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ABSTRACT

North Queensland’s Chinese Family Landscape: 1860-1920

This thesis outlines the Chinese Family Landscape, which developed across North Queensland in the nineteenth and early twentieth century. It specifically focuses on women and the role that women and family played in the Chinese Diaspora, and the contribution they made to longevity and renewal of settlements such as Chinatowns, precincts and String Communities. This thesis is set within the framework of the historical pattern of settlement across the colony of Queensland, with a focus on North Queensland. It is firmly embedded in the broader global Chinese Diaspora, and confirms the importance of established links between destination countries and the ancestral village, China. By statistically and geographically mapping the presence of women as wives, lovers and friends of Chinese men across North Queensland, new understandings and interpretations of Queensland’s Chinese experience have emerged. This indicates that a gender integrated approach to Chinese settlement patterns is important as a means to understand urban and social development of colonial Chinese settlements.

A female presence in the Chinese settlement experience led to generational renewal of Chinatown’s, and establishment of an Australian born, intergenerational Chinese presence within the Australian community. The politics of the private sphere, highlighted by a female approach to domestic affairs emerged through the application of “soft economics”, which played out from an increase in male status due to the presence of a wife, to the strategic formation of companies via the marriage of Australian born sons and daughters. The presence of women in the community enabled the network of translocal and transnational kinship and family linkages to establish and grow but more importantly, enabled a Chinese presence to take root and prosper in a foreign land. The river of money and ideas, which flowed back to the village in China, from families moving between the two worlds, impacted on those who remained in the ancestral village in ways which are only just beginning to be understood in Queensland.

Woman’s participation in community formation, renewal and longevity emerges as an essential element in the North Queensland Chinese settlement experience and challenges the long held popular narrative of a single male gold-seeking sojourner, who was confined to the Palmer River Goldfields. A holistic approach to a gender integrated narrative should be included in future investigations with North Queensland’s Chinese Family Landscape providing a starting point for this process.
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**GLOSSARY**

Cantonese (c.); Mandarin (m. pinyin); Long Dou (l.)  
**Characters (traditional, simple, pinyin)**

Note: Some Characters used for places in Queensland, had the mouth radical added and are non-standard and difficult to reproduce today. They were sometimes phonetic. For Example: Atherton. To be as inclusive as possible to all learning capabilities I have included all language variations to reach as broad a range of audience.

| **Aborigine** /Aboriginal | **土著** | The first inhabitants on the land from its earliest time. Also referred to internationally as First People, Native and sometimes Locals. Term can be used interchangeably with the word 'Indigenous’ though ‘Aborigine’ or ‘First People’ are preferred.  
In this thesis ‘Aborigine’ refers to the first inhabitants living in Australia. It does not include people who lived on islands across the Torres Strait, who are referred to as Torres Strait Islanders, or other islands of Micronesia. |
|---|---|---|
| **Ancestral Village**  
Ancestral Home  
Overseas Chinese native place  
Qiaoxiang (m.)  
kiu hoeng (c.) | **僑鄉**  
Pinyin  
**鄉下**  
**家鄉** | The ancestral village or home where the primary couples are from and where the Clan ancestral tablets are kept. Characters also used which mean ‘ancestral home’ but which may not relate to migration. |
| **Amoy**  
Xiamen | **廈門** | Xiamen, also known as Amoy, is a sub-provincial city in southeastern Fujian province. Principal historical dialect of Amoy was Hokkien/Fujian. |
| **Atherton** | **丫打頓**  
**亞瑟屯**  
*Traditional* | Key town over the ranges in the hinterlands to Cairns, known for its Chinese led industry of Maize. |
| **Australian born Chinese**  
See also oversea Chinese | | A person born in a colony of Australia with at least one parent a China born migrant. It can refer to a person where both parents are China born as well as to a child born into mixed heritage / interracial families. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bachelor society</th>
<th>A popular term used to describe a community of men who live together seemingly without women or family. However, while presenting outwardly as “single”, this term is deceptive because the absence of women does not describe individual circumstance of overseas Chinese men. Many men had wives back in the ancestral village. A better term to describe overseas Chinese men living together is “married bachelor” society. See also Married Bachelor society</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bound Feet</td>
<td>The practice of breaking a female toddlers’ toes and bending them over while “binding” them to the foot with cloth bandages. This over time creates little feet or “lotus feet”. Women from the middle to wealthy elite bound the feet of their daughters as a visible sign of wealth. Would be husbands would need to have the means to employ a servant to attend to a wife with bound feet. It was a crippling practice for women.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brisbane</td>
<td>Capital of Queensland and site of largest Chinatown in the Southern District.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cairns</td>
<td>Northern port town in Queensland above Townsville. It had the largest and longest running Chinese Chinatown outside Brisbane. The characters are phonetic. The 1900s term (and there are two) based on Cantonese.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central District</td>
<td>Region of Queensland taking in Gayndah and Wide Bay Burnett, ports of Rockhampton, Gladstone and Maryborough and out to the Northern Territory border. It forms one of four districts for this thesis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chain Migration</td>
<td>The process of movement by migrant people from their homelands to destination host countries whereby networks are built upon using familiar social relationships such as clan and kinship associations, to construct new places of habitation that reflect the cultural norms and societal expectations of the homelands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charters Towers</td>
<td>Key town over the ranges in the hinterlands of Townsville, known for its rich mineral ore in gold. Closely located near Cape River and Ravenswood goldfields.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Chinatown**  
Tong Yen Gai (c.)  
Tángrénjiē (m./p.)  
Tong jangaai (Jyutping)  

For the purpose of this thesis  
“Chinatown” describes a community within a community where Chinese people, their businesses, social institutions and families were confined, and which developed as a gender diverse, self-sufficient and inter-generational society, which was tolerated only to the extent that the host colony allowed it to exist.

**Chinese Diaspora**  

The dispersal or spread of Chinese people in the nineteenth and twentieth century across the globe from their homeland, China.

**Chinese Family Landscape**  

The Chinese Family Landscape describes the sum total of all elements involved in the coupling, family making and intergenerational pattern of relationships experienced through legal marriage, defacto unions, and casual intimate relations found associated with the Chinese Diaspora.

In Queensland the Chinese Family Landscape is made up from China born migrant Chinese men married to Chinese migrant women, White women, Aboriginal or Torres Strait women, South Islander women or Japanese women, but for other host destinations, the interracial racial mix may vary according to settlement variations.

**Chinese Female Diaspora**  

The dispersion or spread of Chinese females both girls and women, in the nineteenth and twentieth century across the globe from China.

**Chinese woman**  
Chinese female  
Chinese women (plural)  

An adult woman of Chinese ancestry born in China.  

Sometimes used incorrectly in historical texts to refer to a woman or girl born in a host country, such as Queensland, where both parents are Chinese migrant settlers.  

This thesis, which focuses on primary couples, defines the term to a Chinese female zhōng guó nǚ xìng 中国妇女 born in China to Chinese parents.

女性 = more old fashioned. 女性 = simplified and neutral

**Ching Ming**  
Qingming  
Tomb Sweeping Day  

Ching Ming or “tomb sweeping day” is an important part of the Chinese solar calendar dedicated to paying respect to community ancestors while making provision to assist them in the afterlife with food and offerings.

Ching Ming was observed in the Queensland colonial community through the preparation of food, drink at the
temples and transported to the cemetery. Graves of deceased were tended and food offerings (roast pig and fruit) laid out at the gravesite. Incense (joss sticks) and paper offerings were then burnt in purpose built ceremonial burners at the cemetery. I.e.: Ceremonial burner memorial at Cooktown Cemetery.

Chung Shan (l.)
Heung Shan (c.)
Xiangshan (m.)
Chongshan (c.)
Zhongshan (m.)

The dominant region in Guangdong province where number of settlers migrated from. Located in the Southern Pearl Delta region of China, it takes in smaller districts of Long Dou and Leung Dou. See Definition Long Dou and Liang Dou

Pre-1925 it was known as Heungshan in Cantonese or Xiangshan in Mandarin. After 1925 it became Chungshan in Cantonese or Zhongshan in Mandarin. 1925 was the year Dr Sun Yat Sen died, and the area he was from was renamed.

Colonial born

A person male or female who is born in the colony of Queensland or another Australian colony to non-Aboriginal parents.

Concubine
Qiè (m.)

A historical term for woman who lives with a man but has lower status than his wife (in polygamous societies).

Unable to be regarded as First or primary wife in female hierarchy.

Confucius
Kǒngfūzǐ (m.)

Confucius, born in 551 BCE and died at around 479 BCE, China was a teacher, philosopher and politician who founded a societal movement of rules which governed every tier of every aspect of life pertaining to Chinese society, its people and its families.

Confucianism is based on five principles: Humanness, Loyalty to one’s self, ritual norms, reciprocity and filial piety.

These principles set out how an individual conduct themselves throughout life according to the five relationships: Emperor and Subject, Father and Son, Husband and Wife, Elder Brother and Younger Brother and Friend and Friend. Each of these relate to superiority for example: Parent over child, Man over woman and eldest over youngest and permeated throughout family life influencing decision making, relationships and personal conduct associated with the Chinese Diaspora.

Cooktown

Key port town which developed in Far North Queensland which serviced the Palmer River Goldfields.

Many goods and exports flowed through this town including gold, bones, sandalwood, beche-de-mer and people.

Cultural precinct

A “cultural precinct” is a community which is smaller than a Chinatown and unable, through its population size to be self
sufficient or isolated from the broader community.

It is usually an area consisting of two or more Chinese commercial interests, household or gardens located in or near White settlements with an extended longevity over time or generations.

This term encompasses both the social development within a town of more than one cultural community, and makes provision for a definition of an alternative physical footprint of place within an urban environment to the much larger Chinatown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Destination Country</th>
<th>The country where Chinese Diaspora immigrants migrated to. Used inter changeably with Host Country. See also Host Country.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emigrant Hometown</td>
<td>僑鄉 Emigrant hometown, characterized by remittances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhumation</td>
<td>折返魂歸故土 (Soul returning to homeland) To dig or disinter a deceased buried person out of the earth; disinter; for the purpose to relocate to another place i.e.: China. Related to action of Returning Bones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filial Piety</td>
<td>孝順 Filial piety is the living of a good and wholesome life through a daily virtue of respect for one's parents, elders, and ancestors as set out by Confucius in his book Xiaojing (m.) or Filial Piety is crucial to Confucian moral and ethical wellbeing and played an important role in transnational transgenerational settlement patterns associated with the Chinese Diaspora to Queensland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Generation</td>
<td>The first-born generation of children to a primary couple in this study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Nation</td>
<td>土著 A term used in British Columbia to describe an Aborigine or first inhabitant of the country prior to British colonization. See Definition Aborigine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four Districts</td>
<td>四邑 Guangdong's &quot;Four Counties&quot; (See Yup) district included four main districts. In Cantonese these places include Toishan, Hoi ping, Sunwui and Yanping, now called in pinyin Taishan,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ssu Yip (l.)</strong></td>
<td>台山 Kaiping, 開平 Xinhui, 新會 and, Enping 恩平. These districts speak Sze Yap dialect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goong, gong (c.)</strong></td>
<td>宮殿 c. Cantonese for &quot;palace&quot;. It is used for temples with multiple buildings or high status.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Guangdong</strong></td>
<td>A province in the Southern Pearl Delta Region of China where the Chinese Diaspora originated from in the nineteenth Century.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Guanxi (m.)</strong></td>
<td>A system of exchange through mutual benefit extended by one party to another through actions, alliances, marriage relationships. It can extend inter-generationally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gold Mountain Firm</strong></td>
<td>A firm formed in host country by overseas Chinese men. I.e.: Hap Wah Sugar Mill in Cairns which was set up by a consortium of men led by Andrew Leon, 1882.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gold Mountain Men</strong></td>
<td>Chinese men who left the village and went overseas to seek their fortune in order to return home with glory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gold Mountain Woman</strong></td>
<td>A married Chinese woman who remained in the village ancestral home and received remittances from a husband or son, sent from overseas destination countries. 一个在中国的妻子-汇款的妻</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grass Widow</strong></td>
<td>A married woman who is left behind in the village whose overseas husband fails to send remittances back home to support her or their children. It can also apply to a man who has abandoned his wife and never returns to the village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Host Country</strong></td>
<td>The country where Chinese Diaspora immigrants migrated to. Used interchangeably with Destination Country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hua qiao</strong></td>
<td>See Overseas Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Huiguan (c.)</strong></td>
<td>Meeting Hall (association)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Indigenous**

The first inhabitants on a land from its earliest time. Also referred to internationally as First People, Native and sometimes Locals, and is also used interchangeably with the word Aborigine/ Aboriginal.

In this thesis ‘Indigenous’ refers collectively to the first inhabitants living in Australia including both Aborigines and Torres Strait Islander peoples. It does not include Melanesian people outside the Torres Strait, or Polynesian people.

**Indigenous woman**

A woman who is neither Chinese nor White but Indigenous to the country on which she is living.

See also Aborigine/ Aboriginal

**Indigenous wife**

An indigenous woman married to or in a relationship with a Chinese man.

**Intergenerational**

The relating, involving or affecting of several generations of the one family or extended family linked with couples associated with the Chinese Diaspora over a period of time. Over multiple generations.

**Interracial Marriage**

A marriage between two people of different culture and ancestral backgrounds.

Interracial marriage *yí zú tōng hūn* 異族通婚 (m.)

Also referred to as Mixed Marriage.

See Mixed Marriage.

**Jiapu (m.)**

家譜 pinyin

The family ancestral genealogy tree kept in the family history book. The jiapu relates to the family and are patrilineal leaving out the names of wives and daughters.

**Joss house**

A western term used to describe a Chinese Temple. Commenced use in the 19th Century and sometimes colloquially mis-referred to as a “Josh house”.

**Kongsi (c.)**

Ui-koon

Huiguan (c.)

Wiukoon

Wui gun (l.)

空寺 pinyin

A meeting hall for benevolent organisation of overseas Chinese of the same origin, or same place association: 同鄉會 tongxianghui (m.) tōng huāng wài (c.) who form a company or society in mutual benefit.

Could also be regarded as a *ui-koon, huiguan* or *wiukoon*. An association place. 會館 The meeting-hall was usually attached to the side of a temple and a place for district members of community to meet, discuss community business
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leung Dou</strong></td>
<td>良都, traditional A small district in Guangdong Province where a number of Chinese migrant settlers came from to North Queensland. Leung Dou has many clan, kinship and family links through marriage to neighboring Long Dou. See Definition Long Dou.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local woman</strong></td>
<td>本地人妻, An indigenous woman who is “Local” to the land/island/country being referred to. The term can be applied to women who identified as First Nation woman from British Columbia, a Native American Indian woman from the US, or a woman Indigenous to the colony or country. It does not include African women as former slaves; Mulatto women, or South Sea Islander women in Australia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Long Dou</strong></td>
<td>隆都, pinyin A slightly larger district in Guangdong Province from which the majority of early settler families migrated from to North Queensland. Dialect spoken in that region is Loong Dou. Long Dou has many clan, kinship and family links through marriage to Leung Dou. See Definition Leung Du.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Married Bachelor</strong></td>
<td>A term used to describe a community of Chinese men who live together seemingly without women or family but who have a wife back in the ancestral village. Refer to “bachelor” society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Miao</strong></td>
<td>廟, Traditional A temple which mostly enshrines nature gods or national gods. i.e.: the Hou Wang Miao, Atherton.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mixed Marriage</strong></td>
<td>捲喚婚姻, A marriage between two people of different culture and ancestral backgrounds. Also referred to as Interracial Marriage. A Mixed Marriage. See Interracial Marriage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mixed Race</strong></td>
<td>A person born of parents who have two different cultures and race.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mui tsai / jai</strong></td>
<td>妹仔, Little Sister / slave girl A female Chinese bonded servant usually sold as a child from a poor family or family unable to meet the needs of a large family, into a wealthy family as a servant or companion to a daughter or wife.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<p>| <strong>Mulatto female</strong> | A woman of mixed white and black ancestry. This term is used in the USA, South American and former colonies of the British West Indies. |
| <strong>Natal village</strong> | The birth place of a person. |
| <strong>Native American</strong> | A term used in the United States to describe an Aborigine or first inhabitant of the country prior to British colonization. See Definition Aborigine. |
| <strong>New Gold Mountain</strong> Sun Gaam San (c.) Xin Jin Shan (m.) | The term or nickname given to Australia (specifically starting with Victoria) when gold was discovered to delineate between the two major places where gold mining occurred. See Old Gold Mountain |
| <strong>Northern District</strong> | The region where this thesis is geographically located. It takes in an area which includes the towns of Mackay, Winton and Boulia on its Southern border, taking in all of the towns and communities up to Thursday Island and the Torres Straits. It is the region which includes Cairns Chinatown, the largest and longest running Chinatown outside Brisbane. |
| <strong>Old Gold Mountain</strong> Gao Gaam San (c.) Jiu Jin Shan (m.) | Gold Mountain is the term which was applied to California, San Francisco and more broadly to western regions of North America, British Columbia and Canada. California was the original Old Gold Mountain. Where North America was Old Gold Mountain, the colonies of Australia were considered New Gold Mountain. See New Gold Mountain. |
| <strong>Overseas Chinese</strong> Húa qiáo (m.) Wah kiu (c.) | For the purpose of this thesis overseas Chinese refers to migrant people of Chinese birth living outside China associated with the Chinese Diaspora in the nineteenth and early twentieth century. |
| <strong>Port (place)</strong> Fowl (c.) Bu (m.) | A town or city with a harbour or access to navigable water where ships load or unload. [Used by Cantonese to mean any market port.] |
| <strong>Polygamy</strong> | A term to explain the relationship of one man with more than one “wife” married at the same time. In traditional terms one man is “married” to only one woman, with subsequent “wives” being concubines or denoted as Second Wife, Third Wife etc. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Primary Couple / Generation</strong></th>
<th>A primary couple is the first man and woman to come together whether in marriage, defacto union or casual intimate relations producing a child for the purpose of this study.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Private Altar/Shrine** | A small private altar set up in stores and private quarters to remind individuals of their filial obligations and to provide a place for requests for special blessings. Private altars included a small shrine, altar, incense, deity or altar ware such as candlesticks or incense **burners**.  
  In Queensland they were often situated in the private sphere/quarters and attended to by women and children as part of cultural maintenance and transferral associated with filial piety. |
| **Qiaoxiang (m.)**  
Kiu hoeng (c.) | Overseas Chinese native place. Place of origin of Diaspora individual. |
| **Remittance Letter**  
Gold (remittance) letter  
jin xin (m.)  
gum shan (c.) | The letter with money sent home to the ancestral village family to keep the father, mother, sons and wife in the family home. |
| **Returning Bones** | The exhumation of bones of departed friend 先友 **xianyou (m.)**  
  先友 **sinjou (c.)** in Queensland and returning bones back to village for re-interment.  
  See also Exhumation. |
| **Returning home with glory**  
man zai rong gui (m.)  
mun zoi wing gwai (c.) | A traditional Chinese expression **mun zoi wing gwai (c.)** to emphasize the importance for overseas Chinese to return home with honour and large amounts of capital to the ancestral home. |
| **San cong (m.)**  
Sān cóng | A woman’s Three Obedience’s: to her father, to her husband, to her sons. Known as “Three Obedience’s and Four Virtues”.  
  三從 **sān cóng (m.)**  
  三從 **san fú cóng de hé sì xián liáng (c.)**  
  三從従同四賢良 (c.)  
  三服從的和四賢良 |
| **San Po Tsai (c.)**  
Sim Pu Tsai (h.)  
Xīn pú zǎi (m.) | A daughter in law, raised in the family of her husband from a tender age. She is betrothed to her husband and leaves her natal home as a child to live with her in-laws until she reaches marriageable age. She assumes the official status of daughter in law when the **sheung tau** ceremony takes place. |
| **Sitong/ citang (c.)**  
| **Citòng (m.)**  
| **Cìtóng (m.)**  
| **莿桐**  
| **pinyin**  
| A term sometimes used to describe a village ancestral hall.  

| **Soft Economics.**  
| Soft economics describes the influence women in Chinese settlements made upon community decisions from behind closed doors from the private sphere of the family home/quarters.  
| Soft economics is the outcome of gender inclusive discussions, matchmaking, gender politics, advocating and interference. It affected first and second generation marriage patterns, commercial partnerships, female community relations and decision making as a result of probate.  
| The sphere of influence of soft economics extended from the Chinese ancestral home to North Queensland and back.  

| **Southern District**  
| **昆士兰南部**  
| The Southern District is one of four districts used in this thesis taking in the historical districts of the Darling Downs and out to the Northern Territory and New South Wales border and across to the Morton Bay districts and city of Brisbane.  

| **South Sea Islander**  
| A person, whose place of origin is from one of the 80 islands in the South Pacific, including: the Solomon Islands, New Caledonia, and Vanuatu (formerly the New Hebrides) in Melanesia as well as the Loyalty Islands.  
| Cajoled, kidnapped or recruited from the mid to late nineteenth century as labourers to service the burgeoning sugar plantation industry, both men and women were brought across to Queensland.  

| **String Community**  
| A String Community is a lineal model of connections between individuals through kin and commerce associations over one or more towns involving one or two individuals in each town as singular nodes linking the string together.  
| It relies on loose kinship association for mutual benefit support and first generation Australian born children for marriage partners or labour to strengthen family alliances.  

| **Three Districts**  
| **Sam Yap (c.)**  
| **Sān yì (m.)**  
| **Sam Yip (l.)**  
| **三義**  
| **traditional**  
| **邑**  
| **simplified**  
| Formerly forming part Guangdong's "Three Counties" (Sanyi, meaning the ‘three districts’) (**Sam Yup**): the district included (romanised Cantonese) **Nam-Hoi, Poon-Yue and Sun-dak** which are now recalibrated into districts **Nanhai, Nanhai, Panyu, and Shunde 顺徳.**  

| **Toishan (c.)**  
| **Taishan (m.)**  
| **TaiShān**  
| **泰山 (m.)**  
| **台山**  
| Country district in Guangdong Province in the Southern Pearl Delta region of China.  
| See Definition Four Counties.  
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<p>| <strong>Tong Yen Gai (c.)</strong>&lt;br&gt;唐人街 (m.)&lt;br&gt;Tong jangaai (Jyutping) | <strong>pinyin</strong>&lt;br&gt;唐人街&lt;br&gt;Traditional | The Chinese term for place, which literally means “Streets of the Tang Chinese” (m.) also known as Tong jangaai / 唐人街.&lt;br&gt;See also “Chinatown” |
| Two Primary Wife | 2位妻子的家庭 | A term coined by Adam McKeown to explain the prevalence of one man with a wife in each country. Ie: Two “primary wife” family- One wife China/ One wife Queensland. |
| Thursday Island | | Thursday Island, (TI) is an Island in the Torres Strait Island group, situated approximately 39 kilometres north of Cape York Peninsula at the top of Queensland, Australia. Thursday Island was originally called Somerset. Established in 1848. it was originally set up as a colonial outpost as a trading port, but also served as a strategic customs centre and port to protect the Torres Straits, commercial interests and migration to Australia. |
| Torres Strait Islander | | An indigenous person from the Torres Strait Islands between northern Australia and Papua New Guinea. |
| Townsville  | 湯士威爐&lt;br&gt;Tung Wah Times, 26 October 1912. | Key port town which developed in North Queensland which serviced the early mining towns of Ravenswood, Cape River and Charters Towers. Many bones for return to China passed through this port. |
| Transmigration. | | The act of migrating from one country to another for the purpose of settlement and economic benefit. |
| Transnational | | The two-way flow of people, goods, products, services, and ideas across national borders from one country to another. For the purpose of this thesis, transnational is applied to migration patterns and formation of the Chinese Family Landscape to describe the two way flow of clan, kin and family models between China and Queensland which at times also included interracial family groups and cultural exchange. |
| Huiguan | 会馆&lt;br&gt;pinyin | Association place. A county guild hall or meeting-hall usually attached to the side of a temple and a place for the community to meet, |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wiu koon</td>
<td>discuss community business and mediate disputes. In Queensland it may also denote a Kongsi. See Definition Kongsi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White concubine</td>
<td>From a Chinese perspective the term given to White woman who were married to a Chinese man who also had a Chinese wife back in the village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White wife</td>
<td>A White woman legally married to a Chinese man.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White woman</td>
<td>A woman of White birth who is either colonial born or a migrant woman from the British Isle or a country of Europe. Sometimes referred to in other texts as “European” although this technically does not delineate between women born in the colonies or geographical country of birth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife</td>
<td>A woman married or living in a de facto relationships with a Chinese man for the purpose of this thesis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zupu (m.)</td>
<td>Clan or lineage records kept on ancestral tablets at the village temple in China. These records are patrilineal and as such, women and girls are rarely mentioned.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Between 1860 and 1920, just over three hundred Chinese settler men married or partnered with women across North Queensland and raised families. In doing so they contributed to and participated in the settlement and development of North Queensland, and its three key industries, pastoralism, mining and agriculture. Women and families associated with Chinese men played an integral part in the settlement narrative, yet they remain historically marginalised despite academic interest. This has led to underrepresentation in the Chinese Diaspora account and is characterised by an absence in local, regional and State histories. This thesis aims to provide a gender integrated approach to the settlement narrative by identifying the Chinese Family Landscape associated with North Queensland. It hopes to identify the location of women and families across the region and understand the role that the presence of wives and children of Chinese men played in the formation and longevity of Chinese communities.

This thesis will explore the three different types of women associated with family formation, White, Chinese and Aboriginal, to provide a cultural perspective to family and community formation. In addition, it will explore the impact of the Confucian family model and the role it played in the development of North Queensland’s Chinese communities. It will reveal that transnational commercial and family networks not only linked the ancestral village with North Queensland but were strengthened by strategic marriage arrangements made locally between Australian born daughters and older migrant men in the community. The thesis will also analyse the “married” bachelors who remained separated from their China based wives and children, and explore how this arrangement was negotiated through frequent sojourns back to the village or casual intimate relations made locally.

This thesis combines quantitative and qualitative data to provide voice and meaning to women’s experiences which are validated through text and visual mapping. The identification of towns and places where early Chinese families and women lived, including Chinatowns, cultural precincts, and String Communities, provides a valuable future resource for researchers, heritage practitioners and the community to understand, record and interpret the Chinese Family Landscape in a colonial setting.
Since the 1970s there has been a growing push to understand Chinese family history by genealogists and academic researchers alike. The push for knowledge follows national and international research trends into the study of the overseas Chinese or huá qiáo \(^1\) and has resulted in a better understanding of the Chinese Diaspora for those who have an active or vested interest in the subject. Yet despite this push, the Chinese family landscape remains buried in the popular myth that Chinese men were single and/or sojourners, and remained removed from any family connection whilst in Queensland. However, this perception can no longer be sustained and is challenged by family researchers and academics alike. On one hand, genealogists have concentrated (rightly) on personal family stories which are shared with immediate relatives yet, like most family histories even if published, these works remain in the private domain. On the other hand, academic researchers have concentrated on “big picture” history, an area characterised by data interpretation, historical themes, events, commercial economics and race behaviour to describe Chinese experiences. More recently, this focus has expanded to transnational transmigration interpretations and the analysis of global trends, colonialism and China’s historical interaction with the world. Yet while these works provide understanding into the Chinese settler experience, they fall short of addressing the gender imbalance or emphasise the male experience, rather than adopting an integrated approach to the narrative: one which includes women, families, gender and age.

Chinese marriage and family formation occupied a special space within the transmigration experience. It is characterised by women’s activities and an ability to influence community decisions from within the private sphere. The “soft economics” surrounding provision of conjugal comfort, production of children, and female companionship for the broader male community, can no longer be ignored as inconsequential to Diaspora studies, particularly when it involves a shift in century-old traditions or involves non-Chinese wives. “Soft economics” played an influential role in any Chinese social relations and in Queensland also contributed to Chinatowns’ longevity and ability for community renewal. Women (and children) were clearly present in the North Queensland Chinese community and “family” in all of its forms underpinned aspects of the Chinese Diaspora.

To be able to understand North Queensland’s Chinese Family Landscape, both the statistical quantity of marriages and relationships is required, along with an accurate pinpointing of

---

\(^1\) Overseas Chinese or huá qiáo (m.) or Wah kiu (c.) 华侨, refers to Chinese overseas who retain Chinese nationality. See Glossary.
locations where Chinese families may have lived. Both data sets must be firmly based on reliable primary data. The combination of these two data sets enables an accurate picture or “landscape” to emerge which, when combined with the pattern of settlement and development of industry across the colony, enables new understanding of settlement trends to emerge which otherwise may remain hidden. Underpinning analysis of the trends is a series of questions about gender, women and families within a Chinese community. These questions assist to fold back the layers of what is already known, to reveal the potential effect if any that women and families had on the success, failure or longevity of an overseas Chinese community. These questions are supported by answers to the major research question: “How important was the presence of women and families to Chinese communities, cultural precincts and places throughout North Queensland? This provides an overarching direction to the thesis and is scaffolded by six questions divided into three key areas. They are:

Settlement patterns and community formation:
1. What factors contributed to the pattern of Chinese settlement throughout North Queensland?
2. What type of Chinese community formed in North Queensland and was this consistent with community formation associated with the Chinese Diaspora?

Gendered analysis:
3. What marriage patterns, according to official and non-official data sources, occurred in the North Queensland Chinese communities?
4. Who made up the Chinese Family Landscape associated with the Overseas Chinese across North Queensland and when did it start to form?

Chinese Family Landscape:
5. Where did Chinese families live in North Queensland and why did this settlement occur in these places?
6. What influence did the presence or absence of Chinese families have on the longevity of a Chinese community in North Queensland and why?

***

Findings
Major findings attest that there were 1095 identified women and primary families associated with Chinese men, 1847-1920, across the colony of Queensland. Of the families where the location was discovered during the course of research, 45% of them or 315 women and families
were found to have lived in North Queensland. This figure far outstrips Chinese family formation in Brisbane (21 %), Central Region (19 %) and Southern Region (15%). Not only do these figures firmly position North Queensland as the most densely populated Chinese Family Landscape within the colony of Queensland throughout the 19th century, but it highlights the importance of North Queensland as an overseas host destination for the Chinese Diaspora.

Through the identification of the ethnic background of women living with Chinese men, White, Chinese and Aboriginal women, it has emerged that White wives made up the largest proportion of women at 84% for the whole of the colony and 66% in North Queensland alone. Chinese migrant women on the other hand were more likely to join husbands in North Queensland than the rest of Queensland, making up 27% of the Chinese Family Landscape in the north when compared to only 13 % of the total relationship pool across the whole colony. Aboriginal women remained statistically low across the colony accounting for only 3%, rising a few minor points to 6% of the Chinese Family Landscape in North Queensland alone. The small number of other women who formed relationships with Chinese men remained numerically insignificant both across the colony and in North Queensland, accounting for 1% or less of the marriage population which included Japanese, Torres Strait Islander, and South Sea Islander women.

North Queensland’s Chinese Family Landscape was found to be aligned to three key industries: pastoralism, mining, agriculture, as well as provisioning centres such as port towns. These industries influenced which type of family formed and the geographical location where they were found across the north. The vast majority of families were formed along the east coast and were represented by mixed marriages of Chinese-White couples and China born couples, whereas rural and remote areas, dominated by mining and pastoralism, were more likely to have mixed heritage Chinese-White couples and Chinese-Aboriginal couples. When it came to Aboriginal wives, geographical location was found to be an important element in family formation. Despite the identification of a number of Aboriginal women and families associated with Chinese men, this type of family remains the least statistically researched by scholars and it is hoped that this thesis will provide the basis for future scholarly investigation.

This research has found that the number of White women who partnered with Chinese men in the colony of Queensland was comparable to partnering experiences in both New South Wales (NSW) and Victoria (Vic), where similar population trends emerged for the same period. However South Australia, Western Australia and Tasmania developed much smaller mixed
heritage relationships for the same period. This trend was also true for China born women who were found to be located in the three major eastern colonies. Between the years 1847-1920, Queensland attracted one quarter or 25% of all Chinese women to all colonies of Australia. New South Wales attracted the most Chinese women at 32%, with Victoria not far behind at 29%. The Northern Territory (then administered by South Australia) accounted for only 11% of the national total. However, Port Darwin or Palmerston/Darwin as it is also interchangeably known, and the broader Pine Creek/ Brocks Creek region slightly south, developed Chinese communities and infrastructure which were very similar to North Queensland with both regions sharing family networks across Northern Australia.

When Queensland and North Queensland were compared with other British colonies such as British Columbia (BC) and the British West Indies, or emerging Western democracies such as the United States of America (US) and Hawaii, significantly different population trends start to emerge. Both the US and Hawaii attracted high populations of China born women as part of the Chinese female Diaspora, accounting for a combined 84% of the countries surveyed. In comparison, both British Columbia and Queensland attracted only a low 5% and 6% respectively. The large population of Chinese women in the U.S. can be attributed to the operation of syndicates which trafficked young women from China and Hong Kong to California and San Francisco where they were sold as wives, servant *mui ts'ai* or “prostitutes” to the male community. This practice did not take off in Queensland or any other colonies of Australia, which suggests that the close proximity between China and Australasia was sufficient to enable men to return to their primary wives on a more regular basis.

Another factor which separated the U.S. from the Queensland colonial experience when it came to the management of a Chinese Family Landscape, was that the U.S. implemented anti-miscegenation legislation. This prohibited White women from marrying Black men, which initiated a racial line which extended by default to White women partnering with Chinese men despite no legislation preventing it. Established informally across many U.S. states, this Act provided an efficient deterrent to prevent mixed heritage marriages or union between the two groups. As very few studies have been undertaken in the US to explore the actual prevalence of interracial marriage and marriage-like relationships between Chinese men and White women, a true statistical comparison could not be made. However, preliminary evidence suggests that U.S. Chinese-White marriage numbers were far below the figures discovered in Queensland and other
colonies of Australia. This makes Australia unique when considering Chinese-White mixed marriages within the Chinese Family Landscape and overseas Chinese Diaspora experience.

This thesis has demonstrated that women and families in settlements and communities contributed positively to the social, gender and age diversity of Chinatowns and cultural precincts which enabled communities to grow and renew in ways which otherwise may not have occurred had they remained “married bachelor” societies. Women and family provided numerous benefits to community through the subtle application of “soft economics” which played out from the private quarters of the family home, while their presence in the community “normalized” society, increased status for husbands and enhanced kinship and commercial relationships when strategic marriages were arranged between Australian born daughters and migrant older Chinese men. Furthermore, networks and relationships formed between women in the private sphere, providing support and friendship for women and safe passage for babies, particularly as many White wives acted as midwives within the community. While women were able to apply influence from the family quarters to husbands and children, they also provided a significant role in looking after their husbands’ interests for the extended transnational family upon his death.

With over 28 different North Queensland communities scrutinised and mapped, including 18 Chinatowns and 17 cultural precincts, it has been found that women and families were involved across the spectrum of settlements. North Queensland’s Chinese community did not develop as a homogenous, “married bachelor” society, but as gender integrated network of communities where “family” underpinned relationships, decision making and community renewal. This increased the chance of longevity of the overseas community and reinforced links back to the ancestral home in China.

***

Logistics

Covering a sixty-year period, 1860 to 1920, this thesis reflects the expansion, development and settlement of North Queensland through the platform of the three major economic drivers: pastoralism, mining and agriculture. These industries provide the historical backdrop to Chinese settlement and in particular, Chinese family settlement over a three generational period. By scrutinising three generations of families, marriage and migration patterns, an accurate picture

---

emerges which clearly indicates where families were living, the types of settlement which attracted Chinese communities, and potential for physical evidence which may remain.

This thesis is geographically located within North Queensland but is not an exhaustive study of the region. I scrutinise Chinese families residing in key towns and communities along the east coast from Mackay, through the major ports of Townsville, Cairns and Cooktown and up to the most northern point at Thursday Island. I look at families in towns and communities beyond the coastal hinterland to the pastoral towns of the central west including Winton, Hughenden, and Richmond, and the research area geographically takes in the remote dry tropics of Cloncurry through to Camooweal near the Northern Territory border. I compare communities in the port towns of the North West Gulf region including Burketown and Normanton to port towns along the lush eastern sea board and scrutinise districts dominated by mining such as the Croydon, Etheridge, Hodgkinson and Palmer River goldfields. (See Fig. 1.) The choice of communities is representative of the regions’ development through the expansion of certain key industries, targeting a range of towns and settlements within those regions.

