---

\(^{110}\) Interview with Arthur Gar Lock Chang, 7 March 1998 (Tape 1, A, 14.00).

\(^{111}\) See Appendix IV, Table 10.

\(^{112}\) See Chen Ta, op. cit., pp.175-180, on the presence of plague, smallpox, cholera and other diseases in the villages of south-east China in the 1930s.
have been obtained in order to pass on to fellow villagers, though of the illegal methods mentioned by officials this was not one of them.

Sydney or the village was not the only choice available for those with some money and despite the many improvements *huaqiao* remittances could bring, village life was not always acceptable or safe, particularly for those who had grown used to something different.\(^{113}\) For those who could afford not to live in Sydney, and for the increasing number of Australian-born Chinese who felt at home in (or alienated from) both European and Chinese cultures, Hong Kong was the ideal location. Hong Kong had played a significant role as a conduit between the *huaqiao* and their villages ever since the British had taken control of the island in the 1840s. Even while the British and Chinese had tried to ignore each other, Hong Kong had become the base for operations essential to the *huaqiao* links such as buying passage on European ships, sending and receiving remittances, and the return of bones to the villages. In the development of this role for Hong Kong, *huaqiao*, including Australian *huaqiao*, played a major part.\(^{114}\) Regardless of district, for those with wealth to protect, Hong Kong was a safe haven from both the poverty and corruption of the home villages, and the discrimination and foreignness of Australia.

For families such as the Pan Kees and the Kwoks, regular trips to Hong Kong, the bilingual education of their children and business branches in both Hong Kong and Australia were part of normal life. Thomas Pan Kee of Moree and Narrabri, and later Campbell St Sydney, had 10 children, two born in Hong Kong. During the 1920s all the children were living in Hong Kong while Thomas himself remained in Sydney. In 1930, the whole family returned to live in Sydney. Between 1930 and 1950 various of these children lived in both Hong Kong and Sydney, with most marrying in

\(^{113}\) ibid., p.202, ‘Returned emigrants from Australia and America sometimes were able to found new communities.’

\(^{114}\) Sinn, op. cit., pp.100 & 111-2, and p.163, on the role of educated overseas merchants and p.169, on the role of an Australian born *huaqiao* specifically.
Hong Kong.\footnote{115} Pearl Kwok was Australian-born and left for Hong Kong in 1926, aged 14, marrying there in 1931 one of the Kwoks of Wing On.\footnote{116} She visited her mother in Sydney in 1946 and again in 1949, that time with three of her four children. The entry of these children was refused at first, then later granted temporarily. Pearl and two of her children returned to Hong Kong in 1954 while one daughter, Marina, stayed and became an Australian citizen in 1960.\footnote{117}

From Hong Kong wealthier huaqiao could visit their village when desired, without running the risks humbler huaqiao took in living there full time. These risks included not only kidnapping, such as Lee Man Dick suffered, but also the importunity of poorer relations.\footnote{118} Joe Wah Gow, on the other hand, despite his wealth was satisfied with returning to his village in 1929 taking with him all his Australian-born children.\footnote{119}

The relationship that the huaqiao of Sydney had with their ‘native country’ extended beyond what could be described as ‘holiday’ visits. The most physical element of the link, after marriage, involved frequent and regular journeys to the village for some, including the arrival of children soon after most trips. In order to take this ‘holiday’ to see his wife and family, the huaqiao had to deal first with the requirements of the Immigration Restriction Act and the barriers that these presented. One of these requirements was that the overall numbers of Chinese in Australia should be seen to be falling. A fall some huaqiao slowed by their organised attempts to bring in people in contravention of the Act. These barriers were overcome at the price of continued dependence upon district stores for support, even to the extent of needing them to

\footnote{115} Australian Archives (NSW), SP1122/1; N53/24/2284, Choy See Pan Kee (Mrs Thomas Pan Kee) & N53/24/2285-90, files of the Pan Kee children, Lawrence, Rose, Agnes, Minnie and Mary.
\footnote{116} Nee, Lock Lee of the well-known Alexandria cabinetmakers.
\footnote{117} Australian Archives (NSW), SP1122/1; N67/4101, Kwok Pearl (Mrs) (Pearl Lock Lee).
\footnote{118} Interview with Cliff Lee, 28 September 1997 (5). As Baker put it, ‘it was essential for the rich to keep away from the village’, Baker, op. cit., p.174.
\footnote{119} Victor Gow, 30 October 1997 (6).
buy tickets for travel. If moderately successful, a huaqiao bought rice farming land for which his wife collected the rents and if more successful he donated money to his village for schools and other improvements. China’s social and political disorder, including bandits and civil war, however, stalled any deepening of the connection economically. This disorder also meant that many wealthier huaqiao preferred to live outside their home village in places such as the Zhongshan district capital Shekki or in Hong Kong. The preferences of the aging huaqiao and of the generation which followed, them in both China and Australia, is the subject of the next chapter.
CHAPTER 3 Apart from the native born, the majority are old and weak

除土生者外，余半老弱

In 1939, the manager of Wing On & Co., Sydney wrote to Chiang Kai Shek to ask him to intervene with the British government to allow more Chinese people to enter Australia. He did this because he feared that, ‘apart from the native [Australian] born, the majority are old and weak’. The old and weak he referred to were the last of the pre-1901 huaqiao, their fellows having either died or made their final retirement trips to the village. The importance of finally returning to the village cannot be better illustrated than by the care that was taken to ensure that the bones of many that had died in Australia were returned to the ancestral soil. The majority of ‘native born’ were of a younger generation, a generation that also included those who had come to Sydney after 1901. This succeeding generation was more limited in its ability to sojourn than the ‘domicile’ generation and this fact as well as the impact of war and revolution sees the links with the home districts transformed.

Chapter 3 begins by describing the changes in the now older huaqiao population as age, death and final retirement have their impact and the importance of a final return to the village, even after death, is discussed. After this the growth of a new generation of Sydney huaqiao is examined as, despite the intentions of the Immigration Restriction Act, many huaqiao have entered Australia in the years after 1901. The categories under which this new generation of huaqiao arrived and the influence of restrictions related to these categories in influencing their links with the home villages is considered. Also considered are the Australian-born Chinese who make up a significant proportion of the new generation, and this includes those Australian-born Chinese who were raised in the home villages. Finally, the impact of the Japanese War on the villages and home districts and the nature of the post-war links of the new generation are examined.

---

1 Mar letter: no. 284. Letter, Wing On manager, Sydney to Chiang Kai-Shek, 6 June 1939. Translation by the author with the assistance of Chen Mei-Su.
2 The term ‘Japanese War’ is used here to include what the Chinese refer to as the anti-Japanese War and Europeans to the later starting World War Two or Pacific War.
The effect of the Immigration Restriction Act, combined with the location of most huaqiao families in the villages of south China, resulted in a steady increase in the average age of Sydney’s huaqiao population at the same time that it fell dramatically in size. As we have seen, the average age of the huaqiao on their arrival in Sydney and NSW was between 16 and 25 years of age. By the 1920s, this had risen to their 40s and 50s, and by the 1940s the age of most Chinese market gardeners was such a feature that a visiting Immigration Officer could ‘become suspicious of him because of his apparent relative youthfulness’. Of the 58 huaqiao passengers arriving in Sydney on the Arafura in 1929 from sojourns in the villages, for example, only six were under 50, twenty-five were between 50 and 60 years old, and nineteen, including one aged 71, were over 60.

The desire to go back to one’s home soil was considered in traditional Chinese culture to be as a ‘leaf returning to the roots’, inevitable and proper. As the huaqiao aged, the importance of this tradition meant that an increasing number of huaqiao made final retirement trips to the home villages. This can be seen in a gradual increase in the ratio of permanent returns to sojourns which can be traced in the CEDTs issued and the records of whether or not those CEDTs were handed back, as was required on re-entry to Australia.

Not all huaqiao who made the final trip home would be recorded in the CEDT records as many would have returned without bothering to apply for a CEDT once they had decided not to return to Australia. It is difficult to estimate how many huaqiao might have returned to the home village without getting a CEDT, but a

---

3 See Appendix 1, Table 1.
4 Chapter 1, Chart 1, p.17.
5 Australian Archives (NSW), SP42/1; C47/2352, Leong Hoi Cheng, memo, H. E. Smith, 24 January 1945.
6 Australian Archives (NSW), SP115/1; Arafura, 30 May 1929, Passenger lists.
7 This saying is: 落业归根 (luo ye gui gen).
8 Choi, op. cit., pp.45-6, analyses census data to estimate the retirement pattern of the over 60s.
9 Stephen Fitzgerald, China and the Overseas Chinese; a study of Peking's changing policy, 1949-1970, Cambridge University Press, 1972, p.69, estimates that 500,000 huaqiao returned to China between 1949 and 1966, including many retirees.
10 See Appendix III, C, for a brief description of CEDT related procedures.
check of the passenger lists for 1929 reveals that a total of 956 Chinese passengers travelled in that year compared to a total of 801 CEDT holders in the same year. After deducting women and children the total of male Chinese passengers was 936. If allowance is made for those travelling on temporary certificates and passports, then it can be said that in 1929 perhaps 100 huaqiao departed Sydney without a CEDT. This number can be added to the 228 who did hold CEDTs but who also did not return to give an indication of the proportion who returned permanently at this period.\(^{10}\)

![Chart 5: The percentage of those who did not return remained fairly steady to about 1928 when it rose rapidly until the Depression. It began to rise rapidly again about 1936 when the number of trips themselves fell (see Chart 4, Chapter 2, p.58). The war stopped all travel and its end saw a sudden increase which fell again as few 'domiciles' remained. The increase after 1952 is explained by retirees needing a CEDT as a form of Hong Kong entry visa, whether they intended to return or not.\(^{11}\)]

Some huaqiao, perhaps because they had lost all contact with their families in China, did not return to the village. For huaqiao in this situation old age in Sydney meant living on their market gardens while they could still work or, if they no longer could work, perhaps in one of the many rooms above Dixon St while earning a little money selling peanuts at Sydney’s railway stations and racecourses.\(^{12}\)

---

\(^{10}\) Australian Archives (NSW), SP1148/2; Passenger lists, Outward 1929 & Table 10, Appendix IV.