While trying to isolate North Queensland statistics so that a statistical analysis could be made, it was found impossible to isolate a North Queensland Chinese family presence from the rest of the colony/State. A broader net needed to be cast so that numbers and location could be established. As a result, it can be confidently stated that the majority of Chinese families within the whole of Queensland have also been identified and scrutinised. For the purposes of this study the State has been divided up into four geographical regions: Brisbane, the Southern Region excluding Brisbane, the Central Region and the Northern Region. This was chosen to reflect general historical and statistical boundaries to ensure that statistical comparisons could be drawn between the regions, and analyses developed for the North.

The thesis does not favour any particular theoretical approach but is guided by what may be considered a gendered framework whereby women and families are the core loci when considering the hypothesis and questions which frame the historical investigation. I would prefer to think that I take a gender, age and race neutral approach to this thesis, with the intention to provide an integrated approach to the questions where multiple considerations and perspectives are required. This is important so that the complexities of diverse cultural backgrounds, White, Chinese and Aboriginal interactions are all considered and presented in a cohesive, respectful and culturally appropriate manner.
Methodology

The methodology used in this thesis conforms to standard historical research practice by incorporating quantitative and qualitative research methods. The theoretical underpinning provided by literature on transnationalism is supplemented by analysis of primary and secondary sources, including newspapers, diaries, maps and historical surveys, cultural heritage sites and oral history. The strength of this format relies on its wide and multi-layered approach, and analysis of official primary documents including Births, Deaths and Marriages, Justice Records, Police records, Commonwealth Immigration records, Alien Registration records and War records as the major statistical framework in which to develop findings about location and social fabric. The official data from various sources has been cross referenced and counter matched with family history, newspaper accounts, local burial records and local government records to ensure the most accurate family data can be obtained.

The capture of every single marriage, union or family within Queensland for the study period, is a huge task, particularly when attention turns to the first and second generation Queensland born marriages/unions and families. To ensure that the statistical evaluation of the thesis remains controllable, an emphasis is placed on the first married/union couple associated with settlement in Queensland with only passing, example specific reference, made to subsequent Australian born Chinese children. The first known couple will be referred to as the “primary” couple or family with their children referred to as the “first” generation born in Queensland/ Australian born children of Chinese. In turn, children born from the union of first generation Australian born Chinese (ABC) will be referred to as “second” generation ABC and so forth. This thesis is limited for most part to “primary” families only.

All care has been taken to identify as many names of women who are known to have been married or living with a Chinese man in whatever form of relationship within the study period. A very large database has been developed from a range of primary and secondary sources to identify women who lived with Chinese men; married or not.3 Official marriages identified through the Births, Deaths and Marriages Queensland register (BDM), Church registers, or sighted marriage certificates, have been entered into a database known as “Marriages”. A second data set forms the basis for statistics of “Co-habitative relationships” or “unions”, de-facto,
casual intimate relations or otherwise, which also occurred at the time. This data set is extracted from unions identified through a variety of sources such as registers of births and deaths, police and justice records, marriage ledgers in church records for unions not registered in the BDM registers, Chinese marriages which occurred within China but which were not officially recorded in Queensland, and articles contained in newspapers and books. For the purpose of this thesis, all women living with a Chinese man for this period are referred to as ‘wife’, including de facto or co-dependent unions unless specified.

However, it is acknowledged that there are some irregularities within my data set “Robb Database: Marriages and Unions, 1848-1920”, due to a range of issues including data entry and the information itself. For example: variations in men’s and women’s names has led to doubled entries; White women remarrying another Chinese man after the death of her first husband, have been mistaken as a first generation Australian born Chinese daughter of a primary couple; Aboriginal women partnering which Chinese men are not captured in Births, Deaths and Marriages or when they are, have multiple names for the one person such as Maggie/ Annie/ Topsy; and lastly, Chinese women’s names may have originally been inaccurately recorded at the time of marriage, births or deaths, if recorded at all, leading to the potential for a data entry mistake to occur. These issues have contributed to a small margin of error. However, over the years of compilation, and due to digitization of resources such as Queensland’s Births, Deaths and Marriage which have been put online, and historical newspapers made available at TROVE through the National Library of Australia, I am confident that much of the irregularity has been corrected. This will improve further as new information comes to light. I am confident that the statistics presented in this thesis have about a 2% data error at this point in time for overall numbers of couples identified, and I doubt that substantial numbers of couples will emerge in the future to dramatically change the overall figures to affect the findings of this thesis.

The quantitative data has been verified and enhanced by a collection of personal communications and a small amount of oral history interviews. This part of the research has drawn on 50 + previous interviews undertaken as part of my honours thesis, “Wives of Chinese men: Strategies for Survival” undertaken in 2002, and in a private consultancy project on the Cairns Chinese community in 2004. Oral history provides a social context to the statistical information and clarifies location of family in a geographical landscape. In addition, a limited number of interviews and personal communications have since been undertaken with both male and female descendants of Chinese families or members of the broader community. This
material is highly subjective and based on a combination of accurate account, memory and in
some cases family myth. However, this in no way detracts from the content which is
acknowledged as an individual’s “Truth”. As this is a social geographical thesis based largely
on quantitative statistics and locational mapping, the qualitative aspect of research provides a
valuable grounding and support to the quantitative findings.

There are several limitations to the research and writing of this thesis. Firstly, not only is it a
large topic, but primary information relating to Chinese settlers and their families throughout
North Queensland is often hidden deep in primary source records located at either the State or
Commonwealth archives, requiring time to find, patience to cross match data, and resources to
undertake. This is even before couples are identified and entered into the data base or
descendants linked to the correct family before interviews with these descendants can take place.
This has led to the locations of some families unintentionally having been apportioned the wrong
location.

Secondly, when this thesis was commenced, Queensland’s official Births, Deaths and Marriage
information was located on microfiche sheets – four different sets. It is possible that couples may
have been missed when trawling through the sets of Births Deaths and Marriage microfiche late
at night, and I have not had time to cross reference now that they are digitized and some data
made available online. As painful as this process was at the time, this methodology has remained
the most reliable one because despite digitization, there are names in my dataset from the
microfiche which do not come up on the online repository. In addition, technological advances
and digitization programs by some repositories over the course of the thesis, such as the
Commonwealth Immigration Records (Certificate of Exemption to the Dictation Test – CEDT)
not only opened up new lines of enquiry, but led to a natural incorporation of information in
order to keep up with relevant to the thesis. While this alleviated some of the logistical
difficulties of accessing information, it also meant additional time was needed to access, collate
and cross reference data. However, technological advancement and digitization also brought its
joys, as photos of women and families became available. These have been sometimes the first
images families have seen of their ancestors who lived in North Queensland.

---

4 Without knowing the names of people to search in the first place, the BDM online cannot be interrogated successfully and
therefore is limited in its ability to reveal all of the names of couples or couples who had children.
Thirdly, the geographical area outlined in the thesis is very large and subject to the seasonal vagaries of the Wet and Dry seasons; both hazards for the survival of paper records. Records pertaining to local councils such as Rates and Valuations, Council Minutes or Sanitary Registers for example are kept in a range of repositories and conditions with many records in rural and remote local council areas damaged by flood, eaten by book worm, silverfish or termites, thrown down mine shafts or too fragile for use due to the conditions they have been stored in. I have spent years in my holidays from work tracking down, negotiating access, and travelling vast distances to view and record these valuable resources so that I could scrutinise the information at home. They have been retrieved from unusual places and viewed in unsuitable conditions, and I have provided my services to assess their value, catalogue and store them in more appropriate places. In some cases, it took two years before I was given access to the records. As a result, I would say that building relationships and reciprocity in rural and regional communities became an essential part of the process and success to research in Central and North Western Queensland.

Lastly, it is my observation that in towns, particularly in the North West and North Western Gulf areas, residents are completely unaware of their Chinese settler history or the important role Chinese settlers and their families played in the development and health of the community. In addition, there are many contemporary families of mixed heritage background who are unaware of their heritage or have only recently learned of a Chinese ancestor. This has led to confusion in identity and rifts in families as descendants struggle to come to terms with what seems to be a long-kept secret, but to the aging keepers has been a method of protection from prejudice in the wider community. Either way, loss of collective community and/or family memory has resulted in early Chinese sites being forgotten and knowledge of their location lost over time.

In the course of researching the question of who were the couples and families, where did they live and how important were women to Chinatowns and cultural precincts throughout North Queensland, some additional research areas emerged which remain outside the scope of this thesis but which are worth mentioning. There were a number of dark themes concerning individuals, couples, men, women and families which were not explored including incidences of suicide, unlawful activities, verbal and physical violence, domestic violence, and abandonment. In addition, the full range of women’s experiences were not explored such as some women/wives working as prostitutes, ended up destitute, or were interned in benevolent asylums such as Dunwich Benevolent Asylum. Likewise, children’s experiences remain unexplored, particularly
those of mixed heritage children who were sometimes forcibly removed from a Chinese father or taken away from a White mother who had been charged with “vagrancy”. These children become caught up in colonial orphanages, consigned to the reformatory system, or farmed out as cheap labour. Some were abandoned, some were sold and some went into a life of crime suffering from anti-social behaviour, difficulties with the law, and dislocation from community. I predict these will be new research areas of the future.

***

Chapter Outline

There are ten chapters in this thesis which are sectioned off after the literature review into three components aligned to the research questions. Chapter 1, Introduction, outlines the aims, research questions, methodology and perimeters of the thesis while Chapter 2 undertakes a comprehensive Literature Review of contemporary interpretations of the study of Chinese families in the Chinese Diaspora. This provides an overarching context as to where this body of work lies within national and international scholarly studies of the overseas Chinese. Chapter 3, Historical settlement of Chinese families in North Queensland, provides the first chapter to address research questions through a broad contextual history of the Chinese settlement across North Queensland, highlighting the key economic influences which drove settlement expansion. This is followed by Chapter 4, Chinatowns and Cultural precincts, a chapter aimed at exploring the urban and built environment associated with overseas Chinese settlement. I have felt it is important to draw upon other scholarly work in this chapter, in particular the work of Chuenyan Lai from Canada, in order to position Queensland’s pattern of urban development. It is also a very useful framework to insert gender and age considerations on Chinatown and precinct environments. Hopefully this demonstrates the physical development of North Queensland’s Chinese settlement types and provides enough scope for my new theory of String Communities to emerge.

The second section to address some of the research questions and relates to family and family formation commences with Chapter 5: Overview: Families Associated with Chinese men in North Queensland. As it implies, this chapter provides an overview of the type of families associated with Chinese men across Queensland and North Queensland. It takes a quantitative approach to demonstrate the complex range of partnerships entered into by Chinese men in order to create families in their host land. This chapter identifies the three main types of wives and

lovers associated with the Chinese Family Landscape and North Queensland’s statistics are compared to the rest of the State to highlight the significant part North Queensland played in the overseas Chinese story. Queensland trends are also compared to other colonial statistics where known or undertaken by other researchers, but much more is needed in this area to draw out any conclusive family trends.

Chapters 6, 7 and 8 introduce the three main ethnic types of woman identified as wives and partners of Chinese men. All three chapters rely on quantitative data which has been compiled as part of my statistical dataset to reflect, with a reliable degree of accuracy, the numbers of marriages and relationships Chinese men entered into across Queensland in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Chapter 6, “A good yellow man is better than a bad white one”: White women and Chinese men, sets out and analyses the statistics surrounding marriage and partnering of White women to Chinese men in North Queensland while also comparing and contrasting this information with known figures from around Australia as well as other host countries around the globe. Chapter 7, “Number four wife catchem boy…”: Chinese Female Diaspora, sets out and analyses the Chinese Female Diaspora of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries to North Queensland and compares and contrast these statistics with known figures from around Australia as well as other destination countries around the globe. Lastly, Chapter 8, “Co-habitating with his Aboriginal Paramour”: Aboriginal women and Chinese men, sets out and analyses the statistics surrounding marriage and partnering of Aboriginal women to Chinese men across North Queensland where information is available. It also compares and contrasts this information with known figures from around Australia as well as other host countries around the globe. These three chapters, together, present key findings about each group of women.

Chapter 9, The Chinese Family Landscape, presents all information together: the ideas and theories behind formation of Chinatowns and precinct, the statistical mapping of couples, and the context of three key industries in determining settlement patterns with the visual mapping of physical locations where couples, women and families lived. Through the methodological integration of statistics and spatial mapping, a recalibration of narrative associated with the Chinese Diaspora can occur, using North Queensland as a case study. It shows that no longer can the Diaspora be represented as a male only activity, or that Chinatowns and cultural precincts were bachelor societies. Instead communities were age and gender diverse and complex in social and physical structure. Women and families were very present in each community and their
existence increased the likelihood of community longevity through the Queensland generated renewal process. Key findings and observations are summed up and restated in Chapter 10, the Conclusion. This chapter will also outline research areas which have emerged during the course of research but which are not explored as they fall outside the scope of this thesis.

***

Conclusion
To aid the understanding of the thesis and its integrated historical/heritage approach some key definitions are required to be explained to ensure that the reader is conversant with particular terms. These definitions are located in the Glossary and are set out in alphabetical order to assist a fast reference to particular terms which may be used throughout the thesis. Some may be used interchangeably and this also will be explained in the Glossary.  

This thesis will provide a greater understanding of Queensland’s Chinese Australian history and contribute to the broader understanding of Chinese settlement within Australia. Through the development of a quantitative framework supported by qualitative data, women and families associated with the Chinese Diaspora to North Queensland are revealed such that they can no longer be ignored. This information can be used as a guide to inform future historical research and as well as cultural heritage surveys. I am confident that it will contribute to meaningful development of appropriate and accurate interpretation of sites which are associated with Chinese settlement and Chinese families throughout North Queensland as well as contribute to comparative studies at national and international level pertaining to the Chinese Diaspora.

---

* For definitions of terminology, refer to Glossary Definitions
Fig. 1. Map of Queensland showing North Queensland region of study

Chapter 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

Studies which use an integrated gendered and age approach to historical research concerning Chinese communities across North Queensland, have been absent from histories of the broader settlement experience. Prior to the 1970s, very little attention was paid to Chinese settlement history across Australia at all, and what was written focused on a colonial response to Chinese migration and degrees of assimilation from a White Australian position rather from a Chinese response to emigration and settlement in a foreign land. In the 1980s, academic focus shifted, and alternative historical perspectives began to be explored and emerge. This positioned Chinese migrants and settlers at the centre of race relations, settlement patterns, and matters relating to the larger experience of Chinese Diaspora. Driven by a push for revisionist perspectives and enhanced from within the Chinese community itself, studies since the mid-1990s emphasised the rich textures of political, migrant, and social organisation history. This approach was consolidated ten years later as recognition for an interdisciplinary and multi-disciplinary approach to Chinese settlement emerged as a means to frame the diverse experiences. Taking in major contributions from historical, anthropological, archaeological, sociological, and psychological approaches, themes of cultural and transnational identity, cultural pluralism and displacement theory were able to be explored. Despite a number of decades of historiographical development, analysis of scholarly literature across the nation reveals that only a handful of dedicated researchers have focused solely on women, families and the private sphere in recent times, despite a rise from within the Chinese Australian community to investigate and document family histories.

It is ironic that for much of the time, the construction of narrative relating to the Chinese Diaspora remains as a male-only experience when in reality, migration was based on the very bedrock of traditional “family” structure, which naturally included women. Through clan and kinship relations, Tongs, chain migration and marriage relations, as well as the presence of non-Chinese women and children in host settlement communities, family was clearly at the centre of migration and settlement experiences rather than separate to it. This literature review will investigate the integration of gender and women into the Chinese Diaspora experience in order to emplace North Queensland experiences in the literature. The first part includes a critique of scholarly works about Chinese settlement, women and families in North Queensland and
Queensland, which will be compared against scholarly contributions at national level. This critique will be expanded to review material undertaken at international level with particular emphasis on the United States of America but also including British Columbia, and South America. It will also take in a short analysis of works written about the South Pacific and Trans-Tasman regional areas to firmly place the study of women and families associated with Chinese men in North Queensland in a regional and tropical context where family and trade linkages/competition were present between North Queensland and countries such as New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, and Fiji. The critique is intended to position this thesis within current global Diaspora research trends.

***

Part 1: North Queensland and Queensland

Investigation of Chinese immigration and settlement to Queensland commenced in the late 1950s with an Honours thesis at the University of Queensland (Tan, 1958). Challenging traditional historical perspectives and arguing that Chinese exclusion was based on racism rather than labour protection, Tan failed in his effort to excite scholars to explore, challenge and reposition Chinese settlement history into a more integrated and inclusive model. It wasn’t until the 1970s that a departure from traditional White-dominant history emerged when a small number of emerging scholars commenced investigation into Chinese settlement in Queensland notably Cronin, May, Brown, and Kirkman. By re-positioning Chinese immigration and settlement at the locus of historical discussion rather than using a traditional model used by previous historians such as Jones and Bolton, May, Cronin, and the work of Holmes, Jack and Kerr on Ah Toy’s garden on the Palmer Goldfield, have emerged as important contributions to reposition scholarly directions. In particular two seminal works influenced scholarly focus when it came to North Queensland Chinese history: May’s seminal book *Topsawyers: the...
Chinese in Cairns, 1870-1920\(^{16}\), and Jack, Holmes and Kerrs’ article on Ah Toys Garden\(^{17}\). May’s book emerged to become the most widely referenced historical book for Queensland, taking in themes of economics and race relations as a lens to view settlement patterns in North Queensland. “Ah Toy’s Garden” has inspired many archaeologists and North Queensland historians as the first archaeological survey of a Chinese heritage site in Queensland.

However, despite setting up a benchmark study, May’s work falls short of providing an integrated approach to Chinese settlement studies, with its focus on the male experience only and a demeaning of White wives through general references such as “European Wife” rather than by an individuals’ names as is done with the male protagonists.

Robb took up the challenge to investigate, acknowledge and provide context to May’s anonymous wives of Chinese men in the Cairns and surrounding districts. The preliminary paper for an Honours thesis revealed women and families associated with Chinese men in Far North Queensland helped to form a large and diverse community consisting of Caucasian, Chinese and Aboriginal women married or living with Chinese men. This broadened into a dominant line of enquiry through an Honours thesis resulting in an expanded geographical area and statistical analysis project, forming a pilot study for this PhD thesis.\(^{18}\)

Literature on women associated with Chinese men remained inhibited for two main reasons. Firstly, feminist historians in Queensland concentrated their enquiries on readdressing the gender imbalance in mainstream historical studies rather than ethnic groups. Queensland historians Cahir\(^{19}\); Wegner\(^{20}\); Spearritt\(^{21}\); and Henningham\(^{22}\) concentrated scholarly efforts on themes of settlement, industry, marriage and sexual economics as a means to insert women’s settlement

\(^{16}\) Cathie, May, Towsawyers: the Chinese in Cairns, 1870-1920, (James Cook University, Townsville, 1984).
experiences into the general narrative. While a more inclusive gender approach was developing, it did not include investigation of women where race or racial identity were present or challenged through marriage choices such as White women marrying Chinese men. Secondly, scholars from within the Chinese community remained silent. Chinese Queensland family history had not developed, and there were few records left by women married or living with a Chinese man from which to draw upon. As such, the mood to write about women and families living with Chinese men was slow to develop, remaining secondary to broader questions raised concerning elements associated with the dominant male experience including migration, economics and race relations.

Since 2000 the interest in the Chinese Diaspora has increased dramatically, leading to a number of academic scholars, heritage professionals and members of the Chinese community collecting, writing and contributing to the understanding of Chinese settlement throughout North Queensland and Queensland. Academic works within the broader Queensland context fall into two categories: those with a primary focus on Chinese or Asian related history, and those who insert Chinese contributions into the broader Anglo-centric settlement story. Whether works were undertaken at Masters or Doctoral level, or published by established historians, the rise in Chinese specific enquiry has been influenced by an accelerated interest at both national and international level in the Chinese Diaspora. Chinese settlement related studies in Queensland included topics of self-representation (Ling23), race relations (Reynolds24; Ganter25, Griffiths26, Richards27), immigration and legislation (Wong Hoy28); or law, order, the judicial system and policing, (Gouglas and Weaver29; Finnane30) as well as Queensland born Chinese participation in

25 Regina Ganter, Mixed Relations: Asian Aboriginal contact in North Australia, (University of Western Australian Press, Crawley, Perth, 2006).
the Australian Defence Forces (Kennedy31; Hamilton32). However, the inclusion of women and families within Chinese Queensland research and analysis remains sporadic, with few scholars engaging with the topic using a gender inclusive approach.33

An example of an integrated approach to Chinese settlement studies is Wong Hoy’s Master’s thesis, ‘Becoming British subjects 1879-1903: Chinese in north Queensland’. This thesis illustrates the value of a gender integrated approach to demonstrate the impact of legislative restrictions of the White Australia policy and the effects on community and community formation within a Queensland context. However, this approach is not shared by all emerging scholars, with those who remain committed to writing race relations still doing so from a traditional perspective. As such, the absence of a gender inclusive approach inhibits the discussion of race relations and represents a lost opportunity to present the multi-faceted aspects of race relations including how women were discriminated against through legislation and social behavior in an effort to contain and control Chinese male immigration. Failure to explore beyond gender stereotypes or traditional model norms is not confined to academics alone.

One continued issue for Chinese Diaspora studies is that an unconscious bias remains prevalent at both local and State level, where historical researchers suffer from settlement amnesia. For example, in the 21st century, it is disappointing to note that “big picture” publications undertaken by professional historians including Evans34, Fitzgerald, and Megarrity and Symonds35, fail to explore alternative settlement narratives or gendered voices within their revisionist interpretations. Instead popular themes continue to be presented as an Anglo male response to settlement, with limited exploration or integration of alternative perspectives.

Thematic or topic-based research and publications have provided a more apt platform for researchers to explore Chinese settlement themes with studies into agriculture and health showing clear improvements in the integration of new perspectives. Griggs’ Global Industry, 31

32 John Hamilton, Gallipoli Sniper: the life of Billy Sing, (Pan Macmillan Australia, Sydney, 2008)
33 The same principle applies to the acknowledgement and insertion of Aboriginal perspectives into research and analysis. However, failure to do so perpetuates the “us and them” divide and inhibits full discussion of issues faced by Aboriginal families which may have synergies with White and Chinese women.
Local Innovation: the history of cane sugar production in Australia, 1820-1995,\textsuperscript{36} includes a well-integrated racial approach to the sugar industry, acknowledging contributions from a range of non-White settlers with an emphasis on Chinese sugar industry participation. Another important agricultural study is the PhD thesis by Gilmore\textsuperscript{37} which dedicates a chapter to Chinese agriculture on the Atherton Tablelands, while Ree\textsuperscript{38} provides a comprehensive analysis of the state of public health and its relation to Chinese in his thesis.

Broader local histories also are slowly becoming more inclusive with recent publications across North Queensland incorporating some Chinese settlement perspectives, such as Douglas\textsuperscript{39}, Shay and Shay\textsuperscript{40}, Forrest and Forrest\textsuperscript{41}; and Hanson, Megarrity, Menghetti).\textsuperscript{42} However, any gains in this area have been hampered by some researchers continuing to write from a traditional perspective.\textsuperscript{43} This has inhibited an inclusive narrative from emerging. While unconscious bias towards White settlement is particularly true in rural and remote areas of North Queensland, it is not the only amnesia maintained for cultural advantage. “Cuckoo-ing” or ousting of a former migrant group by a later migrant group, is evident in at least one local history, the Lower Herbert region, where the district’s substantial Chinese history is forgotten and replaced by a later Italian one (Vidonja Balanzategui, 2011; Vidonja Balanzategui, 2015).\textsuperscript{44} As a result, it is a revelation to contemporary residents that the region supported a sizable Chinese population in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, despite the fact that there are many Chinese descendants in the community today.

***

\textsuperscript{36} Peter D. Griggs, \textit{Global Industry, Local Innovation: the history of cane sugar production in Australia, 1820-1995}. (Peter Lang, Bern, Switzerland 2011)


\textsuperscript{40} Bev and John Shay, \textit{The Chinese on the Goldfields} (The Cooktown and District Historical Society, 1999).


\textsuperscript{42} Geoff Hanson, Lyndon Megarrity, Diane Menghetti, \textit{Goldfields that Made Townsville: Cape River, Ravenswood, Charters Towers}, North Queensland History Series No. 8, North Queensland History Preservation Society, (Townsville Museum and Historical Society 2018).

\textsuperscript{43} When discussing with an author in Hughenden the possibility of including the settlement story of the Chinese market gardeners in her much-anticipated local Shire history, her response was amazement that the notion would even be considered, despite the fact that they kept the town, stations and district supplied with vegetables and fruit for approximately 70 years.

\textsuperscript{44} Bianka Vidonja Balanzategui, \textit{The Herbert River Story} (Hinchinbrook Shire Council, 2011); Bianka Vidonja Balanzategui, \textit{Gentlemen of the Flashing Blade} (Department of History and Politics, James Cook University, 1990). This is despite an earlier study which incorporated the Chinese: Janice Wegner, Hinchinbrook: the Hinchinbrook Shire Council, 1879-1979, M.A. thesis in History, James Cook University, 1984.
Gender and the Diaspora

Research into women and families associated with Chinese men has remained slow to develop, and largely absent from discussion (e.g. Fitzgerald45). It has been neglected as an addition to the male experience (e.g. May46) and stereotyped in an offensive manner (e.g. Beattie47). Since 1970 only four researchers have addressed this gap in knowledge in Queensland, commencing with an unpublished thesis on the history of the Chinese on the Darling Downs by Fischer in the mid-1990s.48 Fischer’s work is important for its sensitive acknowledgement of individual women (White) married to Chinese men, and through its documentation of the contribution of families to the Darling Downs and South East Queensland region. However, the work falls short through its limitation of marriages to interracial marriages between Chinese men and White women only. By omitting other relationships such as Chinese and Aboriginal wives, lovers, de-facto, and casual unions and absent families, the full diversity of families, and meaning of families, in this early settlement phase remains underrepresented.

In 2004/2005 further research was undertaken in South-east Queensland through the works of two researchers who sought to redress this imbalance. Focusing on the Chinatown community of Brisbane and associated urban landscapes, both Tan49 and Fisher50 provide excellent historical research into the Chinese community driven from two different angles. On the one hand, Tan provides an important critique written from a Chinese perspective which gives voice to the difficulties faced by many individuals and families as they strove to be accepted as equal to White Australians and legitimate citizens. She reminds the reader that the process of racialization that Chinese Australians went through on account of their “Chineseness” meant that historically, Chinese settlers were cast outside the scope of nation building identity through the promotion of “Chineseness” and “Australianness” as mutually exclusive. This positions “the Chinese’ as the perpetual “other”, cast away as either foreign or outside the Australian nation.

46 May, Topsawyers, Appendix O. Appendix O records the names of prominent Chinese individuals and business firms (all male). While a synopsis is provided about the individuals, the women are referred to in a dismissive manner that he is “married to a European/Chinese woman”. As the woman is not identified by her name other than her race, she remains nameless, voiceless and invisible in the settlement story.
47 George Beattie, The settlement and integration of the Chinese in Brisbane, PhD Thesis, University of Queensland, 1986. Beattie’s work is particularly offensive for a lack of critique of sources, a perpetuation of myths and stereotypes, and its subjective portrayal of women and families in sentences such as “As the first Commonwealth Census taken in 1911 shows that only 801 married Chinese men in the country were living with their wives, including those who had married Chinese women, this suggests that a good many of Australia’s half-Chinese children up till then were probably born out of wedlock. It seems little doubt that the isolation and loneliness experienced by some Chinese men drove them to seek the companionship of a European or Aboriginal woman with no thought of binding the relationship.” (p. 129)
psyche. This left a mark on a personal sense of self and belonging. As Tan notes it described a cultural barrier when it came to being Australian and inscribes the notion of ‘Chineseness’ whether individuals felt ‘Chinese’ or not.\textsuperscript{51}

On the other hand, Fisher provides an overview of women and family inserted into the broader themes of social structures, organisations, religious practices and occupations. Fisher’s work provides a valuable comparison between the Brisbane Chinese community and the Cairns and North Queensland communities as outlined by May in 1984. However, Fisher’s thesis incorporates limited discussion about the social impact of the introduction of women and family to the Brisbane communities, and the census figures consulted were not broad enough to provide an accurate picture. As a result, women are underrepresented statistically and do not indicate the full range of women in the Chinese community. In contrast, researchers in North Queensland have been documenting the range of women associated with the Chinese Diaspora and analyzing them using two different discipline approaches.

Taking an anthropological approach to Chinese family relations in a Queensland environment, Ramsay\textsuperscript{52} set about researching and recording Aboriginal women and Chinese men’s interracial marriages, using self-perception, cultural identity and cross racial relationships, to explore alternative themes of marginalised race relations from an Aboriginal perspective. Challenging racial narratives of White versus minority, or White versus Aboriginal, he draws out the complex framework of group relations and bi-cultural identity formation which developed, focusing on Aboriginal- Chinese relations juxtaposed against a White dominant background. However, despite his work being innovative in the field of Chinese Diaspora studies, his approach fails to integrate these experiences within a broader Diaspora context whereby Chinese men sought “family” as overseas settlers. Nor does he explore the importance of these families to the Chinese men and constraints faced by them in choosing families such as the risk of separation through prohibitive legislation with wives and children separated from the men, or Commonwealth rejection of requests to take Aboriginal-Chinese children home to China to fulfil filial and cultural obligations. Ramsay also does not acknowledge that Chinese men had

\textsuperscript{51} Tan, “Chinese Inscriptions’: Australian-born Chinese lives.”

relationships with a range of women partners, of which Aboriginal women were only one partner type.

The area of Chinese-Aboriginal relationships has had a slow uptake in interest for historians with the discipline of anthropology taking the lead into investigations. More recent investigations have been made by anthropologists in families in the remote North West Burketown region, North Queensland. Work undertaken by Trigger, Martin, and McLean in 2014 and Maclean, Trigger and Martin in 2016 outline the intricate and interwoven familial kinship pattern associated with Aboriginal Chinese families. This work has provided excellent reference for developing a historical understanding for the timing of interracial unions: a really important aspect when traditional customary law is taken into account regarding Aboriginal women’s choice of marriage partners. However, it remains easy for broader Queensland scholars to simply note that there were “many” Chinese – Aboriginal partnerships during the early phase of settlement.

Slocombe in her book on the Burnet and Wide Bay districts notes that there were “many” informal marriages between Chinese men and Aboriginal women without statistical evidence to back up the claim as to what constitutes ‘many’. This is where the problem lies: assertions about White-Chinese and Aboriginal-Chinese relationships in Queensland are often based on historical assumptions and not verified through evidence-based research. As a result, Chinese-Aboriginal partnering experiences remain classified as “many”, when in fact, they may have been few. What remains is that on a State or Colonial level, they are not well understood, nor their cultural context from an Aboriginal point of view.

What is now not disputed, due to the work of Rains, Robb, and Wong Hoy, is that Northern Australia, in particular, Northern Queensland, was an important regional and national part of the Chinese Diaspora to Australia in the 19th and early 20th centuries. This was confirmed at the inaugural Chinese Heritage in Northern Australia Incorporated (CHINA Inc.) conference in

55 Margaret Slocombe, Among Australia’s Pioneers: Chinese indentured pastoral workers on the Northern Frontier 1848 to c.1880 (Balboa press, Bloomington, 2014).
56 In 2005, at a conference in Bendigo, Kevin Rains, Sandi Robb and Kevin Wong Hoy decided to start a northern Australian platform to research, write and present the importance of Northern Australia to the national narrative of Chinese Diaspora studies. As a result, Chinese Heritage in Northern Australia Inc was formed and conferences held every two years in Northern Australia.
Family histories

It is well accepted that self-representation of Chinese voice, and self-actualisation of the Chinese Australian family, is a vital part in the pursuit of meaningful scholarly research. While the use of

71 The Ingham Family History Society Incorporated in conjunction with Sandi Robb are researching and designing an exhibition on the Chinese in the Lower Herbert Region to be held on the 2-18 February 2018.
oral history is an integral part of the research process, it cannot provide the depth and breadth of family experience better than the “voice” contained in personal autobiographical or family biographical accounts. Autobiographical and biographical works in Queensland remain historically scant with few published. For the most part, Chinese Queensland experiences remain in private family collections as unpublished family documents or, given the recent rise in interest since 2005, remain works in progress.

Two of the earliest and most famous autobiographical accounts from Queensland’s early Chinese settlers include the published work of Taam Sze Pui and unpublished manuscript of Tam Sie in the mid-1920s. However, it was not until the 1970s that family historians began to document family history for future generations. Between 1970 and the mid-2000s families throughout North Queensland have quietly been recording family histories with assorted papers and manuscripts providing a rich and personal texture to any academic enquiry. With the exception of a handful of writers such as Lin Foy, 1970; King Koi, 1993; Low Choy, 2001; Wong Hoy, 2010; and Rains, 2011, whose works are all publically available as published works, there are a number of unpublished papers and manuscripts which remain in private family collections: Forday, Ching, Bow, Keong, O’Neil, Shang, and Morris. In addition many more works are in progress: Ellams, Dooley, Volkmar, and Timmerman.

---

75 Taam, Sze Pui. My Life and Work (Hong Kong, 1926).
76 Tam Sie, Memoirs 1875-1925, unpublished typescript, Mitchell Library, ML DOC 1532
80 K. Wong Hoy (Ed.), Miscellany: a further collection of stories by descendants of the Yet Foy family of Queensland (Kevin Wong Hoy, North Melbourne, 2010).
81 Kevin Rains, Cedars of the west: the Ah Foo family story (Chinese Heritage in Northern Australia Inc, North Melbourne, 2011).
82 W. Forday, Obituary, Rockhampton Morning Bulletin, Tuesday 22 July 1969, BIOGRAPHY in papers held at John Oxley Library file “Chinese in Queensland”.
83 Henry Ching, date unknown, Neither East nor West: A Historical account of a Family Compiled and Edited by Henry Ching, private family history document, pp. 1-21
84 Edmund Lee Wah Bow, My Memories of Times in Places I call Home-Shekki, Cairns and Hong Kong, China, unpublished manuscript, date unknown; and Edmund Lee Wah Bow, The Lee’s Family Tree of LarmHar Village, Lundo, Zhongshan, China, unpublished manuscript, date unknown.
85 Steven Keong, Keong Family Records, assorted papers in possession of Steven Keong, Queensland.
86 Emily Field, Lum So San Family Saga, private document, date unknown, Cairns.
87 Allen O’Neil, Bowman Family Records, Assorted Papers regarding Northern Territory and Northern Queensland.
88 Keith Shang, Hing Family Records’, Assorted Papers, Cairns’ Innisfail.
90 Helen Ellens and Jana Kahabka, My ‘Half Full Lations’. Helen Ellens is researching her Aboriginal Chinese ancestors, the Bing Chew family at Croydon.
Some have made it into limited edition family publications, such as Faulkner\textsuperscript{94} and Tim So,\textsuperscript{95} while others are published as part of conference proceedings.\textsuperscript{96}

\textbf{National:}

Literature outlining the history of Chinese settlement within Australia has substantially progressed since the mid-1960s with Chinese Australian history developing into a thriving academic field from the early 1980s onwards. Early scholars Mackay\textsuperscript{97}, Palfreman\textsuperscript{98} and Oddie\textsuperscript{99} wrote about the Chinese settlement experience from a dominant Western perspective which serves to remind contemporary scholars just how far Chinese Australian studies have come and how broadly concepts of immigration, settlement and race relations have developed. Oddie’s work, indicative of the times, offered a traditional approach to the study of Chinese in Victoria from a Western dominant point of view. The only discussion about women associated with Chinese men (as families were not mentioned at all) was directed towards women who were labelled as “prostitutes”. Oddie made no attempt to explore individual circumstances, even when citing the mixed heritage marriage of Mrs. Hui Yung.\textsuperscript{100} In 1968, A.T. Yarwood\textsuperscript{101} made a serious attempt to address broader immigration and race relations, investigating racial attitudes towards non-White immigrants within the context of exclusionary legislation: the White Australia Policy. However, he continued to present Chinese migrants and settlers as passive participants within a White social order.

Chinese immigrants continued to be portrayed as passive within the prescribed male Anglo-centric framework where citizenship was based on the degree or willingness to assimilate.

\textsuperscript{92}Julia Volkmar, A Company of his Countrymen: Refining the Hop Wah story, paper presented at the Rediscovered Past: Chinese Tropical Australia conference February 11-12, 2012 for CHINA INC, Cairns, 2012 Julie is researching the family history of Andrew Leon and Mary Piggott in Cairns.

\textsuperscript{93}Myra Timmerman is researching her ancestors, the James Ah Ching family and English migrant Sarah Hadley.

\textsuperscript{94}Claire Faulkner, Conquest: an inside story: the integration of a colonial Chinese-Australian family cluster, Claire Veronica Faulkner (Ayr, Queensland, 2013) Faulkner researched her ancestors from the Central goldfields - Young Sing and wife Emma.


\textsuperscript{100}Oddie, “The Lower Class Chinese”: 144

Scholars Inglis\textsuperscript{102} and Huck\textsuperscript{103} continued to support a colonial historiographical view, namely that “assimilation” did not successfully occur when discussing Chinese settlement patterns. However, in the late 1970s, Choi\textsuperscript{104} and Yong\textsuperscript{105} presented alternative interpretations of Chinese migration and settlement history and in doing so challenged others such as Markus\textsuperscript{106} to follow. The seminal work of Choi particularly influenced changes to research analysis when he examined the influence of Chinese cultural background and traditional modes of kinship in relation to migration and settlement patterns. Drawing upon key documents including census data, documents indicating numerical intensity of immigration, and settlement patterns he statistically identifies key data, much of which remains current today. On the other hand, C.F. Yong explored the social and economic activities of Chinese immigrants from the merchant class in Sydney and Melbourne to provide a snapshot of urban Chinese communities and, like Inglis and Huck, continued to use an assimilation model as the basis for understanding inclusion in or separation from the broader White community. All works mentioned to this point barely acknowledge women associated with Chinese men and there is little discussion, if any, exploring the contribution women and families made to the formation of Chinese communities.

From the early 1980s feminist historians began to agitate for the gender imbalance to be addressed to provide voice and enrichment to women’s history. Feminist writers Tankey\textsuperscript{107}, Loh\textsuperscript{108}, Ryan\textsuperscript{109}, and Atkinson,\textsuperscript{110} challenged scholars to acknowledge and insert women associated with Chinese men into the new interpretative models which were rapidly developing.

In New South Wales, Monica Tankey in particular called for a “Blueprint for Action”
challenging historians to provide a “voice” for women and families and contest stereotypes about the Chinese community to address the imbalance in the literature. Using her own personal ancestry as an example, Tankey exemplifies herself as a prime example of the complex relationships negotiated between immigrant Chinese men and White women during the early settlement phase.\footnote{Descended from a mixed heritage union, married in a Catholic service at a Catholic Cathedral as one of the earliest unions in NSW to an indentured labourer from Amoy, Tankey proudly detailed her family history and called for a Blueprint for Action to be developed to incorporate women and families into mainstream historical lines of enquiry.} Her call for action was the first time this inequity had been raised as an issue and she argued for a concerted response from historians to redress the paucity of information. This challenge was taken up by Morag Loh who researched and documented Chinese and White wives of Chinese men in Victoria, providing a concise community history with statistical evidence to substantiate female settlement patterns.\footnote{While starting out as a journal paper, her research led to two successful books and a exhibition focusing on women and family earning her a reputation as a progressive advocate for Chinese families.}

Academic and non-academic literature outlining the history of Chinese settlement between 1860 and 1920 within Australia has substantially progressed over the last 50 years with a rapid rise in diverse areas of interest since the 1990s. Thematic ranges of scholarly work undertaken include works in race relations, (Inglis, Huck, Choi, Markus, Cronin, O Neill, Brawley, Ganter, Reynolds)\footnote{See works of Christine Inglis, Arthur Huck, C.F.Choi, Andrew Markus, Kathryn Cronin, Alan O’Neill, Sean Brawley, Regina Ganter and Henry Reynolds listed in the Bibliography.}; exclusionary legislation and the White Australia policy ( Griffiths, Jones, Fitzgerald)\footnote{See works of Phil Griffiths, Paul Jones and John Fitzgerald as listed in the Bibliography.}; immigration ( Yarwood, Yu, Williams\footnote{See works of A.T. Yarwood, Ouyang Yu and Michael Williams listed in the Bibliography.}) ; trade and labour ( Atkinson, Darnell, Frost, Martinez, Haskins, Balint\footnote{See works of Ann Atkinson, Maxine Darnell, Warwick Frost, Julia Martinez, Victoria Haskins and Ruth Balint as listed in the Bibliography.}; law and order ( Ryan, Presland, Noonan, Holst, Mountford)\footnote{See works of Jan Ryan, Gary Presland, Heather Holst, Jane Noonan, and Benjamin Mountford as per Bibliography.}; defence (Kennedy, Khoo and Noonan, Hopper)\footnote{See works of Alastair Kennedy, Tseen Khoo, Jane Noonan and Peter Hopper listed in the Bibliography.}; mining ( Mountford, Reeves, McGowan, Mayne, Ngai)\footnote{See works of Benjamin Mountford, Keir Reeves, Barry McGowan, and Alan Mayne listed in the Bibliography.}; trans-nationalism (Lake, Ryan, Williams, Fitzgerald)\footnote{See works of Marilyn Lake, Jan Ryan, Michael Williams, and John Fitzgerald listed in the Bibliography.}; religion (Welsh, Penny)\footnote{See works of Jonathon Welsh and Benjamin Penny (in Bibliography).}; State histories (Jones, Moore)\footnote{See works of Paul Macgregor, Gordon Grimwade, Ely Finch and Sandi Robb (in Bibliography).}; temples (Macgregor, Grimwade, Finch, Robb)\footnote{See works of Paul Macgregor, Gordon Grimwade, Ely Finch and Sandi Robb (in Bibliography).}; social organisation and identity (Wang, Chan, Shen, Kok, Doggett, Rasmussen, Ting, Doggett, Bowen, Khoo, Kuo)\footnote{See works of Barry McGowan, Juanita Kwok, Sandi Robb and Hilda McLean (listed in the Bibliography).}; market gardens ( Kwok, McGowan, Robb, McLean)\footnote{See works of Barry McGowan, Juanita Kwok, Sandi Robb and Hilda McLean (listed in the Bibliography).};
Chinatowns (Lyndon, Stone and Steele, Christie, Yu, Chua, Fitzgerald, Dimond, Giese)\textsuperscript{126}. However, amid all of these scholarly works, a natural integration of gender, female perspectives, women, families or age-related differences, has remained sporadic at best and absent for most of the time.

In Western Australia in 1990, Jan Ryan adopted an alternative approach when she explored the cultural identity, Whiteness and cultural construction of women associated with Chinese men. In her paper “‘She lives with a Chinaman’: Orient-ing ‘White Women’ in the Courts of Law”, Ryan concentrates on the West Australian judicial system in relation to gender and judicial fairness, and argued that White women who lived with a Chinese man had their ‘whiteness’ reconstructed or “Orientalised”, that is, repositioned by others to outside the social norm and therefore not eligible for the social and moral benefits usually assigned to the role of wife, mother and homemaker within the community. This placed women outside the rule of law and vulnerable to charges and public shame though labelling as a moral degenerate. Ryan highlighted the discrimination experienced by White women who were outcast from their primary community and repositioned as ‘the other’. At the time Ryan’s arguments were innovative and exposed the hidden aspect of Chinese history associated with the private sphere. However, Ann Atkinson chose a more traditional model of interpretation, and inserted the presence of women and families adjunct to broader themes with many similarities in the weight apportioned to the male Chinese immigrant experience between the work of Atkinson in Western Australia and May in Queensland. Both scholars were progressive in the acknowledgment of women and families associated with Chinese men but with limited discussion, or inserted them as adjunct to broader historical themes.

Until this point, the majority of scholars positioned Chinese participants as secondary passive subjects, within a “big picture” with women associated with the Chinese Diaspora as hidden participants. Loh\textsuperscript{127} and Chan\textsuperscript{128} sought to challenge researchers to combine qualitative and quantitative work to ensure the best voice for Chinese Australian experiences could be heard. On one hand, Loh encouraged more biographical accounts from within Chinese communities to ensure the voice \textit{radiated out} to the broader community, while on the other, Chan directly called

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{126} See works of Jane Lyndon, M.F. Christie, Shane Stone and Roger Steele, Ouyang Yu, McAndrew Chua, Shirley Fitzgerald and Glenys Dimond, and Diane Giese as listed in the Bibliography.
\textsuperscript{127} Kok-Wah Francis, Loh “The Chinese in Australia: An overview”, in P. Hawks and A. Perry (eds), \textit{The Chinese in Australia}, papers from the conference held on 19 March 1988.
\end{flushright}
for the scope of academic enquiry to be reviewed and include a range of topic areas which had, until that point, failed to attract academic attention. Over the next ten years, not content with just talking about the theory behind cultural identity, Chan pushed the boundaries to challenge popular conceptions of Australian culture and encouraged researchers to reflect upon the WASPish (White Anglo-Saxon male) perspectives which remained pervasive. Chan continued to vehemently argue that Chinese family and relationships, particularly Anglo-Chinese and Aboriginal-Chinese relationships, had remained a hidden element of Chinese Diaspora history and that this deficit needed to be rectified.\footnote{Henry Chan, “The Identity of the Chinese in Australian History”, \textit{Queensland Review}, 6, 2 (1999): 1-23.}

Chinese historical enquiry began to depart from traditional models of enquiry to develop a more targeted approach after the publication of MacGregor’s \textit{Histories of the Chinese in Australia and the South Pacific}, which was compiled from proceedings of an international conference held at the Museum of Chinese Australian History in Melbourne in 1993. It was clear that a vigorous interest in Chinese Australian history was evolving which took a multidisciplinary approach to the subject. A range of new research trajectories was being developed including the voice from within known as “family history”.\footnote{Paul Macgregor (ed.), \textit{Histories of the Chinese in Australia and the South Pacific}.}

Norma King Koi’s paper of maternal family history, “Discovering my heritage: an oral history of my maternal family-the Ah Moons of Townsville 1888-1945” encapsulated not only a Chinese perspective on history but positioned women at the centre of the discussion and acknowledged conditions which were less than optimal for them, including some of the difficulties mothers faced concerning poverty, isolation and intergenerational cultural change. King Koi\footnote{King Koi, in Macgregor, (ed.) \textit{Histories of the Chinese in Australia and the South Pacific}: 287-299.}, like Tankey fifteen years earlier, voiced the frustration felt by present generations regarding the suppression and loss of cultural identity experienced by families in order to “fit in”. Two years later, another sort of “fitting in” was inadvertently captured in an interview with prominent Darwin resident Nellie (Shu Ack Chan) Fong by Rees.\footnote{Mary Rees, “Nellie (Shu Ack Chan) Fong: ‘it’s been a good life!’”. \textit{Journal of Northern Territory History}, 6 (1995): 45-51.}

Rees’ work encapsulated, without clarification, the badge of survival called “fitting in” where only positive aspects of family and kinship relations were explored and recollected and negative aspects, including racial terrorism\footnote{Sean Brawley, “Racial Terrorism: Recalibrating the Chinese Experience in Colonial Australia”. in Robyn Lincoln and Sharleen Robinson (eds) \textit{Crime over Time: Temporal perspectives on Crime and Punishment in Australia}. (Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2010): 83-109. Brawley provides interesting alternative language and ideas to describe the use of intimidation, racism and violence by one group against another. He introduces new ways of reading events through the introduction of new definitions which provides greater freedom in which to think though racism and race relations antagonism.}, deliberately omitted and kept from the interviewer.
Whereas Rees was unable to interpret background history underpinning the difficulties experienced by Chinese Australians to contextualise the interview, historians Giese, Fitzgerald, Diamond and Wilton were able to utilise oral history interviewing techniques to deftly and sensitively traverse and explore a range of themes, couple them with documentary sources, and draw out diverse opinions and feelings concerning racism, marginalisation and cultural suppression. Oral history began to form an important research tool utilized by historians.

Since 2000 scholars researching and documenting women and families associated with Chinese men in Australia have actively combined both a qualitative and a quantitative approach in an effort to uncover new information and promote and encourage new lines of enquiry, most notably Williams; Couchman; Bagnell; and Hales. Michael Williams adopted a transnational approach, researching both China and Australia, to uncover new aspects of migration patterns, reveal the prevalence of kinship linkages and provide a statistical analysis of women and families from the Southern Pearl Delta Region, Guangdong province through studying families who migrated. On the other hand, Couchman, Bagnell and Hales actively challenge and address popular stereotypes which have historically castigated women married to a Chinese man, as either poor Irish, drunk, victims, prostitutes and opium addicts rather than free agents making informed choices.

In particular, Bagnell and Hales take care to interrogate these stereotypes as depicted by popular secondary sources and newspapers to present a counter image of women as resilient and proficient at raising families with stability and competence in a hostile and exclusionary environment. Both Bagnall and Hales provide direct reference to individual women as primary

139 Sophie Couchman (ed.), Secrets, Silences and Sources: Five Chinese Australian family histories (Chinese Australian Family Historians of Victoria, Latrobe Asian Studies papers research series 7, 2005); and Sophie Couchman, In and out of focus: Chinese and photography in Australia, 1870s-1940s, PhD Thesis, La Trobe University, Melbourne 2009.
subjects through the use of the women’s names, which is a departure from previous mainstream efforts. Bagnall and Hales build on previous scholarly works of Loh, (Victoria), Ryan (Western Australia), and Wilton (New South Wales) and complement the work of Tan, King Koi, Ramsay and Robb (Queensland). More recent scholars contributing to gendered Chinese Australian history include Rule in her book Families of Fortune: Chinese People in the Tweed, which investigates a rural community in northern New South Wales. However, over the last five years further growth and innovation in alternative interpretations of Chinese Australian settlement have emerged.

The works of Sophie Loy Wilson in labour and migration; Claire Lowrie in domestic service and the Chinese in the Asia Pacific Rim; Peter Gibson, about Chinese furniture makers; Juanita Kwok on market gardeners in the Bathurst region; and Barry McGowan writing thematic local histories of the NSW Central and Western Region, have provided a more nuanced picture, showing readers occupations and customary traditions which evolved in Australian conditions. McGowan was prodigious in his determination to record local history in rural and remote New South Wales, and was a game changer in his integrative approach to history, using a methodology of inclusivity to flesh out aspects of both gender and race within settlement narratives. He is one of the few historical scholars who have gone down the path of automatically including women and Aboriginal families in his writings rather than taking a targeted approach. Other scholars such as Fred Cahir for Victoria, Haskins for Balint for


145 Joanna Boileau, Families of Fortune: Chinese People In The Tweed, (Tweed River Regional Museum, 2010).

146 Sophie Loy-Wilson, “White cargo: Australian residents, trade and colonialism in Shanghai between the wars”, History Australia, 9, 3 (December 2012): 154-177.

147 Claire Lowrie, Masters and Servants: Cultures of Empire in the Tropics, (Manchester University Press, Manchester, 2016).


150 Fred Cahir, Black gold: Aboriginal people on the goldfields of Victoria 1850-1870, (ANU E-Press and Aboriginal History Incorporated 2012).


W.A., and Martinez\textsuperscript{153} for the N.T. have focused instead on race relations, sexual economies and invisible divisions perpetrated by White authorities.

While writing a decade apart, both Martinez\textsuperscript{154} and Haskins focus on labour relations and enforcement of the White Australia policy in North Australia. However, whereas Martinez (Qld and N.T.) extensively investigate attitudes in north Australia toward White workers, Aboriginal and Asian labour, and the stevedoring and pearling industry, Haskins (W.A.) critically analyses Chinese legal rights to Aboriginal labour despite the fact it was considered a “privilege” to employ Aboriginal people based on a hierarchy of race under which only Whites were eligible.\textsuperscript{155} Haskins demonstrates that challenges were made by Australian Born Chinese which were considered problematic for bureaucrats, who attempted to maintain the Commonwealth edict of a White Australian policy which deliberately disadvantaged non-Whites.\textsuperscript{156}

However, Balint on the other hand takes a cultural approach to sexual relations, which comes closer to the focus of this thesis. Like anthropologists Marie Reay writing on NSW\textsuperscript{157} and Guy Ramsay on Queensland,\textsuperscript{158} who investigate the cultural identity of mixed Aboriginal/Asian families, Balint drills down to explore the contribution and sexual economy of Aboriginal women to the pearling industry in Broome, W.A. Balint argues that Aboriginal women’s contribution, through childbearing with Asian men, led to the creation of a distinct pearling economy and culture that blurred racial boundaries. Departing from the dominant White patriarchal analysis that the pearling industry was a White and male industry, Balint repositions Aboriginal women at the centre of the pearling industry rather than on the periphery, noting that Aboriginal women’s contribution of labour faded into the background as soon as Asian male immigrants arrived. However, despite this, Aboriginal women maintained a continuous labour role as inshore collectors of pearl shells, shell sorters, domestic servant and sex workers to support the industry, but were denied inclusion or citizenship based on gender and race. By Balint’s positioning of Aboriginal women at the centre of historical enquiry including areas such


\textsuperscript{155} Chinese settlers, deemed inferior to Whites and therefore not eligible for the privilege, felt disadvantaged by the policy when illegally administered by enforcement officers.

\textsuperscript{156} By using the example an Australian Born Chinese female employer (an Australian citizen), the issues of Aboriginal protection, the meaning of citizenship, who was accepted as a citizen and under what terms, are explored to reveal a complex construction of fluid interpretations of inclusion and exclusion based on racial background.


as family relations, cultural identity formation, cultural maintenance, race relations, labour relations and legislative exclusions, new interpretations will continue to develop and provide new narratives.

New perspectives of scholarly research have enabled the whole framework of historiography to explode with fresh interpretations. Firstly, there is an increased interest in using alternative sources as a means to reveal new narratives about Chinese settlement and family formation. This is demonstrated by Valerie Lovejoy in her article “Falling leaves: Chinese family and community in Nineteenth Century Bendigo”.\(^{159}\) She takes an innovative approach to explore the meaning of family, who makes up a family, and constructions of family based on kinship relationships through the analysis of coronial inquests on suicide and death. These records challenge the popular view that Chinese men were lonely and lacking in family. Instead they reveal many men who immigrated travelled with “family”, that is a father, a brother or an uncle. In many cases immigrants were already married before they left China, with their wives remaining behind. Rather than being depraved and immoral due to their single status, Chinese men developed close male relationships based on kinship and mutual benefit obligations with each other, which resonates with the famous Australian White male settler identity of mateship. Lovejoy challenges scholars to think abstractly about the meaning of family beyond the stereotypical construction of a husband, wife, children, and grandparents to include extended family or constructed family through kinship and mutual obligation societies.

Secondly, there has been a huge impact – including self-analysis regarding Australian Identity formation - arising out of the book *Big White Lie* by eminent academic, political commentator and scholar, John Fitzgerald.\(^{160}\) The influence on Chinese studies in Australia from this book cannot be overstated and is comparable to the works of Yarwood, Choi and Chan. *Big White Lie* provides a comprehensive alternative and revisionist view of the settlement by Chinese in Australia, providing a “renovated” Australian history. Incorporating a gender and class inclusive, revisionist interpretation of Chinese Australian immigration, Fitzgerald engages a general audience to reflect on the meaning of citizenship and cultural inclusiveness. Set out using previously hidden aspects of Chinese Australian History including secret societies, nationalist political exclusion, Christian evangelism, community organisation and interstate connections, Fitzgerald does what Loh, Chan and feminist historians have been asking for since the 1980s: he

\(^{159}\) Valerie Lovejoy, “Falling leaves”.
inserts women and families into the big picture as integral participants of history, providing enhanced opportunities for new interpretations and lines of enquiry to develop. Fitzgerald remains one of the handful of male historical writers who write without gender bias and for this reason his book is a remarkable piece of scholarly work.

The last historical perspective which is slow to emerge is the view of family from within. Perceptions of Australian cultural identity are beginning to be articulated by fourth, fifth, and sixth generation Chinese Australians to provide a rich narrative for non-Chinese scholars to digest. The journey of self-discovery and drive to understand cultural roots is clearly articulated by forerunner Helene Chung, in her article “Ching Chong China Girl: from white to multicultural Australia”. Her wrestling with the complexity of a Chinese identity in a White world, in the 1970s and 1980s, resonate in the work of Christopher Cheng, who, although a couple of generations later, picks up on Chung’s identity quandary as he negotiates straddling the Chinese / Western divide. This is an area which should gain more attention as younger generations seek to express themselves in what is now regarded as a multicultural society.

In conclusion, investigation of national scholarly works which include research about women and families as a normal part of their area of interest, has found through analysis of 199 papers that only 25% of all work employs a meaningful reference to women and families or integrated gendered approach. This means approximately 75% of historical literature has a male gender bias, and lacks any meaningful acknowledgement of women and families. This is indeed an irony, given that it is for “family” i.e. ancestral benefit that migration occurred in the first place. It was through family and family hardship that settlement in a foreign land could occur, as women at home looked after their husband’s property and interests, and women married in Australia were able to further a man’s opportunities.

***

Part 2. International Literature:

The history of Chinese Diaspora, settlement and family formation across the globe has been a matter of interest for scholars for decades, and explored through analysis of diverse global destinations such as the United States of America; Canada; South America (Peru, Mexico, the

---

163 At this time excluding all material about Queensland.
former British Guiana and Cuba); the West Indies (Trinidad); South Africa; Europe (England and the Netherlands); the Asia Pacific region (Indonesia, Borneo, Malaysia, Papua New Guinea); Eastern Melanesian countries (Solomon Islands, Samoa, Fiji and Tahiti), as well as across the Tasman (New Zealand). A consistent enquiry into Chinese female immigration has been most prevalent in America compared to other countries, covering aspects such as immigration, Chinese female prostitution, exclusion and social history. Other countries have remained focused on race relations, labour and immigration. New and innovative interpretation methodologies have continued to develop but the research focus has remained confined to experiences of Chinese women only, with other types of marriages and unions unexplored. The U.S.A., Canada and Mexico as well as the West Indies, and South American countries remain well represented in scholarly works as do countries in the Asia Pacific region closest to Queensland. However, only a small number of researchers are engaged in Europe and Africa for any Chinese diaspora studies with most scholarly works in all countries (with exception of the U.S.A.), lacking in any meaningful reflection or acknowledgement of Chinese female immigration or woman and families associated with Chinese men.

***

**America, British Columbia and Mexico**

From the time sociologist Rose Hum Lee\(^ {164} \) examined and wrote about the Chinese community in the Rocky Mountains in 1947, scholars have taken an interest in Chinese immigration to the U.S.A. However, it took a further 30 years to gain momentum as a distinct historical line of enquiry, commencing in the late 1970s with three researchers, Rhoades,\(^ {165} \) Wang Sing Wu\(^ {166} \) and Wang Gungwu.\(^ {167} \) Subsequent studies in Chinese immigration and settlement history until the present time remain focused on either the study of immigration and diaspora or the study of communities such as Chinatowns. It is fair to say that the seminal work of Wang Sing Wu’s *The Organisation of Chinese Emigration 1848-1888, with special reference to Chinese Emigration to Australia*, not only influenced but provided encouragement for other scholars to pursue enquiry into Chinese immigration, race relations, and labour history. Undertaken as his Master of Arts in 1969, his work developed theoretical understanding into transnational and transoceanic enquiry. The study of Chinatowns and Chinese cultural precincts has remained a


steady line of enquiry across all major Chinese communities and is reflected in the works of Hune, Anderson, Lai and Curtis, Voss, Chen, Markus and Chen, and Hu-Dehart.

However, from 1993 onwards interest in Chinese female immigration to America began to attract the interest of scholars Takaki, Wegars and Yung. Whereas Takaki compared the experiences of Japanese and Chinese women migrating to the U.S.A. and Hawaii, it was the works of archaeologist Wegars, interpreting the presence of women on Chinese sites, and historian Yung, who utilized a range of oral and documentary sources, who elevated the study of women associated with Chinese men into the wider academic arena. Focusing on the immigration, historical presence and social history of female Chinese immigrants, their work evoked change to historical enquiry and initiated other researchers into providing a fresh interpretation of immigrant Chinese women, such as Huping Ling, McCunn and later, Elizabeth Sinn.

Through the investigation of female marriage experience Ling identifies a broad range of relationships associated with the Chinese community including polyandry. McCunn on the other hand paints an intimate portrait of the life of an individual Chinese woman including her background, marriage and life experiences in a small frontier area. Both scholars provide


182 This is where one woman lives with a number of men as wife – a shared wife.
valuable comparative research material when considering Chinese women married in Queensland during the early settlement period. However, unlike the rise in Australian academic interest in mixed heritage marriages and unions, Ling limits her focus to relationships concerning Chinese women, cultural identity and immigration, only briefly identifying the presence of African-American, White and First Nations women as partners. The trend to focus primarily on Chinese women exclusively has remained consistent across America with very few U.S. scholars exploring mixed heritage unions and relationships.

New interpretations show that far from passive participants in their immigration experience, Chinese women were resourceful individuals with agency and license, despite experiences of oppression, discrimination and exploitation. Ling departs from a mono-national focus on one community, to explore multiple communities in a transnational environment. Through adopting a transnational methodology, she was able to analyse newly available Government resources and immigration files from the Immigration and Naturalisation Service (INS) which specifically applied to Chinese immigrant women. These new resources were brought to scholarly attention by Peggy and Chao. The development of supplementary sources and information literacy for scholars and family researchers enabled new lines of enquiry to be developed including analysis and interrogation of the Exclusion Laws and legislation.

The scrutiny of newly available case files from the National Archives enabled a range of scholars to explore the implication of American Exclusion Laws following two main streams of interest: immigration / deportation provisions, and sexual economics/ prostitution. First, works undertaken by McKeown, Lee Sung, Lee, Calavita, Abrams and Yamin
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188 C.N. Wing and Erika Lee, “At America’s Gates: Chinese Immigration during the Exclusion Era, 1882-1943”, The Journal of Asian Studies, 64, 1 (2005): 159-161. Unlike the Australian and Queensland colonial experience, the Exclusion Laws of America including the Page Law of 1875 and 1877 Special Committee on Chinese Immigration, were deliberately drawn up to curb the influx of Chinese women into the USA, usually through major port towns along the West Coast, imported by syndicates to work as sex workers/ slaves.
concentrated on Chinese diaspora, immigration and use of immigration itself as a means of controlling population trends. Focusing on Exclusion Laws within the context of transnationalism, McKeown provides a holistic overview of the Chinese diaspora through a transnational and transoceanic perspective, to challenge academic discourse to revisit Exclusion Laws in the framework of global mitigating factors which were driving Chinese female immigration. He argued that a broad understanding of global push-pull factors underpinning female migration was essential to shift the emphasis away from a lineal model associated with the Chinese male diaspora. On the other hand, Lee restricts analysis to the mono-national level, to conclude that while the legislation was exclusionary in itself as a policy, it did not come into its own as the tipping point, that is where America shifted from being a country welcoming of immigrants to a gate keeping nation, until it was rigorously applied by suspicious, racist or ignorant enforcement officers in regional ports such as San Francisco.

Taking this argument forward, through a legal analysis of legislation, Calavita builds upon Lee’s work to argue that while enforcement officers may have been racist and suspicious when administering the policy, many were also ill equipped to interpret the conflicting sections of the legislation especially in regards to immigrant Chinese women. Continuing with a legal approach to historical interrogation, Abrams takes the initiative of stepping back from the subject matter to look more broadly at immigration law before 1875, broadening the line of enquiry to include “settlement history”, that is, White settlers within a Western-constructed territory. This approach provides a more integrated analysis to the interrogation of emerging law and policy because it includes a full range of immigrants across class, occupation and race. Abrams argues that exclusionary immigration laws are situated as part of a set of legal strategies used to produce, shape and maintain populations. All three arguments are useful to a Queensland and Australian context to understand the development of legal structures and application of exclusionary policies to maintain desired population trends leading up to the White Australia policy.

Secondly, scrutiny of the Exclusion Laws commencing with the Page Law of 1875 as a way of controlling the sexual economy of young Chinese immigrant women brought in as sex workers/
"prostitutes"/ wives, has been the other area which has generated the most interest amongst American scholars. Scholars such as Stevens192, Matsubara193, Yung194, Moloney195, Lui196 and Cho197 directly investigate the immigration of Chinese women as part of the sexual economy within community formation and the ways in which authorities drafted and applied compliance to legislation to legitimize the deportation of Chinese females. There have been detailed and innovative approaches to the investigation and interpretation of information, including micro-biographical analysis of one Chinese woman’s experience at a deportation centre (Yung), restrictions and criteria for entry based on class and the regulations enforced to deport them (Stevens, Moloney), scrutiny of legislation formation and transnational influences (Matsubara198) and analysis of prostitution (Moloney, Liu).

For most part the sexual politics of the organised importation of Chinese women to service the needs of the male population outlines several aspects of Chinese women’s journey to another country. All scholars address the inability for a Chinese woman, through cultural, physical and emotional reasons, to walk towards her own destiny; the difficulty of entry into a host country and humiliation experienced upon entry; her sexual vulnerability and dependency on the male community, and the official castigation of her as the perpetrator of illegal activity rather than a pawn of Western and Chinese paternal culture. This makes the work of Moloney and Lui useful for comparable studies with Queensland concerning women who did not become wives but lived within the Chinese community. Moloney highlights the restrictions placed on immigrant women of all nations based on ideas of correct sexual conduct. She explores notions of women’s economic vulnerability and dependency on male wage earners with particular reference to Chinese women. Lui, on the other hand, explores social perceptions of White women living with a Chinese man through analysis of the political and Christian motives of the suffragette movement. Lui encourages researchers to reflect upon moral views of the time about sex workers, the political and Christian agenda used to exploit “prostitutes” to further their cause,

and the lives of women who lived with a Chinese man, pressured by unsolicited external forces to conform to broader social expectations.

By 2010, a number of American scholars including Pegler-Gordon\textsuperscript{199}, Kuo\textsuperscript{200}, Pfaelzer\textsuperscript{201}, Marcus and Chen\textsuperscript{202} and Cronin and Huntzicker,\textsuperscript{203} were researching a range of non-traditional aspects of Chinese American history including photograph interpretation, modernity, class hierarchy, and racial representations. However, it is the work of Elizabeth Sinn who, like John Fitzgerald in Australia displays the most gender neutral approach to writing.

Sinn has emerged as a highly regarded academic, scholar and commentator after the success and publication of her thesis \textit{Power and Charity} which studied a charity hospital in Hong Kong, the Tung Wah Hospital.\textsuperscript{204} However, it took her 2013 publication on the migration movement of people to and from Hong Kong in the 19th century, \textit{Pacific Crossing: California Gold, Chinese Migration and the Making of Hong Kong},\textsuperscript{205} to cement her status as one of the foremost contemporary Chinese Diaspora writers in America alongside Wang Gungwu. Her book takes a gender integrated approach to her subject, and represents women not just as the stereotypical passive migrant and sex slave, but in contrast, as determined entrepreneurial women who strategically invested in their lives and made considerable gains in America. By positioning women as strong-minded individuals rather than passive recipients of fate, she reminds the reader that personal agency is achievable. Her focus, however, remains on Chinese women, and like most American studies excludes White and Native American women from the narrative. This is an area in American Chinese studies which needs to be addressed by scholars.

Recent scholars who attempt to include alternative marriage partners, arrangements, individuals and marriage laws are Bronson and Ho in \textit{Coming Home in Gold Brocade: Chinese in Early North West America}.\textsuperscript{206} Taking a social history approach, their work is brief, (only 1.2% of the total book), general in approach, yet insightful in the absence of any evidence from other


sources. What is important about this book is that the authors acknowledge that other marriages and relationships existed, present them respectfully and with examples, and provide the evidence that Chinese partnering in America was more diverse than has been previously discussed.

Works like this build upon the seminal contribution by key scholars further north in former British Columbia, including the prolific Yuen-Fong Woon and Henry Yu and Jean Barman. Woon from the late 1990s onwards took a gendered approach to migration patterns, her focus being understanding family separation and exclusion. Her work is the most relevant to this thesis. In addition, she challenges scholars to think about their work and the assumptions which have been made using terms such as “voluntary sojourner”\(^{206}\), “patriarchal oppression”\(^{207}\) and “excluded wife”.\(^{208}\) Not only does she explore the legislative restrictions on women migrating to British Columbia, she explores the social and cultural impact of migration from a Chinese female perspective including wives, bonded servants (Mui tsai), tea house girls and prostitutes. In addition, she explores and explains the cultural and social impact of restrictions on migration on women from the village: “excluded wives” who remained in the village to attend to their husbands’ families, and second wives or concubines purchased specifically for migration purposes, which she describes bluntly as vessels for marriage sex. Woon provides a valuable reference for any international studies on a gendered approach to the Chinese Diaspora.\(^{209}\)

Yu on the other hand takes a broad approach to understanding British Columbian Chinese settlement history. While having an established reputation for transnational and globalised thinking when it comes to migration and settlement patterns relating to Canada in “Global Migrants and the New Pacific Canada”,\(^{210}\) and having worked extensively on the Chinese Head Tax, Yu has contributed to scholars thinking outside the “norm” when it comes to family representation, race and gender. This he does by challenging his own sense of “belonging” to British Columbia and raises awareness of what it means to be a Chinese Canadian: to scrutinise and understand the legacies passed down from grandfathers to families over the period where family intimacy was denied. More recently in the last few years he has turned his attention to

\(^{206}\) Yuen-Fong, Woon, “The Voluntary Sojourner”, 673-690.
\(^{208}\) Yuen-Fong Woon, The Excluded Wife (McGill-Queens University Press, 1998). Woon refers to the married women back in the village, who were unable to migrate due to legislative barriers, as the “Excluded Wife”.
\(^{209}\) See also Yuen-Fong Woon, “Review of Tan Chee-Beng, Colin Storey and Julia Zimmerman (eds), Chinese Overseas: Migration, Research and Documentation”, Pacific Affairs 81, 2 (Summer 2008): 266-267.
highlight First Nations people and Chinese migrant interactions. In his dialogue with Musqueum Nations people, Vancouver, he advocates that scholars “break the silences and speak the truth” about the past; to understand indigenous family perspectives, interracial relations and displacement. For this thesis, his article “Nurturing Dialogues between First Nations, Urban Aboriginal, and Immigrant Communities in Vancouver” is most relevant when it comes to understanding Aboriginal-Chinese marriage relations and women’s decision making.

Jean Barmen provides an influential comparative analysis regarding the work undertaken on intimacy and relationships between First Nations women and Chinese men in early British Columbia. Her work “Beyond Chinatown: Chinese men and Indigenous Women in Early British Columbia”, provides an excellent framework to position Australian Aboriginal women’s interaction with Chinese men. However, it remains ironic that Chinese migrants partnered and raised families with First Nations women, yet paradoxically may also have been responsible for the displacement of First Nations people and demise of access to country as new settlers. This suggests that parallels between British Columbia and North Queensland should be explored further.

At the southern end of America, integrated historical experiences specifically associated with the borders of the U.S.A. and Mexico have emerged, providing new interpretations of transnationalism through “Borderland” histories. Academic scholars such Camacho, Delaro, Romaro and more recently Hu-Dehart have explored the complexities of borderland histories including aspects of economic, family, and community patterns associated with migratory and seasonal patterns as families moved between host destination towns across the border. But while Delaro and Romaro only briefly mention family relationships as they explore commercial networks, trade, labour recruitment and human trafficking, it is the work of

Camacho which provides insight into the social cohesion or lack of cohesion which underpinned Mexican/Chinese relations.

Primarily investigating the early 20th century and interwar period, Camacho offers a valuable reflection on the difficulties faced by mixed heritage families who were rejected as citizens by a number of nations (Mexico, America and China). Relegated to a category neither Mexican nor Chinese, mixed heritage families experienced personal difficulties when faced with “identity prejudice” when Mexico forcibly deported Chinese settlers with Mexican wives and families in the early 1930s. Repositioned as borderless citizens, mixed heritage families were forced to accept a hybridized identity shaping their strength of character as they faced a cultural identity crisis. Camacho explores the value of new constructions of family and community to provide cohesion when faced with adversity. There are many parallels which can be drawn between the cultural identity formation of family and displacement experiences of Chinese/Mexican families of the 1920-30s and Chinese/Aboriginal families of North Queensland for the same period.