\(^{11}\) See Appendix IV, Table 10.

\(^{12}\) Interviews with Billy Gay, 19 March 1998 (Tape 1, B, 300); King Fong, 1 April 98 (interview notes); Cliff Lee, 28 September 1997 (8); Fitzgerald, op. cit., p.164.
example, lived with about 30 fellow *huaqiao* in the rooms of the Say Tin Co. (瑞田公司) above Dixon St in Sydney’s Chinatown until not long before his death in 1987.\textsuperscript{13}

For those who died in Sydney before they could return to the villages, it was not necessarily the end of the wish to return to the home village. The practice of returning the bones of the dead to rest in the soil of their ancestors was a fundamental one in Chinese culture and played an important role in the bond with the village.\textsuperscript{14} This is illustrated in an advertisement that appeared regularly in the *Chinese Australian Herald* (《悉尼华报》) in 1903.\textsuperscript{15} It was placed by people concerned about Chinese graves in Townsville whose home villages could not be identified and describes the terrible condition of the ghosts of people who remained apart from their ancestral soil and requests information about the identity of the dead so that their bones can be returned to their villages. The advertisement lists stores in Sydney and Queensland as contact points for passing on the information. The concern of the *huaqiao* that bodies not be lost was so strong that ‘the putting of coffins on board vessels going to and fro in case a Chinaman dies’ was one of the functions of Sydney’s many *huaqiao* societies.\textsuperscript{16} Money was also donated to the Tung Wah Hospital in Hong Kong to ensure that this was done at the that end also.\textsuperscript{17}

\textsuperscript{13} Interview with King Fong, 1 April 1998 (interview notes) and Billy Gay, 19 March 1998 (Tape 1, B, 300). Rent receipt books of the Say Tin Co., 1970-1983, in the possession of Mr. King Fong. According to Dr Charles Price, based on interview notes made during research conducted in Sydney’s Chinatown in the 1970s, the awareness of how many elderly *huaqiao* were living in Sydney even in the 1970s was kept from the non-Chinese population of Sydney by ensuring that daily walks were done in pairs to avoid attracting the hostility of white Sydneysiders. Interview with Dr Charles Price, Canberra, 23 February 1998.
\textsuperscript{14} Freedman, op. cit., pp.139-140, on the role of bones in ancestor worship. Sinn, *Power & Charity*, op. cit., p.18, considers that concern for the dead was ‘paramount’ with the overseas Chinese.
\textsuperscript{15} *The Chinese Australian Herald* (《悉尼华报》), 3 June 1903, p.3.
\textsuperscript{16} *Royal Commission*, op. cit., p.55, line, 2113.
\textsuperscript{17} *Royal Commission*, op. cit., p.70, lines, 2724-28. Sinn, *Power & Charity*, op. cit., pp.108-9, mentions that coffins were placed on emigrant ships to prevent the dead being thrown over board.
Figure 7: ‘Notice: exhumation and transport of bones from Townsville.’
This advertisement appeared regularly in the *Chinese Australian Herald*.¹⁸

¹⁸ *Chinese Australian Herald*, (广益亿报), 3 June 1903, p.3.
Bones rather than bodies are referred to, as the usual practice was to bury a body for several years then to collect the bones of a number of huaqiao at once to be ‘returned to China’.\(^{19}\) An alternative, for those who could afford it, was to be embalmed, as Hong Wong was in 1901, his body being accompanied to the home village by his sister Ah Ching.\(^{20}\)

![Huaqiao burial and returns to China 1875-1950](image)

**Chart 6:** At the period of most active exhumation and shipment of bones, from 1875 to the late 1930s, a peak of 75% of burials in the ‘Old Chinese Section’ of Rookwood Cemetery were, ‘returned to China’, with an average of 55% to 65%. Note the drop in returns around the time of the 1911 revolution. The total number of burials in this section from 1875 to 1950 was 3,094.\(^{21}\)

Those who were buried in Sydney sometimes had to wait quite a time to be ‘returned to China’. Ah Chung was buried in 1892, but was not returned until 1923, while Ah Sing, who was buried in 1884, was finally removed only in 1946.\(^{22}\) Another Ah Chung, who died in 1889 aged 23 in Sydney Hospital, must wait indefinitely as his entry is marked, ‘Typhoid case not permitted to be removed.’\(^{23}\) However, the average

---

19 ‘Returned to China’, usually written in red ink, indicated exhumed plots. Rookwood Cemetery, Anglican Trust: Register of Burials in the Necropolis at Haslem’s Creek, under the Necropolis Act of 1867, 31st Victoria, no.14, ‘Chinese Section of General Cemetery’.

20 Australian Archives (NSW), SP42/1; C47/2369, Wellington Wing Ning, Charles Wong Wing Kau, statutory declaration by Ah Ching, December 1914.

21 See Appendix IV, Table 12.

22 ‘Chinese Section of General Cemetery’, op. cit., Ah Chung, 1892 & Ah Sing, 1884.

23 ‘Chinese Section of General Cemetery’, op. cit., Ah Chung, 1889.
time in the ground for those whose bones were exhumed was six to seven years, though 10 or 15 years was not unusual. There was a tapering off of returns after 1930, and after 1938 there were very few removals until after World War Two. Many of those who died after 1931 were exhumed between 1946 and 1948, after which only 10 more were removed in 1950, with the last recorded exhumation from this section of Rookwood Cemetery in 1962.\textsuperscript{24}

\textbf{Figure 8:} Quong Sin Tong construction, erected 1877.
‘There is one very old society called Quong Sing Tong.’\textsuperscript{25}

The \textit{Chinese Australian Herald} advertisement is another example of services provided by the district stores, however, it was the district societies which played the

\textsuperscript{24} ‘Chinese Section of General Cemetery’, op. cit., Rookwood has other ‘Chinese Sections’ which contain later burials and Sydney had at least 3-4 other cemeteries where \\textit{huaqiao} may have been buried, though Rookwood was certainly the major location. Evidence to the Chinese Gambling Commissioners was that 500 bones (from NSW?) had been sent in ‘the last 10 years’. \textit{Royal Commission}, op. cit., p.14, line, 485. In the same period 250 bones were exhumed from Rookwood.

dominant role in the return of bones. The people of the Dung Guan, Zhongshan and Gao Yao districts, who together made up perhaps 60 to 70% of Sydney’s huaqiao, all had societies which assisted in the return of the bones of the dead. The societies collected fees from their members and used the funds to ship the bones of those who died in Australia. The Hing Foon Tong (洪福堂) of the Gao Yao people, founded in 1893 by members’ subscriptions, kept a membership book which recorded the names and villages of its members to ensure the information would be available when required. The Chinese Gambling Commissioners were told in 1891 that it cost ‘£10 to remove a man’s bones from the country’ and that it cost Way Kee’s society £529/19/2 to ‘raise 84 bodies’. The return of bones to the actual villages was probably done through the Tung Wah Hospital based in Hong Kong, a role this institution played for the huaqiao of many countries.

The huaqiao generation which had been resident in Sydney and NSW since before 1901 were aging, retiring and shrinking in numbers. Its place was being taken to a smaller extent in Sydney by a succeeding generation. This generation was developing in Sydney despite the intentions of the 1901 Commonwealth Parliament and was made up of those who entered Australia after 1901 on Certificates of Exemption, those who were Australian-born and, by the late 1930s, people who can be generally described as ‘refugees’. This last group includes Chinese crew members who refused to return to Japanese held ports in China and residents of the Pacific islands and New Guinea who were evacuated as Japanese armies advanced.

---

26 Sinn, Power & Charity, op. cit., p.18, says concern for the dead was, ‘a keystone of community leadership and influence’.
27 This and support for the return of old men is given as the primary function of all societies referred to in the Royal Commission, op. cit., various references. See Appendix VI for a discussion of district proportions in Sydney.
29 Royal Commission, op. cit., p.15, lines, 486-7 and p.57, line, 2232.
30 Royal Commission, op. cit., p.105, line, 4169, ‘they send some money to the Chinese Hospital in Hong Kong, the Tong Wah Yee Yuen’. Sinn, Power & Charity, op. cit., p.6, refers to general huaqiao links, p.71, n.119, mentions links with Sydney in 1887 and p.73, refers to membership by Australian organisations.
Between 1902 and 1946 over 6,400 people entered Australia on temporary Certificates of Exemption.\textsuperscript{31} An estimate of how many of these where able to remain in Australia is that 3,500 had done so by 1947. Though 1,228 of those were relatively recent, having arrived within the previous four years.\textsuperscript{32} This would mean that roughly about one in three people who came on a Certificate of Exemption were able to remain permanently.\textsuperscript{33} The numbers of Australian-born Chinese also rose significantly over the same period. There were 1,456 Australian-born Chinese in 1911 when they are first distinguished in the Commonwealth Census, rising to 3,728 by 1947. The figures for ‘refugees’ is less clear as these were also given Certificates of Exemption. However, between the Census of 1933 and that of 1947, the numbers of China-born people in Australia rose greatly with, as already stated, 1,228 arriving since about 1943.\textsuperscript{34}

What these figures mean is that by 1947 the breakdown of the \textit{huaqiao} population of Australia and proportionally in Sydney, was roughly as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>\textit{Huaqiao} in 1947</th>
<th>Australia</th>
<th>Sydney(^{(25%)})</th>
<th>Proportions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australian-born Chinese</td>
<td>3,728</td>
<td>931</td>
<td>40.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-1901 Certificates of Exemption</td>
<td>2,272</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>24.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-1901 ‘Domiciles’</td>
<td>1,921</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>21.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugees (arrivals within 4 years)</td>
<td>1,228</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>13.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9,149</td>
<td>2,286</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These figures are a rough guide only as many ‘refugees’ would have arrived since 1939 and so the Certificate of Exemption category is overstated and that of refugees understated. Similarly, the proportions for Sydney are not exact as refugees would

\textsuperscript{31} Figures from, Barry York, \textit{Admitted: 1901 to 1946. Immigrants and Others Allowed into Australia between 1901 and 1946}, Centre for Immigration & Multicultural Studies, Australian National University, 1993, throughout. See Appendix III, C, for a description of Certificates of Exemption.

\textsuperscript{32} Choi, op. cit., p.42.

\textsuperscript{33} See Table 13, Appendix IV.
have been more likely to have entered and remained there. Nevertheless, these figures give an indication as to the make-up of the generation that succeeded the ‘domicile’ generation by the end of the Japanese War.

More than 2,000 people entered Australia on Certificates of Exemption and managed to remain until war-time conditions made their return impossible or at least politically difficult. These people entered under various categories and conditions of the same Act that granted CEDTs to their father’s generation. They entered as students, merchants, the wives of merchants, and as substitutes and assistants to those working in stores and market gardens.

While the children of huaqiao who were born in China had no right to enter Australia, it was possible (and this almost always meant sons) to gain temporary entry for study. The conditions of the temporary ‘Certificate of Exemption’ issued in such cases appear to have been strictly adhered to in the early administration of the Immigration Restriction Act. Ah Wang of Forbes, was one of the first to take advantage of the student provisions of the Act. Using a local land agent rather than a Chinese store to assist him, Ah Wang inquired how he might bring his son Yut Ming, aged 14, to Australia as a student. Despite being refused twice, he was granted permission in January 1909 for his son Yut Ming 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

34 Figures derived from Commonwealth Census data in Palfreeman, op. cit., p.145, Table III; and Choi, op. cit., p.42.  
35 ‘Student’ was defined variously, in 1912 it was a minimum of 17 years, then no age limit in 1920, this was replaced with a minimum of 14 and a max of 19 years in 1924. Finally, the age was dropped to 10 years in 1926 when attendance at approved private schools was required. See, Australian Archives (NSW), C4203/1; Boarding Branch Records, 1914-1931, vol.2, p.358, circular, Secretary to Collector of Customs, 6 September 1920, 2 July 1924 and p.449, 24 November 1926.  
36 Yarwood, op. cit., p.105, states it was rare for people on certificates to be released from their conditions.  
37 Yarwood, op. cit., p.112, states that the very first was on 1 April 1902 and was in fact a girl. Only three girls in total entered Australia under this category.
then wrote personally 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. What advantage Yut Ming derived from his schooling in Australia and whether this was all his father had hoped, can only be speculated upon.

Cliff Lee was also brought to Australia as a student by his father Lee Man Dick in 1949, this being the second time Lee Man Dick had sponsored a son. In 1924, Cliff Lee’s brother, Ting Hoy, had come to Sydney, but after reports that ‘Lee Ting Hoy has been seen about the city a good deal and appears to be a lad who would be much better off attending school,’ he had been required to return to China. Cliff Lee was more fortunate than his brother in being able to change his ‘status’ from student to that of a market garden assistant, thus enabling him to remain indefinitely in Australia. The differing treatment of these two brothers illustrates the changes in the administration of the Certificates of Exemption as the war and then the new government in China made the option of deportation an increasingly difficult one for both administrators and politicians.

While the entry of students became gradually more common, a more dramatic change occurred with the exemptions for ‘substitutes and assistants’. Under the Immigration Restriction Act, a person could enter Australia either as a ‘substitute’ for

38 Australian Archives (NSW), SP42/1; C11/2756, Yut Ming.
39 Australian Archives (NSW), SP1122/1; N1953/24/2504, Lee Man Dick (Man Duck), memo, 18 February 1931.
40 Cliff Lee, 28/9/97 (4) and Wilton, op. cit., p.122, on the significance of student sponsorship.
41 Yarwood, op. cit., pp.110-112, on the evolution of the substitute and assistant categories.
a ‘domiciled’ huaqiao 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. In the early period of the Act such exemptions were rare and of limited flexibility, such as when Kee Chung’s son was allowed to come and assist in his father’s Binnaway store, but only for six months and with a guarantee that no extensions would be asked for.42 Ensuring that Chinese numbers did not increase was a great concern for officials, as when Wong Ka Yee was allowed to enter for 12 months as an assistant to replace Mar Chat, and administrators were careful to see that he left within 3 months of Wong Ka Yee’s arrival.43 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 huaqiao and that this was endangered by their aging.44 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.45

The substitute and assistant provisions required the need for them to be demonstrated. This was interpreted in terms of turnover and a judgement that the position required a Chinese person to do it. This in turn meant that those with

42 Australian Archives (NSW), SP42/2; C16/4361, Kee Chung.
43 Australian Archives (NSW), SP1122/1; N57/2190, Wong Ka Yee, letter, Assistant Secretary to Wing Sang & Co., 9 April 1930.
44 Choi, op. cit., p.53, on the treatment of cabinet makers and the impact of huaqiao aging on the market gardens.
45 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.
businesses were in a better position to bring family members, or at least fellow villagers, than the average huaqiao market gardener.\textsuperscript{46} When the Chinese World News, the newspaper of the Chinese Masonic Society, applied for Louey Kee Fong to work as a Chinese compositor, the fact that he would, ‘not keep a local man out of employment’ was significant.\textsuperscript{47} Stores such as Kwong War Chong & Co. needed to import goods into Australia as well as to sustain a certain turnover in order to be allowed to employ assistants. In 1933-4, this store imported goods worth over £1,780 and paid duty of more than £1,791. Once a month, salted vegetables, tinned fish, bean curd and ginger were imported on the Changte, Taiping and the Tanda, the same ships that carried the huaqiao between Sydney and China. In 1948, the Kwong War Chong, with a turnover of £5,994, was able to employ four assistants.\textsuperscript{48}

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.\textsuperscript{49} This was in a sense a continuation of the pattern of the credit-ticket system.\textsuperscript{50} The freedom to sojourn was much less than that enjoyed by huaqiao with ‘domicile’ rights and less if the employment was not secure.\textsuperscript{51} 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

\textsuperscript{46} Yarwood, op. cit., pp.110-112, on firms such as Wing On & Co. being favoured; Fitzgerald, op. cit., pp.37-40, on the need to be importer/exporters; Wilton, op. cit., pp.120-5, on the sponsorship of assistants by stores in northern NSW.

\textsuperscript{47} Australian Archives (NSW), SP11/12; Louey Kee Fung, report, Investigations Officer to Secretary, 31 March 1933. Whether or not the ‘local man’ being protected might be a local Chinese person, the report did not say.

\textsuperscript{48} Australian Archives (NSW), SP42/1; N59/3386, Kwong War Chong & Co. Figures attached to minute, 18 March 1948.

\textsuperscript{49} Wilton, op. cit., pp.129-30, mentions this virtual bonding; Choi, op. cit., pp.86-87, on the union contribution to restricting opportunities for improvement.

\textsuperscript{50} See Chapter 1, p.24, for examples of ‘indentures’ given to the Chinese Gambling Commissioners.

\textsuperscript{51} No figures are available on trips by those on Certificates of Exemption. Their files are usually about getting extensions and rarely about taking a trip unless leaving permanently.
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. The Chinese Republican News by saying that, ‘as this man refuses to leave … we now disclaim any further responsibility for his stay in Australia’. 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 again 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, continued to battle with administrators over improving his status. He was finally granted permanent residence in 1959, after various friends certified that he was ‘a very good type’ and ‘has adopted the Australian way of life’. Ken Wong married an Australian-born Chinese,
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.\(^{52}\)

Yut Kwan illustrates the difficulties for those of the post ‘domicile’ generation who were only able to live in Australia under the conditions of the temporary Certificates of Exemptions. Yut Kwan may have had his personal reasons for not visiting China after his arrival in 1926, but even had he wished to do so, he would have found it extremely difficult to maintain the kind of sojourning undertaken by the ‘domicile’ generation. Apart from his dependence upon his employers, the temporary nature of his ‘Certificate of Exemption’ meant there was no guarantee he would be allowed back to Australia. A consequence of this was that links to the home villages were weakened or, as appears to have been the case with Yut Kwan, extinguished entirely.

Yut Kwan was able to marry an Australian-born Chinese woman, something members of his generation were more able to do. However, Australian-born Chinese, whose numbers totalled 3,728 in the Commonwealth Census of 1947, do not represent all people of Chinese origin who were born in Australia. Under pre-Federation NSW law, the children and wives of naturalized Chinese were exempt from the £100 poll tax and could enter freely. The Immigration Restriction Act, on the other hand, recognised the Australian, or rather ‘British’ citizenship of those naturalized in NSW, but not the rights of their children. A naturalized person such as Sing Kee, for example, was told in 1903 that his children could only be admitted under ‘para (A) of s.3 of the Immigration Restriction Act’, that is under the Dictation Test, or in other words, they would not be admitted.\(^{53}\)

\(^{52}\) Australian Archives (NSW), SP11/12; Yuk Kwan, Tai Moon, & others, 1926-47 and SP1122/1; N56/6446, Yuk Kwan Wong.

\(^{53}\) Australian Archives (NSW), SP42/1; C1903/2582, Sing Kee, letter from Collector of Customs, 2 June 1903.
For children who were born in Australia but raised in China the position was similar legally to that of Sing Kee’s children, though they were in fact often treated better in practice. The main factor here was a High Court ruling that stated citizenship was dependent upon ‘domicile’ and that such ‘Domicile [could be] considered abandoned through long absence’. The administrators of the Immigration Restriction Act considered an absence of ‘say ten years’ as a rule of thumb in determining such cases but were not consistent in its application. The overseas born daughter of Mrs Thomas Pan Kee, for example, had no difficulty entering Australia in 1922, though the fact that she had eight Australian-born siblings may have been a deciding factor. Pearl Kwok was also Australian-born and at one stage was told that she needed to return by the end of 1926 or she would not be able to return at all. Pearl Kwok chose to return much later in the 1930s and had no trouble entering Australia, though all her children by her Hong Kong based husband were at first refused entry and later granted only temporary entry. Jow Wah Gow’s sons, who had left Australia in 1929, had no trouble re-entering, the last, Victor Gow, did so just as the Japanese were occupying southern China in 1940.