***

West Indies, Caribbean and South America

Since the early 1990s investigations into the “Coolie trade” associated with the West Indies, Caribbean and South American countries have remained steady with several researchers investigating the sugar plantation and guano mining regions of the former British West Indies, Cuba, Jamaica, Trinidad, British Guiana, Mexico and Peru. With an emphasis on the indentured Chinese labour trade for sugar plantations after the emancipation of African slaves, scholars such as Look Lai218, Lee Loy219, Bohr220, Jung221, Lopez and Meagher222, Lutz223, and Navaez224 provided documentation and analysis of Chinese coolie labour following familiar streams of investigation including race relations, immigration and labour protection. Of the 16 articles

222 Kathleen Lopez, “Review of Arnold J. Meagher, The Coolie Trade: The Traffic in Chinese Laborers to Latin America 1847-1874, Labour History, 97 (November, 2009): 208-209. Between 1847 and 1874 over 250,000 Chinese indentured labourers were kidnapped, bullied or coerced into signing contracts to work in Cuba and Peru on sugar plantations or in guano beds. This constituted an involuntary migration pattern.
reviewed about Latin America and West Indies/Caribbean Chinese migration experiences, only two writers, Lee Loy and Lutz, include any acknowledgement or discussion of women and families associated with Chinese men. This was limited to acknowledgment of the historical presence of wives rather than any meaningful analysis and only one mentions the diversity of Chinese family relations which included Chinese men living or married to African, Indigenous or White women. It is true in some countries that restrictive legislation was drafted by White colonists to prevent marriages and unions between African and Indigenous women and Chinese men. However, it is also clear that some unions persisted leaving many questions unanswered.

***

Pacific Rim

The contribution of South East Asia and regional Pacific studies investigating the Chinese diaspora and immigration patterns has been significant since the early 1950s. Important works taking an anthropological or sociological approach to social structures and race relations have covered most countries associated with the Chinese diaspora including the Asia Pacific region (Indonesia\(^{225}\); Sarawak, Malaysia\(^{226}\); and Papua New Guinea\(^{227}\); Eastern Melanesian countries (Solomon Islands\(^{228}\); Samoa, Fiji\(^{229}\); Tahiti\(^{230}\) and Vanuatu\(^{231}\) ) and New Zealand. However, despite early scholarly enquiry from T’ien\(^{232}\); Laracy\(^{233}\); and Tom\(^{234}\), it is the combined works of Bill Willmot\(^{235}\) which really provide tangible comparative investigation into Chinese settlement.
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229 Bessie Ng Kamlin Ali, *Chinese in Fiji, Samoa*, (Institute of Pacific Studies, University of the South Pacific, 2002).
throughout the Asia Pacific rim which has direct relevance to the pattern of settlement within northern Australia and north Queensland.

However, while Willmot investigates race relations, immigration and economic transnationalism between countries, he fails to provide a social and historical analysis of women and family associated with Chinese men, leaving a noticeable gap in history – a trend replicated by Featuna'i Liua'ana when discussing Chinese settlement in Samoa. Not all scholars are remiss in this area, as Yeh Ho Wu makes some attempt to address this imbalance in *The Chinese in Papua New Guinea 1880 – 1980* where he investigates the immigration, economic history and pattern of settlement by Chinese men and the effect of external global influences including World War Two leading to the evacuation and resettlement of Chinese Papua New Guinea families in Australia. New Zealand scholars Ip, Whitehead, Bradshaw and Lee provide the best analysis of Chinese settler families in New Zealand through their investigation and documentation of family relationships, providing the closest comparable information in shared regional history, transoceanic linkages both familial and economic between the New Zealand and Australia, and analysis of families formed. In particular, New Zealand scholar Manying Ip has been an influential academic contributor to the history and understanding of New Zealand Chinese family relations, being the first to introduce this discourse into mainstream historical investigation and by writing about the full range of relationships including White relationships as well as Chinese Maori unions. Research into Chinese Aboriginal unions in North Queensland will yield information useful to trans-Tasman studies on First Nations peoples, family relationships and cultural identity.

**Britain and Europe**

Large scale Chinese immigration to Europe including the British Isles and European continent did not reach the levels experienced within the Americas, the South Asia Pacific nor the trans-
Tasman region with immigration to these areas associated with colonial expansion in conjunction with the opening up of Chinese ports in the late 1840s. Studies undertaken in England and Europe remain slim in number and difficult to obtain. English scholars Seed\textsuperscript{242} and Benton and Gomez\textsuperscript{243} focus on the transitory migration patterns of Chinese sailors resulting in the formation of Chinatowns as lodging areas and interface districts where race relations was played out with the broader community. Seed, through analysis of the Limehouse Chinatown on the London docks, interweaves the complexities of Victorian literary images about Chinese, together with statistical data from the census to critically analyse the accuracy of census data collection to construct a picture of the Chinatown district. While inclusive of women and families associated with Chinese men, he none-the-less resorts to a standardized approach when referencing the women, using the term “English Born Wife” rather than acknowledging the woman’s actual name.

Gregor Benton is a prolific scholar and editor. He has written several books on the Chinese Diaspora and explored migration to Britain and across the Channel to many countries in Europe\textsuperscript{244}. His latest book, edited with Hong Liu, enjoys a prestigious foreword by Gungwu Wang. *Dear China: Emigrant Letters and Remittances, 1820–1980*, explores the economy of remittance trade in letters and remittances to and from communities and individuals in destination countries and village families.

However, Dutch blogger Manya Koetse\textsuperscript{245} unpacks the construction of community within the Netherlands, taking in historical “Chinatown” around the Nieuwmarkt and Binnen Bantammerstraat docks where boarding houses for Chinese seamen were established in the early 20th century. Respectful of the history, she raises the worrying trend for a new “orientalising” of districts. She argues that a “Disneyfication” of Chinatown is now occurring through modern interpretation practices to manufacture places to suit an external (tourist) market in a way which conforms to the Western perception of what the place ought to be (imagined) rather than based on historical reconstruction. This is a position which directly resonates with Australia’s Anna


\textsuperscript{245}Manya Koetse, Blog: “The Imagined Space of Chinatown: an Amsterdam Case Study”, posted 5 February 2010, http://manyapan.wordpress.com/2010/02/05/the-imagined-space-of-chinatown-an-amsterdam-case-study (Koetse is a Dutch graduate student of Literary Studies, Japanese Studies and Chinese Studies, and a fresh MPhil graduate in Asian Studies (Chinese track)).
Lisa Mak, who critiques the artificial construction of Sydney’s Chinatown through popular myths to “create” a Chinatown from an imagined external Western perception rather than based on historical fact as a quarter similar to other ethnic areas within the city.

In Queensland, the illusionary “Chinatown” has also emerged, however rather than a renewal and rebranded version as outlined by David Chen Lai in his theoretical understanding of Chinatowns, it is purposely constructed Chinatowns in places where one never existed before. This was evident in the 2016 constructed Gold Coast Chinatown precinct with its three arches, substantial financial ties involving three sister cities in China, and approximately 100,000 Chinese visitors gracing its streets per annum. These environments are imagined and constructed to suit an external (and increasingly Chinese) tourist market: to incorporate a “Chinese streetscape and real street life imagery”. No longer are they actual places where Chinese migrant workers lived in the 19th century, built on brotherhood and kinship unity, chain migration and filial obligations. They are now commercialised shopping and holiday experiences, occupied by accommodation outlets, tourist shops and food outlets. Commodified Chinatowns and fake Asian places are the historical places of the future for scholars to ruminate about. The 21st century “oriental” landscape complete with constructed counterfeit enclaves, threatens to overwhelm the historical Cantonese narrative unless scholars continue to write about it. The irony has not gone unnoticed.

Clive Hamilton in Silent Invasion: How China is Turning Australia into a Puppet State explores the relationship between China as a single-party state and its increasing influence upon Australia. While not a book about colonial migration patterns associated with the Chinese Diaspora, and also not a book on historical Chinatowns and communities within, Hamilton’s work is included because has hit a raw nerve among Australian scholars and split the current Australian academic community who undertake research into the Chinese Diaspora. Some

247 https://www.destinationgoldcoast.com/places-to-see/gold-coast/events/chinatown-street-markets
248 Ibid.
249 Nick McKenzie, Chris Uhlmann, Richard Baker, Daniel Flitton, SashkaKoloff, “ASIO investigation targets Communist Party links to Australian political system", A joint Four Corners-Fairfax investigation, ABC, Four Corners, 6 June 2017. This is undertaken as a means to secure ties between the Peoples Republic of China and local government authorities. This has led to cries of political interference right up to key figures in both political parties at the national level.
250 Clive Hamilton, Silent Invasion: How China is Turning Australia into a Puppet State (Hardie Grant Publishing, 2018). This book looks at the financial ties between the three tiers of Australian government, urban development and donations from Chinese organisations with links to the Chinese Communist Party.
scholar’s express apprehension when it comes to China “managing” its Overseas Chinese narrative, particularly when it comes to 19th and early 20th century political commentary, while others condemn this premise as the emergence of a new type of anti-Chinese sentiment, not dissimilar to 19th century newspaper propaganda. Either way, its presence must be acknowledged as the “elephant in the room” and it threatens innovative ways of analyzing overseas Chinese, such as the normalisation of gender integration in scholarly works, through its power as a distraction.

The history of Chinese Diaspora and settlement around the world has been documented in a number of countries and tackled from a range of perspectives. Yet few countries with the exception of the U.S.A. and New Zealand have taken a direct interest in, or made any attempt to integrate, the history of women and families associated with Chinese men within the broader settlement experience. Scholarly leaders in the U.S.A. have produced a number of works dedicated solely to the investigation of legislation and immigration of Chinese women, and American researchers utilize innovative ways to interrogate historical data. In contrast to Australia, where works are usually written by non-Chinese academics, it is also significant to note that American Chinese scholars are most prevalent as authors. However, the primary focus for enquiry into women associated with Chinese men in the U.S.A. rests solely with investigation of Chinese wives with little investigation extended to women from White backgrounds, Native American backgrounds or African-American backgrounds. This thesis will enable comparisons to be made of the statistical incidence of the full range of marriages and unions between the U.S.A. and Australia. In a broader global context, countries associated with comparable labour-attracting industries such as sugar, and indentured labour to North Queensland and Australia, including the Latin American and West Indies/Caribbean nations, have very little research or documentation of Chinese family formation which leaves a large gap in historical understanding. Figure 1. Global Literature Comparison – Gender focused Scholarly Review, (p. 53) provides a clear visual reminder as to why an integrated gender, (and I would argue age) approach is required to fully understand the Chinese Diaspora.

**Contribution to Scholarship**

Since 2002, I have researched and written approximately 20% of the literature within Queensland regarding women and families associated with Chinese men. This demonstrates the ongoing contribution I make to the study of women and families associated with Chinese men and heritage site interpretation within Queensland and the contribution to comparative history
and cultural heritage within a national and international framework. Scholarly investigation solely concentrating on the statistical evidence behind the incidence of marriage and marriage-like unions between Chinese men and a range of women in North Queensland, as well as family relations, is a new aspect of research in Queensland and it has the potential to contribute substantially to national and international investigations. This thesis complements the works of May, Tan, Fischer, Fisher and Ramsay (Qld), Bagnall, Wilton, Hales and Williams (NSW), Couchman, Rule, Keir and Lovejoy (Vic), Ryan (WA), and Balian and Martinez (NT). By teasing out the definition of what Chinese settler “family” actually means, including family formation and geographical constraints faced by Chinese men when looking for family opportunities in north Queensland, new and alternative perspectives can be developed in regards to community and community formation and the role women and families made to their success.

Conclusion

The history of the Chinese Diaspora and settlement within Australia and around the world has been documented through a number of academic disciplines, utilising a range of traditional and innovative methodologies as well as introducing new perspectives and interpretations. Yet it is clear that few countries have taken a direct interest or made any attempt to integrate to any degree the history of women and families associated with Chinese men within the broader settlement experience, leaving large gaps in knowledge and producing incomplete historical narratives where only half the story is presented for academic and non-academic consumption. Of the 357 international, national and State journal articles, books, theses, and key family history works, more than two-thirds had a gender bias towards the male Chinese Diaspora experience only. This indicates a need for new approaches to be adopted to fully comprehend what was historically happening at mono-national and transnational levels. The research into Queensland Chinese family experiences is consistent with international trends but when broken down to the types of families investigated, Queensland as a case study provides the most integrated approach to acknowledging relationships formed by Chinese men, covering as it does Chinese, White and Aboriginal marriages and unions as well as separated families. When viewed from a national perspective, Australia remains active in its academic interest in the Chinese diaspora and Chinese family relations, but has some way to go to provide a fully integrated gender research approach useful to a global context.

At an international level, the U.S. and New Zealand provide the most scholarly work in relation to the immigration of women and formation of families associated with Chinese men.
Researchers have utilized innovative ways to interrogate historical data, and Chinese American scholars contribute the most works compared to Australian scholars, who do not necessarily identify with a Chinese ancestry. However, despite a large volume of female orientated scholarly works associated with the Chinese diaspora to America, very little investigation has been undertaken regarding non-Chinese wives and mixed heritage unions. Countries in the Trans-Tasman region lead in this regard. This is a research area which requires attention. In countries associated with labour attracting industries comparable to north Queensland and Australia, such as sugar, including the Latin American and West Indies/Caribbean nations, little research has been undertaken into Chinese family formation. This leaves a gap in historical understanding of family formation in a tropical region for which this thesis contributes.

Fig. 1. Global Literature Comparison – Gender focused Scholarly Review.
Introduction: Overview of Chinese Settlement

Chinese settlement in Queensland began in the late 1840s when Chinese men commenced work as indentured labour on pastoral stations on the rapidly expanding White settlement districts of Darling Downs and Burnett. However, from the early 1860s when north Queensland began to open up to colonisation, Chinese men headed north or arrived directly from China to participate in new and emerging opportunities which settlement expansion brought with it. Three key industries emerged and drove settlement expansion across North Queensland: pastoralism, mining and agriculture. Chinese men were attracted to each industry and found a number of ways to participate in all.

Pastoral expansion paved the way for settlers to push north, occupy the land and introduce herds of sheep and cattle, many of which were shepherded by Chinese men who had experience from the Darling Downs. However, with pastoralism came the discovery of gold. Alluvial gold and tin mining attracted many Overseas Chinese, which arrived directly from China. Mineral discoveries came at a point in time when Chinese men were heading overseas to host countries around the globe. However, as mining declined in some areas from the late 1880s, it was the alternative industry of agriculture which attracted the most stable and long-term Chinese migrant. In rural and remote towns Chinese men set up market gardens and small shop keeping businesses while along the east coast, in provisioning centres and large port towns, Chinese men participated as labourers and lessees of farms in sugar, bananas and maize production, settling into and stable and long-term residency. The Chinese Diaspora to Queensland and north Queensland, and the broader community response to it, gave rise to communities, cultural precincts and Chinatowns, and it is women in these communities which the next few chapters will address.

From 1848, Chinese men were present in the northernmost regions of the NSW colony, brought in as a ready and cheap source of labour for pastoralists. Chinese labour was obtained by agents in Singapore and Fukien Province (most notably the port of Amoy), with agents acting for
prominent colonial pastoralists. The first sixty-two indentured Chinese workers to be employed as shepherds, hut keepers and sheep washers arrived in 1848 to the Moreton Bay district on the ship *Nimrod* as part of a larger shipload of indentured labourers intended for Sydney. Four months later the barque *London* brought a further fifty-odd labourers, one third of a shipment of workers bound for pastoral stations. Indentured for a period of five years, and living in remote, isolated and dangerous conditions, Chinese men served out their contract under the NSW Masters and Servant Act 1845 with varying degrees of success. Some ran away to escape the harsh and lonely conditions, some committed suicide, while other persisted with their employment, married White women, and moved on to other opportunities when they arose.

Between 1847 and 1859, twenty Chinese men had either married or entered a relationship with a Caucasian woman, living either in Brisbane, on the Darling Downs or in the Wide Bay and Burnett region. One of the first relationships recorded was William and Esther Wing in 1847 with the birth of their son Robert. Located primarily at Drayton, Dalby and Roma, Chinese husbands from Amoy, China were usually married to immigrant women from Scotland, Ireland and England or colonial born Caucasian girls. Most weddings were according to Wesleyan or Church of England rites. Married while the colony was the northern most point of New South Wales, most families opted to remain in the southern districts. However, by 1860 news of the potential for opportunities further north had begun to reach the Brisbane, Darling Downs and Wide Bay communities, precipitating a move for some families.

As early as 1839-40, pastoralists speculated about the river systems in north Queensland as a region with great commercial potential and an area ripe for further pastoral expansion. This view was enhanced after 1844-5 when Ludwig Leichhardt made his journey to Port Essington in N.T. from Jimbour Station, passing through the Burdekin region, including the rich pastoral area of the Valley of Lagoons, and north through the Western Gulf country. Leichhardt gave favourable descriptions of the land, river systems and flora, which stimulated speculation that a permanent route between New South Wales and Port Essington could be sustained by establishing new pastoral holdings in north Queensland along the major northern river systems in an effort to develop a major export industry and secure the commercial interest of India and other parts of Asia.

252 Maxine Darnell, *The Chinese Labour Trade to New South Wales 1783-1853*, PhD Thesis, University of New England, 1997: 111-113; Fischer, “The Forgotten Pioneers”, 19. They were advertised in the *Moreton Bay Courier* on arrival as ready for engagement, which was attractive to pastoralists on the Darling Downs who were actively seeking labour. “Indentured” means under a binding agreement to serve for a specified term. Between 1848 and 1853 a large number of Chinese indentured labourers entered New South Wales with approximately 227 working on the Darling Downs, representing 29% of all Chinese males in the colony.
253 Queensland State Archives: (QSA): A/4870 Court of Petty Sessions Record Book, Gayndah, 1850-1857.
255 Bolton, *A Thousand Miles Away*, 11-14. It was argued that a permanent route between New South Wales and Port Essington could be sustained by establishing new pastoral holdings in north Queensland along the major northern river systems in an effort to develop a major export industry and secure the commercial interest of India and other parts of Asia.
pastoral routes could be secured through to a northern port to provide export opportunities. His descriptions inspired further exploration parties, both Government and private, with other notable expeditions including Edmund Kennedy (1848), and A. F. and F. T. Gregory (1856) and George Elphinstone Dalrymple (1859). Concurrent with inland exploration, an exploration by sea for a suitable port north of Rockhampton was also conducted. In 1859 Captain Henry Daniel Sinclair reported a suitable bay which he named Port Denison, later Bowen, the north’s first port. With the reports of Kennedy, Gregory and Dalrymple, combined with Sinclair’s report of the discovery of a bay suitable for a port, preparations began to be made in earnest for the further settlement of North Queensland.

***

**Settlement Drivers: Three Key Industries**

Between 1860 and 1886, the industries of pastoralism and mining were critical to the rapid growth which occurred across north Queensland and from 1886 onwards growth was sustained by the development of agriculture through sugar production. A pastoral push commenced with the Kennedy district being opened up for selection as the first pastoral district in north Queensland officially, with Bowen providing the only port to service this very large area. From the beginning vast distances and lack of transport routes to pastoral stations inhibited expansion for selectors. Alternative closer ports were sought and more suitable options explored, both north and south, culminating in three new ports proclaimed over as many years: Mackay (1862), Cardwell (1863), and Townsville (1864). These ports developed into mercantile centres offering export/import facilities as well as goods, services and labour for the expanding region. However, it was not until after 1861 that northwestern Queensland was thrown open for selection. The districts of Flinders, Cook and Burke were established, with Normanton and Burketown established as ports in the Gulf of Carpentaria. The Queensland government established a supply depot at Landsborough’s 1862 camp on the banks of the Albert River, and the township of Burketown was surveyed in 1865. Normanton, while first settled in 1864, was not
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256 However, enterprising pastoralists such as Christopher Allingham, (c1851-2), William Kilman (1854) and W. H Gaden (c 1856-7) also followed Leichhardt’s footsteps in the hope of securing new runs, although little documentary evidence surrounding these private ventures has yet come to light.

257 Fitzgerald, Megarry and Symons, *Made in Queensland*, 21

258 Bolton, *Thousand Miles Away*, 9. Settlement did not occur until after separate search parties for the ill-fated Burke and Wills expedition, including Frederick Walker’s exploration of the Flinders and Hughenden district, William Landsborough’s traverse of the Hughenden district and investigation of the Gulf and inland rivers system, and J. McKinlay’s accounts of the eastern basalt country crossed as he returned to Port Denison (Bowen) published their findings about the north.
declared a town until 1868 owing to an outbreak of fever at Burketown so that its residents eventually abandoned the town and moved to Normanton in 1867.²⁵⁹

As pastoralists took up stations in the districts, families and workers moved out with them. Runs were initially stocked with sheep but sheep proved unsuitable in the Gulf Country and selectors quickly changed to cattle. Unlike the development of the Darling Downs, which relied on Chinese labour, the extent of Chinese shepherds, hut keepers, shearsers and sheep washers in the north and north-west of north Queensland has yet to be fully understood. Station records including those detailing rations and provisions, pay ledgers and agreements exist but have not been analysed in detail to date. However, bank entries which indicate a Chinese presence associated with the development of many early towns and settlements throughout the region provide a glimpse into station employment activities.

**Pastoralism:**

The employment of Chinese labour on pastoral stations was sporadic around the region. Occupations ranged from shepherds, shearsers and fencers to cooks and station gardeners. Considered industrious as well as thrifty, Chinese cooks and gardeners were valuable members of the stations and were employed on the majority of stations throughout western and north-western Queensland. While initially two men may have been employed to carry out the role of station cook and gardener, difficulties attracting labour to remote positions meant that, in many cases, one Chinese man was charged with both positions. The role required the cultivation of vital fruit and vegetables, raising and maintaining poultry, and creating meals on a daily basis for the manager and his family, domestic staff and station hands. In some instances, the cook/gardener was also the unofficial protector, aiding a White mistress when the husband was away, often resulting in strong bonds forming between the two. While the length of time a Chinese cook or gardener stayed with a pastoral station varied from station to station, usually 1-3 years, there are some instances where the Chinese employee remained for longer. Go Foon Young was one such worker, employed as a cook at Donaldson Station near Aramac for over 28 years.²⁶⁰ Chinese workers moved around the north-west and Gulf stations south west to Boulia and south

---

²⁵⁹ McIntyres Last Letter.’ Border Watch, 1 August 1866, p. 3.
²⁶⁰ Queensland National Bank Register: Signature Book, QNB Cloncurry Branch, 1884-1945, item held at Cloncurry Historical Society, Cloncurry.
east to Winton and Muttабurra regularly, with periods spent between station employments used to catch up with kinsmen or bank wages in district towns.261

Chinese workers enjoyed occupational flexibility, commencing as shepherds on stations, relocating to other stations as cooks, or commencing as cooks and moving into market gardening. From market gardening many Chinese men progressed into storekeeping, goods and services including occupations such as hoteliers and lodging house keepers, butchers, bakers, carriers, and carter licenses.

By 1883 north-western Queensland was established as a major producer of cattle with stock routes as well as a rail networks to facilitate transport, with the rail head located at Hughenden. Far western regions, beyond the railway, were accessed by Cobb and Co, packers, and carriers, with pastoralists overlanding livestock between Brunette Downs and the Northern Territory through the Barkly Tablelands to the port at Burketown in the Gulf of Carpentaria. This led to the establishment of Camooweal in 1884. Croydon, in the central north-west, was surveyed two years later in 1886. The gold rich reefs of Croydon rose to considerable prominence in the region and were accessed by a network of transport links which extended from Burketown and Normanton through to the east coast via the Einasleigh uplands and Herberton tin fields.262 Concurrent to the rapid expansion in the north and central regions of the colony, the colonial government developed administrative systems to manage growth throughout Queensland with laws set down to regulate settlement in new towns. Under the auspices of The Divisional Boards Act of 1879, structure, stability and service provision were outlined for local governments including an ability to collect rates and make valuations on properties. This enabled growth from an administrative level in towns through returns on all rateable properties including owners, tenants, special leases, market gardens, tailings areas, and pastoral holdings.

Gardens sprang up along stock and transport routes and were quickly established in mining areas, particularly where reef mining was present, such as at Charters Towers, Ravenswood and


262 Chinese settlers were excluded from the tin fields, and instead turned to small storekeeping businesses such as Go Sam in Herberton or commenced activities tolerable to the broader White community such as wood carting or charcoal burning.
Croydon, or anywhere where bulk vegetables were required. Chinese gardeners dominated the supply of fruit and vegetables and were begrudgingly tolerated within the community for the essential service they offered the community. Gardening was a profitable occupation. Not only was it relatively stable, with little or no competition from other ethnic groups, it was flexible as leases could be abandoned and new ones taken up as settlements waned. In particular it was quickly recognised by the broader community that a stable supply of food was integral to the successful development of any settlement and this sentiment was articulated in Ravenswood when one commentator noted:

The Chinese will probably settle down to their legitimate calling as gardeners, and as a means of increasing and cheapening the supply of vegetables, we shall all join in the welcoming the influx of the Chinese population.

**Mining**

Despite the premature announcement that gold had been discovered near Bowen by Dalrymple within months of its settling, gold mining in north Queensland did not commence in earnest until the discovery of gold in 1866 on the Cape and later Gilbert Rivers. This was followed closely by copper at Cloncurry (1867) and gold at Ravenswood (1868). Within three months of its opening, Cape River was occupied by miners including a number of Chinese hotel licensees.

The Etheridge followed in 1870 and in 1872, gold was discovered first at Charters Towers and later that year further north on the Palmer River. By November 1873, Chinese men were alluvial mining at the Palmer and busy establishing market gardens, even before the official goldfield administration had arrived. The following year miners and families, including some Chinese, had moved north from Charters Towers and the Etheridge fields to the Palmer River district. (Refer Chapter 9.) This marked the beginning of a significant Chinese presence on the far northern gold field.

---

263 QSA: 11 CHA/N3, Charters Towers Municipal Council Valuation Register 1885-1887; QSA: MWO 11/15; PRV10576 - 1 – 2: Postage Book and Registration of Applications for Market Gardens – Ravenswood 1881-1882; QSA: MWO14A/69 Mining, Warden, Index to register of applications for market garden and tailings areas - Mining Warden, Etheridge and Croydon, 1886-1911; QSA: MWO/14B/40, Mining Warden Georgetown, Register of applications various; market garden areas 1887-1890; QSA : MWO/14B/41 PRV10316, Mining Warden Etheridge, Register of applications various; market garden areas 1880-1912

264 ‘Northern News’, Rockhampton Bulletin and Central Queensland Advertiser, 21 September 1871, p. 3. Small market gardens, usually between 3-5 acres (1-2 hectares), provided fresh food.


266 ‘Bowen’, Warwick Examiner and Times, 2 November 1868, p. 2.

267 The Cleveland Bay Express, Saturday April 17, 1869. At Cape River at one court sitting up to six Chinaman’s Town residents applied for liquor licences. This includes Hock Johnson for the Canton Hotel; Jimmy Ah Kin for the Chinaman’s Friend Hotel; Sin Yan Long for The Pekin Hotel; Ah Teak for the Royal Charter Hotel; Ah Ching for the Hong Kong Hotel and James Kin Long for the Diggers Friend Hotel.

58
The Palmer River goldfield attracted the largest influx of Chinese migrants in the shortest period of time to Queensland, specifically north Queensland. From 1873, Chinese men migrated direct from China to north Queensland to the port of Cooktown, newly established to service the goldfield. The Palmer River goldfield had an estimated Chinese population of 1500 by the end of 1874. This number increased to 9,000 by the end of 1875. Chinese miners proved diligent and industrious and were well organised in their ventures. Unlike the experience of the Chinese indentured labourers, new migrants arrived directly from the Southern Pearl Delta region of Guangdong, taking in several provinces as well as from the nearby island of Macao. By 1877, it was estimated that over 18,000 Chinese migrants were on the goldfield including those in the towns of Maytown and Byerstown. New Chinese hopefuls were arriving regularly on Chinese shipping lines as well as British owned fleets, which plied their maritime services directly between southern China and Cooktown.

Chinese arrivals took advantage of a lack of infrastructure in emerging settlements and the need for goods and services. Shop keeping, specialist trades, lodging houses and food production flourished and these Chinese-dominated industries also developed in response to the general widespread sentiment against Chinese gold miners. From 1877, a rise in mining license fees aimed at inhibiting Chinese activities was further exacerbated by the introduction of the Goldfields Amendment Act 1878. This legislation excluded Chinese miners from working new fields for three years unless they had made the discovery, and led to alternative occupations developing, giving rise to a high incidence of Chinese storekeeping, service licenses (including licenses for hotels, carriers and butchers) and market gardening. In particular small-scale agriculture such as market gardening developed from then on as a nearly exclusive Chinese enterprise.

Cooktown developed as the major centre of Chinese settlement in north Queensland. Its nearest competition as a port came from Townsville some 400 miles (643 klm) by sea. The Port of Cooktown was proclaimed in 1874, but the town was not declared a municipality until April 1876. By 1877, the Chinese community had grown to 1350. From the early 1880s a downturn of alluvial mining on the Palmer River goldfield meant that the region began to contract. Miners and shopkeepers began to move to other areas which were beginning to open up. Alternative
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268 Kirkman, The Palmer Goldfield, 171.
269 Kirkman, The Palmer Goldfield, 172
270 Queensland Votes and Proceedings (QVP), 1878, Volume II, Report of the Registrar-General, Table 60 Showing Birthplaces Minors and Adults Males and Females in Census Districts, p. 505.
industries provided a source of income as Chinese settlers turned their attention to the *beche-de-mer* industry and exporting sandalwood. The construction of the railway line between Cooktown and Laura facilitated a surge in agricultural pursuits, and market gardens expanded and citrus orchards were established along the line. In addition, rice was grown along the rivers and swamps.\(^{271}\) However, by 1886, while the populations of both the Palmer River goldfield and Cooktown were still vibrant, they had begun to decline.\(^{272}\)

Vulnerable to new discoveries, Cooktown suffered a downturn in population when the Hodgkinson goldfield was discovered in 1876 some 170 miles (270 klms) south east of the Palmer River. The discovery of tin at Cannibal Creek (near the Palmer River) in 1878\(^{273}\) afforded some respite from the exodus but by then people were moving to the new provisioning centres which were established between Cooktown and Townsville along the lush and fertile northern coast.

The ports of both Cairns and Port Douglas were established to service the Hodgkinson field in 1876 and 1877 respectively, and competition for hinterland trade was fierce.\(^{274}\) Both ports provided an alternative to Cooktown for the entrepreneurial settler to establish a business to provide goods and services to the Hodgkinson miners. The discovery of tin around the Wild River, and settlement of Herberton in 1880, further encouraged Chinese settlement to the hinterland districts between the Hodgkinson goldfields and the coast. Among those seeking to capitalise on the new settlement were several Chinese men. Although initially prevented from landing in Cairns by vigilante White men, Chinese businessmen including Cooktown’s Andrew Leon (Leong Chong) were among the first to arrive in the fledgling centre. Chinese men such as Leon and Sun Chong Lee, another Chinese storekeeper from Cooktown, quickly set up stores in what was emerging as the main street through the scrub.\(^{275}\) The shift to ports further south diminished Cooktown’s dominance as a provisioning centre, and shifted the Chinese migrant gaze to other lucrative industries.

---


\(^{272}\) Kevin Rains, Intersections: The Overseas Chinese Social Landscape of Cooktown, 1873-1935, PhD thesis, University of Queensland, 2005:177. As noted by Rains, “A sequence of local, regional and global crises ensued from the 1890s onwards which had a major impact on the town’s business community. By the early decades of the 20th century the town was only a shell of its former self.”

\(^{273}\) ‘Mining Notes.’ *The Queenslander*, 4 May 1878, p. 150.


\(^{275}\) *The Cooktown Herald*, 21 February 1877, p. 2.
The fertile corridor of the wet tropical northern coast provided ideal conditions to experiment with large scale agricultural pursuits. Successes further south with sugar cane cultivation were soon built upon in the northern district. Large scale sugar cultivation had been underway in the Mackay district since 1868, where sugar cane had been successfully grown on a number of coastal selections resulting in up to twenty sugar mills in operation by the early 1880s. This was followed closely by cane growing in the Burdekin districts and the Halifax/Ingham district. Large scale agriculture evolved as the dominant industry on the coast in the wet tropics with agriculture providing the third major industry to attract Chinese migration.

**Agriculture**

**Sugar**

Along the fertile and tropical east coast, large scale agricultural pursuits including sugar production, banana plantations and maize growing provided attractive alternative industries for Chinese migrants who found themselves frustrated or disillusioned by the unstable nature of mining. A new wave of Chinese migrants began to arrive from the mid-1880s to work on sugar plantations or to undertake labouring tasks which met the needs of the broader White selector community. Attitudes towards Chinese migration were mixed yet promising. This was because of three reasons. Firstly, the majority of Chinese immigrants were exploited by White selectors because of a Chinese desire to cultivate land and continue agricultural occupations familiar to many of them. Many took up this economic avenue because unless they became naturalised, Chinese men were unable to own land. It was advantageous for White selectors to lease to Chinese settler men in order to fulfil land selection conditions set by the government, where selectors were required to clear a percentage of the land per annum and ‘improve’ it in order to hold the selection.

Secondly, by leasing virgin scrub to Chinese men, selectors were able to outsource the tremendous physical labour required to clear dense scrub and forest, and at an economical rate. At £1-£3 per acre or £80 per annum, Chinese workers cleared acres of land by hand held implements. Many entered lease terms whereby they leased land for five years, including clearing, with the first year free and afterwards a payment per acre. By undertaking wholesale clearing, while leaving the stumps *in situ*, the land was cultivated for crops. Once the stumps
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277 *Maryborough Chronicle, Wide Bay and Burnett Advertiser*, Tuesday 17 February 1880, p. 4; *Maryborough Chronicle, Wide Bay and Burnett Advertiser*, Thursday 25 August 1887, p. 3.
rotted away (around five to six years), White selectors resumed the improved and cleared land for sugar cultivation. Only then could European farming technology using horses and ploughs be applied. This was considered suitable for White labour to undertake. It was a win-win situation: selectors were able to meet their land selection conditions and clear the land, while un-naturalised Chinese men were able to lease tracts of land to grow produce and earn a living.

Thirdly, behind the use of Chinese labour to clear the scrub was a dominant colonial theory that White men were considered racially unsuitable for hard physical labour in tropical conditions. Attracting White labour and getting them to carry out their work contracts any more than a week in districts north of Mackay usually failed. Chinese labour along with South Sea Island labour was regarded as a cheap and suitable alternative for sugar plantations, even though southern China is more climatically similar to Brisbane than north Queensland.278

Sugar cultivation was a labour intensive industry requiring on average 2000 workers per plantation for field, mill and transport work. In official acknowledgement of the deficit of White workers throughout the colony, and consistent with colonial sentiment regarding White labour in the tropics, legislation was passed to allow the recruitment of overseas “coolie” labour. The Asian Labour Coolie Act 1862 allowed employers to directly recruit a range of labour including South Sea Islander (“Kanaka”) labour as well as Chinese, Japanese, Malays (South-east Asians), Javanese, and Cinghalese (Sri Lankans). The need for a large and cost-effective workforce was acknowledged at a meeting in Mackay in 1883 when a petition was signed by 300 plantation owners to import labourers directly from southern China. It was intended that indentured contract labourers, accompanied by an interpreter, would be sought to work in cutting and planting the cane.279

In the Burdekin, the Kalamia plantation had been established with Chinese teams grubbing out tree stumps and planting cane while other Chinese growers took up leases, including early notable men Ah Han,280 Chock Man and Ching Do. Further north in the Lower Herbert district of Halifax /Ingham, successful use of Chinese labour saw 350 Chinese workers engaged in Colonial Sugar Refinery’s Victoria Plantation, employed alongside a workforce of 200 Europeans and 300 Melanesians. By 1883 an estimated 2000 Chinese were engaged on northern

279 ‘The Labour Question at Mackay.’ The Queenslander, 24 March 1883, p. 469.
280 Kerr, Black Snow and Liquid Gold, 73.
Engaged at 16 shillings a week with rations or 24 shillings without, Chinese workers undertook a range of work including clearing land and cutting drains, field work (chipping weeds, ‘trashing’ cane, cutting cane) as well as mill work including working the centrifugal. New arrivals and former miners from the Palmer River were recruited from Cooktown and brought south; others were imported directly from China.