There could be other limitations to the rights of Australian-born people, including the continued lack of right to citizenship. When Shelia Gock Ming, who was Australian-born and largely brought up in China and Hong Kong, wished to enter Australia she was granted permission as long as, ‘she does not marry a person domiciled outside

---

54 Australian Archives (NSW), C4203/1; Boarding Branch Records, 1914-1931, vol.2, p.254, telegram, Secretary to Administrator, Rabaul, 19 July 1921. See Yarwood, op. cit., pp.75-7, on High Court decisions regarding children raised overseas.
55 Australian Archives (NSW), C4203/1; Boarding Branch Records, 1914-1931, vol.2, p.404, letter, Acting Secretary to Collector of Customs, 14/5/25.
56 Australian Archives (NSW), SP42/1; Choy See Pan Kee (Mrs Thomas Pan Kee), letter, Collector of Customs to Wing On, 26 June 1926.
57 Australian Archives (NSW), SPI122/1; N67/4101, Kwok Pearl (Mrs) (Pearl Lock Lee), letters, Collector of Customs to Kwong War Chong, 15 September 1949 and 8 February 1950.
58 Interview with Victor Gow, 30 October 1997 (2).
In determining how these restrictions were to be imposed the distinction of ‘half-caste’ was a significant factor, though inspectors must have had some difficulties when they were instructed, ‘If the passengers … are obviously less than half-caste … they need not be restricted at all,’ and for ‘3/4 caste Chinese’ a permit was ‘not necessary’. Class was an associated consideration with ‘slightly coloured passengers of superior standing’ also to be unrestricted.\footnote{Australian Archives (NSW), C4203/1; Boarding Branch Records, 1914–1931, vol.2, p.281, circular Secretary to Collector of Customs, 29 July 1920 and p.179, Secretary to Collector of Customs, 16 October 1919.}

It is difficult to estimate how common it was for Australian-born children to be taken to the villages to be raised while the father returned to Australia. The files show a number of examples of young men returning to Australia who left when children, and the 1929 outgoing ships passenger lists show at least three children under the age of three years travelling in steerage, where they could only have travelled with their fathers.\footnote{Australian Archives (NSW), SP1122/1; N53/24/2298, Shelia Gock Ming, letter, Secretary to Director of Wing On, 19 March 1935.} Billy Chee Hoon was born in Sydney in 1885 and taken to his father’s village when aged nine. He returned to Sydney aged 17 and worked there and later in Glenn Innes as a storekeeper.\footnote{Australian Archives (NSW), SP42/1; C11/502, Billy Chee Hoon.} Similarly, John Louie Hoon was born in Sydney and taken home by his father when aged seven.\footnote{Australian Archives (NSW), SP1122/1; N1952/24/3951, John Louie Hoon.} Both of these people were Australian born, but neither citizenship laws nor attitudes regarded them as Australian or British subjects. Instead, they were subjected to the same regulations as \textit{huaqiao} born in various south China villages. Some \textit{huaqiao} took back to the village not only their children but their non-Chinese wife. Again, numbers who may have done this are

\footnotesize

\textsuperscript{59} Australian Archives (NSW), SP1122/1; N53/24/2298, Shelia Gock Ming, letter, Secretary to Director of Wing On, 19 March 1935.

\textsuperscript{60} Australian Archives (NSW), C4203/1; Boarding Branch Records, 1914–1931, vol.2, p.281, circular Secretary to Collector of Customs, 29 July 1920 and p.179, Secretary to Collector of Customs, 16 October 1919.

\textsuperscript{61} Australian Archives (NSW), SP1148/2; Passenger lists, Outgoing 1902, 1929, 1939. No women, apart from a very few \textit{huaqiao} wives from Tonga, travelled in steerage.

\textsuperscript{62} Australian Archives (NSW), SP42/1; C11/502, Billy Chee Hoon.

\textsuperscript{63} Australian Archives (NSW), SP1122/1; N1952/24/3951, John Louie Hoon.
unknown but they were sufficient to have inspired a circular in 1911 entitled, ‘White wives of Chinese and their children’.  

The Australian-born Chinese, whether raised in Australia or China, and those on Certificates of Exemption in Sydney received a sudden increase in numbers when refugees began to enter Australia as the result of Japan’s war in China and the Pacific. Some were Chinese crew members who refused to return to Japanese held areas and others were residents of the many Pacific islands evacuated in the face of the Japanese advance. Still others included those with Australian birth such as Victor Gow and Pearl Kwok who were able to leave Hong Kong and the villages on the approach of the Japanese.

This extension of the Japanese war beyond China not only brought in more huaqiao to Sydney but significantly affected the links the last of the old huaqiao had with their families in the villages. In 1941, the Tanda turned back because of Japan’s attack on Pearl Harbour and the invasion of Malaya. All Chinese on board, including Leong Hoi Cheng, a ships deseterter from 1938 who had just been deported after he was detected working in a market garden, were permitted to ‘remain under exemption’. The Tanda was the last ship to attempt to take huaqiao to their villages. From November 1941 until 1945, not a single CEDT was issued to a Chinese person.

The Japanese invasion not only prevented huaqiao from visiting their families, it also
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64 Australian Archives (NSW), C4203/1; Boarding Branch Circulars, 1914-1931, p.207, circular, Secretary to Collector of Customs, 9 June 1923. The purpose of the circular was to warn such women before leaving that nothing could legally be done if their husbands died and they wished to return to Australia with their children against the wishes of the husbands family.
65 Fitzgerald, op. cit., pp.41-42, on Chinese seamen deserting their ships. Interview with Victor Gow, 30 October 1997 (7) and Australian Archives (NSW), SP1122/1; N67/4101, Kwok Pearl (Mrs) (Pearl Lock Lee).
66 Australian Archives (NSW), SP42/1; C47/2352, Leong Hoi Cheng, memo, 24 January 1945.
67 Australian Archives (NSW), SP726/1; Particulars of Applications for CEDTs, vol. 6, 20/8/34 - 22/1/1959. See Appendix IV, Table 10.
cut off those already in the villages from returning. The Japanese invasion of southern China in 1937 caused many people in the nearby districts to flee to Hong Kong from which those that could came to Australia. Those that could not, generally returned to their villages after the Japanese, in 1942, also invaded Hong Kong. Huaqiao, such as John Louie Hoon, who had left Australia to go to their villages after the Japanese had invaded China itself, could not return once Hong Kong was invaded. Billy Gay relates that John Louie Hoon and his family at one point were reduced to eating grass and how on several occasions John Louie Hoon was struck by Japanese soldiers with rifle butts for not being quick enough to bow.

The invasion of Hong Kong also meant that remittances could no longer be sent through stores and agents based there. This drastically reduced the flow of money to the villages when the huahu needed it most. Some remittances did continue to get through, smuggled via the Chinese wartime capital of Chungking, but deprived of most of their remittances and suffering the disruptions of war many huahu suffered greatly.

With the end of the war, Sydney’s links with south China did not return to its pre-war condition. The Kuomintang government, even before the end of the war, had begun channelling remittances through the Bank of China, cutting out the many district stores that had performed this task since the nineteenth century. The new

---

68 Interview with Victor Gow, 30 October 1997 (7). Sinn, Xin Xi Guxiang, op. cit., p. 382. Hong Kong’s population was 1.6m when the Japanese invaded and 500-600,000 in 1945. The Japanese encouraged return to home districts.

69 Interview with Billy Gay, 19 March 1998 (Tape 1, B, 200).

70 Interview with Billy Gay, 19 March 1998 (Tape 1, B, 200).

71 C. H. Wu, Dollars Dependents and Dogma: overseas Chinese remittances to Communist China, The Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace, Stanford, California, 1967, p. 81, ‘there were virtually no remittances … and most of the dependents lived in areas occupied by the Japanese’.


73 Interview with Norman Lee, 25 September 1997 (6).
Communist government also encouraged remittances and also accepted them only through the Bank of China.\(^{74}\)

These changes, combined with the increased number of Australian-born Chinese and the final return of the last of the domiciles who still wished to do so brought about the end of the link between Sydney and south China as it had existed for more than half a century.\(^{75}\) Hong Kong remained as a refuge for many and a continuing source of new arrivals to Australia, often as ‘cafe assistants’.\(^{76}\) Many Sydney residents had relatives in the new China and were anxious for news and opportunities to bring them out, but were less inclined or able to visit them than in the past. Arthur Chang, at one stage, used the well known New Zealand adherent of the new Chinese Government, Rewi Alley, to carry a letter to his family and Donald Young remembers regularly receiving closely typed news sheets from Hong Kong about his and other families from his district.\(^{77}\)

Some of the very few older *huaqiao* who remained in Sydney continued to return. Lee Man Dick returned in 1956 aged 69, dying in that same year.\(^{78}\) 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.\(^{79}\) Perhaps the last *huaqiao* to return, recorded by the old methods before the abolition of the Dictation test in 1958, was Sun Lee aged 77, who departed in 1958 on a Qantas flight, having been in Australia since 1898.\(^{80}\)

\(^{74}\) Stephen Fitzgerald, op. cit., p.27, n.56, Interview with Norman Lee, 25 September 1997 (6).
\(^{75}\) Wilton, op. cit., pp.229-230, on the lessening of the sense of China as home and p.232, on the effects of Australia becoming less racist.
\(^{76}\) Sui, op. cit., p.107, on post-war chaos in Hong Kong; Wilton, op. cit., pp.227-8, refers to the harsh conditions and begging letters from relatives in China; Palfreeman, op. cit., p.152, Table XII gives figures on the increase in this category after the war.
\(^{77}\) Interview with Arthur Gar Lock Chang, 7 March 1998 (Tape 2, A, 19.00) and Donald Young, 11 October 1998 (9).
\(^{78}\) Cliff Lee, 28 September 1997 (4) & Australian Archives (NSW), SP1122/1; N1953/24/2504, Lee Man Dick (Man Duck).
\(^{79}\) Australian Archives (NSW), SP1122/1; N52/24/1534, Young Sing.
\(^{80}\) Australian Archives (NSW), SP1122/1; N58/4695, Sun Lee.
For the succeeding generation, the generation that in a sense did not return, the links to south China, while not ended, were of a different nature. For people such as Arthur Chang, Cliff Lee and Victor Gow, the link was a matter of efforts to bring remaining family members to Australia, or of nostalgic visits in later years. Cliff Lee, for example, returned to China to visit his mother, after his father died in 1957, entering through Macao and leaving again the same way. He helped to set up his mother and two sisters-in-law in Macao before returning to Sydney. Cliff Lee currently has investments in Zhongshan and lives in Shekki (now Zhongshan City), for part of every year. Victor Gow, a son of Joe Wah Gow, also has interests in Zhongshan, in a joint venture business which imports air conditioner parts into Australia. A further stage in the links occurred in 1981 when Louie Yick Cheong, manager of Hong Sings in Dixon St and a member of the Chinese Masonic Society, helped to bring John Louie Hoon’s youngest daughter, She Fang to Australia. John Louie Hoon now has a grandson growing up in Sydney with no doubt as to his Australian citizenship.