Chinese labour gangs required men with entrepreneurial skills to liaise between their countrymen and the planter. However, before long Chinese entrepreneurs struck out on their own to become hirers and land owners themselves in key sugar growing districts. Chinese landowners (such as Ching Do near Brandon) cultivated large holdings of land and actively sought, eased and supported the immigration process for new arrivals, thus smoothing the transition for many of their countrymen as they settled in north Queensland. In return they made capital gains on their investment and benefitted from a large, accessible workforce which was eager to migrate.

In Cairns by 1886 the Chinese population attracted to the region by large scale agriculture, had grown to account for 60% of all farmers and 90% of all gardeners across the district including the Redlynch valley with 795 cultivators and gardeners alone. Andrew Leon emerged as a leading entrepreneur, one who immediately invested in the developing Cairns along with compatriot James Ah Ching. Together they purchased multiple selections and experimented with a range of crops including cotton, tobacco, coffee, rice, sugar, and bananas. Leon was instrumental in the establishment of sugar cane cultivation in the Cairns region and formed a consortium of Chinese investors in 1881 to erect and manage the first sugar plantation and mill for Cairns, the Hap Wah Mill. Run entirely as a Chinese co-operative, with the exception of the engineer, it crushed the first sugar cane in the district in 1882. By 1885, an area of 2528 acres (1023 ha) was under cultivation, but despite efforts by the syndicate to maintain production, the venture could not be sustained and it failed due to a combination of falling sugar
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281 *Queenslander*, 8 December 1883, p. 923.
283 Diana Shogren, The Politics and Administration of the Queensland Sugar Industry to 1930, PhD thesis, University of Queensland, 1980: 51, and *Brisbane Courier*, 29 January 1879, p. 5. Labour contracted directly from China to the lower Herbert cost £20 each to planters but was considered a failure as most of the men ran away after they arrived. Chinese labour was employed in hoeing and weeding as well as planting at a rate approx 26 shillings a week no rations.
284 *North Queensland Register*, 16 January 1905, p. 48. Ching Do employed many Chinese men on his farm and supported a number of others applications to come out to work from China.
285 May, Topsawyers, 112-113
286 Sandi Robb, *Cairns Chinatown: Heritage Study.* (Cairns and District Chinese Association Inc. Cairns, 2012): 3-4
287 He went on to become an outstanding and well-respected community leader, who ensured the continuation of Chinese culture by providing land and funds for the erection of the Lit Sung Goong Temple, and acted as an interpreter between the Chinese and broader European community.
prices and lack of capital.\textsuperscript{288} In 1886 it was forced to close. The machinery and the land were sold at auction the following year.\textsuperscript{289} Despite this failure, Chinese settlers continued to expand their commercial interests in large scale agriculture north at the Mowbray valley near Port Douglas, and south in the Johnstone River district, near Geraldton (later Innisfail).\textsuperscript{290}

Chinese growers who had invested heavily in sugarcane from Mackay to Mossman were increasingly hampered by the introduction of Government legislation designed to frustrate and restrict Chinese agricultural activity in the north. Driven by a desire to populate north Queensland with White settlers, the Government used legislation as a convenient lever to wedge Chinese interests out, fueled by the shift in colonial attitudes to White settlement in the tropics. Previously, imported “coloured races”, South Sea Islanders as well as “Asiatic” labour, were considered preferable to work in the oppressive tropical environment, and South Sea Island labour had been utilized throughout the industry. However, increased scrutiny of the South Sea Islander labour trade combined with the post-Federation emphasis on White Australia meant a shift in the attitude towards Melanesians, changing to one of exclusion. In a move to protect White labour interests, Queensland legislation was passed to abolish the South Sea Islander labour trade in 1890 and reinforced by one of the first Commonwealth acts passed after Federation in 1901, the Pacific Island Labourers Act, resulting in the labour trade ending in 1904 and the majority of South Sea Islanders departing by 1906.\textsuperscript{291}

To offset concern expressed by many plantations and growers in north Queensland, the departure of South Sea Islander labour in 1906 was offset by a rebate which provided preferential treatment to White labour. Introduced in 1905, \textit{The Sugar Bounty Act} rewarded sugarcane growers with six shillings per ton to those growers who replaced South Sea Islander labour with Caucasians. Under the \textit{Sugar Bounty Act} 1905, Chinese were excluded from receiving the bounty on the basis of race, regardless of whether they employed Chinese labour or were Chinese land owners themselves. Between 1911 and 1921, single White male labourers steadily increased, representing 43% of contract cane cutting gangs.\textsuperscript{292} The legislation openly discriminated against one sector, on the basis of race, to the benefit of another, with Chinese
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\textsuperscript{292} Timothy Bottoms, A History of Cairns, PhD Thesis, University of Queensland, 2003: 347. In 1911 the White population had been 5193, increasing to 7455 by 1921.
growers placed at a financial disadvantage. The legislation also deterred White growers from employing Chinese labour and there was much uncertainty as to whom it applied.\footnote{National Archives of Australia (NAA): 3058167 J2773; correspondence, William LAM PAN re Sugar Bounty. The extent and implications of the Act were tested through questions raised by growers. In 1910 Mr McCallister from the Burdekin wrote to seek clarification on his eligibility for the Sugar Bonus because his daughter-in-law’s young brother, a Queensland born Chinese lad age 14, William Lam Pan, had joined his sister on McCallister’s farm at Ayr. Even though the boy was Australian born, he was still considered “Chinese”, but due to his age and providing he did not work on the farm, it was considered his presence would not affect eligibility for Mr McCallister.}

The effect of the \textit{Sugar Bounty Act} was heightened by a tightening of Commonwealth immigration laws, making it increasingly difficult for Chinese immigrants to obtain Entry Permits. This resulted in naturalised Chinese growers (such as Ching Do in Brandon and Jan See Chin in Cairns) supporting a number of applications from relatives and kinsmen in China to work on their farms in the production of sugar cane.\footnote{Queensland State Archives (QSA): CRS/156/36/3661 Brown vs SEE CHIN, Cairns, 1922} Ching Do epitomized Chinese perseverance and diversification in his approach to farming. In 1907 he harvested 1300 tonnes of sugarcane averaging 26 tons to the acre, and also experimented in banana cultivation trialing 25,000 plants later that year.\footnote{Townsville Daily Bulletin, 12 July 1907, p.2.} He constructed a tramway siding during the year, financing the construction at a time when only the local Council would fund the construction of tramways throughout the district.\footnote{Kerr, \textit{Black Snow and Liquid Gold}: 106 and “Ayr Tramway Board.” \textit{Townsville Daily Bulletin}, 12 July 1907, p.2. So successful was Ching Do Siding as it was known, that the Divisional Board refunded his money. Ching Do siding was renamed Poopoonbah in 1917 to mollify anti-Chinese sentiment in the district. This is despite the fact that Ching Do, his wife Annie Leeds and six children were well respected Church of England members and community participants.} However despite best efforts by Chinese growers, over the next decade Chinese participation in the sugar industry of north Queensland waned considerably due to increased pressure from another piece of legislation, \textit{The Leases to Aliens Act}, passed in 1911.

By 1912 both the newly formed Australian Workers Association and Australian Workers Union gained membership amongst the sugar workers. Their protectionist views regarding White labour reflected the change in opinion: that White men could work in the tropics. Two Acts, \textit{The Sugar Works Act}, 1911 and \textit{The Sugar Cultivation Act}, 1913,\footnote{The Sugar Works Act, 1911 set a minimum wage for sugar workers in order to exclude “alien” labour. It worked on the basis that given the choice between an “alien” or white worker a employer would choose a white worker. \textit{The Sugar Cultivation Act} 1913 excluded anyone from the sugar industry, which failed a dictation test.} both provided protection of White labour interests. In particular the \textit{Sugar Cultivation Act}, 1913, S.4, stated that certain persons not having first passed a dictation test could not be employed in the sugar industry. Those who had passed the test or who had proved they were already employed in the sugar industry before the \textit{Acts} were passed were given exemption certificates. The Cairns branch of the A.W.U., unhappy that the \textit{Acts} did not go far enough to protect European workers, kept a constant eye on Chinese labour in the district to ensure that breaches of the \textit{Act}, especially in
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regards to exemption certificates, did not occur. This vigilante attitude may have been later responsible for allegations against Jan See Chin, which eventually saw the police acting which resulted in a Supreme Court case with See Chin, for breaches of Section 4 of The Sugar Cultivation Act 1913. This obstructionist attitude may have contributed to Jan See Chin and his family abandoning the area to live in Hong Kong.

Despite a reasonable number of Chinese men engaged in the sugar growing district of the Burdekin their presence had been reduced significantly by 1919. Only forty-six Certificate of Exemption to the Dictation Test (CEDT) permits were issued to Chinese at Ayr in 1919, with a further fifty-eight issued at nearby Brandon, mainly working on the Pioneer Plantation. This represented a steady decline of a third of the region’s Chinese workers from the district since 1909 and contrasted starkly with the increase of another “Alien” workforce arriving directly from Italy.

Since the mid-1890s a steady migration of Italian workers had flowed into north Queensland, most notably the Lower Herbert district, but despite being regarded as more suitable for tropical agriculture than workers of British origin, they did not pose a significant threat to Chinese labour interests because they were not numerically significant enough to compete as a viable alternative workforce. However, after 1915 newly arrived Italian sugar cane workers became a direct labour threat to Chinese workers as they were not only competitive, but were highly organised, able to provide a ready and willing alternative workforce which fitted the official definition of ‘White’ and were considered reliable hard workers. The “Italian invasion” provoked considerable debate as they were not seen to be the “right” type of White settlers for the north. With contracts allowing in single men, couples or couples with children, this represented a policy departure from the Chinese immigration experience where wives were unable to immigrate. The competing Italian immigration impacted directly on the already vulnerable and aging Chinese workforce throughout the Burdekin, Lower Herbert and Innisfail districts and accelerated the population decline.
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**Bananas**

Chinese migrant settlers to Geraldton, while first engaged on sugar plantations, quickly moved to the more lucrative industry of banana cultivation. Banana plantations quickly developed into a very large-scale industry which, at its peak, spanned from Tully to Mossman including the Aloomba and Greenhills area near Cairns. In particular transport of produce to Geraldton was serviced through Chinese initiated and constructed infrastructure including a canal and kilometers of tramways which connected to a small wharf at Maria Creek. Owned and operated by Chinese immigrants and settlers, the banana industry was well organised. Key individuals, including the prominent businessman Tam Sie, managed the trade using their commercial and kinship links within and between the northern communities, as well as with other colonial centres in Sydney and Melbourne. In 1891 banana exports from Cairns worth £25,585 were sent to southern ports in New South Wales and Victoria. The industry was recognized as vital to the growth of the region and many vocalized fears of disastrous results for the local economy if the banana industry failed. A substantial decline was halted in the mid-1890s when a cyclone wiped out the main export competition, located at Fiji. By 1898 bumper harvests in the Cairns and Geraldton district were recorded. This included a harvest of 37,771,462 dozen bunches in 1898. By the end of the first decade of the new century, the banana industry throughout Queensland was estimated to be worth £150,000 per annum and stretched from Port Douglas to Brisbane, with over 550 growers, nearly half who were Chinese.

As Cathie May notes, banana cultivation, undertaken by Chinese settlers, became the mainstay in both Cairns and Geraldton (Innisfail) during the 1890s and contributed substantially to the expansion of the Chinese population throughout the district. Concurrent with the development and expansion of the region’s banana and sugar industries, new Chinese arrivals and settlers were clearing land and planting maize in the Cairns hinterland at Tolga, and Atherton near Herberton. Much of the agricultural industry in North Queensland was initiated or dominated by Chinese men who introduced and experimented with crops and technologies. Chinese driven agricultural industries included crops such as bananas, maize, pineapples, and rice as well as fruit trees including oranges, lemons, mangoes and limes. In addition Chinese growers
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experimented with tobacco, coffee, and lychees with the earliest lychee orchard planted by Wong Wah Day near Greenhills, which still remains in production.310

Unlike small scale agriculturalists such as market gardeners who carefully cultivated gardens using traditional and sustainable farming techniques, large scale banana farmers cropped heavily until the soil was exhausted before moving onto new areas. Cultivation exhaustion, fruit fly, and decimation of the Cairns and Geraldton crops from a cyclone in 1906 brought the banana industry to a steady and inevitable decline. Chinatown’s merchants had been working with the Cairns Chamber of Commerce for at least a decade to maximize benefits from the booming banana industry. However, restrictions imposed by the southern states due to fruit fly meant that exports of bananas from Cairns were rapidly decreasing despite constant attempts to find practical solutions to satisfy southern fruit fly regulations.311 By 1908, exports of bananas from north Queensland to Victoria had fallen by 75%. Chinatown merchants again asked the Chamber of Commerce to look into the reason for the decline in the banana industry and a Cairns delegation without a Chinese member went to the Minister for Agriculture, without result. Fruit fly restrictions, plus direct imports of bananas from Fiji, directly affected the industry.312

Despondency over the future of the industry was growing as Chinese growers lamented that the harsh regulations were crushing the industry.313 The broader economic implications of the loss of the industry for the Mossman, Cairns, Innisfail and Tully districts were strong, with one commentator noting that the “prosperity of Cairns had been materially affected by the extinction of a once flourishing industry.”314 By 1911 the banana industry had all but collapsed. The following year The Leases to Aliens Act prohibited Chinese from leasing more than five acres each which ended any chance of resuscitation for the Chinese dominated industry.315 While the region maintained a constant, yet much reduced export of bananas to southern states over the next few years, a massive cyclone in 1918 destroyed the town of Innisfail including Chinatown, and decimated crops between Cairns and Innisfail. The industry never recovered and by 1920 large scale Chinese grown banana cultivation had all but ceased.
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Maize
Whereas the Chinese sugar industry was co-located with White growers along the eastern seaboard, the large and thriving maize industry was mainly driven by Chinese growers and contracted to the Atherton Tablelands because its success meant it could undercut maize growing areas elsewhere. The maize industry had sustained consistent returns for Chinese settlers around Atherton and Tolga since 1900, spurred on by a growing demand for maize by the dairy industry as well as demand from poultry keepers and horse teamsters. In 1901 Atherton recorded a Chinese population of 481. Indicating ongoing support for a stable Chinese population, a new temple was constructed at Atherton Chinatown: the Hou Wang Temple in 1904. By 1909 Atherton’s Chinese population had swelled to an estimated 993, with 948 adults and 45 children who had been born in Queensland since 1901. Atherton and district’s population represented 23% of the Chinese population throughout the north followed by the banana district of Geraldton at 16% of the population and Cairns sustaining 10% of the population. Two years later, in 1912, the maize industry on the Tablelands was reaching record production in both acreage and output. In 1913 Tam Sie, one of the foremost Chinese merchants in Innisfail, estimated that over a thousand banana growers had moved to the Tablelands to grow corn. Chinese growers dominated cultivation of maize on the Tablelands until a similar move to curb and suppress Chinese activities was brought into effect through the Discharged Soldier Settlement Act of 1917.

The Atherton Tablelands was an ideal place for a Soldier Settlement Scheme. Not only was it fertile and comparatively cool, suited to dairying which was considered a good industry for small selectors, it had been substantially cleared by Chinese tenant farmers. Once their leases expired, the land was resumed for the returning soldiers, with the scheme orchestrated as a solution to resolve two problems. It provided land for the returning soldiers as a reward for their war effort, and it enabled the government to legitimately divest the area of Chinese farmers. From 1918, the exodus of maize farmers from Atherton and Tolga down to the coast provided temporary growth for both Innisfail and Cairns Chinese communities. However, as the possibilities for Chinese in the sugar and banana industries were all but exhausted, it was not long before aging Chinese workers retired or returned to China. By 1920, the Chinese population
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consisted of aging Chinese men with very few new immigrants below 30. Most had arrived before, or at the turn of, the century and while some of their Queensland born children had followed them into agriculture, in most cases the younger generation were more engaged in commercial enterprise rather than agriculture. With no large-scale agricultural industry to provide work and sustain a large rotating immigrant population, coastal Chinatowns and cultural precincts contracted in size as the next generation concentrated on storekeeping, goods and services.

***

**Population Trends**

Chinese population trends in major towns across North Queensland indicate a correlation between migration patterns and key industry trends. Chinese population figures across north Queensland in 1886 clearly reflect the pattern of settlement of the three key industries, pastoralism, mining and agriculture. Port towns on the other hand including Cooktown, Cairns, Townsville, and Mackay, also enjoyed large Chinese populations but were dependent as provisioning centres on the major industries which they serviced. Figures for pastoral districts of the central west and north Gulf districts reflected the smaller and more scattered communities across larger areas.

![Chinese Population in Key Districts: 1886](image)

Fig.2. Chinese Population in Key Census Districts, 1886

By 1901 the mood amongst north Queensland Chinese was optimistic. In 1901, Cairns had become the largest Chinese community outside Brisbane, exceeding the number in any other part of the State. Cairns with a population of 2078 Chinese, outclassed both Townsville with
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a population of 636, which serviced the sugar towns of Ayr, Home Hill and Giru in the Burdekin and mining towns of Ravenswood and Charters Towers, and Atherton on the Tablelands, which took in Herberton, Atherton and Kairi/Tolga which only had 481 Chinese settlers. The sugar, banana and maize growing districts around Cairns, Atherton and Mackay provided an attractive and lucrative option for new arrivals, and it is evident by the population figures that the east coast was preferred over the hinterland and inland districts.

Mining districts on the other hand, including Palmer River, Charters Towers and Croydon, still remained attractive to Chinese settlers with populations exceeding 250 in all places. However, a decline was beginning to become evident as populations in mining regions such as the Palmer River, the Etheridge and Cloncurry with up to two thirds or more of the population recorded as having moved. The populations of Chinese in Ravenswood, Thornborough and Herberton further reinforce this. Chinese men headed to the more profitable districts of the east coast which also accelerated the decline of port towns servicing mining fields such as Cooktown, Port Douglas and Townsville.323 Port Douglas suffered the swiftest downward trend after the completion of the Cairns to Mareeba railway line in the early 1890s which removed the hinterland trade to Cairns. Port Douglas and the Mowbray valley suffered a gradual decline which was exacerbated by seasonal floods and cyclones. The Atherton Tablelands by this stage was emerging as an important maize growing region which prompted many to move. Those who remained behind followed quickly after March 1911 when a cyclone destroyed every building in Port Douglas including the Temple.324

Chinese settlement in pastoral communities in the west and north-west had diminished even more, by half, throughout the 1890s. Chinese station workers, cooks, gardeners, shearsers and station hands were dismissed from stations as anti-Chinese sentiment worsened, as both the Shearers Union and the United Pastoralists Association fought for freedom of contract rights during the 1891 and 1893 Shearers’ Strikes.325 Many Chinese men, discouraged from working on stations, turned their attention instead to gardening and storekeeping in and around rural
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324 Daniel M. Connolly, Chronicles of Mowbray and Port Douglas and the Pioneering Saga of the Reynolds and Connolly Families, D.M. Connolly Qld, Cairns, Qld, 1984: 25 and ‘Labour Troubles’, The Northern Miner, 7 March 1891, p. 3. On the 6 March 1891 it was reported the United Pastoralists Association on Queensland agreed to a Sydney resolution regarding Freedom of Contracts held this morning, “was not intended to include Chinese, Polynesians or Asiatic labor, and we earnestly recommend the members of our various associations to discontinue the further employment of this kind of labor.”

towns and communities. Even then they were not safe with many gardens trashed and robbed by union shearsers on strike.326

By the end of the century the Chinese population across Queensland was officially estimated at 10,076 persons including 93 Chinese women.327 By 1900, Chinese settlers represented less than 2% of the general population despite growing fears and claims by some anti-Chinese agitators which were never realized when the figures are considered.328 Occupations ranged from speculative entrepreneurs to street hawkers, miners to jewelers, opium house keepers and boarding house keepers to merchants. Other niche occupations such as carpentry and boat building serviced both Chinese and non-Chinese interests.329 With an industrious nature and keen eye for opportunity, Chinese settlers were noted by one observer as

… a very industrious race and will make a living where the ordinary white man would starve. They are also intelligent and saving, and soon start businesses on their own account.330
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Fig. 3. Chinese Population in Key Towns, 1901331
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Rapid growth and expansion of the maize industry on the Atherton Tablelands created a thriving Chinese community located at Atherton as well as smaller satellite centres at Carrington, Tolga and Kairi. As the Tablelands population expanded, other regional centres including Port Douglas, Cairns and Geraldton contracted. While natural elements wiped out Port Douglas in 1911, the Chinese populations of Cairns and Geraldton (now known as Innisfail) had suffered from a slow and steadily decline since the 1890s and newly arrived migrants preferred to move to the hinterland of the Atherton Tablelands rather than stay on the coast. By that time a number of aging Chinese men, those who had arrived seeking gold in the 1870s-1880s, were also beginning to return home to China.

The importance of the maize industry as a source of income for Overseas Chinese is evident in a population of nearly 1000 Chinese people across the Atherton Tablelands in 1909, which had exceeded that of the banana driven economy of Geraldton and the stability and prosperity of Cairns. However, from 1910 onwards due to ever-increasing restrictions placed on the Chinese population through legislation and the White Australia policy, populations continued to decline across the State at a rapid pace. In 1910 the population of Chinese across Queensland was recorded as 9313 Chinese. This figure dropped two and a half thousand to 6714 by the end of 1911.332
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**Fig.4. Chinese Population in Key Towns, 1909** 333
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So, how do the industries stack up against one another as attractants for migration associated with the Chinese Diaspora? By the end of the first decade of the 20th century approximately 65% of the Chinese population were living or occupied on the eastern sea-board in large scale agriculture, 20% were engaged in goods and service industries servicing mining towns, 10% were living in major service centres and were occupied with commercial enterprise, and the remaining 5% were associated with pastoral towns. While some overlap between industries occurs, such as small-scale agriculture (market gardening) on the coast as well as in a pastoral or mining context, it is fair to say that the earlier focus of mining as a driving influence for migration in the mid-1880s had turned significantly to large scale agriculture between 1886 and 1910. This shift in focus influenced the subsequent pattern and location of settlement across north Queensland which had further implications for the Chinese Family Landscape which developed. In addition, population migration and large-scale agricultural industries along the east coast followed completely different trends to the pattern of settlement and industry which dominated inland rural and remote districts. This affected the occupations and population trends across these districts which were reliant on either the fickle economies in mining districts or the limited employment across the pastoral districts. Both industries attracted populations of individuals and small syndicates of Chinese bachelor men in shop keeping and gardening occupations which were unified in their experience with their coastal contemporaries by social impositions, colonial restrictions, and Commonwealth exclusions.
Fig. 5. Chinese population in Key Towns, 1909, by percentage

Fig. 6. Chinese Population in Key Towns, 1909, Industry identified

POLL/IJ Return of Chinese in Several Police Districts of Queensland April-May 1909 (Via Circular Memorandum No. 534)
Restrictive legislation

From as early as 1867, the Queensland colonial government sought multiple legislative ways to control the number of Chinese immigrants arriving and settling in the colony. A series of restrictive and prohibitive Acts were passed commencing with The Aliens Act 1867 (31. Vic. No. 28) which excluded any Chinese or African aliens from applying for a certificate of naturalisation for British subject status unless married and a resident of Queensland for three years. In other words, they were not entitled to full citizenship rights as were other races of non-British subjects, who were eligible. Trends adopted from overseas in the U.S.A., Canada and New Zealand saw further immigration restrictions introduced in 1877 with Queensland passing The Chinese Immigration Regulation Act (41 Vic., No. 8) in response to the influx of Chinese onto the northern goldfields. This Act authorized a £10 poll tax to be paid by the ship’s master on each Chinese immigrant. Its effectiveness was questioned and was replaced after much debate by The Chinese Immigrants Regulation Amendment Act of 1884. The poll tax was raised to £30 per Chinese immigrant and the intake of Chinese set at a limit of one immigrant per fifty tons of the vessel’s tonnage.

In 1888 an inter-colonial conference was held in Sydney to debate the Chinese Question. All colonies except for Tasmania voted to tighten restrictions placed upon Chinese immigrants. This facilitated an abandonment of the poll tax and strengthened the limit to one “Chinaman” per 500 tons burden of the vessel. In addition, those who illegally entered Queensland from the Northern Territory would be subjected to a pecuniary penalty and gaol sentence as well as cutting off of their queue (pigtail) as a measure of further humiliation.

In 1901, the new Federal government introduced The Immigration Restriction Act (No.17 of 1901) which was designed to exclude Chinese immigration into the Commonwealth. Known colloquially as the White Australia Policy, this legislation and its regulations were based on a Commonwealth objective to create and maintain a White society. It was the most important and lasting policy to exclude Chinese immigrants and it fueled a broader racist ideology. The White

335 Queensland Parliamentary Debates (QPD), 1888, First Session, 10th Parliament, Vol. LV, pp. 237, 717, 741 and Maryborough Chronicle, Wide Bay and Burnett Advertiser, 31 May 1888, p. 2. Tasmania lobbied for a relaxing of conditions to attract labour and met with much condemnation from the other colonies.

336 QPD, 1888, First Session, 10th Parliament, Vol. LV, p. 239. Queensland’s representative Samuel Griffith remarked that “It is satisfactory to know that this is a subject on which all parties in the House are agreed, that is to say we are all agreed as to the common objective in view—namely the exclusion of the Chinese from Australasia as far as practical”.

337 Ibid. p.745. The Chinese Immigration Restriction Act (53 Vic. No 22), although formulated in 1888 at the height of anti-Chinese hysteria, was not passed until 1890 due to refusal of Royal assent and was superseded by The Chinese Immigration Restriction Amendment Act (54 Vic. No. 29) of 1890. Until the 1911 Revolution, no Chinese man was re-admitted to China without a queue.
Australia Policy was fed by a belief that immigrant Chinese labour would undermine wage levels, work conditions and standards of living for White men, and went so far as to suggest that the presence of a great number of Chinese immigrants would destabilise social harmony if racial integration were allowed and create a subordinate class of citizens. It was feared that social division, potential conflict and moral depravity would descend upon the civilized community, creating chaos fed by communicable diseases and vice.

After the “White Australia” policy emerged, racial divisions which had previously been relaxed in some towns were re-established and the Chinese population was controlled more strictly; a task made easier in northern areas which benefitted from State legislation including the *Aboriginals Protection and Restriction of the Sale of Opium Amendment Act* 1901, the *Sugar Bounty Act* 1905, *The Leases to Aliens Act* 1911 and *The Sugar Cultivation Act* 1913. The negative effect of legislative restrictions upon Chinese men who had settled in north Queensland was palpable and it was the last straw for some such a prominent sugar grower Jan See Chin of Cairns who as noted earlier packed his large family up and moved to Hong Kong. Legislative restrictions along with the soldier settlement scheme, aging population and rise of White labour rights effectively stifled the Chinese population across Queensland, drawbacks from which it was unable to recover until many decades later with the Dictation Test abolished in 1958, restrictions subsequently relaxed gradually, and White Australia Policy officially killed off by the Labor government in 1973.

**Conclusion**

Chinese settlement across north Queensland commenced with the migration of ex-indentured employees from the Darling Downs venturing north to make the most of opportunities after 1860. As the region developed, three key industries emerged, pastoralism, mining and agriculture, to dominate the pattern of settlement until the end of the century. While Chinese migrants were associated with all three industries across the north it was the last two, mining and agriculture, which substantially influenced migration trends and patterns of settlement across north Queensland giving rise to at least two industry led migration influxes: one associated with the early mining discoveries, and the other with large scale agriculture such as sugar. In particular it was the opportunities in agriculture which provided the most stability to the east coast communities and led to two Chinese dominated crops: bananas and maize. However, after
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Federation and the implementation of the White Australia policy, combined with an increased anti-Chinese sentiment across the north, Chinese populations declined as Chinese men were limited in their ability to migrate to Queensland for any length of time, while those who remained were frustrated with legislative restrictions imposed upon them and their families. By 1920 many old men who had been in the first wave of migration to North Queensland in the early 1870s, had either returned home, had become indigent old men or had died, leaving the community a former shadow of itself and reliant instead on the Chinese Family Landscape to continue a Chinese presence in North Queensland.
CHINATOWNS AND CULTURAL PRECINCTS

Introduction
Chinatowns and Chinese cultural precincts were the most populated, talked about and policed section of any town across north Queensland in the 19th and early 20th centuries. Usually located on the edge of town, and confined to designated boundaries, they provided a place for Chinese men to live, work and relax relatively unimpeded while in the host colony. Drawn together by kinship, cultural familiarity and security, Chinatown communities developed all around the globe as self-contained communities, catering to all needs of the Chinese population: both the living and dead. Male dominated in population, Chinatowns’ economic and social structures were based on transplanted political, kinship affiliations where mutual benefit obligations aided the development of strong inter- and extended community networks. However, there were also hidden elements in the community which developed over time, behind closed doors in the private quarters of shops, dwellings, rented rooms, lean-tos and market garden areas. These elements involved relationships conducted with women in the community as wives, lovers, workers and daughters. These relationships enabled north Queensland Chinatowns and cultural precincts to renew and grow in ways which otherwise may not have occurred. It also led to the development of String Communities. However, before it can be understood just how the presence of women and families contributed to the development of community across North Queensland, a broader understanding Chinatowns, cultural precincts and String Communities must first be explored.

Part 1: The meaning of ‘Chinatown’
“Chinatown” is a complex abstract term used to describe a physical place where migrant Chinese men lived in host colonies and countries such as Queensland, and it has been constructed, deconstructed and reconstructed by social commentators and scholars over the last 150 years. Until the first few decades of the 20th century, ‘Chinatown’ was constructed by White observers as an unsanitary, overcrowded and morally dubious place, with very little commentary suggesting otherwise. “Chinatown”, and every White imposed derivative: “Chinese quarter”;
“China camp”; “Hong Kong”; were established across the globe in cities, major towns and smaller communities: anywhere where large populations of Chinese men were associated. The majority of White social commentators, governing authorities and members of the public viewed “Chinatown” as places to be contained, managed and avoided in order to limit the Chinese population from integrating into the broader community. It was also a place used as a means of exercising moral and behavioural control over the broader White population (specifically women), as a social demarcation for “respectability” with those who entered “Chinatown” at risk of being pilloried by their social peers. More recently anthropologists, sociologists, historians and archaeologists have reinterpreted “Chinatown” by exploring alternative theories of transplanted territories and social construction while scholars in tourism and commerce romanticize their existence as an “oriental” imagining in order to re-invent Chinatown as an exciting visitor experience.

Deep cultural values at the core of the British Empire shaped colonial attitudes towards Chinese migrants and the places they lived. “Chinatown” commenced as a physical manifestation for “the Other” by British colonial authorities, based on long held and deep-seated xenophobia towards other races. Chinese migrants were not the first “Others” to be marginalized based on culture or race. British authorities systematically demonstrated a determined approach to isolate certain groups of people even prior to colonial settlement, commencing with the dismissal of Aboriginal rights via the proclamation of the continent as a place of terra nullius; ill treatment of convicts and later colonial Irish settlers who lived in “Irishtowns”; until focus shifted to a new racial group, the Chinese, when the monopoly of resources by Whites came under threat.

However, in seeking to impose racial segregation on the Chinese community, through the confinement of the population to select streets and on the fringes of towns, effective management of the population was abrogated. As a result, overcrowding and activities of “vice”,
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344 Pers. Comm., Alice Robb, 2000, Sandford. For example, the Irish were persecuted as an underclass community in early colonial times and as a result formed Irish-only camps and cultural precincts, giving rise to the name “Irishtown.” In the rural western district town of Sandford, Victoria, a portion of the town across the river away from what was once the central business district, was and still remains known as “Irishtown”. This was originally settled by Irish immigrants in the 1860s in what was predominantly an Anglo-Saxon settlement. Similarly, German immigrant settlements were sometimes referred to as “German-towns” or “German Quarters” or in the case of Townsville, north Queensland, “German Gardens”. 
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which White authorities were so anxious about, were able to occur due to the community developing as a closed community.

The formation of a “Chinatown” meant that a community could function as a self-contained urban enclave; a community within a community, which provided protection to those within and remained forever “foreign” to those who lived on the outside looking in. As a result, the Chinatown community was viewed with suspicion, mistrust and disdain, as an impenetrable community by those on the outside who were obsessed with maintaining cultural divides. Evelyn Hu DeHart, when reflecting on the formation of Chinatowns across the U.S., notes that the formation of Chinese communities enabled the pattern of sojourning to break. This was the one thing authorities wished to avoid. 345

Blinded by a deeply embedded cultural value of “White” superiority and by positioning Chinese racially as “the Other” 346, colonial authorities managed to turn the blame upon the Chinese community for failing to assimilate, despite a Chinese inability to work, live or take an equal social position within the broader community. The physical presence of a Chinatown was steeped with alien characteristics in the Western imagination and resulted in a skewed interpretation. As Kay Anderson notes, “Chinatown” developed as a “social and cultural history and tradition of imagery and institutional practice giving it a cognitive and material reality in and for the West.” The fact that Chinese people congregated together, provided a natural impetus for the dominant culture to use the term to describe the place, despite other races living there. 347

In an attempt to seek answers and identify patterns based on culturally based motivations, US scholars Crissman 348 and McKeown 349 argue that Chinatowns were derived from established patterns indigenous to China rather than self-imposed cultural enclaves united against White racism. They argue “Chinatown” provided a natural response to factors associated with the transplantation of culture from one country to the next, with the Diaspora providing an initiative for the complex stratification of kinsmen to develop as they grouped together for mutual support. Even the term “Chinatown” itself is an extension of the Chinese term for place. 350 “Chinatowns” were organised using established kin, clan and village structures which provided a
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familiar social order including tongs, mutual benefit societies, meeting halls and temples. These networks interlinked the Chinese Diaspora communities across the globe and enhanced social and commercial links between host countries and village communities.\textsuperscript{351} The ensuing complex and multilateral transnational relationships had their roots in the village political, family and cultural structures and it was this familiarity which enabled the Chinese community to survive as ‘protected’ enclaves well into the 20\textsuperscript{th} century.\textsuperscript{352}

However, it is through Canadian scholar, David Chuenyan Lai that the clearest definition can be found as the best model to interrogate the role of women in a “Chinatown” formation. Lai describes “Chinatown” as “a self-contained urban enclave where nearly all Chinese people, their businesses and social institutions were confined.”\textsuperscript{353} As a descriptor, this covers the physicality of a “Chinatown” which is most relevant to this thesis, but falls short of including women and families. In the context of Queensland, specifically north Queensland, I propose to amend and expand this description as a means to better reflect gender diversity within the community. In a Queensland context I suggest that “Chinatown” describes a community within a community, where Chinese people, their businesses, social institutions and families were confined, which developed as gender diverse, self-sufficient and inter-generational societies, tolerated only to the extent that the host colony allowed it to exist.

“Chinatowns” arose specifically out of a necessity by Chinese migrants, in response to the need for community support in a strange environment, and as a means to manage the migration experience as a collective, while responding to external pressures exerted by the broader White community. They were located on the fringes of town or well away from the central commercial districts. They were universally confined to one or more town section blocks and developed to form a “unique component of the urban fabric.”\textsuperscript{354} In countries such as the United States, they were often located near a transport terminus or hub,\textsuperscript{355} whereas in Queensland and in particular north Queensland, “Chinatowns” were located wherever major industry interests such as mining or sugar production were active. “Chinatowns” were not homogenous in demographics or in their response to the broader community. While Chinatowns in the United States and British Columbia have been historically portrayed as male only “bachelor” societies, controlled by the
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wealthy and merchant class, “Chinatowns” in the colony of Queensland developed as gender inclusive communities involving women and families as well as marginalised women such as “prostitutes”. However, it could be said that key elements of the physical aspects of “Chinatown”: the look, smell, high population density, poor sanitation and location of populations were similar.

“Chinatown”: Architecture and Layout

Across the globe the architectural and planning development of Chinese communities was ad hoc and opportunistic at best and permanently in crisis, as merchants and entrepreneurs sought innovative solutions to accommodate the requirements of both the permanent and transient residents of “Chinatown”. Confined to one or two streets yet teeming with people, some “Chinatowns” developed distinctive architectural elements in response to need.