For anyone with a memory of the *huaqiao* numbers earlier in the century, as the manager of Wing On & Co., Sydney probably did when he wrote that, ‘apart from the native [Australian] born, the majority are old and weak’, the numbers by 1939 were cause for concern. Age and the desire to return to the ancestral soil meant that the majority of the older *huaqiao* had made their final retirement trips to the villages by the middle of the century. The custom of bones return ensured that many of those who died in Sydney also returned to the home villages. Despite this decline, however, and the operation of the Immigration (Restriction) Act a new generation of *huaqiao* established itself in both Sydney and Australia. This generation was made up of those who entered Australia after 1901 on Certificates of Exemption and were able to remain long enough to take advantage of changes in attitudes and laws, an increasing number of Australian-born Chinese who were either brought up in Australia or if in China were not considered to have lost ‘domicile’, and towards the end of the 1930s, various refugee arrivals. This emerging generation maintained links with the villages

---

81 Cliff Lee, 28 September 1997 (4).
82 Victor Gow, 30 October 1997 (11).
and home districts distinct from those of the pre-1901 huaqiao but sufficient to ensure that the historical links between Sydney and the villages and districts of south China were not lost.

83 Billy Gay, 19 March 1998 (Tape 1, B, 300).
In 1956, Immigration Department officials marked Lee Man Dick’s file ‘no further action will be taken’. They did this because on his final return to Zhongshan, Lee Man Dick ended their interest in him by selling his Rockdale Fruit and Vegetable shop, not to other huaqiao or even to his son in Sydney, but to Italian migrants. In making that comment the officials were acting, perhaps unknowingly, within a history of bureaucratic monitoring of the links between Sydney and the villages of south China that had been in existence for over half a century.

This thesis began by referring to the presence in south China villages of objects such as the Anthony Hordern & Sons safe, of a village medical clinic founded with money earned in Wollongong, and of the puzzlement over the ‘apparent’ citizenship of an Australian-born person. If this thesis has contributed to an understanding of how such things came to be, then it has achieved part of its aim. This thesis has also aimed to contribute to that process of disaggregation of the history of the Chinese in Australia referred to by Henry Chan, as well as to place that history more clearly within the context of south China. For this purpose the term huaqiao has been used in preference to ‘Chinese’ and the ‘Chinese community’ in order to identify those people of Chinese birth and origin whose story is the subject of this thesis. In adopting this usage some of the complexities that exist beneath these terms has perhaps been demonstrated, along with the need for greater care in their use.

The history of the relationship the huaqiao maintained between Sydney and south China, from the late nineteenth century to the middle of the twentieth century, has been traced along the lines of the life patterns of the huaqiao, from youth through marriage and family, into old age, retirement and onto the next generation. In using such an approach the aim has been to focus on the perspective’s most significant to the huaqiao themselves and to attempt to provide some balance in the bias inevitably resulting from reliance on sources created by discriminatory legislation.

---

1 Australian Archives (NSW), SP1122/1; N1953/24/2375, Lee Man Dick (Man Duck), file note 1956.
This approach has assisted in revealing that the majority of Sydney huaqiao maintained links with the villages and districts of south China, and that these links centered on the need to support their families in those villages. The young ‘new chum’ huaqiao were able to mature and grow old in Sydney as residents and workers while also becoming landowners and heads of village households in China. Such a pattern was supported by stores and societies organised around the district of origin, confined by the administration of the Immigration Restriction Act and sustained by the presence in the villages of parents, wives and children.

Naturally variations in this basic pattern existed. Some huaqiao never had any links to their villages, or lost them over time. Others stopped sojourning early to settle in the village, or were prevented from sojourning by decisions under the Immigration (Restriction) Act. Still others married in Australia and either did not maintain links or perhaps began a process of weakened them by using Hong Kong as a safer place to live and educate their children. Many of these variations were based on the opportunities opened by money and class position. It is difficult to say what proportion of huaqiao may have followed these alternatives but it is reasonable to say that the majority of huaqiao who were granted ‘domicile’ in 1901 followed the primary pattern outlined by this thesis.

Particular features of this basic relationship are worth noting. Primary among them was a strong desire by most huaqiao to return to their village. This saw many make a final retirement trip in their old age as well as support a system for returning the bones of their district fellows who died before they could make such a trip. Attempts to bring people into Sydney in defiance of the legislation is a further interesting feature of the link. One feature that is not considered in great detail by this thesis emphasises the personal level on which the links with the villages and districts operated. This was the presence in the villages of unknown numbers of Australian-born children and ‘white’ wives.
Many questions remain unanswered and the need for further study in several areas is clear. Of most interest and potential reward is the need for study in the villages of south China, including oral history research, in order to provide a more detailed picture about such questions as the ‘success rate’ of those who returned, or to fill the frustrating gap in our knowledge about those women who remained in the villages. Those who, while living in fear of bandits and other hazards, collected rents and looked after parents and children.

Sydney has been identified in this thesis as the center of a huaqiao business and support network. It was also seen to be the city in which an increasing proportion of huaqiao lived as their total numbers in NSW and Australia declined during the first half of the twentieth century. This position of Sydney in huaqiao history, as well as the presence of huaqiao representatives from a wide range of Pearl River Delta districts, gives the Sydney researcher many opportunities for comparative work. Research between the people of various Pearl River Delta districts, both within Sydney and between Sydney and other Australian huaqiao communities should give most exciting results.

Much of the evidence of this thesis was derived from the administrative files of the Immigration Restriction Act. These files have captured much evidence about an entire generation at a point when they were going about, what was for them, an ordinary part of their life. These files not only provide broad evidence of peoples’ ages, numbers of trips and the length of time spent in Australia or China, but the careful reading of individual files and examination of the incidentals of lives drawn together by bureaucratic imperatives, along with the comments of officials, enables us to obtain a view into the lives of what one Customs Official described as the ‘ordinary vegetable class’ of huaqiao. Ordinary people who in the usual course of their lives leave scant records for researchers.

---

3 Australian Archives (NSW), SP42/1; C13/734, Jang See, file note, J. T. T. Donohoe, 4 December 1908.
‘Brief Sojourn in your Native Land’ has attempted to contribute to an understanding of the lives of a unique and almost forgotten group of Sydney residents. It is hoped that a fuller appreciation of the importance of the districts of origin to the huaqiao, of the significance of restricted marriage choices and changing conditions in China, of the maturing of a succeeding generation and of the impact of the Immigration Restriction Act, 1901 and its administration has been an outcome of this research. It is also hoped, above all, that a contribution has been made to a clearer knowledge of that pattern of choices and activities, dominated by the desire of the huaqiao to support their families in the home villages, that resulted in a history of intimate links between south China and Sydney that existed for at least half a century.
APPENDIX I  Chinese language considerations

Many systems for the romanisation of Chinese dialects\(^1\) have been used in the past and so much confusion results when texts from different periods are used. ‘Mandarin’, which is the national language of the People’s Republic of China, has had numerous romanisation systems developed to enable it to be pronounced phonetically. Some of the most common are Wade, Yale, Giles, Wade-Giles and finally *Pinyin*, which is that officially used by the Chinese Government today. However, for Cantonese, its sub-dialects and non-Cantonese dialects such as that spoken within the Long Du area of Zhongshan few or no standard romanisation systems have been developed.

As neither the *huaqiao*, nor the various English speaking officials seeking to write down their names, would have known any such systems, the result was a variety of renderings into English script of the names of people and places. Thus, Zhongshan (using its *Pinyin* romanisation in mandarin pronunciation) was usually written either Chungshan or Chongshan and either variation is recognised by *huaqiao* descents today. When it comes to personal names, however, there are even more complications.

As Philip Lee Chun, whose Chinese name was Lee Lum Chun though he’d been naturalized as a NSW citizen under the name Ah Tchee, conceded, ‘I can readily understand that the Chinese system of nomenclature is rather bewildering to a European.’\(^2\) Many Australians of Chinese descent today carry family names such as Hoon, Gay and Gooey which have no relation to traditional Chinese family names. These names usually derive from the personal names of the first family member to arrive in Australia.

The explanation for such renderings is a combination of the non-phonetic basis of written Chinese, dialect variations within spoken Chinese and different cultural practices in the way family and personal names are given and written. The absence

---

1. ‘Treatment of them [Chinese languages] as mere dialects is based on the fact that they all can be put down, at least to some degree, in Chinese characters acceptable to the Great Tradition.’ Moser, op. cit., p.3.
2. Australian Archives (NSW), SP42/1; C36/813, Lily Lee (Lily Lee Ung Land), letter, Philip Lee Chun to the Collector of Customs, 1 February 1915.
of a consistent system of spelling English renderings and a lack of interest in ‘getting it right’ on the part of the officials writing them down are contributing factors.