In Singapore and around Malacca, Chinatown shops utilized the ground floor and street frontage as commercial space, while the rears of the shop, corridors or upper levels were private quarters. Labourers shared the same sleeping space in cubicles in lodging houses. Places constructed across northern Australia showed similar characteristics. Merchant houses and key stores in Port Darwin as well as places in northern Queensland developed along the same lines to provide a dual service to the community: goods and lodging services. Merchant houses were usually two storied with a ground floor commercial area and an upper level for private use. Class was clearly articulated by building structures with the merchant stores usually two storied timber and tin structures and general shopkeepers confined to a low set shop with accommodation. Not only were merchants able to provide commodious living quarters for their usually China born wives and families, but they were able to rise above the smells and dirt of the streetscape and enjoy a cool vantage point. This style of architecture was applied across north Australia with characteristics described as a Fujian style of architecture which was popular across the Asia-Pacific Rim area.

---

356 See Yuen-Fong Woon, “The Voluntary Sojourner”, 673-690. Yuen-Fong Woon challenges the concept of the bachelor society and advocates for a better term such as “married bachelor” society. This articulates the marital status of the majority of settler men and acknowledges the wife at home and role of family and kinship relations in the Diaspora. To date, gender inclusive studies into Chinatowns across the United States and British Columbia (Canada) are few. I am not convinced that this leads to an accurate portrayal of Chinatowns. Women (Chinese, White and Indigenous women) have not been sufficiently studied or inserted into the historical narrative. American historical newspapers demonstrate that White women, Chinese women, children, “prostitutes” and Native American women are associated with Chinese men in Chinatown areas and cultural precincts but not represented in settlement narratives.

357 Henderson, “Attracting tourists to Singapore’s Chinatown”, 526

358 Ibod.
On the other hand, ordinary storekeepers were limited to single story shops built directly on or close to the ground with commercial rooms accessed directly from the street. Private quarters were located at the rear and in some instances a mezzanine level was installed at the back of the shop to accommodate lodgers. Others utilized the cavity under the roof with access provided in the ceiling, or constructed makeshift lean-to accommodation out the back. All available space on the allotment was used and if not used for human occupation, was given over to ducks and chickens and out-house. Because of the high density construction of lodging houses, laundries, gambling shops and opium shops at the rear of the allotments, small access laneways were formed. Every available small or narrow space was blocked in with tin or timber and rented out as living quarters. Chinatowns were noted for their intensely populated communities housed in cramped conditions which continued well into the 20th century.

Entire allotments groaned under the weight of the population which led to infrastructure and sanitation failure, attracting unfavourable commentary in the press. In 1876, San Francisco was described as “…a cesspool of filth; such a hell of vice and crime, such poverty, misery, squalor, filth and disease is to be found nowhere else upon the American Continent.” Across the Pacific, Cooktown’s “Chinatown” was described in 1885 as “filthy beyond description” while Cairns was described five years later as a place for “stinks and other abominations …” with the additional outrage that Chinese men were “frequently to be seen on their back premise in a state of nudity”.

Twenty- five years later, attitudes had hardly changed. Cairns “Chinatown” was described as a “seething, filthy, rotten hole comprised largely of brothels, gambling dens and sly grog shops”. Other colonies fared no better. In 1904, “Chinatown” in Sydney was described as the “stinking purlieu of Sydney”. With the combined forces of public health, moral respectability and racism arrayed against them, Chinese communities rarely lasted into the second half of the 20th century.

---

359 Robb, Cairns Chinatown, p. 33
360 “The Chinese Quarters”, Queensland Figaro, 28 April 1883, p. 9; Cairns Post, 12 February 1929, p. 4.
361 Robb, Cairns Chinatown. See Maps.
362 North Queensland Register, 4 May 1903, p. 3. One man, a Cingalese (Sri Lankan), lived in a space under a building which was lined by hessian and measured 3ft by 7 ft.
363 Cairns Post, 12 February 1929, p. 4.
364 Lai, Chinatowns, 5.
365 “The Chinese In California”, Maryborough Chronicle, Wide Bay and Burnett Advertiser, 26 August 1876, p. 4.
366 Queensland, The Age, 23 December1885, p. 6.
367 “Correspondence”, Cairns Post, 26 Nov 1890, p. 3. They were bathing themselves al fresco.
368 Cairns Post, 15 November 1916, p. 4.
369 “Why the Chinaman is Cheap”, The Worker, 22 October 1904, p. 5.
“Chinatown”: Life cycle

The rise and decline of north Queensland’s “Chinatowns” is usefully scrutinized using the framework provided by Lai. In his comprehensive study in 1988, up to 12 Chinatowns across British Columbia were interrogated in order to develop his theory. Lai build up a map of each “Chinatown’s” life, which led to new ways of interpreting spatial longevity, immigration and demographics. While he does not explore the presence or influence of gender in his work, he none the less provides a starting point to evaluate the effects of the introduction, presence and occupations of women and families on the formation and lifespan of a “Chinatown” in north Queensland. Of the 12 “Chinatowns” in Lai’s study between 1890 and 1930, half become extinct and disappeared, while the other half were able to revive and readapt. In addition, he found that only 6 were associated with immigration prior to 1900, all associated with mining, and 3 of those survived until the 1930s. However, the majority entered their peak period only after 1910 and all began to fade away after 1930 until only a few remained.370

To provide a framework for his analysis Lai formulated that a “Chinatown” has four morphological stages in its lifetime.371 His model analysed the waxing and waning of the community in both its population levels as well as built elements. The four stages of longevity, otherwise known as the lifespan of a “Chinatown”, commence with a budding or emerging stage, followed by a blooming or booming stage, before it contracted and went through a withering or declining state to be left with one of two alternatives: die or revive. The last stage, if revived and readapted, enabled the community to be reinvented, providing a sense of place through the emergence of new geopopulation trend based on historical and exotic orientalised tourism.372

From the commencement of a definitive Chinese urban cultural precinct, the budding stage took in the initial formation of settlement where Chinese men came together, formed a community, constructed the physical infrastructure and developed social cohesiveness to become self-contained. The budding stage is characterised not only by urban development, but by human endeavour when men seized opportunities and worked hard to assert their commercial and entrepreneurial skills with a view to acquiring wealth and status. The budding stage can be applied to the early “Chinatowns” in California; the railroad communities of Texas; “Chinatowns” across British Columbia; Chinatowns in the colonies of Victoria and New South...

370 Lai, Chinatowns, 6-20.
371 Ibid. 6.
372 Ibid.
Wales; and lastly, Queensland. The *budding* or emerging stage is consistent with the Chinese experience across north Queensland where “Chinatowns” started to develop from the early 1870s onwards as Chinese men responded to the rapidly developing mining and port towns.

Historical perceptions arising from the *budding stage* have entrenched the experience as a male only experience leading to many communities labelled as “bachelor” societies. For example, in Texas, the Chinatown communities have been characterized as remote “bachelor” only societies despite clear familial and kinship interconnections within the community and the presence of a few women.  

Huping Ling challenges this concept when she brings to light the development of urban communities complete with Chinese women and families who lived at the back of stores and shops. This is consistent with the experience in Australia’s colonial Chinatown environment with women and children present in Queensland’s colonial “Chinatowns” from the commencement of the *budding* stage.

As “Chinatowns” across British Columbia entered a *blooming* or booming stage between the 1890s and 1915, the community developed integrated Chinese social structures which formalized financial gains made. Fully self-contained and self-supporting communities displayed social infrastructure such as Chinese associations, temples, schools and other institutions. The *blooming* stage was characterized by a thriving community which encouraged recreational, spiritual and extended family opportunities, as transnational families negotiated marriages, family unity and wealth creation and distribution between the host country and the clan village.

“Chinatowns” across British Columbia in this stage reflected both the merchant and labouring classes and were expanding in population and commercial growth. Family migration reflected male familial, kin and village relationships such as father, son, brother, uncle, cousin or brother in law. In contrast, the “Chinatowns” of colonial Queensland, while suffering family migration restrictions under the White Australia policy in the 20th century, still managed to attract women to the community and put down roots. This was largely made possible by intergenerational growth within the community as Australian born mixed heritage and Chinese daughters and sons

---

373 Rhoads, “Chinese in Texas”, 7 and 22; Edward C. M. Chen and Fred R. Von Der Mehden, History of Houston's Chinatown, Online web resource, http://chinatownconnection.com/houston_chinatown_history.htm At least one woman, Mrs Mrs. Anna Wah Yuan (a White woman) and her son Lincoln Yuan have been identified and acknowledged in Houston, Texas, 1880. It suggests that more women may be found if they were looked for in the first place. Chinatowns in Texas were predominantly bachelor societies with only El Paso developing a Chinatown comprising of a population in 1916 of 239 men over 21 years, and only 4 women or male minors.

374 Huping Ling, “Family and Marriage of Late-Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Century Chinese Immigrant Women”, *Journal of American Ethnic History*, 19, 2 (Winter 2000): 47 and interview, Estelle Kingsley, Cairns, 2 May 2001, Tape 1. In some cases the women also worked alongside their husbands in shops or managed his business affairs in his absence in addition to household duties.
married back into the Australian and China born community. Queensland’s pattern of intergenerational growth during the *blooming* stage reflected many of the elements outlined in the *blooming* stage of British Columbia’s experience, including that restrictive legislation made family unification itself prohibitive. Lai concludes that this leads to a contraction.\textsuperscript{375}

At the time of the First World War through to the 1930s, British Columbia experienced a distinct pattern of *withering* and *decline* across all of its “Chinatowns”. This reflected an overall decline in Chinese communities in both British Columbia and across the United States as noted by Lai (Canada) and Rhoads (U.S.).\textsuperscript{376} Lai observed that individuals who remained behind in British Columbia’s “Chinatowns” were left in a community which began to unravel. The declining population had dropped to such an unsustainable level that the social and physical ties which bound the community could not be maintained. Shops and dwellings were increasingly abandoned, and fell into such a state that they were condemned or demolished.\textsuperscript{377} This pattern was also repeated across the United States. Edward Rhoads confirms that the combination of aging Chinese men dying with a drop in permanent population, impacted on the core elements of the community. No longer able to maintain mutual benevolent societies and social infrastructure, “Chinatowns” across Texas simply disappeared by the end of the 1940s.\textsuperscript{378} This pattern resonates with the *withering* phase of north Queensland’s major “Chinatown” communities including Mackay, Cairns, Lower Herbert, Innisfail, and Atherton. Nearly all north Queensland Chinatowns entered a period of contraction from 1915 onwards, entering an accelerated decline in the 1920s to near extinction in the early 1930s. This impetus was attributed to similar pressures from within the community such as population decline, assimilation into the wider community and from external pressures from local authorities.\textsuperscript{379}

From the 1930s local authorities across the globe stepped up attempts to purge themselves of their Chinese communities and the *withering* turned to a slow *death* for communities. Demolition of buildings provided a permanent solution to the perceived problem in their midst. The departure or death of a local Chinese person from the community initiated the removal of buildings and shops, and vacant buildings and land were re-occupied or filled with new buildings which were occupied by arriving Greek and Italian immigrants. Efforts by city

\textsuperscript{375} This aspect remains speculative as Lai did not explore the female population in the community, including the presence of non-Chinese women as wives. It is unknown if it would change his framework if the study was done again as gender-inclusive.


\textsuperscript{377} “Chinatown in Mackay”, *The Queenslander*, 28 June 1934, p. 5; “About Sachs Street”, *Cairns Post*, 2 February 1929, p. 4.

\textsuperscript{378} Rhoads, “Chinese in Texas”, 18.

\textsuperscript{379} ‘Bubonic Plague’, *The Northern Herald*, 26 October 1921, p. 8; ‘Innisfail Dead House’, *Cairns Post*, 21 July 1925, p. 11.
administrations targeting Chinese quarters were not isolated to British Columbia or Queensland during this period. In England\textsuperscript{380} and across the channel in Holland, local authorities forcibly repatriated Chinese men to China, with the Dutch repatriating more than 1000 Chinese seamen in the 1930s.\textsuperscript{381} At the same time, an anti-Chinese movement had moved to Mexicali on the U.S. - Mexican border and lands formerly belonging to Chinese settlers were resumed and men forced back to China.\textsuperscript{382} Lai estimated in British Columbia that by second half of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century only three late 19\textsuperscript{th} century “Chinatowns” had managed to survive. Their renewal became dependent on the transformative qualities bestowed on them through two alternative pathways: either renewed through a change of immigration policy which initiated a revitalization and brought in a new wave of Chinese investor immigrants, or through the more recent constructed imagery of the romantic orient which attracted nostalgia buffs seeking a piece of the “old Chinatown”.\textsuperscript{383}

From the 1930s generational change accelerated the withering, decline and subsequent death of north Queensland’s Chinatowns which led to a near collapse of all communities. Between 1920 - 1940, second, third and even fourth generation “Chinatown” residents were unable or unwilling to sustain “Chinatown” as a community. Efforts to maintain established infrastructure such as the hospital or Tong associations, entered a decline, and they eventually shut their doors due to a lack of patronage and difficulty with new tax laws. Old and indigent Chinese men were at the mercy of the community and authorities.\textsuperscript{384} Some were assisted by the State to return to China as this was considered less of a financial burden than the upkeep of a Chinese man in a Benevolent Asylum. Others were provided for within the Chinese community. Accommodation was offered in the temple halls where many ‘Ah Bucks’ lived until they died. This practice was undertaken in Cooktown, Cairns and Innisfail, with Innisfail being the last community to make provision for their aging male population when they constructed a cyclone proof concrete Temple in 1940.\textsuperscript{385}

In Cairns, the largest Chinatown outside Brisbane, efforts were invested into community festivals and social gatherings such as the Bar-Lun Sui-Yee Wui or Barron River Memorial Festival, commemorating the deaths of a crew when their boat capsized in the river. Other cultural calendar events such as Ch’ing Ming were also observed and the temple used until

\textsuperscript{381} Koetse, “The Imagined Space of Amsterdam”, blog, 2010.
\textsuperscript{382} Curtis, “Mexicali’s Chinatown”, 335-348
\textsuperscript{383} Lai, Chinatowns, 9-11
\textsuperscript{384} Indigent Chinese’, Cairns Post, 23 July 1930, p. 13
\textsuperscript{385} Townsville Daily Bulletin, 22 October 1940, p. 3.
1965. By World War II, Australian born Chinese families were nearly all integrated into suburban living, leaving only one or two families in “Chinatown”. Only Cairns and Innisfail were supporting Chinese communities with a reasonable sized population, whereas Atherton, Cooktown, Charters Towers, Halifax and Mackay had already faltered. For those who remained, political changes in China drove a wedge into the community. Younger and progressive members of the community aligned with the Chinese Nationalist or Kuomintang movement which pushed a reformist agenda. This was in contrast to the older traditional masons, who relied upon Confucian principles to provide social cohesion and promote structure to community.

Having effected control over the Chinese community through the use of restrictive laws, local authorities renewed efforts to condemn, remove and erase Chinatowns from north Queensland. In 1936 in an effort to reinvent the area, Cairns Municipal Council went so far as to rename the main street of “Chinatown” from Sachs Street to Grafton, and the aldermen congratulated themselves for making the Chinese quarters disappear. North Queensland’s withering, decline and subsequent death of all Chinatowns commenced in the 1920s and was complete by 1940 with only the two “Chinatowns” noted above remaining: Cairns and Innisfail. Both places received a small reprieve during the 1940s, due to American and Australian soldiers availing themselves of the recreational pursuits of gambling and whoring in Innisfail and Cairns Chinatowns while stationed in those places. However this was only a weak reprieve and did not signal a revival. By 1950 prostitution and gambling were pushed out into the suburbs and Innisfail’s and Cairns’ “Chinatowns” met their ultimate end. Very little infrastructure remained to indicate that a self-contained Chinese community had existed in the towns as all the signature characteristics which made it a “Chinatown” had been removed.

***

386 Robb, Cairns Chinatown, 96.
387 May, Topsawyers, 80-83 and Mei-fen Kuo and Judith Brett, Unlocking the History of the Australasian Kuo Min Tang, 1911-2013 (Australian Scholarly Publishing, North Melbourne, 2013): 40-42. By the end of 1916, thirteen Kuomintang (KMT) branches were established throughout Australasia, seven of which were situated in Queensland and 5 in north Queensland. These included Atherton, Townsville, Ayr, Bowen, Mackay, Rockhampton and Brisbane.
388 “A Clean up, Cairns Chinatown Disgusting Condition”, The Week, 10 January 1934, p. 29; “ “Chinatown” in Mackay”, Queensland, 28 June 1934, p. 5.
389 Bottoms, A History of Cairns, 224-225 and 505. While it was allegedly proposed that the street be named in honour of Alderman Hoare, the city aldermen passed over the pun in favour of the more prudent Grafton Street.
390 Cairns Post, 8 June 1936, p.3
391 Robb, Cairns Chinatown, 111-113.
Other types of community: Cultural precincts and String communities

“Cultural precinct”

Cultural precincts and String communities provide useful alternative models by which to understand the diversity of community type which formed outside full scale “Chinatowns”: both of which were associated with the Chinese family landscape. Both Cultural precincts and String communities formed as smaller communities which failed to develop into a “Chinatown”, usually through lack of population, location, or lack of industry to attract large numbers of migrants to the region. However, they differ in a number of ways to each other. Whereas a cultural precinct developed as a community with more than one individual, element or industry constructed in close proximity to each other within an area or town, a string community was more linear, and individuals within it were connected through kin and commerce associations over one or more towns involving one or two individuals in each town as singular nodes linking the linear community.

Huping Ling in her article “Reconceptualising Chinese American Community in St Louis from Chinatown to Cultural Community” suggests that it is important to re-conceptualize the terms for the Chinese communities in order to fully understand the range of Chinese settlement experiences and resulting types of community formation.392 Ling argues that rather than restrict analysis to Chinatowns alone, that smaller communities also provide an important means to understand the Chinese Diaspora and as such, warrant attention. She describes the term “cultural community” as a place which is socially defined by the common cultural practices and beliefs of its community but which is somewhat integrated into the broader community through economic or social activities. She suggests that cultural communities are more likely to be found in the hinterland and remote areas of America where the “transnational economy has limited penetration”. In other words, the networks which were maintained between Chinatowns across America and the village clans and families in China, were unable to be maintained due to the rural and remote location of smaller communities and as a result networks were broken down or never able to develop in the first place. In particular, she argues that the term ‘cultural community’ provides a good model to define Chinese populations in areas which were not large enough to constitute a physical Chinatown but which were substantial enough to form social communities even though not defined by physical boundaries.393

393 Ibid. 67-68.
Ling’s model is useful to apply to smaller towns and market garden cultural precinct areas on the fringe of towns across north Queensland where economic integration was important to both communities. However, I prefer the term “cultural precinct” to describe an area where two or more Chinese commercial interests or households were located over a period of time. This term more accurately encompasses both the social development within the town of more than one cultural community, while making provision for the physical footprint of place within an urban environment. By referring to these smaller communities as cultural precincts, they can be mapped as cultural precincts within an urban landscape to delineate between the larger Chinatowns and smaller groupings of people, as well as in line with cultural heritage definitions for an area with more than one element in close proximity to each other.

Cultural precinct longevity lies not with the size of the community or its capacity to form a “Chinatown”, but through an ability of the Chinese settlers to find economic niches enhanced by business acumen and/or hard work. Cultural precincts are not categorized by one type of building or activity; instead a cultural precinct can include a cluster of commercial buildings, or produce gardens, or houses, and can be located within a town as well as further afield, such as a group of gardens. Chinese gardeners were experts in capitalizing on traditional utilitarian skills which led them to dominate food production in remote western towns and settlements. The health of a community depended on a constant ready source of fresh fruit and vegetables and so demand drove a need for constant supply. In rural and remote communities where, Chinese food production was a valued contribution to a town’s survival, market gardens and associated garden/shop cultural precincts were able to remain viable until the 1950s by which time the majority of the old men had died out. However, across Western Queensland there is one exception to this and that is in Winton, where Willie Mar junior carried on a shop and garden business inherited from his father until 2007.394

**String Communities:**

String communities on the other hand are the tangible and intangible elements of small nodal communities which developed across rural and remote regions in a lineal trajectory in a response to family or kin chain migration. Chain network migration takes in the act of migration and settlement where one or more members from one village or family, such as brothers, all migrate at the same time and lead to the migration of other village or family members to the same host

---

country region once the first arrivals are established. This is the case for the Pang clan in north Queensland where three brothers, Pang Muen Young, Pang Ah Way and Pang Ah Cum all migrated together in 1874 and settled in the Cairns and Port Douglas districts.\(^{395}\)

String communities developed as a lineal community which stretched out over distance as a series of individual units or “beads”, interconnected by kinship and/or commercial relationships. In each town, they are too small to be described as a cultural precinct, although cultural precincts may exist in the string, and they cannot form a Chinatown because they are usually confined to singular businesses and/or families at each “bead”. Yet these communities are important in the context of the Diaspora as a means to understand more obscure interconnections within the Chinese family landscape. They provide a useful tool to explore the Chinese settler response to father/son/brother/uncle/kinship connections and the maintenance of connection through family business and *guanxi* connections.\(^{396}\) Highly dependent on the strength of these relationships, string communities have been described by Hu-DeHart as “Borderland” communities in Mexico/America, where one Chinese settler and his family on one side of the border have kinship, commercial and generational ties with a brother and family on the other side,\(^{397}\) and as an extension of kinship relationships across Diaspora countries in South East Asia where the forces of *guanxi* are applied, usually through the local wife’s family.\(^{398}\)

String communities occurred within North Queensland in response to chain migration to accommodate lineal relationships which developed through the long-distance settlement of multiple kin and family members including fathers and sons, sets of brothers, uncles and nephews, and kinship cousins. These extended family, village and kinship relationships connected individual “units” across western Queensland linking individuals, businesses and families through informal *guanxi* or direct commercial transactions where both parties experienced mutual benefit. This is evident through the provision of initial "startup" support, and business agreements between two parties located in different towns; provision of practical logistics such as a point of contact for correspondence and acting as couriers for remittances and messages sent when family members return to the village, as well as through the provision of

---

\(^{395}\) Lin Foy, “The Pangs and the Lin Foys”.

\(^{396}\) With no other term found to describe this type of small lineal community, I have developed the term “String Communities” to describe the phenomena of individual units or family “beads” in one town as a single unit who are connected through kinship, village or family connections to another individual family “bead” in another. I liken these communities to pearl beads held together by a string which connects them all.

\(^{397}\) Hu-DeHart, “Chinatowns and borderlands”, 442.

courier services for unaccompanied minors back to the primary wife in China for education. (See Fig.10. String Communities: Lineal Relations)

**String Communities:**

**Lineal relations**

Fig.7. String Communities: Lineal Relations: Townsville to Richmond.

The String Community model provides a useful means to understand the contribution women and the Chinese family landscape made to smaller Chinese settlement experiences. An example of the extent of relationships in a String Community is demonstrated in the commercial, legal and marriage linkages of one family which extended inland from the port town of Townsville to the rural and remote town of Richmond in western Queensland. The “Leong String” sets out the interlinking of nodal relationships through kinship and marriage of the Leong family from Caobian village in the district of Liang Du. This String Community also highlights the mutually beneficial *guanxi* which developed to the benefit of individuals and commercial businesses culminating in a key family group – the “Leong Lum Sing” family.

---

399 NAA: BP342/1, 9857/299/1903. A four-year-old child, Margaret Ah Foo, the daughter of Caroline Tups and James Ah Foo of Townsville, was taken to China by her uncle Lee Foo where she remained until she was 17 years old. Chen Quing Boo, an older Chinese man living in Queensland as a storekeeper in Cairns, was acquainted with Lee Foo who informed Chen Quing Boo that the child was “1/2 caste” and born in Townsville. Quing Boo approached Lee Foo to arrange a marriage to Margaret but as she was only 11 years old, Lee Foo said she was too young. Chen Quing Boo then left for Queensland with the arrangement that when Margaret was seventeen years old, Lee Foo was to write to Chen Quing Boo and send her out to him. In the meantime, he considered himself betrothed to her. Chen Quing Boo wrote to Lee Foo and sent passage money to China for Margaret so that she would be sent to Queensland for marriage. Upon her arrival she was married to Chen Quing Boo on 14 September 1903 in a Methodist ceremony in Cairns.
The Leong String took in complex commercial, legal and private relationships between Leong Jew who eventually managed the Tie Hop and Co.’s shop, Hughenden, and the Leong Lum Sing family who eventually lived in Richmond. (See Fig. 8. A Leong String) When the parents died, the extent of complex legal relationships emerged to support the remaining daughters including arranging a marriage to an appropriate man from Townsville. The Leong String Community from Caobian village is only one String which has been surface explored with many other lineal string communities expected to become apparent when more information comes to light.

Fig. 8. A Leong String: Lineal Family Connections or String Community

Part 2:
North Queensland “Chinatowns”

Across North Queensland at least 18 “Chinatown” areas developed from the mid to late 19th century as self-contained communities, the most numerous for a region in Queensland. The development of “Chinatowns” across Queensland encapsulated all of the theoretical modelling discussed in the previous section. Not only were they places where Chinese men were relegated to for the protection of both Chinese and White interests, but they were constructed and reconstructed in the imagination of the broader community. Chinese migrants lived as “the Other” and were used as a demarcation of moral values to maintain respectability and standards of the White (especially female) community. There is only one example to the contrary of
previously discussed theoretical understanding of “Chinatown”, and a view which appears to be a uniquely Australian/Queensland response to identity.

“Chinatown” was appropriated as a word and used by a third party in response to maintaining a tribal identity within an imposed community near Eidsvold, Central Queensland. Cherbourg “Chinatown” remains unique for its label because it is an Aboriginal, not Chinese, construct. The term was used as an identifier by Princy Carlo, an Aboriginal woman of “Asian”, largely presumed to be Chinese heritage, to describe “her place” when she was moved to the reserve. This enabled family identity to be maintained and separated from the other family groups at the Government administered Aboriginal settlement of Barambah. It is not known if this new type of “Chinatown” was established by other First Nation or Indigenous groups to demarcate family group in places which suffered from colonisation elsewhere.

‘Chinatown’ communities began to emerge first in regions which were opened up through gold mining discoveries such as Cape River (1866), Gilberton (1866), Ravenswood (1869), Georgetown (1871), Charters Towers (1872), the Palmer River (1873) and Hodgkinson (1877). Boats and steamers which began to arrive directly from China provided a rapid expansion of the Chinese population which accelerated cultural precincts into self-contained “Chinatown” communities. Early arrivals quickly set up lodging services to cater to the incoming transient Chinese population while others set up provisioning stores to cater to miners on their way to goldfields. “Chinatowns” quickly formed in Cooktown (1874), Cairns (1876) and Port Douglas (1876), with Cooktown and Cairns especially adapting quickly to cater to Chinese social organisation. The emergence of large-scale agriculture associated with sugar production, bananas and maize also contributed to new districts opening up and “Chinatowns” formed in Mackay (1883), Geraldton (later Innisfail) (1884), in the Lower Herbert River valley including Halifax and Ingham (c. mid 1880s) and on the Atherton and Evelyn Tablelands at Herberton and Atherton (1886). The natural propensity for Chinese to live together for familiarity meant that “Chinatowns” existed in nearly every major town wherever Chinese men settled in any great number, with the exception of Townsville.

---

400 Ramsay, “Cherbourg’s Chinatown”, 110-111
Some “Chinatowns” had limited longevity, thriving for only a short period. Cape River “Chinatown” is one such example, while on the other hand others were large and organised, operating well into the 20th century. Cairns “Chinatown” for example enjoyed a lifespan of approximately 70 years. As north Queensland is a large and remote area of Queensland, it is not surprising that the majority of “Chinatowns” were located on the east coast and close hinterland region near the main distribution ports, with only five “Chinatowns” located inland, all in mining towns: Cape River, Gilberton, Georgetown, Croydon and Cloncurry.

The decline of more prominent Chinese communities commenced when industry began to wane. This occurred at Croydon and Georgetown when gold production waned; in Cairns, Atherton and Innisfail when the maize and banana industry collapsed and when the sugar industry was made impossible to produce or work in due to anti-Chinese legislation. Furthermore, by the second decade of the 20th century, aging men who had arrived in the century before simply died,
returned to China, or become old indigent men who were reliant on a few members of the community who took it upon themselves to look after them. Unable to sustain Chinatown due to a decline in population and unable to sustain social services such as benevolent societies, hospitals or temple functions, the “Chinatowns” died a slow death from the mid-1920s onwards until they were demolished or sanitised by the White community who were glad to be rid of the stain on their localities.  

However, while north Queensland had similar patterns of settlement, not every town developed a “Chinatown” despite consistent, fair sized and stable Chinese populations. Townsville, while a major port town providing goods and services to the mining towns of Ravenswood, Charters Towers and Cape River, neither formed a “Chinatown” nor erected social infrastructure such as a Temple or community hall, unlike comparable port towns such as Mackay, Cooktown, Cairns and Geraldton/Innisfail. Two reasons for this have been identified. Firstly, the social and mercantile development of Townsville as a whole community, developed as an extremely diverse community, which attracted direct migration from many overseas countries and acted as the first port of entry to the North. As a result of the multi-ethnic melting pot, Townsville quickly developed a more tolerant approach to the Chinese population, which by the mid-1870s included a large merchant and storekeeper component. This is evidenced though the Chinese merchant community interspersed with White businesses in the main commercial district, with smaller Chinese storekeepers positioned alongside other White storekeepers along the business fringe.

Secondly, the district surrounding Townsville was dry and arid and unable to support the development of sugarcane or banana plantations. This meant that unlike the communities of Mackay, the Lower Herbert, Cairns and Geraldton districts, which attracted sizable Chinese populations in sugar production or banana farming, Townsville was unable to attract Chinese plantation workers or farmers. Instead what emerged was a “Chinese Quarter” sufficient in size to service the needs of the local population as well as the small number of market gardeners from outlying areas. There remains no evidence that the key indicator of a Chinatown, a “joss
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407 Robb Database: Temples, Halls and Kongsis: 1848-1950, based on information contained in Rates and Valuations, newspapers, books and oral history records.  
408 QVP, 1872, Vol. I, “Register-General Queensland: Census”, Part VII, Table XXIX, p. 1167. In 1871 there were over 14 nationalities represented in Townsville.  
409 Rates and Valuations Registers, various years, Townsville Municipal Council held at the Townsville City Library Local History collection.
house” or temple, was constructed between 1860 and 1920, leaving the community to rely on alternative means for spiritual needs. Some may have utilized domestic private altars, while others attended the Chinese Christian Mission Church. Without a community hall to meet in, members of the community met in shops, merchant firms’ premises or rented rooms attached to reputable hotels.

Fig. 13. Chinese Consul’s visit to Townsville: 1913

***

“Chinatown”: elements and characteristics

Across North Queensland, the footprint of “Chinatowns” is laid out in Municipal Council records, historical surveys, newspaper commentary and court records. “Chinatowns” developed to take in both physical characteristics and social infrastructure which was unique to Chinese societies. Individual allotments were intensively occupied, from the front street to the back fence, incorporating shops, houses, makeshift dwellings and “humpies” as well as outhouses, and fowl houses with ducks and chickens. As “Chinatowns” have been mapped from a variety of primary sources, five key characteristics have emerged to show the deeper gender and cultural interactions which occurred within the community. These include ethnicity, family, recreation, goods and services and spiritual/social organisational services.

410 The Brisbane Courier, 24 March 1887, p. 6.
411 Townsville City Council CityLibraries, St. James Cathedral, Rectory and Chinese Church after Cyclone Leonta, Townsville, 1903. The building is reputed to have been dismantled and removed to St Johns Church precinct, South Townsville. This has not been verified.
412 Townsville Daily Bulletin, 9 May 1929, p. 10 notes that the visiting Chinese Consul-General was entertained at the ‘Roof Garden’ of the Council buildings and later met residents at the Kuomintang rooms.
413 TCC Image number 303144, Reception to honour the Chinese Consul in Townsville, 1913
Firstly, “Chinatowns” across north Queensland were not ethnically homogenous communities or “bachelor societies” – men living together as separate and non-related individuals. The community was made up of diverse races of both genders, including married Chinese men with wives back in China, White women (as wives or “prostitutes”), Chinese women (as wives or servants), Japanese men (shopkeepers), Japanese women (as wives or “prostitutes”), and in the 20th century, immigrant Greek and Italian men. This first characteristic was reflected across all north Queensland “Chinatowns” with no exception. Ethnic cultural precincts were not confined to Chinese migrant settlers alone, but could also form towns for the Malay, Javanese and South Sea Islander migrant communities with none of them mixing well due to tensions between the groups.\textsuperscript{414} Indentured labourer groups such as Javanese, South Sea Islanders and Japanese workers associated with the sugar industry did not interact in “Chinatown” and lived for most part on plantations.

Aboriginal people were not allowed to live in “Chinatown” due to restrictive legislation which prohibited them from cohabitating or fraternizing with a Chinese person. The further west and north-west that the community was, and the more isolated it was from authorities, the more likely it was that the community included Aboriginal women and children. They formed the basis of Chinese families in most of those districts, which is demonstrated in towns such as Boulia, Camooweal and Burketown in the far western and Gulf region of Queensland. In addition the only western remote “Chinatown” community of Cloncurry reflected a very different type of ethnic diversity including Chinese men, Aboriginal women, White women, and their families as well as Japanese and Punjabi men (‘Afghans’) all living in the “Chinatown” area on Coppermine Creek on the outskirts of town.\textsuperscript{415} The location and interracial diversity of the Coppermine Creek community reflected both the shared collective disenfranchisement from the White community as well as its relegation to the fringe of society.

Secondly, unlike the “bachelor” societies of the America, Nauru, South Africa and Banaba Island communities, north Queensland “Chinatown” communities reflected diverse gender, age and family status incorporating White wives, Chinese wives, Aboriginal wives, Japanese women, first generation Australian born children, and extended families such as fathers/brothers/uncles/sons/cousins. For example, Cooktown “Chinatown” had, by the early 1880s, Chinese women who had migrated as wives, Chinese girls who had migrated as child servants,

\textsuperscript{414} The Queenslander, 2 April 1936, page 4
\textsuperscript{415} Cloncurry Shire Council, Valuation Register and Rate Book, 1913; Valuation Register and Rate Book 1916-1918; Valuation Register and Rate Book 1918-1919; Valuation Register and Rate Book 1920-1922.
White wives, and White women living in the community and working as “prostitutes”. The broader community also interacted with Chinatown. White women and men visited Chinatown for the purchase of goods and services, or for curiosity. Chinese New Year was shared with prominent White members of the community, and Chinese hawkers from shops went door-to-door selling wares to White housewives whose families were dependent on them for fresh food. While it was a self-sufficient community, it did not exist in isolation from the broader community. These relationships maintained Confucian societal and kinship family structures and created new alliances with external individuals, which resonated throughout the north.

Thirdly, “Chinatown” provided a recreational centre for labouring men from the surrounding area to come and enjoy their day off. Chinese men would stay at boarding houses, spend their money gambling, sit back and smoke opium, socialize, enjoy music or seek intimacy with a woman. Whether legal or illegal, recreational pursuits undertaken in “Chinatown” attracted both Chinese and non-Chinese customers (usually male) and the community’s reputation became synonymous with vice. Attitudes towards recreational pursuits were divided. Bored, lonely and missing village life, Chinese settler men sought entertainment such as gambling and opium smoking which, had they remained in the village, they may otherwise have avoided. The White community on the other hand, viewed these activities as proof of moral corruption: evidence that they were morally superior. This outrage was reinforced through regular reporting in daily newspapers of fines against Chinese men, with offences brought to Court ranging from lottery ticket selling, gambling, selling liquor after hours, or opium related offences. However, gambling in Chinatown was also a popular pursuit by White men as well. As a result, gambling games changed over time, commencing with Chinese games such as Pie Gow, Gee Far, Pak-A-Pu and Mah Jong to more western forms of gambling such as cards, billiards and horseracing.417

“Chinatowns”, as high density urban cultural precincts, provided goods and services to the local community and reflected diverse occupations undertaken by both men and women. Occupations in “Chinatown” included merchants, storekeepers, money lenders, financial brokers, bookkeepers, hoteliers, grocers, fruitierers, bakers, cooks, boarding house keepers, opium shopkeepers, croupiers, bankers, gambling house proprietors, butchers, carriers, and errand boys. Trades included blacksmiths, watchmakers, tailors, barbers, jewellers, priests, musicians and Chinese doctors and herbalists. Female occupations owned and run by women included boarding

416 Rains, Intersections, 106 -112
417 See Changes over time in Robb, Chinatown Heritage Study.
house keepers, hoteliers, cleaners, washerwomen, seamstresses, pearl shell buyers and midwives, but there were also other women in the community, not related to Chinese men, who worked as sex workers or “prostitutes” referred to at the time as “women of ill fame” or “fallen women”. Gender division in occupations was no different to occupational difference in the broader community, with women engaged in occupations such as sewing, cleaning and midwifery. However, others engaged in commercial enterprises as bakers, hoteliers, boarding house keepers, and pearl shell buyers, with women carving out their niche or stepping into the breach to run businesses where necessity such as the death or absence of a husband required. One aspect of the Queensland colonial “Chinatown” which was different to other parts of Australasia, the United States or Great Britain was that there were no Chinese laundries associated with Chinese occupations across north Queensland. Where a laundry was present, in towns such as Cairns, Townsville, Hughenden and Cloncurry, they were instead owned and operated by Japanese men or couples.