When, for example, John Louie Hoon’s father, Louie Hoon, gave his name he was expressing his family name Louie (雷) and his personal name Hoon (宽) in the Chinese order. Europeans, however, considered ‘Hoon’ to be the family name. Both ‘Louie’ or ‘Louey’ and ‘Hoon’ were roughly rendered English phonetic equivalents of the characters 雷宽 in the Min dialect of his Long Du area in the district of Zhongshan.³ When his son was born he was given the English name John, though usually called Jack, and this was appended to his father’s name to make him John Louie Hoon in the files of the Customs and Excise Office of NSW. He was also given a Chinese name which began with his family name Louie (雷) and then Jer (则). This last was chosen either because it sounded similar to John (or Jack) or visa versa. As an added twist, John Louie Hoon’s fellow Chinese might ignore his Chinese name and attempt to write his ‘English’ name in Chinese characters. The result, 则雷宽 or Jer Louey Hoon was a confused mix of naming conventions.⁴

John Louie Hoon and his father were relatively unusual, however, in referring to their family name at all. The majority of villagers when asked their name for the purposes of registration or CEDT applications would omit what, for English speakers would be the essential element, the family name. This was not because it was thought unimportant, but because it was too important. For most Chinese speakers at the end of the nineteenth century the ‘family’ name was the clan or lineage name. They were members of a specific clan but were not in the habit of using that name as part of their personal identification. Such a use was all the more unlikely given that most huaqiao would have come from either single surname villages, or villages that had at most, 3 to 4 separate clan names. In such a situation, the habit of using a ‘family’ name as a personal identifier would not have been very practical.

³ These same characters would be written Lei Ze in pinyin when romanising their mandarin pronunciation.
⁴ Australian Archives (NSW), SP1122/1; N1952/24/3951, John Louis (Louie) Hoon. This was how Norman Lee explained the various renderings in Chinese characters of John Louie Hoon’s name that appear throughout his file, interview with Norman Lee, 25 September 1997 (12).
The result of all this was that when giving his name to a Customs official in the port of Sydney, the average huaqiao simply gave his personal name. Yuk Kwan’s family name, for example, was Wong, a name that does not appear in his files until the 1950s, some 30 years after the file began, when he also begins to refer to himself as Ken. If a name happened to sound similar to an English name or word then that was written down, such as with Young or Lee. Otherwise a name was rendered as best the differences in basic sounds between the two languages allowed, such as Duck or Dick for 德, and Yet or Yat for 日.

Another common variation also came about when a person had only a single character for their personal name. In this case, it was usual to extend it and make it sound more ‘polite’ by adding another sound to the beginning. For those of the Pearl River Delta districts this was invariably the sound ‘ah’ (亞). Sufficient people became known as Ah something, Ah Moy, Ah Yat, etc, that the second and subsequent custom-made alphabetical CEDT registers ordered by NSW Customs had additional leaves tagged ‘AH’ inserted between the ‘A’ and ‘B’ leaves to facilitate their being recorded.

The final factor adding confusion to this issue is that a huaqiao’s name might have been different when a boy or young man (that is, before marriage) from that later in his life. As Philip Lee Chun explained, for the benefit of the Collector of Customs, when a son is born, ‘the mother gives him a name; when he goes to school, the schoolmaster gives him a name; if the boy marries, then he takes his paternal name…’ ‘The names given to him in his infancy are of no import, except the family name. It is when he marries that he acquires a definite name.’ This was the Chinese practice, but the imperatives of bureaucratic documentation meant that the name of ‘no import’ often became a huaqiao’s permanent name. Philip Lee Chun himself was writing this explanation because the Collector of Customs wanted to know why he was claiming to be the naturalized Ah Tchee, the name he used before his marriage.

Chinese characters

5 Australian Archives (NSW), SP11/12; Yuk Kwan, Tai Moon, & others, 1926-47 and SP1122/1; N56/6446, Yuk Kwan Wong.
6 Australian Archives (NSW), SP726/2; Particulars of Applications for CEDTs, vol. 2, 10/1/11 - 21/10/18. For a similar explanation for the number of ‘Ah’ names see, Char, op. cit., p.61, n.19.
7 Australian Archives (NSW), SP42/1; C36/813, Lily Lee (Lily Lee Ung Land), letter Philip Lee Chun to the Collector of Customs, 1 February 1915.
This table lists some of the variations in romanisation of Chinese words and names referred to in the text.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character (former name)</th>
<th>Pinyin Mandarin</th>
<th>Wade-Giles Mandarin (former name)</th>
<th>Cantonese (former name)</th>
<th>Other dialect or non-standard romanisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>中山 (香山 or 香邑)</td>
<td>Zhongshan (Xiangshan or Xiang Yi)</td>
<td>Chung Shan (Hsiang Shan or Hsiang I)</td>
<td>Chungshan (Hsiangshan or Hsiang Yap)</td>
<td>Chongshan (Heãngshang Heong Shang Hung Shang)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>隆都</td>
<td>Long Dou</td>
<td>Long Tou</td>
<td>Lung Dou</td>
<td>Loong Doo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>石岐</td>
<td>Shiqi</td>
<td>Shi Ch’i</td>
<td>Shekki</td>
<td>Shakee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>四邑</td>
<td>Siyi</td>
<td>Ssu I</td>
<td>Sze-Yap</td>
<td>Ssu Yap See Yip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>台山 (新寧)</td>
<td>Taishan (Xinning)</td>
<td>T’ai Shan (Hsin Ning)</td>
<td>Toisan (Sunning)</td>
<td>(Sun Wing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>開平</td>
<td>Kaiping</td>
<td>K’ai Ping</td>
<td>Hoi Ping</td>
<td>Hoy Ping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>新會</td>
<td>Xinhui</td>
<td>Hsin Hui</td>
<td>Sunwui</td>
<td>Sun Wiy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>恩平</td>
<td>Enping</td>
<td>En Ping</td>
<td>Enping</td>
<td>Ying Ping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>三邑</td>
<td>Sanyi</td>
<td>San I</td>
<td>Sam Yap</td>
<td>Sam Yip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>翻浴</td>
<td>Fanyu</td>
<td>Fan Yu</td>
<td>Pan-yu</td>
<td>Par Yoon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>南海</td>
<td>Nanhai</td>
<td>Nan-hai</td>
<td>Nan-yu</td>
<td>Namhoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>順德</td>
<td>Shunde</td>
<td>Shun-te</td>
<td>Shuntak</td>
<td>Sun Duck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>東莞</td>
<td>Dong Guan</td>
<td>Tung Guan</td>
<td>Doon Goon</td>
<td>Toon Goon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>增城</td>
<td>Zeng Cheng</td>
<td>Tseng Ch’un</td>
<td>Cheng Sing</td>
<td>Chang Sing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>高有</td>
<td>Gao Yao</td>
<td>Kao Yao</td>
<td>Go You</td>
<td>Go Yiu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>和山</td>
<td>He shan</td>
<td>Ho Shan</td>
<td>Hao Shan</td>
<td>Hock Yiu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>客家</td>
<td>Kejia</td>
<td>K’er Chia</td>
<td>Hakka</td>
<td>Har Kar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>廣州</td>
<td>Guangzhou</td>
<td>Kwang Chou</td>
<td>Kwangchou</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>廣東</td>
<td>Guangdong</td>
<td>Kwangtung</td>
<td>Kwang Tung</td>
<td>Canton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ŌōmiAls</td>
<td>Yin De Tang</td>
<td>Yin Te Tang</td>
<td>Yum Duck Tong</td>
<td>Yum Tak Tong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ôé,ëlAls</td>
<td>Hong Fu Tang</td>
<td>Hong Fu Tang</td>
<td>Hing Fook Tong</td>
<td>Hung Fook Tong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¼óôAls</td>
<td>Gong Yi Tang</td>
<td>Kong Yi Tang</td>
<td>Koon Yee Tong</td>
<td>Goon Yee Tong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>廣善堂</td>
<td>Guangshantang</td>
<td>Kuangshantang</td>
<td>Quong Sin Tong</td>
<td>Quong Sing Tong</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Oral sources were used to provide much of the evidence of this thesis. In all seven descendants of Zhongshan *huaqiao* were interviewed. These were:

- **Cliff Lee** entered Australia as a student in 1949 aged 12. Cliff is the second son of the second wife of Lee Man Dick, market gardener and storeowner. Contacted through Dr Shirley Fitzgerald and interviewed in Sydney, 28 September 1997 and in Zhongshan, January 1998.

- **Arthur Gar-lock Chang** also entered Australia as a student, in 1936 aged 14. Arthur is the son of the Chang Yet. Met at a conference on Chinese Australian history and interviewed in Sydney, 28 October 1997.

- **Donald Young** entered Australia as a student in 1949. Donald is the son of an Hawaiian *huaqiao* and the grandson of a Queensland *huaqiao*. Met through Arthur Gar-lock Chang and interviewed in Sydney, 11 October 1997.

- **Victor Gow** was born in Wollongong in 1922 and returned with his father, Joe Wah Gow, to his village in 1928, where he grew up, returning to Sydney in 1940. Met through Donald Young and interviewed in Sydney, 30 October 1997.

- **King Fong** is the son of Fong Say Tin who came to Australia from Fiji and owned the Say Tin Co. in Sydney. Interviewed in Sydney, 1 April 1998.

- **Billy Gay** is an Australian-born Chinese who spent three years as a teenager in his father’s village in the 1930s. Billy is the son of George Gay a well known Sydney Market Gardener and a cousin of John Louie Hoon. Met when researching possible Sydney relations of John Louie Hoon and interviewed in Sydney, 19 March 1998.

- **Norman Lee** is one of five sons of Philip Lee Chun a well known Sydney merchant. He has only briefly visited his father’s village. Contacted through Dr Shirley Fitzgerald and interviewed in Sydney, 25 September 1997.
For those interviews which were taped, citation is by tape number, side and minutes/seconds in brackets, e.g.: (Tape 1, B, 9.00). Some interviews were recorded by notes only and the references are to the paragraph number of the record of interview notes in brackets, e.g.: Victor Gow, 30 October 1997 (5).

Transcripts of all interviews were checked with the interviewees for errors or clarification. Tapes and transcripts made of interviews will be deposited in a suitable oral history archive to be arranged.
APPENDIX III        Administrative files of the Immigration (Restriction) Act

A. Nature and origins of individual files
From 1902 until 1956, immigration in Australia was carried out under the Immigration Restriction Act.¹ From 1902 until 1947 the Custom & Excise Offices of each State had responsibility for administering the Act under the direction of a variety of Commonwealth Departments.² In 1947 the Department of Immigration was formed and responsibility for immigration at all levels was taken over by that Department.

In the Australian Archives the files relating to individuals created by the administration of the Immigration Restriction Act are contained in two main series. The first is the C/- series or correspondence series, SP42/1. Each new application or file was given a ‘C’ for correspondence, followed by the year date, followed by a consecutive number. For example the Australian Archive (NSW) file, SP42/1; C33/6496, Mew Get, is a file created in 1933 for Mew Get and was the 6,496th file or item of correspondence of that year. As people made subsequent applications or other contact with Customs, their previous files where removed and added to the new file, often called ‘top numbering’. Thus Mew Get’s 1933 file also contains his applications in previous years. The Australian Archive (NSW), series SP42/1 therefore consists of all such files in chronological order of their creation.

When the Immigration Department was formed in 1947-8, the filing notation was changed, these files are in the series, SP1122/1. In NSW the ‘C’ was replaced by ‘N’ for NSW. For example, Australian Archive (NSW), SP1122/1; N53/24/2504, Lee Man Dick (Man Duck), is a file created in 1953, the /24/ being a reference to the category ‘Asiatics’. The series SP1122/1 is a continuation of SP42/1 and Lee Man Dick’s file contains similar material. His file ended because he returned permanently to China while many similar files end when they do because a person became naturalised. This feature has led many researchers to refer to such files as ‘naturalisation’ files.

¹ In 1912 it was amended to become the Immigration Act.
² These were the Department of External Affairs 1903-1916, Department of Home and Territories 1916-1928, Department of Home Affairs 1928-1932, Department of the Interior 1932-1947, and after 1947 the Department of Immigration under various comparable titles to the present day.
The files of these two series, SP42/1 and SP1122/1 are most fruitful because they contain the applications every person who applied for a CEDT had to provide. These applications contain at least the following information:

- **Name** (Chinese characters also given approximately 50% of the time)
- **Date of birth** (usually a year only)\(^3\)
- **Date of arrival in Australia** (usually a year only)
- **Number of trips out of Australia** (length of time in China, departure/arrival dates)
- **Family** (wife and children, this question was not asked between 1905 and 1930)
- **Occupation** (past occupations, including often pre-Federation jobs)
- **Location** (past locations are listed, including those before Federation)
- **File number** (this can be used to relate the file to other material)
- **Photo** (often on the file, and always on the CEDT copy in series, ST84/1).

A typical example of such a file is:

**Australian Archive (NSW), SP1122/1; N52/24/3951, John Louis (Louie) Hoon:**
This file consists of a series of applications for Certificates of Exemption from the Dictation Test, between 1916 and 1950, including associated Police reports, photos at various ages, hand and thumb prints, name in Chinese characters, references as to character, departmental memos and handwritten comments. Included is a police report giving a summary history of John Louie Hoon’s father, Louie Hoon, dating back to his arrival in Australia in 1884. The file creates a picture of a pattern of existence for John Louie Hoon that involved extended periods of time living in both Sydney and China. This included the presence of a wife and at least two sons in the village of Shekki (Shiqi), Zhongshan, Guangdong, China. Other information includes, occupations, addresses, and general physical description.

---

\(^3\) Place when given is almost invariably ‘Canton.’ See Appendix V.
Chronology:

- Born 26th June, 1908 in Sydney. Described as ‘half-caste’, his mother ‘deserting’ when he was 7 years old.
- Travelled to China in March 1916 aged 7, accompanied by his father who plans to send him to ‘college’.
- Returns to Sydney 19/11/24 aged 16. A note states his father, ‘died 3 years ago’.
- Trip to China 9/3/28, returned 24/12/28
- Trip to China 4/3/37, returned 1939
- Trip to China 4/3/40, returned 25/10/46
- Trip to China 23/8/48, returned 18/9/50
- The final file entry is in 1955 when John Louie Hoon is working as a Gardener.

In all John Louie Hoon spent 19 years in China and 29 years in Sydney up till age 47. His file ends at this point because John Louie Hoon ceased to have any dealings with immigration officials as he never travelled again nor did he become naturalised. He continued to live in Sydney, dying there in 1987 aged 79.

B. Examples of other types of administrative files

In addition to the two large series of individual files there are many general files of interest. The Australian Archive title of each series used in this thesis is given in the bibliography, however as these titles are not always accurate and can be misleading as to what each series actually contains the titles used here are more descriptive.

CEDT copies (ST84/1)

This contains a copy of every CEDT and Certificate of Domicile issued by Sydney Customs throughout the life of the Act. Each of these certificates also contains a photo of the applicant.

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

This material does not appear to have been researched previously. Examples include, letters of applications, queries concerning the operation of the Act and a report on the possible fall in Chinese numbers in Sydney gauged by comparing the imports of Chinese goods over a period and a detailed report on smuggling methods.

Register of Certificates of Exemption from the Dictation Test (SP726/1)
In six volumes this is a record of every ‘Certificate of Exemption From Dictation Test’ issued in NSW from 1902 to 1952. Each volume is indexed by the name of the applicant alphabetically and a record of date of arrival and departure, ship name and CEDT No. is given.

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.

General Correspondence (SP11/26)
This is a seemingly random collection of very early correspondence relating to the Immigration Act of 1901, such as petitions requesting exemption from the NSW £100 poll tax and letters requesting the picking up of CEDTs.

Certificates of Exemption by ship (SP11/6)
These files contain the records of inspection of Chinese passengers as they disembarked from various ships in Sydney in 1927-29. The individual records usually contain a ‘Form 32’ stating they have been identified and permitted to enter, thumb and hand prints and the returned copy of the CEDT that would have been carried on the journey. Occasional documents include a Birth Certificate with details of trips on the back, or letters from the Collector of Customs giving permission to enter Australia that were forwarded to Hong Kong.

Register of Birth Certificates (SP726/2)
This is a register kept of the Birth Certificate details of people of Chinese origin born in Australia who travelled outside Australia. There is an alphabetical index at the front with the entries by date. Most of the entries were made on people’s return to Australia. Occasional remarks were made such as, ‘Charlie Hoy Kee Lee/born in Sydney 1 May 1891/left when 10 months old with parents/returned 31 October
1913/Father died in China, mother in China and brother George.’ The majority of entries, however, contain only basic details of dates.

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

In 1939, each police district in the Metropolitan area was required to count all aliens, including Chinese residing within their districts. The returns are by nationality, age and sex.

**C. Brief description of Immigration Restriction Act procedures**

In order to travel to the village the Immigration Restriction Act required of the *huaqiao* that they apply for a CEDT (from 1902-7 a Certificate of Domicile). The application required various details: six photos, a thumb print (originally a full palm print), two written references as to character and a £1 fee. The police were used to verify photos, though this became less common as the *huaqiao* applied for subsequent CEDTs.

The CEDT was drawn up in duplicate and one handed to the *huaqiao* or perhaps a shipping agent by the Customs Boarding inspectors at the ship. The CEDT carried to China was necessary to purchase a ticket back to Australia. On return, the CEDT was handed in to the Boarding Inspector who compared the photos and thumbprints.

If a CEDT expired or was lost, a letter could be sent stating that the *huaqiao* would be admitted on being satisfactorily identified. On return with such a letter, a blank CEDT would be issued retrospectively.

For those who were not ‘domiciles’, a ‘Certificate of Exemption’ was issued instead. These certificates did not have photos and the category and period of validity were simply written in. On expiration, they were returned and a fresh one issued.
**APPENDIX IV**

Tables of statistics and sampling methods

Table 1: Chinese populations of Australia, NSW and Sydney, 1861-1947

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Australia</th>
<th>NSW</th>
<th>Sydney</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1,806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>12,986</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>28,662</td>
<td>7,208</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>38,274</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>38,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>35,523</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>35,821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>29,153</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>29,418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>21,856</td>
<td>897</td>
<td>22,753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>15,940</td>
<td>1,143</td>
<td>17,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>9,311</td>
<td>1,535</td>
<td>10,846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>6,594</td>
<td>2,550</td>
<td>9,144</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Percentage of Chinese in NSW and in Sydney

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>NSW of Australia</th>
<th>Sydney of NSW</th>
<th>Sydney of Australia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tables 1 and 2 are derived from a variety of sources, most of which are ultimately derived from either Commonwealth or NSW Census data. The figures are sometimes difficult to interpret, as it is not always clear when figures include both China and Australian-born people. Generally, aggregate figures are used, as the earlier data does not make the distinction. ‘Sydney’ is also difficult to define but the general trend of the figures is clear.

---

CEDT derived statistics: Tables 3 to 9

Statistics for these tables are derived from the CEDT applications found on the individual files in Australian Archives (NSW); SP42/1 and SP1122/1. A total of 130 files were examined on a random basis from the years spread across the period. These were 1903, 1911, 1913, 1920, 1929, 1931, 1933, 1936, 1941, 1946, 1947, 1952 and 1955. The details of name, date of birth, arrival, trips, family, occupation, and location were recorded and analysed to provide the statistics. As explained in Appendix III, ‘top numbering’ means that files in one year contain information about previous years. Files from the 1930s were generally the most fruitful, while files of the 1940s and 1950s contain more information but due to the rapid drop in *huaqiao* trips after the late 1930s there are far fewer of these files.

**Table 3: Locations & Table 4: Occupations** are derived from the applications for CEDTs which requested details of all previous jobs and locations. The details from the 130 files sampled were tallied to provide the distribution of both locations and occupations. As many people had multiple jobs and locations, the totals exceed 130.