---

418 Interview with Mrs. Mabel Garvey, Cairns, 26 June 2002
419 Brisbane Truth, 20 July 1902, p. 7. This is the case for Mrs Mary Sang on Thursday Island who successfully operated her bakery for more than 20 years after her baker husband died.
419 Robb Database: Rates and Valuations: 1882-1940. Database compiled over 10 years data entry taken from local Council records for north Queensland towns of Townsville, Ravenswood, Charters Towers, Hughenden, Winton, Richmond, Cloncurry, Normanton, Croydon, Georgetown, Cairns, and Innisfail.
420 Wyangerie Shire Council, Water Authority Minute Book 1913-1915; Cloncurry Shire Council, Valuation Register and Rate Book 1916-1918.
421 Town and Country Journal, Saturday 2 August 1884, p. 27

Fig.14. Cooktown “Chinatown”: Recreational and Social Activities: 1884

---
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Transplanted communities

North Queensland’s “Chinatown” communities were culturally furnished with transplanted village social and spiritual order as a collective means to manage and organise a coherent self-contained society. Infrastructure such as benevolent societies, political organisations, community hospitals, meeting halls and temples were installed or built to enable the community to maintain separation from, and eliminate the need for interaction with, the broader community beyond what was necessary. Based on traditional Chinese village and clan structures, key pieces of social and physical infrastructure enabled overseas communities to quickly create social order: an ancestral meeting hall, a temple, and private altars in the shop and family home – the first two being the most obvious and the last exerting a more subtle influence on community obligations. The temple, meeting hall and private altars in overseas environments, provided a crucial means to reinforce social and structural organisation of the community, provide a space for the community to meet for discussion and arbitration, and ensure spiritual and ancestral obligations could be attended to.

Back in the ancestral village, the temple was a place where villagers could pay respects to their ancestors and commune with the chosen god in the search for fortune, good seasons or good health. Both the temple and associated meeting hall were important physical elements of the village Chinese family landscape and formed part of the public sphere associated with ceremony, calendar events and clan requirements. Most temples were publicly accessible, while some villages had clan halls as well. Each played a role in matters regarding life and death and were associated with honouring the dead, filial obligations, and events associated with Ching Ming or “tomb sweeping day” as well as Chinese New Year.

The most prominent cultural marker of North Queensland “Chinatowns” was the Temple. Built in nearly every North Queensland “Chinatown”, they adhered to stylised architectural principles and served a variety of function for the community. To a colonial onlooker, any structure or room with a shrine, altar, incense, deity or altar-ware such as candlesticks or incense
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423 Raymond Seid, 2016, Notes on The Ancestral Village of Changsha in Xinhui County, China........a Photo Essay, Presentation by Raymond Seid at Chinese Genealogy Workshop, Las Vegas, Nevada, January 10-14, 2016. These three elements helped to weave the social fabric of the village together.
425 With the exception of Capeville, Chinatown on the Cape River goldfield.
burners was automatically rendered a “joss” house,\textsuperscript{426} regardless of whether it was a private altar, a meeting hall or a temple.\textsuperscript{427}

Throughout north Queensland, 26 Temples have been recorded in this study with a further 8 temples located elsewhere in Queensland.\textsuperscript{428} As more evidence comes to light more temples may be discovered.\textsuperscript{429} Using the current figures of places identified to date, 26 temples or 79 \% of all constructed temples across Queensland were located in north Queensland. Two temples or 12 \% were located in Southern Queensland, four temples or 6 \% in Central Queensland, and only 1 temple representing only 3\%, in the metropolitan area at Breakfast Creek, Brisbane. The 26 temples located across North Queensland were constructed across 15 locations: Mackay, Ravenswood, Charters Towers, Gilberton, Georgetown, Mt Hogan, Croydon, Palmer River, Cooktown, Port Douglas, Cairns, Herberton, Thornborough, Innisfail, and Halifax. Some towns had more than one temple at the same time such as Cairns and Charters Towers, while other communities had to reconstruct due to pest, fire or cyclone damage including Cooktown, Atherton, Innisfail, and Georgetown. Only two temples remain standing in present times out of the 26 built in the late 19\textsuperscript{th} and early 20\textsuperscript{th} centuries. These are the Hou Wang Miao in Atherton, the second temple constructed in 1904, and the Innisfail Lit Sung Goong, the third and last temple constructed in Innisfail and Queensland in 1940.\textsuperscript{430}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item The Wonderland of the Month, The \textit{Queenslander}, 30 December 1899, p. 1291. To the White observer, the ““joss house” was the church of the Chinese. Exotic and full of bright colors and smells, the “joss house” was a source of wonder and often described as such. In the \textit{Queenslander} in 1899 one was described: “Far away in Atherton they have in their colony a “joss” house, gorgeous with scarlet and purple, and with many devices of strangely carved and gilded woods. Beneath the Idols incense is perpetually burning, and in a vessel of oil a light is kept night and day. A strange barbaric drum, carved and lettered, hangs upon the wall, and so beneath an alien sky, and in a foreign land, the Chinese keep the faith of their forefathers.”\textsuperscript{426}
\item Paul Macgregor, “‘Joss’ houses of colonial Bendigo and Victoria”, in Mike Butter (ed.), \textit{An Angel by the Water: Essays in honour of Dennis Reginald O’Hoy}, (Holland House Publishing for the Bendigo Trust, Bendigo Australia, 2015): 104. Paul Macgregor provides an excellent and succinct description of the complexities of understanding what a “joss house” exactly is. MacGregor writes, “The term “‘joss’ house” was very widely used in 19\textsuperscript{th} century English-language accounts of such buildings in Australia, although occasionally the words ‘temple’, ‘club-house’ or ‘masonic hall’ are used. …The Chinese themselves, when speaking in Cantonese, used the terms \textit{ui-koon} (also written as \textit{huiguan} or \textit{wiukoon}, meeting-hall), \textit{kongsi} (company or society), \textit{mew} (\textit{miao}, temple), \textit{sitong} (\textit{citang}, ancestral hall). There is no collective term in Chinese for all of these types of buildings, but in colonial Australia, “‘joss’ house’ in fact serves that purpose in English.”\textsuperscript{427}
\item These further 8 include Brisbane, Killarney, Stanthorpe, Texas, Gympie, Maryborough, Boldercombe and Rockhampton as well as a hospital at Gayndah and a Meeting Hall at Condaminne.\textsuperscript{428}
\item TROVE is the National Library of Australia’s digital repository of resources relating to Australia. TROVE provides a search engine which brings together content from libraries, museums, archives and the community.\textsuperscript{429}
\item The first Cooktown Temple was burnt down and the first two temples in Innisfail were severely damaged by cyclones.\textsuperscript{430}
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
The number of temples constructed in Queensland is slightly below, but still consistent with, the colonies of New South Wales and Victoria. Among all three colonies, Victoria has the most temples with 52 recorded or 36%; followed by New South Wales with 47 recorded or 33%, and lastly Queensland with 32 recorded or 22%. Other colonies including Tasmania and South Australia, including the Northern Territory, have 5% and 4% respectively and Western Australia had none. At this point, these figures remain approximate as it is a developing field and Macgregor predicts that more may be discovered as local newspapers are digitized.

What remains outstanding is the dominance of the east coast in the construction of temples in the 19th and early 20th centuries compared to other colonies, along with the figures emerging as remarkably parallel to the marriage figures between White women and Chinese men for the same period. It also indicates that the east coast colonies were a dominant and favoured destination in the Chinese Diaspora.

---

432 Pers. Comm. Paul MacGregor, Monday 26 October @ 12.30pm (Email).
433 These statistics are a compilation of my research as well as discussion with both Paul MacGregor and Gordon Grimwade. In addition see Paul MacGregor in An Angel by the Water and Jack Foster Waltham, Chinese Temples in Australia, Unpublished report for Undergraduate subject in Archaeology, Flinders University, July 2014: 1-22.
Across the colonies of Australia so far 143 temples have been identified as either constructed or having existed (given that some “joss houses” in Victoria were just calico tents). This can be compared to only two Chinatowns, Round Hill and Lawrence, having a Chinese temple in New Zealand; an estimate of 63 temples in the U.S. in 1906; and at least 16 in British Columbia. A full study of all host places across the globe associated with the Chinese Diaspora where temples were constructed, has not been undertaken and remains outside the scope of this thesis. Graphs indicate a preliminary investigation.

Fig. 17. Colonial Temple distribution: 1850-1930
Fig. 18. Comparison Temple Western Host Countries: 1850-1910

Across north Queensland, Chinese settlers set out to construct, transplant and take care of their own, making provision for the past, present and future filial and spiritual welfare of their kinsmen. This meant that temples and their associated meeting halls, kitchens, accommodation rooms and pig ovens were built in order to carry out this obligation. Unable to cater for clan usage specific to one or two family groups, north Queensland’s temples were built to accommodate the needs of broader regional areas such as Toishan or Chungshan. This is demonstrated in the construction of two temples in Cairns: one for Sze Yap and Sam Yap
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434 *Argus*, 28 May 1858, p. 7
speaking migrants (Toishan) while the other was for those from Lung Du and Liang Du, two small regions in Chungshan, neither of which could understand each other’s dialect so Cantonese was adopted as the preferred communication method. In what was perhaps a pragmatic approach to diversity in the migrant population, community temples or Lit Sung Goong temples ("hall of various gods or sages") were constructed in Cooktown, Cairns, and Innisfail, incorporating the three major spiritual traditions of China, Buddhism, Taoism and Confucianism, all under the one roof. This provided a practical solution to community organisation and enabled the whole Chinese community to minister to their filial obligations.

The Halifax and Mackay Temples on the other hand, are presumed to be single community focused with the Halifax temple being a Buk Ti or Pak Ti temple and the Mackay Temple attributed to a Sze Yap community. This is the only temple in North Queensland so far to have been identified as erected by and dedicated to Sze Yap speaking people.

![Fig. 19. Interior of Mackay Temple, 1908](image)

Temples constructed across north Queensland were built to serve a community: to guide and aid men to work hard in their new environments, act as good citizens and maintain their filial

---

441 “Our Illustrations”, *North Queensland Herald*, 4 April 1908, page 7
connections back home to the ancestral village. They served a number of purposes as spaces and were built with little variance in style. Utilitarian in form and constructed using timber and tin, they were fitted out with elaborate furniture and fittings imported from China. They were ornate and colourful in contrast to White urban interiors, and imbued comfort to any Chinese person who stepped inside through their familiar cultural style which played out through elaborate carving, motif symbolism, furniture style and general décor which were the only architectural reminders of the ancestral village. In addition, donor boards and Temple couplets (poems) reinforced community bonds and provided words of inspiration and fortification to Chinese men. This is evident in the couplets found either side of the main altar at the Sze Yap temple in Mackay, opened in 1903. The couplets implored the “god(s) or person(s) to whom the temple was dedicated, to ever receive the people's offerings, to act and be an example, to guide the people” presumably in their daily lives. (See Fig. 23, Interior of Mackay Temple, 1908). Far from being passive spaces, temple accoutrements in the form of couplets, temple furniture, fixtures and fittings also demanded protection, with temples furnished with weapons and bamboo sticks used periodically to defend the community from White troublemakers. Adjoining the temple were community halls, constructed with accommodation at the rear for the temple caretaker who also acted as a temple official when required.

In China, the village ancestral hall provided a place for reverence; a place where the village men were honoured on name placards, and clan meetings were held to make village decisions. In addition, the ancestral meeting hall provided a place where the village clan genealogy could be deposited such as zupu books and ancestral tablets. Temples and ancestral halls were integral to village life and this relationship was transplanted to Queensland. However, through the act of migration, a utilitarian architectural and philosophical decision was made to amalgamate the two distinct village structures into one, nearly with every temple incorporating a meeting hall in its design. However, while all temples had a meeting hall, not all meeting halls appeared to be attached to temples. In at least two places across Queensland, stand-alone meeting halls were provided where a temple was absent: in Townsville on the upper floor of merchant store Hook Wah Jang and Co., later known as Tin Yuen’s, and in the Southern Region at Condamine on the
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442 Rains, Intersections, 179-180
443 Pers comm. Ely Finch, email correspondence regarding translation of Mackay Temple couplets, 22 October 2015.
444 Queensland Times, Ipswich Herald and General Advertiser, 8 March 1888, p. 3; Warwick Examiner and Times, 16 May 1888, p. 2; Toowoomba Chronicle and Darling Downs General Advertiser, 8 July 1897, p.5.
Darling Downs. 446 Further west from Condamine, Texas had a structure locally referred to as a “Kongsi”. Whether this Kongsi was a temple or a meeting place remains unknown. 447 To the broader community it was regarded as a temple but the name “Kongsi” suggests that it was a clan meeting hall instead.

Meeting halls constructed across North Queensland were typically, free standing buildings on one side of the temple and accessed through a front or side door in the small corridor between the two buildings. The meeting hall provided a venue to maintain social cohesion, as a space in which to arbitrate and resolve community disputes, record members of the community, and provide a collection point for community fines. This was the case in Cairns when shipments of bananas were infected with fruit fly, with those caught selling infected fruit receiving a fine which they had to pay to the Temple. 448 The hall was used in the 19th century as temporary overnight accommodation for out of town men, which transitioned into permanent accommodation in the 20th century for the aging indigent men to live out their days. 449 In one instance, an indigent White woman sought shelter in the dilapidated and disused Buk Ti Goong temple in Cairns, indicating that gender was not as important as need. 450

Together the temple and community hall provided a multipurpose place constructed to balance the “chi” energy force, or flow of harmony, throughout the Chinatown community, as well as ensure more earthly matters were attended to in the immediate environment. Temples not only provided a sacred space for worship, a place to make community decisions and arbitrate on matters of dispute, but a central location to store regalia such as banners, used for public celebrations or to prepare food such as roast pig for celebrations such as births, Chinese New Year, the Harvest Festival and Ching Ming. 451 In addition, both the temple and community hall provided a controlled environment to entertain Western visitors in, on occasions when the Chinese community played host to the broader community. For example, Governor General Lord and Lady Hopetoun in 1901 and Lord and Lady Chermside in 1903, were entertained in

446 Condamine had a meeting hall constructed very early on for Chinese indentured workers and it is still in existence, and now converted into a house.
447 Interview, Merleen Freedman, Miles, 2004
448 May, Topsawyers, 72
450 Cairns Post, 12 February 1929, p. 4
451 Large cylindrical above ground ovens were usually constructed within walking distance of the hall and caretaker’s cottage and utilised to roast a pig whole. Pigs were vertically lowered into the oven after preparation where they slowly cooked over coals. Pig ovens have been found near temples on the Palmer goldfield, at Thornborough, Croydon, Ravenswood and at the Hou Wang Miao, Atherton. There was also a pig oven located at the rear of the Lit Sung Goong temple, Cairns.
452 Cairns Post, 17 September 1901. When news of his arrival reached Chinatown, residents rang the tocsin to summon the community to get ready for the procession. They presented a magnificent procession display in traditional celebratory costumes with some carrying flags and banners. Others carried halberd shafts from the Temple. Following tradition, a deputation presented an
the Lit Sung Goong temple in Cairns by the civic leaders of the Chinese community including their wives.453

Importantly, the function of the temple was to keep a record of the community, who was in it, who had returned back to China and who had died and was buried on foreign soil.454 Temple caretakers played a significant role in facilitating the process of application for exhumation by identifying deceased men and keeping a record of each man’s village and family. They along with community leaders made representations to the Queensland government on behalf of the community or family to exhume deceased Chinese men, in order to have the bones prepared and sent back to China to fulfil kinship and ancestral obligations. This is evident in a letter from Lam Pan, secretary of the Kung Shin On society, temple caretaker, herbalist Doctor, storekeeper, and civic leader, who wrote in 1899 to the Home Secretary for approval to exhume the bones of up to 50 deceased Chinese men from the Chinese cemetery near Millchester at Charters Towers, with a view to sending them back to their villages in China.455

Returning deceased men’s bones back to the ancestral village was considered a necessary function and a community obligation of the overseas community. The balance and harmony between the living and the dead, so important in China to fulfil ancestral obligations, was under pressure from the complex logistics of trying to do so in an overseas environment. Maintaining filial obligations was made difficult by distance, transportation of remains and cultural ignorance by White authorities when it came to the process of exhumation and transportation. Exhumation required an application to be made to authorities accompanied by a fee of £1. Making an application for exhumation of Chinese bones to be sent back to China was quite frequent in the late 19th and early 20th centuries and estimated at over 660 requests for exhumation submitted over the whole of Queensland.456 Of this number, 654 were in relation to men, with only 4 applications made for Chinese women including one White woman, Jane Mah, the wife of
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453 Cairns Post, 5 June 1903. About 100 Chinatown residents, dressed in traditional bright silk clothing, met the Governor General and his wife at the Railway Station. They accompanied both Lady and Lord Chermside to Sachs Street and entertained them in the back of the Lit Sung Goong Temple, which had been decorated especially for the occasion. The reception included fireworks and afternoon tea.

454 Paul Macgregor, 2015, “‘Joss’ houses of colonial Bendigo and Victoria”, 104.

455 QSA: HOM/A22/04405/29 Police, Charters Towers, Letter from Lam Pan to Home Secretary. Because he was requesting such a large number of exhumations, Lam Pan made enquiry as to whether a discount could be made as the community found the application fee of £1 per exhumation difficult to meet.

456 Robb Database: Exhumations, 1848-1950 The number of exhumations and statistics comes from the compilation of official records including the Colonial Secretary and Home Secretary files, Burial registers, and newspaper reports. The data could not have been researched without the generous help of Jonathan Richards who shared his database with me so that I could combine data.
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Willie Mah from Cunnamulla and Wah Quey and baby Mary, the wife and child of Ah Ming, Townsville. Exhumation applications were made for the north Queensland towns of Charters Towers, Cooktown, Croydon, Georgetown, Herberton, Ingham, Maytown, Millchester, Ravenswood and Townsville, with approximately 88 exhumations applied for, but this number remains an estimate only as not all exhumations have been accounted for in official records.

While the temple and hall were public examples of transplanted infrastructure, an equally important element, small private altars, were set up in stores and private quarters to remind individuals of their filial obligations and to provide a place for requests for special blessings. As William Lakos observes, “Of crucial importance and significance to Chinese (religious) family life and Chinese culture was the worship of ancestors, a fact indicated by the almost universal keeping of family altars”. Private altars in shops and family quarters included names or images of deceased kinsmen and favoured gods, flanked by incense and offerings. Based on village practice, occupants wished the unseen energy force of harmony “chi”, encapsulated within filial observance, be enabled to flow seamlessly from the public elements of the meeting hall, temple and graveside memorial, through and into the private space of the family home; this harmonious hierarchy underpinned the very model of Confucian fundamentals for the proper ordering of Chinese society.

By constructing temples, halls and funerary burners in the public sphere and small altars in the private sphere, order to the social realm of family and kinship was provided in a foreign land, enabling the world of the living to transcend with the spirit world of the dead.

While Chinese women had access to “Chinatown” temples, it remains unknown just how much interaction they had with them for filial purposes in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Instead, it is more likely that China born wives who migrated to north Queensland, engaged more with the private family altar with their duty including to ensure offerings were made to the ancestors and later, her deceased husband on behalf of the immediate and extended family. The prevalence of private altars in stores and family homes remains an overlooked aspect of cultural transplantation.
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457 QSA HOM /J72529/5208: ID848344 Exhumation Jane Mar, 1929, Cunnamulla
458 QSA COL/A435/85/6540 Ah Ming.
459 Robb Database: Exhumations: 1848-1950
460 The Mongolian at Cooktown, Brisbane Courier, 19 February 1879, p. 5.
462 Ronald G. Knapp, China’s living houses: folk beliefs, symbols, and household ornamentation, (University of Hawaii Press, 1999): 11-12.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>DATE RANGE</th>
<th>STRUCTURE</th>
<th>IMAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cooktown</td>
<td>3X Temples with meeting halls Two different kinship communities</td>
<td>Lit Sung Goong 1874 May 1875-Oct 1875 1877-? 1892-1930s</td>
<td><img src="1877-?" alt="Image" /> Lit Sung Goong 1892-1930s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmer River Goldfields</td>
<td>2-3 Temples</td>
<td>c.1874 -? c.1875 -? c.1875 -?</td>
<td>1X 1874 Palmerville 1X 1878 Byers town 1X Uhrs camp? 1 1878 Maytown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Douglas</td>
<td>2-3 Temples; 2 rebuilt</td>
<td>1888-1899 1899-1911</td>
<td>2X reconstructions Destroyed by 1911 cyclone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cairns</td>
<td>Two different kinship communities</td>
<td>Lit Sung Goong 1886-1964 Buk Ti Goong c.1898 - 1934</td>
<td>2 Temples with Halls Timber and tin with timber cladding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atherton</td>
<td>2 X Temples 1 rebuilt</td>
<td>Hou Wang Miu 1890-1907 1904- existing</td>
<td>2X Temples with halls 1X rebuild Timber with tin cladding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herberton</td>
<td>1X temple</td>
<td>? - 1932</td>
<td>1 Temple, hall unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geraldton / Inmisfail</td>
<td>3X temple 2 rebuilt</td>
<td>Lit Sing Gung 1891 – 1918 1932 – 1930s 1939-existing</td>
<td>3 Temples 2X Timber and tin 1 rebuild timber and tin post 1918 1X Rebuild concrete 1920-1938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etheridge Goldfields</td>
<td>Possible two different kinship groups</td>
<td>1882-c.1896 1905-1950s c1888-1896</td>
<td>3 Temples with hall 2X Georgetown Different locations: 1X Mt Hogan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilberton Goldfield</td>
<td>1X Temple</td>
<td>1870 - ?</td>
<td>1 X temple description unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croydon Goldfields</td>
<td>2X temples rebuilt</td>
<td>Hou Wang Miu 1890-1907 1904- existing</td>
<td>2 Temples with meeting hall Timber and tin 1X rebuild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halifax</td>
<td>1X temple</td>
<td>Buk Ti Goong c1900-1927</td>
<td>1 X Temple with meeting Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charters Towers &amp; Millchester</td>
<td>2X temples Two different kinship communities</td>
<td>1873Millchester c.1877 Queenston c 1891 -? c1889- ?</td>
<td>3 temples with hall 2X Bluff Road Queenston) rebuild 1XMillchester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravenswood</td>
<td>1874-1882 1882-1915/20</td>
<td>2 Temples with hall Timber and tin. 1X rebuild</td>
<td>![Image](Ravenswood Temple 1882 – c 1915/20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thornborough</td>
<td>1X temple</td>
<td>c.1898-?</td>
<td>1 Temple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mackay</td>
<td>1X temple</td>
<td>1903 - c1935</td>
<td>See Yup 1 Temple with hall</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 20. Identified Temples across North Queensland

---

463 Robb Database: Temples, Halls and Kongsi’s: 1848-1950
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The transplantation and maintenance of Confucian practice, as seen from the number of temples and meeting halls constructed, cultural practices concerning the dead, attention to exhumation rites and presence of small altars in shops and private quarters, ensured the philosophy of life force and flow of harmony was able to be introduced, maintained and managed in north Queensland’s “Chinatown” environments to the benefit of the community. However, while “Chinatowns” were a distinct feature of larger settlements, so too were the “Cultural precincts” which developed in rural and remote north Queensland.

***

“Cultural precincts”: North Queensland

Across north Queensland, Chinese “Cultural precincts” were associated with nearly every small town and settlement with the exception of those on the Cape York Peninsula, where Chinese settlement never really took off in the very remote districts. Chinese “Cultural precincts” have been identified in over 17 locations across north Queensland, adjoining prominent towns and settlements. This figure represents a sample of the “Cultural precincts” which existed across the north but which were not explored in detail as part of this thesis. (See Fig.21) Chinese “Cultural precinct’s” emerged when one or more Chinese settlers lived and worked in an outlying street of a town, along a nearby watercourse or on land deemed unsuitable for occupation such as areas prone to flood. In many cases Chinese settlers took out leases from the Crown on “Special Lease” which adjoined the Town Common or stock route, but invariably it was situated away from the main White population. “Cultural precincts” are associated with market garden areas and small business district in rural towns and to a smaller extent some areas associated with the pastoral stations. They provide a means to understand the Chinese settlement patterns, and in particular interaction with the Chinese Family Landscape. Two key areas, market gardening and small business cultural precincts will be explored. Chinese “Cultural precincts” emerged when one or more Chinese settlers lived and worked in an outlying street of a town, along a nearby watercourse or on land deemed unsuitable for residences such as areas prone to flood. In many cases Chinese settlers took out “Special

---

464 The term “Cultural precinct” describes the smaller communities of Chinese settlers, some with families, who lived and worked near each other but who were otherwise engaged in singular occupations as market gardeners, bakers, butchers and storekeepers in rural and remote environments. As small populations of Chinese settlers, they were never large enough in population to form a “Chinatown”, yet developed community cohesion with mutual benefit as a small community.

465 Towns such as Prairie, Pentland, Muttaburra, Aramac, Boulia, Julia Creek, Mareeba and many smaller settlements in more remote locations were not researched or mapped as part of this thesis.

466 Robb Database: Rates and Valuations: 1882-1940 Database compiled over 10 years data entry taken from Local Council Records for North Queensland towns of Townsville, Ravenswood, Charters Towers, Hughenden, Winton, Richmond, Cloncurry, Normanton, Croydon, Georgetown, Cairns, & Innisfail
leases” from the Crown which adjoined the Town Common or stock route, invariably situated away from the main White population.⁴⁶⁷ “Cultural precincts” are associated with market garden areas and small business districts in rural towns and to a smaller extent, some areas associated with the pastoral stations. They provide a means to understand Chinese settlement patterns, and in particular interaction with the Chinese Family Landscape. Two key areas, market gardens and small business cultural precincts, will be explored.

**Market Garden Areas**

Market gardening developed as a profitable occupation across north and north-western Queensland. It was low cost to set up and stable, thanks to the constant demand for fresh food and lack of competition, so it suited the highly mobile and resourceful Chinese migrant of the 19th century. It allowed mobility around the region when new opportunities arose, and was used as a

---

⁴⁶⁷ Robb Database: Rates and Valuations: 1882-1940, database compiled over 10 years data entry taken from local Council records for North Queensland towns of Townsville, Ravenswood, Charters Towers, Hughenden, Winton, Richmond, Cloncurry, Normanton, Croydon, Georgetown, Cairns, and Innisfail.
retirement occupation in the absence of an aged pension. Initially Chinese men opted to work near mining districts, taking up market garden leases on every mining field across north Queensland. However, for some, this proved unworkable and gardens were abandoned after a matter of weeks. This was the case for a number of small garden areas on the Etheridge and Gilbert gold fields in the 1880s. However, more successful gardeners stuck to it with a number staying between six to ten years before they transferred their market garden leases to a kinsman. In the same district, at least three gardeners worked their gardens on the Delaney River for twenty-six years.

Others opted for more permanent returns and took out leases on watercourses near new settlements which developed into permanent towns. In many instances, at towns such as Hughenden, Camooweal, Cloncurry, Richmond and Winton, a number of kinsmen formed syndicates and worked the gardens together. Important for these “Cultural precincts” was the renewal of labour through gardening syndicates, which experienced a regular turnover of members as some departed to larger centres such as Townsville or were replaced by younger men. Even as late as the 1940s there is evidence that intergenerational chain migration was still occurring to north Queensland with the arrival of Mar Yen Shoo in Winton to learn the market garden trade from his father Mar Way.

Examples of major Chinese market garden “Cultural precincts” associated with regional north Queensland towns include the gardens at Camooweal along the Georgina River, the garden area at Cloncurry along the Coppermine Creek, garden areas at Georgetown along the Etheridge River, garden areas near Winton at Pelican waterhole and Mistake Creek, Lee See’s and Ah Hon’s syndicate gardens at Hughenden along the Flinders River, Woods Lake near Burketown and a large garden area at Lawn Hill Station (see Chapter 9). Other small garden areas which could be noted as dedicated cultural precincts include Ah Toy’s garden on the Palmer

---

468 Queensland National Bank: QNB register Winton, 1881-1890; QNB register Winton, 1890-1898; QNB register Winton, 1898-1912; QNB register Winton, 1916-1923. For example, a Chinese migrant could commence his working life in western Queensland as a cook on one station only to retire as the gardener on another. This is the case for Ah Bow, who is noted as a cook on Llanrheidol station in 1892 but ended up 29 years later on Ayrshire Downs as the gardener. Others started their working life on pastoral stations as the cook/gardener but moved into towns when they had saved enough to become storekeepers.

469 QSA MWO/14B/40, Mining Warden Georgetown, Register of applications for market garden areas 1887-1890

Goldfield\textsuperscript{471}, Market Garden 31 at Georgetown on the Etheridge River,\textsuperscript{472} and the shop and garden complex associated with Willie Mar Senior and Willie Mar Junior at Winton.\textsuperscript{473}

![Fig.22 Chinese garden, Normanton, 1935](image1)

![Fig.23 Chinese orchards, Charters Towers](image2)

**Business districts**

Despite much mobility by Chinese men across rural districts in the 19th century, a great number set up business in small towns. Some commenced work on pastoral stations first, as cooks or gardeners, before gravitating to nearby towns when enough funds were saved. Once there, they opened grocery stores, fruit stores and bakeries while others worked as butchers, carriers or hotel cooks.\textsuperscript{476} The relationship between a town’s market garden community and the town storekeeping community was a mutually beneficial one. Many towns developed a commercial relationship between the town gardeners and storekeepers. This is evident at Winton and Hughenden where the garden syndicates, See Lee’s at Hughenden and Pelican Waterhole gardens, Winton provided the town’s Chinese grocers and fruiterers with fresh produce to sell. In return the store provided not only a commercial outlet for the garden but provided additional distribution benefits via door to door delivery in addition to sales at the garden gate.

Despite the inability to benefit from “Chinatowns”, with their broader transplanted societal elements such as benevolent societies, temple/hall complexes, and Chinese hospitals, rural and remote Chinese men were able to remain socially organised though kinship connections and took

\textsuperscript{471} Jack, Holmes and Kerr, “Ah Toys’s Garden”, 51-58.

\textsuperscript{472} QSA MWO/14B/40, Mining Warden Georgetown, Register of applications for market garden areas 1887-1890. MG 31 was worked continuously from 1881 until at least 1911. In that period, it had six market gardener leases with the longest, Meu Lin and Ah Fory, occupying the lease for over 20 years.

\textsuperscript{473} Sandi Robb, Heritage Assessment, Chinese Market Garden, Dwelling and Shop Cultural precinct, Consultancy Report to Winton District Historical Society and Museum Inc. (WDHSandMI), 2009: 6-14.


\textsuperscript{475} Source: JCU Library Image: 11263: Charters Towers

\textsuperscript{476} Information compiled from Winton Burial Register, Commonwealth Exemption to the Dictation Test, QNB Records and Commonwealth Alien Registration Certificates.
advantage of mutually beneficial relationships between each other, providing a bed to sleep on, a
place to enjoy recreation, or an economic opportunity should someone wish to return home for a
couple of years.\textsuperscript{477} In addition, some storekeepers in rural and remote areas acted as “go-
betweens” for the exhumation and repatriation of deceased’s’ bones back to China.\textsuperscript{478} “Cultural
 precincts” in rural and remote areas lasted well into the 20\textsuperscript{th} century and adapted in towns to
changing circumstances such as aging men. As the 20\textsuperscript{th} century unfolded, a number of Chinese
storekeepers moved into expanding their stores to create a shop/garden complex as old
gardeners relinquished their leases and retired, unable to work, or returned to China. It could be
said that that Western Queensland towns were nourished by the market gardeners and Chinese
“cultural precincts”. Prominent north Queensland towns with “Cultural precincts” include
Normanton, Cloncurry, Croydon, Winton, Hughenden, and Richmond as well as places such as
railway sidings including Black Bull near Normanton, and coastal towns such as Bowen.\textsuperscript{479}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{Fig24.png}
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{Fig25.png}
\caption{Fig.24. Chinese Gardener, Bowen\textsuperscript{480} Fig. 25. Chinese Garden, Hughenden, c.1915\textsuperscript{481}}
\end{figure}

\textbf{Conclusion}

In many respects, Chinatowns and cultural precincts across north Queensland developed in a
similar way to other settlement communities associated with the Chinese Diaspora around the
globe. David Chuenyan Lai’s seminal study of the development of ethnographic enclaves in
destination countries such as British Columbia provided a useful framework to scrutinise the

\textsuperscript{477}‘Hughenden Chronicles.’, \textit{The Evening Telegraph}, 18 April 1908, p. 5. Mutual assistance was offered to overlanding Chinese men
in the form of temporary lodging, food and work, and individual shopkeepers such as Leong Jew from Tie Hop and Co. in Hughenden
and Charlie Ah Foo of Sun Kum Wah of Winton provided a similar service, as key merchant firms in larger centres. A number were
charged for their involvement with recreational pursuits such as gambling offences while others were charged with selling opium
charcoal or alcohol to Aborigines.

\textsuperscript{478}QSA: COL/B36 Letter 6/7/96 3881 Away, Item 8728, King Nam Merchant Firm, Thursday Island.


\textsuperscript{480}Source: JCU Library Image: 15892

\textsuperscript{481}E. J. Brady, \textit{Australia Unlimited}, G. Robertson and Company, Melbourne, c.1918, pp. 462-463

It should be noted that “cultural precincts” also occurred as a cluster of shops or shop/house areas in larger towns such as Cairns,
Ingham, Townsville and South Johnstone. These were largely associated with the movement of Chinese families outside
Chinatown areas in the early 20\textsuperscript{th} century.
pattern of settlement across Queensland. However, while it is useful to examine stages of community growth and decline, it remained essentially a patriarchal approach to the subject and ignored the deeper role of the transnational family, the contribution of women, and their important role in the renewal process by sending sons and daughters to put down family tap roots into the host country. Fong-Yuen Woon more clearly articulates that a broader net should be cast when thinking about community. She challenged the popular notion of “bachelor” communities to better reflect the reality of “married bachelor” communities so prevalent in places such as the United States, British Columbia and colony of Queensland. Huping Ling argues that a broader reconceptualising of the settlement experience needs to be undertaken to insert something “more” which is overlooked: it is apparent that two Chinese settler experiences might have developed, one without women and children locally, resulting in the seemingly ‘bachelor’ communities, and the Queensland experience with its inclusion of women and families at the local level. Both British Columbia and Queensland saw the development of the “two primary wife family” which was also present in places such as Peru and Hawaii.