### Table 3: Locations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NSW location</th>
<th><em>huaqiao</em></th>
<th>per</th>
<th>Sydney</th>
<th><em>huaqiao</em></th>
<th>per</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>Botany</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Far West</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>Nth Sydney</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern NSW</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>Double Bay</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Rose Bay</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Fairfield</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brisbane</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>Liverpool</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>Alexandria</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>Camden</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverina</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>Manly</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snowy Mts</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Australia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wollongong</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Parramatta</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Australia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Windsor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Granville</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>203</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>70</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4: Occupations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>huaqiao</th>
<th>percentage</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>huaqiao</th>
<th>percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>Scrub cutter</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labourer</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>Tobacco</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storekeeper</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>Drapery</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawker</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>Bookkeeper</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groceries</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Station work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabinet Maker</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenter</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>Multiple jobs</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miner</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Huaqiao ages

Both the date of birth and the date of arrival in Australia were recorded, so it was a simple matter of calculating the age on arrival of each person from the sample files.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>huaqiao</th>
<th>percentage</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>huaqiao</th>
<th>percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6: Length of time before first return

Each file began with the first application for a CEDT and this date could be used to calculate the number of years since arrival in Australia. The number of previous trips was also asked and this occasionally revealed *huaqiao* who had travelled before 1901, but this was rare.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th><strong>huaqiao</strong></th>
<th>percentage</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th><strong>huaqiao</strong></th>
<th>percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>131</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Marriage after first sojourn

As explained in the text, Chapter 1, p.28, the question about family only appears between 1902-05 and again after 1930. Files were examined from both periods, including some that had information from both periods. While the sample is small, the statistics clearly shows the tendency to marry after the first sojourn to the home village, or to travel when ready to marry.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1902-1905</th>
<th>1931</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Family</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife only</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widower</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife &amp; Children</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8: Dates of huaqiao arrivals

Date of arrival in Australia was always recorded and easily tallied.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>huaqiao</th>
<th>percentage</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>huaqiao</th>
<th>percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1891</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1892</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1893</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1894</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1882</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1895</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1883</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1897</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1898</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1899</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Average periods spent in China

The number of previous trips and the dates of Sydney arrival and departure were all recorded on each subsequent CEDT application, this allowed the approximate length of time both in China and between sojourns to be calculated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time in China</th>
<th>Time in Australia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 12 months</td>
<td>1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 years</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 years</td>
<td>1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 years</td>
<td>9 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 years</td>
<td>1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>11 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 years</td>
<td>12 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 years</td>
<td>13 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>13 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 years</td>
<td>14 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>14 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 years</td>
<td>15 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 years</td>
<td>16 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>16 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10: CEDT figures on number of trips

These statistics are taken from the Registers of CEDTs found in Australian Archives (NSW); SP726/1. There are six volumes of registers which record for each *huaqiao* who departed Sydney the name, date of departure and arrival, ship name and CEDT number. If a person did not return then the appropriate space was left blank. ‘Returns’, even after many years, were back filled.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Departures</th>
<th>Non returns</th>
<th>% of non returns</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Departures</th>
<th>Non returns</th>
<th>% of non returns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1934</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>787</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>1040</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>1115</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1942</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>1137</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>862</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>1153</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>994</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926</td>
<td>1082</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td>1052</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27654</td>
<td>4883</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11: Chinese passengers travelling from Sydney, 1929

These figures are based on the lists of passengers departing Sydney found in Australian Archives (NSW), SP1148/2; Passenger lists, Outward 1929. The ‘race’ or ‘nationality’ of each passenger was always recorded and passengers transshipping from New Zealand clearly identified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ship</th>
<th>2nd class</th>
<th>Steerage</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanda (12/1)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changte (16/1)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiping (16/2)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changte (20/3)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arafura (26/3)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanda (13/4)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiping (17/4)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changte (22/5)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arafura (15/6)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiping (19/6)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanda (13/7)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changte (24/7)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiping (21/8)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arafura (14/9)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changte (18/9)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiping (19/10)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanda (12/10)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changte (20/11)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Albans (16/11)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nellore (14/12)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiping (18/12)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals** | **141** | **20** | **33** | **795 956** |
Table 12: Burials and Returns

The statistics in this table are derived from the Rookwood Cemetery, Register of Burials in the ‘Chinese Section of General Cemetery’. Each burial was recorded and then crossed out in red ink when exhumed. If a burial subsequently took place in the same plot it was recorded by being written over the same space. The figures for ‘Returned’ relate to the year of burial not the year of removal. Exhumations usually took place several years later.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Burials</th>
<th>Returned</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Burials</th>
<th>Returned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1918</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1882</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1883</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1922</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1924</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1934</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1898</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1942</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3094</td>
<td>1523</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13: Arrivals in Australia by CEDTs and Certificates of Exemptions (C of E)

This information is extracted from that provided in Barry York, *Admitted: 1901 to 1946. Immigrants and others allowed into Australia between 1901 and 1946*. Centre for Immigration & Multicultural Studies, Australian National University, Canberra, 1993.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>CEDT</th>
<th>C of E</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>CEDT</th>
<th>C of E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1924</td>
<td>1544</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>1549</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>1518</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>1440</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>1,312</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>1213</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>1,628</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>1025</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>1,618</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>1,684</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>1,851</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>2,098</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>1934</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>2,187</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>1,681</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>2,178</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>2,191</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>1,889</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>1,575</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>1,336</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>1,395</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>1942</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>1,464</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td>1,681</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>1,668</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44571</td>
<td>6379</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX V  

District proportions in Sydney

An estimate of the proportions in which huaqiao emigrated to Australia from the various Pearl River Delta districts would be of great value in beginning the process of ‘disaggregation’ of the Australian-Chinese communities referred to by Henry Chan. This is of particular importance for Sydney, as it appears to have attracted an unusually wide range of districts compared to other Australian regions, particularly when compared to Melbourne’s domination by the Sze Yap.¹

The most ambitious attempt at estimating Sydney’s Chinese population by district of origin was that by Dr Charles Price.² His findings were Chungshan (Zhongshan) - 40%, Kao Yao (Gao Yao) - 24%, Tongkoon (Dong Guan) - 20%, Sze Yap (Si Yi) - 10%, Sam Yap (San Yi) - 3% and non-Cantonese - 2%. However these figures were based on Department of Immigration files of the late 1960s and early 70s and it cannot be assumed that the proportions had remained the same since the nineteenth century.

A Chinese Chamber of Commerce membership list of 1913 provides some comparative evidence. This membership list shows the stores and the district of origin of each manager who were members of the Chamber.³ The table below shows the tally.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Xiangshan (Zhongshan)</td>
<td>Ïãɽ (ÖÐɽ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gao Yao</td>
<td>,BÖ³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dong Guan</td>
<td>¶«Ý¸</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xing Ning (Taishan, one of the Si Yi)</td>
<td>ÐÂÄþ (̨ɽ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He Shan (one of the San Yi)</td>
<td>²×Ê½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeng Cheng</td>
<td>Ōô³Ê</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most obvious difference between the estimates of Dr Price and the Chamber list is the appearance of Zeng Cheng. This is a district often associated with Dong Goon

and which according to evidence given in the Royal Commission co-operated in the Loong Yee Tong.\textsuperscript{4} The relatively few representatives of the Sze Yap districts and the preponderance of Zhongshan and Dong Guan/Zeng Cheng districts does, however, roughly fit with the Price calculations.

Of course stores and managers do not necessarily correspond neatly with population numbers. Particularly when is possible that a manager was not from the same district as the store’s orientation. This appears to have been the case with Wing On & Co., an undoubtedly Zhongshan store, whose Chamber of Commerce member was from Dong Guan!

Various estimates of society membership are also given in the Royal Commission into Alleged Chinese Gambling. At a time when the census reported the total NSW Chinese population at 13,048 and Sydney’s share as 3,499, the Koon Yee Tong of the Dong Guan district is reported to have had 600 ‘scattered’ members.\textsuperscript{5} The Loong Yee Tong which also had Dong Guan members, as well as Zeng Cheng district members, is said to have had 1,500 members representing 80% to 90% of the community.\textsuperscript{6} The Gao Yao are reported to have 1,000 of the ‘clan’ in Sydney and of the Sze Yap there were 300 in Sydney.\textsuperscript{7}

Taking this evidence at face value and assuming all but the Koon Yee Tong evidence were referring only to Sydney, the total mentioned are 2,800. This leaves a further 700 to be made up by Zhongshan district members. This calculation would show a much higher representation for the Dong Guan and Zeng Cheng districts in the nineteenth century and a smaller one for Zhongshan than the 1970s Price estimates. Yet Zhongshan had at least two societies in operation at this time. If, however, the 1,500 for the Loong Yee Tong is taken to mean NSW and this is added to the 600 Koon Yee Tong members then the total NSW proportion for the Dong Guan and Zeng Cheng districts is not too far off the 2,600 the Price calculations would give

\textsuperscript{3} Noel Butlin Archives Centre (ANU); Deposit 111, 111/2/3, Chinese Chamber of Commerce of NSW and other Chinese Associations, miscellaneous 1913-26, membership list.
\textsuperscript{4} Royal Commission, op. cit., p.146, lines, 5871-2, where it is transcribed as ‘Chang Sing’.
\textsuperscript{5} Royal Commission, op. cit., p.54, lines, 2056-83.
\textsuperscript{6} Royal Commission, op. cit., p.153, lines, 6098-99.
\textsuperscript{7} Royal Commission, op. cit., p.391, lines, 14174-76 and p.145, lines, 5807-09.
them. The figure for the Gao Yao people in Sydney is also not too far off its Price level of about 1,000, though the Sze Yap level is twice as high.

Little definite can be said from such calculations except that it is highly likely some districts shrank in size more rapidly than others in the years between the 1891 Royal Commission and the final ‘non-European’ files of the Department of Immigration of the early 1970s. If further sources of figures can be found it may be possible to come to more conclusive findings.

Canton
A final confusion of identification exists over huaqiao places of origin. Huaqiao in nearly all the files and records of the Immigration Restriction Act administration give ‘Canton’ most often as their place of origin.⁸ Officials generally were not interested in village or even district names, however, the huaqiao were not naming the only city in south China they thought these officials may have heard of, rather they were referring to their province of origin, Guangdong.

The Royal Commission minutes has numerous instances of witnesses replying ‘Canton’ when asked where they come from. Only Sun War Hop answers, ‘I come from the big city in Canton.’⁹ In English-speaking terms this means he actually came from Canton. Char, op. cit., p.88, n.2, confirms this, ‘When Chinese speak of themselves as being from Canton, they may mean from the province of Kwangtung [Guangdong] and not necessarily from the city of Canton. The word Canton is used instead of Kwangtungese.’

---

⁸ An interesting exception to this is during the 1930s when a question concerning the ‘location of wife’ was asked, the answer often given was the name of a specific village.
⁹ Royal Commission, op. cit., p.398, line, 14490.
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