While many similarities are identified between the Queensland and British Columbia experience, particularly in the physical structural development of Chinatowns, the theoretical understanding of the social development of a Chinatown in all cases remains lacking and falls short of an integrated mode of enquiry which is what is required to understand the Chinese Family Landscape.
Chapter 5

OVERVIEW: FAMILIES ASSOCIATED WITH CHINESE MEN IN NORTH QUEENSLAND

Introduction
North Queensland’s Chinese Family Landscape had its roots firmly established by a prior pattern of mixed marriages between Chinese men and White women on the Darling Downs and in the Wide Bay and Burnett districts. As settlement extended northward after 1860, three distinct marriage patterns concerning types of couples began to emerge: Chinese men and White women, and Chinese men and China born women; and from the 1890s, Chinese men with Aboriginal women. These marriages formed Queensland’s Chinese Family Landscape. This chapter will provide an overview to Queensland colonial Chinese relationship trends including marriage type, ethnic background and settlement patterns. By looking at overall colonial and State statistics regarding Chinese relationships, regional variations between Brisbane, Southern, Central and Northern region can be clearly delineated. This information reveals north Queensland’s position in the Chinese Family Landscape as an important settlement region associated with the Chinese Diaspora to Queensland. This chapter also provides the base for the next three chapters, where each family type across north Queensland is discussed in detail and compared to national and international family formation trends.

For the purpose of this thesis, the term “primary family” refers to the first couple or family recorded in Queensland where the Chinese husband is the migrant settler. It includes couples where Chinese men have settled with women of different racial background such as White, Indigenous, Japanese, or South Sea Islander women as well as Chinese women who migrated to Queensland to join their husbands. It may at times also refer to couples who were separated, such as a Chinese settler husband living in north Queensland and his First wife and her children in the natal village in China. Where this happens, it will be spelt out clearly for the reader. Children born to a primary based couple are referred to as First Generation Australian Born Chinese and after they marry, their children are referred to as Second Generation Australian Born Chinese; and so forth.

Couples and families may be referred to as couples identified and verified as having undertaken a legal marriage, or co-habitative couples who live in long term de-facto relationships, or those
in short term intimate liaisons. In order to understand the part north Queensland played in the Chinese Family Landscape, graphs will usually refer first to the whole of the colony or State statistics, followed by north Queensland statistics. Graphs will outline the racial background of women associated with Chinese men, location of marriages and unions across the colony, and geographical distribution of Chinese families where percentages of unknown locations are removed. In addition, the pattern of marriage over the whole time frame on a decade by decade basis is presented in a visual format to analyse the peak periods of marriage for each region, which when combined with statistics on the prevalence of marriages versus other unions provides the most comprehensive study so far into marriage and relationships associated with the Overseas Chinese to Queensland and north Queensland.

***

Statistical Trends: Queensland vs. north Queensland
To understand the Colonial Chinese Family Landscape and in particular north Queensland’s Chinese Family Landscape, a firm understanding of just who was marrying Chinese men is required, followed by what types of couples, where they were located, and why these relationships occurred. The following section will answer these questions and compare them across the colony to identify important regional differences.

To delineate north Queensland’s population data from the rest of the colony, Queensland has been divided up into four geographical regions: Brisbane, Southern Region, Central Region and Northern Region. This makes population figures easy to identify for comparative purposes, and mirrors the historical pattern of expansion and settlement of the colony in order to compare regional variances and industry factors driving settlement which might affect the rate of marriage or migration patterns.

Ethnicity: Queensland
Across Queensland 1095\textsuperscript{482} Chinese men actively sought family and intimacy with women throughout the 19\textsuperscript{th} century, entering into marriage and marriage-like unions with White,
Chinese and Aboriginal women as well as South Sea Islander and Japanese women. Distinct patterns of marriage trends emerged from analysis of the primary database indicating that marriage to White women was the most prevalent in Queensland for Overseas Chinese settler men. Across the colony of Queensland, women associated with Chinese men 1847-1920 either married (under *The Marriage Act 1864*) or in a co-habitative union (de-facto marriage or short-term liaison resulting in the birth of a child) were statistically quantified as 84% White women, 13% Chinese women and 3% women of Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander heritage. So far, identified Aboriginal / Chinese families are confined to north Queensland with the exception of one union in Central Region in the 1880s. Out of all of the marriages and unions recorded in the database, only three women did not fit the majority ethnicities: two Japanese women and one South Sea Islander. As the numbers of these two groups was so small, they did not rate a percentage for Queensland.

**North Queensland**

Across north Queensland figures of mixed heritage marriages and unions including Chinese men married to Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal women make up 73% of all relationships. Of these relationships, 66% are between White women and Chinese men, 6% between Aboriginal women and Chinese men, and 1% between women of other races, such as Japanese, and Chinese men. While these figures indicate a lower proportion of White mixed heritage families when compared to whole of Queensland, northern percentages reflect the influence a larger presence

---

483 While more women and couples may be identified as new information comes to light, this database compiled through the process of this thesis forms the most comprehensive numerical study into Chinese family relations in Queensland in the 19th century to date. See Introduction – Methodology for an explanation of how this was achieved.
of Chinese migrant women living in north Queensland (27%) when compared to the rest of the colony/State (13%). This means that nearly one third of Chinese settler families living across north Queensland were families where both parents migrated from China. Similarly, the percentage of Aboriginal marriages/ unions across north Queensland was double that of the overall Queensland figures. The larger number of Chinese/ Aboriginal families located in north Queensland is attributed to cattle stations on rural and remote western and Gulf Country communities where many Aboriginal families were located, relatively safe from the reach of the Protector of Aborigines and the draconian provisions in the *Aborigines Protection Act* regarding marriage.

**Intimate relations:**

**Legal Marriage versus co-habitative relationships**

It is difficult to accurately analyse the percentage of legal marriages under *The Marriage Act 1864* versus cohabitative or de-facto relationships for partners and wives associated with Queensland’s Chinese settler population. While many marriages are entered in the Births, Deaths and Marriage registers, there are many which are not. Extensive scrutiny of the registers has not accurately quantified the number of intimate relationships, casual affairs or paid sexual services. Therefore, correct numbers of de facto or casual intimate liaisons and short-term unions resulting in the birth of a child born outside of legal marriage under the Act remain fluid and difficult to verify. The current figure projected in this thesis for non-legal unions is an estimate only as even legal marriages at the time of writing could not be verified.

This is because there is the potential for bona fide “marriages” to be inadvertently captured in the “informal union” data set. It is to be noted that at this time, analysis for this thesis takes in all known marriages I have found to date but does not include a thorough cross-referencing with the official digital database online, which was uploaded late in the thesis research process. However, it is predicted that digital Queensland Births Deaths and Marriages verification and cross referencing of all couples may reveal that legal marriage was the preferred status for couples. Only when the location of every family is known and verified will the analysis showing legal and non-legal marriages and relationships be 100% correct. However, with over 50% of the total database identified already as ‘legally married’, it can be asserted that marriage under *The Marriage Act 1864* was the most prevalent form of relationship between Chinese men and

484 The information comes from registers of births and deaths, police and justice records, marriage ledgers in church records not sent in, and secondary sources such as newspapers and books outside the official marriage register under the Act.
women across colonial Queensland, which suggests that not only was the law obeyed by the majority of migrant men and women, but that the advantages for Chinese men to partner with a White woman or marry in the host country were quickly understood by them.

Marriage: The Marriage Act 1864

Between 1847 and 1920, 584 legal marriages, under the Marriage Act 1864, were identified in the official register for Births Deaths and Marriages (BDM). These figures can be broken down further which indicate that 88 families or 15% lived in or around Brisbane; 48 families or 8% lived in the Southern Region including the Darling Downs; 60 families or 10% lived across the Central Region; and 151 families or 26% have been identified as married and living across north Queensland. There are a further 237 couples who married in the colony but their location is unknown at this stage. However, by removing this 41% of unknown couples from the figures, it is clear that nearly half of all couples, 44%, who were legally married under The Marriage Act 1864, were living in towns and settlements across north Queensland. The next largest group lived in the Brisbane and surrounding South-east Regions.

Fig. 28. Percentage Primary Marriages by District: 1848-1920
Fig. 29. Percentage Marriages: Location known: 1848-1920

Population Geography of Families:

Queensland

Between 1847-1920, over 1000 primary marriages and unions occurred between Chinese men and White, Chinese, and Aboriginal women across the colony of Queensland. When combined with the figures relating to marriage of early first generation Australian Born Chinese children in the 19th century, which began to emerge in the early 1880s, this figure increases by a further
quarter to a figure of approximately 1245. As new couples are identified in the first and second generations of Australian born Chinese, this figure will increase.\textsuperscript{485}

Based on the statistical data collected for this thesis, across Queensland 1095 primary families and couples associated with Chinese settlement have been identified as living in Queensland over a seventy-year period. Of those families and couples, 150 families (14\%) lived in the city area of Brisbane; 108 families (10\%) in Southern Region; 133 families were in Central Region (12\%) and 315 across north Queensland. There are a further 355 couples or families for whom I have not been able to identify locations despite years of compilation of database sets. This means that the exact location of every family has not been identified in the thesis, leaving 35\% of families still unaccounted for.\textsuperscript{486}

Despite Southern Region being the first area to attract Chinese settler men as indentured labour, it remained a small area statistically throughout the study period and reflects its early pastoral settlement experience. Central Region, while having industries aligned with Chinese migration patterns, failed to attract large numbers of migrant men while Northern Region, with its close proximity to Hong Kong, China and shipping routes of the Pacific, emerged as the district which was able to attract the most Overseas Chinese. In summary, just under one third of the total population of Chinese settler families for the period 1847 to 1920, were living in north Queensland with the other two thirds either located in the other three districts combined or have yet to have their location identified.\textsuperscript{487}

The removal of the percentage of families and couples where location remains unknown from the statistics provides an unambiguous picture of colony-wide variances. From this, it is very clear that north Queensland played a significant role in attracting Chinese settlement to Queensland and that the Chinese Family Landscape was most prominent in this region.

\textsuperscript{485} The figure 1245 was correct as the time of thesis production. New families are added when information comes to light and the number is slowly increasing.

\textsuperscript{486} These percentages are based on current knowledge at this point in time and will be subject to change when new information comes to light.

\textsuperscript{487} Statistical database compiled by author and formatted in Excel spreadsheet covering the period 1847-1950, compiled from Births Deaths and Marriages, church marriages, baptism and death records, police and justice records, Commonwealth records, newspapers, family histories, oral history and secondary sources.
North Queensland

North Queensland’s ability to attract Chinese settler couples can be more clearly viewed in the data when the number of families whose location is unknown is removed from the analysis. North Queensland, from Mackay up to the Torres Straits and across the Gulf country, out to the Northern Territory border and down to the south-central Shire of Winton, accounted for 45% of all known primary couples associated with Chinese settlement in Queensland. In comparison, families and couples living in Brisbane were less than half the percentage of northern couples, at 21%; Central Region had even fewer, at 19%; and Southern Region had 15%.

The pattern of settlement for the Chinese Family Landscape in 19th and early 20th century Queensland was directly related to the expansion of both geographic spread of settlement and the emergence of key industries which drove economic development. These two reasons alone supported the emergence of economically stable communities and attracted and sustained the Chinese Family Landscape from their inception until well into the 20th century.

Settlement Patterns:

Queensland

Queensland’s Chinese Family Landscape, over a seventy-year period, mirrored the growth, rise and decline of three key industries: pastoralism, mining and agriculture. On a decade by decade basis the number of marriages and unions recorded, when weighed against this expansion, reveal a synergy between the period of emergence of key industries and the incidence of marriage. This
is particularly evident in north Queensland where patterns quickly emerge concerning the number of couples, the ethnicity of female partners and key periods of economic growth. North Queensland’s Chinese family landscape fits in with international expansion trends associated with mining and large-scale production, but with the exception of Chinese settlers diversifying as specialist labour for pastoral interests. Chinese shepherds, hut keepers, shearsers, station gardeners and cooks appear to be a colonial Australian/Queensland category rather than one associated with more usual global industries attracting Chinese involvement such as mining or sugar production.

Queensland’s Chinese Family Landscape indicates a direct relationship of the growth and expansion of the colony to the Chinese Diaspora and family experience. Teasing this out a bit further, decade by decade, it is clear that the majority of Chinese settler marriages occurred in the thirty-year period 1870 – 1910, which reflects the peak period for the expansion and settlement of Queensland and its three key industries. This period also reflects assisted female migration programs from England and the increasing incidence of women arriving direct from China.

![Total Primary Marriages & Unions per decade by district 1847-1920](image)

Fig. 32. Total Marriages and Unions per decade district by district-1920

Queensland’s colonial Chinese marriage and union trends commenced in 1847 at a time when the northern districts remained part of New South Wales. Chinese indentured workers from Fukien and Amoy districts of China, contracted for a period of five years to newly settled
pastoralists, began to form relationships with White women with whom they came in contact, making them among the first marriages to be recorded in the colony. Between 1847 to 1859, twenty Chinese men had either married or entered a relationship with a White woman, living either in Brisbane, on the Darling Downs, or in the Wide Bay and Burnett region.488 (See Table 2). Located primarily at Drayton, Dalby and Roma, Chinese husbands were married to migrant women from Scotland, Ireland and England or colonial born White girls. Most weddings were undertaken according to Wesleyan or Church of England rites at a time when the colony remained the most northern districts of New South Wales.489 By 1860, news of pastoral rich lands further north began to reach the Southern and Brisbane communities which precipitated a move for some families.

![Combined Chinese Marriage & Unions: 1839-1859](image)

Fig. 33. Combined Chinese Marriages and Unions: 1839-1859 by District.

Over the next twenty years, Chinese men migrated, married and were located across Queensland in consistent numbers across all four regions. By 1870, however, marriages in Southern Region began to decline in comparison to other regions, with numbers in Brisbane, Central and Northern Region seeming to reflect the increasing populations in port towns from 488 Robb Database: Marriages and Unions, 1848-1920
489 Among the first couples to be recorded in colonial Queensland records was Ester (surname unknown) and William Wing whose son Robert was born on 11 June 1847 at a time when Queensland was the northern part of the New South Wales colony. Their three sons were baptized in a rural church a number of years later, location unknown, but they remain registered in official Queensland registry of births.
both active migration programs from the British Isles and the discovery of gold. Port towns such as Brisbane, Maryborough, Rockhampton, Mackay, Townsville and Cooktown began to flourish. However, the discovery of gold at the Palmer River and other major goldfields in the north combined with the emergence of large-scale agriculture in places such as Cairns, the Herbert River and Mackay, meant that from the 1880s it was north Queensland which emerged as the place where most marriages and unions were located.

North Queensland

From 1860-1869, the Chinese Family Landscape began to emerge in north Queensland. While small in number at first and geographically confined to the newly emerging port towns and surrounding districts, at least 18 families were identified in Northern Region in this decade, making up 15% of the total of 120 families throughout the colony. The discovery of gold at Cape River and Ravenswood in the late 1860s precipitated a migration north of Chinese men from the southern goldfields, and therefore some Chinese couples and families. The opening up of more gold fields in north Queensland led to the mass migration of Chinese miners, both internally from southern districts as well as directly from China. The largest influx to Queensland and north Queensland in a limited amount of time was the initial gold rush to the Palmer goldfield in the early 1870s.

The Palmer goldfield and emerging port town of Cooktown saw several arrivals of Chinese migrant women for the first time in Queensland. The arrival of these Chinese women, as well as increased marriages between Chinese men and White women, began to form a pattern, which as the decades rolled on saw the north emerge as a preferred destination by Chinese settlers, including China-born women. Between 1870-1879 the Chinese Family Landscape in North Queensland nearly doubled, hosting a population of 31 Chinese families including 7 China born migrant wives who had travelled to live with their husbands. The discovery of gold in the north provided the initial impetus for an increase in families in the north, either through direct association with mining or as husbands took up businesses such as shopkeeping. This trend continued in the next decade.
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490 Rockhampton Bulletin and Central Queensland Advertiser, 1 June 1871, p. 2; Queensland Times, Ipswich Herald and General Advertiser, 29 May 1875, p. 2; Rockhampton Bulletin and Central Queensland Advertiser, 12 January 1867, p. 3; Maryborough Chronicle, Wide Bay and Burnett Advertiser, 6 January 1872, p. 2; Mackay Mercury and South Kennedy Advertiser, 1 February 1873, p. 3.
From 1880 until 1899, a surge in family formation saw 146 marriages registered and 107 unions identified for the period. This included 29 families where the couple were both China born. North Queensland alone accounted for 81 families, both mixed heritage and full Chinese, meaning that approximately 32% of all known families were now residing in the north of the colony, which reflected the expanding mining interests and emerging large-scale agricultural interests such as sugar, along with the Chinese driven banana and Atherton Tableland maize industries. On one hand, the spike could be attributed to the combination of huge numbers of immigrant Chinese men arriving in Queensland from the mid-1870s who were now moving around the north as the region’s economy grew. However, it could also be argued that the upturn in marriages and unions was also due to an increased preference for Chinese partners by colonial and passage-assisted immigrant White women, who were making informed choices in husband/partner selection. Chinese men with their sober habits and reputation as good providers were an attractive source of partners in a settlement environment which was dominated by European male alcohol abuse and violence. The influx of Chinese men concurrent with the mining boom and direct immigration of women to regional northern ports precipitated an increase of unions between Chinese men and White women, as new arrivals were less likely to be imbued with colonial prejudice against Chinese. This trend continued into the new century. In the twenty-year period, 1890-1910, primary Chinese settler marriages and unions across north Queensland outperformed Southern, Central and Brisbane Region counterparts, continuing the trend over the previous three decades.

The development of Chinatowns and precincts large and small, and the presence of women and children, established the realm of private, domestic “soft economics” which played out through husband/wife relationships, social interactions and female friendships. This hidden “force” contributed to community stability, and provided an avenue for regeneration through the birth of children, maintenance of cultural traditions, including cultural literacy, and creation of marriageable partners from within the community: the benefits of which played out in Chinatowns, precincts, business interactions and String communities. The maintenance of cultural family traditions, particularly Chinese female traditions, was bolstered by an increased number of Chinese women coming direct from China after 1901. This increase was most evident in the jump in Chinese marriages and unions between 1901 and 1905 at a time of peak economic prosperity for the local Chinese driven banana and maize industries. The relaxed

immigration legislation, arrival of young Chinese women and booming Chinese economy encouraged community growth, and Cairns emerged as the largest Chinatown outside Brisbane.

The introduction of Commonwealth legislation in 1901, which relaxed immigration laws, enabled many young Chinese wives to join their husbands. The Commonwealth immigration legislation which replaced earlier restrictive Queensland colonial acts was relatively generous for female Chinese immigrants, and this helped to cause the statistical spike occurring in the north regarding marriages and unions between 1901 and 1903. Chinese women were able to enter the Commonwealth as wives, usually of merchants, under the *Immigration Restriction Act 1901*. This came at a time when White/Chinese marriages were on the decline and Australian born first and second-generation mixed heritage daughters were the major source of marriage partners for the Chinese male community. However, what happened next is not just statistically measurable, but undeniably catastrophic in its effect on the family landscape. The suspension of clause 3m in the legislation, which had allowed the immigration of wives, and subsequent repeal of these clauses in 1905 meant that Chinese female arrivals to north Queensland plummeted. Restrictions on the entry of Chinese women, combined with a requirement that exemptions be granted for only limited periods of six month thereafter, inhibited the growth of Chinese communities and cemented the fate of the “separated family”. It can be concluded that the legislative barrier, intended to deter Chinese female immigration and prevent two Chinese parent family formation, was successful.

Between 1910 and 1920, north Queensland’s Chinese community contracted as it struggled to cope with change. Not only were few Chinese women able to migrate to form new settler families, those who had previously arrived were returning to China; some for good. Mixed heritage daughters were preferred as marriage partners to White women and only a few Chinese-White primary marriages were recorded for this decade. Men who married or partnered with Aboriginal women faced the likelihood of their Aboriginal women and mixed heritage children being removed in an effort to prevent miscegenation by the Government, as it exerted increasing control over the Aboriginal population under the notorious 1897 *Aborigines Protection and Restriction of the Sale of Opium Act*. (See Chapter 8.)
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492 Commonwealth *Immigration Restriction Act 1901*, s.3(m).
493 NAA: J2483 185/57 HOP WHO SING Family 1912; NAA: 2483 105/23 HOP WHO SING Family; NAA: J3115 81 TAI YET HING Family; NAA: J2483 18/94 TAI YET HING Family; NAA: J3136 1906/251 TAI YET HING Family.
494 The reduced number of White/Chinese marriages may also have been due to the Births Deaths and Marriage records only going to 1914 at the time the database was compiled.
Across the north there was increased mobility of families as the mining and Chinese agriculture sectors declined. Couples and families consisting of at least one or even both parents as first or second generation Australian born, moved to larger and more stable towns located along the east coast in search of work. This generation often became small mixed business owners, such as bakers and storekeepers, or clerks and labourers in other Chinese stores.\textsuperscript{495} By 1920, marriage patterns within the Chinese community across north Queensland consisted of first and second generation marriages as well as the emergence of third generation marriages. In contrast, the few Chinese women and families who managed to arrive after 1920, came instead under temporary exemption provisions to join their husbands, or were Australian born British subjects who had been living in China from childhood and were seeking to return. Due to a number of factors, the Chinese family landscape was unable to sustain itself as a separate community and as a result Chinatowns declined. As noted earlier, across north Queensland many Councils acted in the 1930s to remove the Chinese ‘taint’ from their communities in a systematic effort to raze, remove and rename their Chinatowns, thus forcing many families to move out.

\textbf{Conclusion:}

Across Queensland between 1860 and 1920, north Queensland emerged as the region which supported the most couples and families associated with the Chinese Family Landscape. With an estimated 1095 marriages and unions recorded in a 70-year period, the generalisation that Chinese men were sojourners, or that there were not many families, cannot hold. Over half of these relationships have been verified as legal marriages suggesting a note of permanency and commitment which when combined with de-facto relationships, short term unions and casual intimate relations, it is evident that the Chinese Family Landscape was not only present but distributed throughout the colony.

Women associated with Chinese men were predominantly White women, Chinese women and Aboriginal women with only three women identified in the whole study as of other ethnicities. White women were the dominant marriage partner across Queensland from the beginning of the Chinese Family Landscape until such as time as communities became self-sufficient through a process of renewal with the marriage of daughters back into the community. Chinese women,

not surprisingly became the second most prevalent choice of wife. This is reflected throughout the colony but is most notable across north Queensland which experienced an increased incidence of China born couples from the mid-1880s. The same is true for Aboriginal wives which are more than for the state average.

Historical settlement patterns across Queensland and industries such as pastoralism, mining and agriculture not only drove expansion but clearly impacted on Chinese marriage patterns throughout the decades. As a result, it is evident that north Queensland can be observed, through rising numbers of marriages and unions across the decades when compared with the other regions, as a popular place for families through its association with all three major industries. The stability and importance of Brisbane as the capital of the colony can also be measured in its ability to secure the second highest rate of marriage couples when compared to the larger but economically variable Southern and Central Regions.

This chapter has aimed to set out the big picture or whole of colony overview of the Chinese Family Landscape. Through the use of statistics, analysing of data and drawing comparisons to each four regions, patterns and trends have emerged. Northern Region clearly emerged as the place which attracted the most Chinese couples and families in the 19th and early 20th centuries and enjoyed the largest and longest-lived regional population of Chinese settlers outside any major east coast Queensland city, including Brisbane. Information contained in this chapter will be expanded in the following chapters, with the first three chapters focusing on ethnicity of marriage partners, and location and community in the final chapter by place and town.
Fig. 34. Geographic Location and Ethnic Background: Queensland Population: Chinese Family Landscape: 1847-1920
Fig. 35. Cultural Background: North Queensland Chinese Family Landscape showing period when Commonwealth Legislation introduced.
Introduction:
Throughout the 19th and early 20th centuries, White women took advantage of active immigration schemes to escape poverty across Great Britain and Europe in order to begin new lives. On settling in their new lands, they soon became aware of the abundant partnering prospects available to them, including men from different cultures who they had never considered before, including Chinese men. In some colonies and countries, prohibitive legislation was enacted to prevent interracial marriage from occurring between White women and non-White men. However, in Australia, colonial governments in New South Wales, Victoria and Queensland took a more relaxed approach and left it up to class and social pressure to provide the disincentive to marry outside their own ethnic group. Legally free to do what they wanted in a fledgling society, a number of White women turned to Chinese men for marriage and intimate relations. This was so much so, that overall the colonies of Australia have emerged as the place where the most Chinese-White marriages occurred over 1860-1920, for anywhere around the globe. The colony of Queensland itself displays unique statistical characteristics which set it apart from other global colonies such as British Columbia and New Zealand, with north Queensland proving to be an exceptional place for interracial marriage between White women and Chinese men.

This chapter will trace the migration of White women to colonial countries around the globe; discuss the prevalence and reasons underpinning their partnering with Chinese men, and compare known figures of such partnering’s from around the globe with statistics of Queensland. This information will be then compared specifically to the settlement and marriage patterns across north Queensland to reveal the true extent of the Chinese –White Family Landscape.
Part 1: Exodus
From the early 19th century, women across the British Isles journeyed to new and emerging colonies to seek better prospects for themselves. Due to a shift in traditional women’s occupations brought on by technological and social changes, women in England found access to work competitive, unemployment high and poverty and recession prevalent. Across the channel, Ireland fared no better with political unrest, crop failure and famine affecting many communities. By 1881 England was experiencing a large gender imbalance with the population consisting of over one million more women than men. Marriage, while still considered the principal means of assuring a safe economic future for women, remained unlikely for many. These conditions encouraged women to seek more hopeful futures overseas.497 Faced with limited opportunities at home and persuaded by reports of better possibilities abroad, over one million more women than men left England and Ireland in search of a new life.498 Between 1853 and 1913, around 23 million emigrants left the British Isles499 with most emigrants journeying to one of four global destinations: the United States of America, British North America (including British Columbia), South Africa, and “Australasia” (Australia and New Zealand combined).500

Fig. 36. White Female migration to other colonies and countries: 19th Century.

500 Timothy J. Hatton, “Emigration from the UK, 1879-1913 and 1950-1998”, European Review of Economic History 8 (2004): 149-150. At the time, statistical figures of emigration to Australia and New Zealand were counted together as one under the label “Australasia” by the Board of Trade statistics.
Up to 62% of the gross outflow of emigrant men and women from Britain and Ireland went to America, which was favoured through an established transport route with faster travel times. Of these, the colonies of America and British Columbia attracted an estimated 6 million Irish settlers between them, with the United States receiving the majority of migrants. In comparison, it is estimated that only 1.6 million British and Irish immigrants settled in Australia, of which one third were Irish. Over the forty year period 1870-1913, immigration peaked in three distinct phases: the mid-1870s, the early 1880s, and between 1910 and 1913. These periods correlate to political and social push factors within the United Kingdom and incentive schemes offered by colonial governments abroad. The first two peak phases of female migration from the British Isles can be linked to peaks in White-Chinese marriage patterns in north Queensland, particularly 1872-1893 when the majority of such marriages occurred. (See Figure Below)

![UK Migration to United States, Canada Australia and New Zealand 1870-1913](image)

Fig. 37. UK Migration to United States, Canada Australia and New Zealand 1870-1913

Immigration of female British and Irish subjects was influenced by both push factors from within the United Kingdom, and pull factors from within the colonies themselves. Colonial administrators, tasked with managing Empire standards, were faced with a range of issues which required the presence of White women in order to control, manage and maintain the burgeoning colonial populations. By their presence, White women were thought to transform society, and
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501 Ibid., 150
503 Hatton, “Emigration from the UK”, 152,
steer men towards an acceptable level of masculine behaviour thus providing a passive moral regulator to communities. Through their presence, women propelled settlements to maturity, from raw pastoral and mining communities to robust societies appropriate to British Empire expectations. White women also provided an instrument by which racial purity could be maintained, and their presence strengthened White racial dominance over the land, Indigenous people and environment. While the expectation invested in White women was that they would settle and breed in the colonies, their use as domestic labour was equally valued in order to free up White men to undertake masculine pursuits such as exploration, prospecting, mining and farming. With these goals in mind, colonial governments supported immigration schemes to attract women from the United Kingdom to fulfil all of these goals. Immigration schemes to colonial places commenced in the early 1820s, first to British Columbia and to New Zealand from the 1840s, with Australian colonial immigration schemes introduced in New South Wales from 1848, South Australia in 1852; Victoria, 1852; and Queensland in 1860. While poverty provided an excellent push factor for many women to leave Great Britain, the promise of employment and better life prospects provided a strong pull factor, especially the ability to attain financial security.

A shortage of female workers, in particular domestic servant labour, provided an incentive for young women to immigrate to the colonies of Australia. It is estimated that approximately 89% of emigrant women from the United Kingdom and Ireland were domestic servants, but through concurrent philanthropic schemes available for middle class women, other positions than the domestic were also offered. In Queensland, domestic labour was the main occupation women could enter into, encompassing a wide range of occupations including cooks, barmaids, laundresses, general servants, housemaids, nursemaids, dairywomen, and farmhouse servants. The scarcity of paid employment in Britain combined with a perception of endless opportunities for work overseas ensured that women viewed emigration favourably, with many women having the additional advantage of being of marriageable age.

505 Kate Mathew, “The Female Middle-Class emigration society governesses in Australia: a failed vision?” Journal of Australian Colonial History, 14 (2012):108. Colonial sponsored schemes were intended to structure and encourage female emigration. These schemes worked in conjunction with British philanthropic societies and offered either free or subsidized passage to women who otherwise may not have had the means or connections to do so. Schemes were funded by the sale of land in the Colonies or funded by colonists themselves to bring out extended family members. The intended results were twofold: they acted as a growth mechanism for the population to expand via family reunification or prospective marriage partners, and introduced a domestic labour force to the colonies to service the growing demand for servants and capable wives.
506 Proudfoot and Hall, “Points of Departure”, 248-253
507 Ibid., 252-253
508 The most common occupation of the bride on Chinese-White marriage certificates was “domestic servant”.
509 “Schedule 1”, Queensland Times, Ipswich Herald and General Advertiser, 23 September 1869, p. 4.
Marriage, it seems in colonial environments, could offer unexpected rewards for women both horizontally, due to the large number of men for women to choose husbands and lovers from, and vertically in terms of ability to move up the ladder in social status. However, these choices also resulted in one unintended consequence for White female emigration, and one obviously not considered by the patriarchal authorities. This was the prospect and occurrence of marriage between White women and Chinese men.

Interracial marriage patterns: Global Trends

Interracial marriage developed as an unexpected consequence of White female emigration. Having first taken the risk of leaving England and Ireland, White women were faced with freedom of choice with a large range in occupation and quality of the opposite sex, and freedom from family constraints as they considered prospective partners. Unencumbered by social norms or difficult social, economic and environmental conditions, women were able to focus on the quality of the man and what he could offer her when it came to the selection of a husband. This enabled some women to step outside tradition when it came to marriage and intimate relations. In response, to women making free marriage choices with non-White men, colonial men sought ways to protect their rightful conjugal interests.

The partnering of White women with men from other racial backgrounds, particularly Chinese men, astounded and outraged White men in every colonial environment for a number of reasons: it challenged White masculinity, provoked competition for a scarce resource, and disrupted the traditional paternalistic social order which had privileged White (and particularly British) men for centuries. Depending on the colony or country, it was uniformly met with negative social pressure exerted on the White women (by both White men and women), racial prejudice exerted on Chinese men (including violence and bullying), and official pressure through administrative restrictions by the passing of State laws to inhibit and prohibit partnering of White women with non-White men. Legislative measures in the form of anti-miscegenation laws were introduced in the U.S., while discriminatory legislation attached to national rights was imposed on women in the United Kingdom.

510 The largest racial group of men in the British colonies other than White men were men from Asia including China, Japan and Malaysia. In British West Indies and parts of the U.S., it also included those of black African descent or Mulattos (a person of mixed White and Black ancestry).

United States
While Chinese men and White women were the target of laws to prevent interracial marriage in the United States throughout the mid-19th century, laws to prevent miscegenation had been enacted long before in 1664 as a measure to control White English women marrying “Negro” slaves in Maryland.\textsuperscript{512} As the United States developed, the law extended to other states and by 1857, places such as New Mexico had expanded the law to include any woman of the White race and any “Negro” or “Mulatto”.\textsuperscript{513} By the mid-1850s Chinese men, as the largest non-White immigrant male group, were singled out as a significant threat to White male hegemony.\textsuperscript{514} As late as 1901 Arizona introduced a law which banned the marriage of any White woman to any non-White husband. Any marriages already solemnized were targeted by authorities who refused to acknowledge their legal status, thus rendering marriages null and void, followed by fines for anyone who defied the law.\textsuperscript{515} Chinese men were considered a threat to the assumed property that White women were considered to be by White men; with White women deemed commodities as marriage partners, exclusively for White men.

Further north in Canada, additional laws were introduced which banned the employment of any White woman by Japanese, Chinese or “Orientals.”\textsuperscript{516} Not only was White masculinity at risk, there was a general fear that with too-close proximity, children of mixed race would be born. A fear of mixed-race citizens and a “hybrid” community provoked deep-rooted fears based on White Sino-phobic paranoia: a paranoia which is buried deep in the belief in the superiority of a ‘pure’ the White race. Anti-miscegenation laws still existed in America with little amendment until the late 20th century when the Supreme Court ruled the law unconstitutional in 1967.\textsuperscript{517} Despite this, some interracial marriages and unions managed to take place and with surprising results.

\textsuperscript{513} A person of mixed White and Black ancestry, especially a person with one White and one Black parent, was referred to as a Mulatto.
\textsuperscript{514} Pascoe, “Race, Gender, an Intercultural Relations”, 7-9.
\textsuperscript{515} Delgado, “Neighbours by nature”, 410.
\textsuperscript{517} Pascoe, “Race, Gender, an Intercultural Relations,” 6 and 17. In 1948 in \textit{Perez vs Sharp}, in the Supreme Court of the U.S., it was found that the laws were unconstitutional, but changes only occurred at a state by state level and did not occur straight away. Texas and Oklahoma were the last two states to change in 1967. They only changed because of another legal case, \textit{Loving vs Virginia}; It was later extended to Malays when couples challenged the constitutional legality of the legislation in the Supreme Court, but this did not occur until the middle of the 20th century.
Very little statistical data is available to explore the prevalence of marriage by White women to Chinese men across the United States. Some academic researchers have historically skirted around the issue of Chinese–White marriage, either ignoring it or focusing on sexual exploitation of women as a means for relations. It was authors such as Adam McKeown and Huping Ling who provided the best insights into the origins of women partnering with Chinese men across the United States. Ling notes that White women who partnered with a Chinese man came from a range of places of origin in the British Isles and Europe. The small number of White women - Chinese marriages is evidenced in the population trends of 1880 for Louisiana. Among 489 Chinese men in Louisiana, there were 4 married to Chinese women and 31 to non-Chinese women including 4 Mulatto women, 12 African-American women and 8 White women. The dominance of Irish women, and the specific place of origin for women coming from Europe, can be seen in the following geographical breakdown of Chinese marriages in the U.S.

Along the south-west coast, in California and further south in Cuba, Chinese labourers associated with sugar plantations and railroads partnered with White women from Irish and French immigrant backgrounds. The immigration of French women reflected established trade routes and French colonial interests which were prominent in Cuba and California at the time. Along the borderlands in the southern state of Arizona, only a handful of unions occurred between Chinese men and immigrant French women. Along the East Coast, in New York, women were initially from Irish immigrant backgrounds, which later shifted in the 1890s to Italian origins, reflecting new immigration sources in Europe. Further north in the Mid-West, White women were principally from German and Polish backgrounds, and in the twin cities of Minneapolis and Saint Paul only 6 marriages had occurred by the early part of the 20th century with all women being from Irish or Polish backgrounds.

In summary, White women across America who partnered with Chinese men in 19th/early 20th century U.S.A. were of Irish and of European backgrounds, either Italian, Polish or German in the northern States, while in the southern States along the Mexican border, and in California as well as further south in Cuba, the women were principally Irish or French in origin. This point is

520 Ibid.
521 Delgado, “Neighbours by nature”, 410
522 Warwick Examiner and Times, 18 February 1893, p. 5; Ling, “Family and Marriage”, 57.
524 Ling, “Family and Marriage”, 57.
encapsulated an article published in several Queensland newspapers in early 1893 under the title “John Chinaman marrying White Women”. It notes when reflecting on White women having intimate relations with Chinese men in New York that the Irish immigrant “Biddy” was said to be charmed by Chinese men in New York, as well as Australia, Chile, and Peru, with her fellow female immigrant Italian counterparts equally enamoured with the prospects of a Chinese husband.\textsuperscript{525}

Reaction against Chinese men for stealing the mothers of the nation was immediate. Anti-Chinese sentiment based on sexual rights to women resulted in unrest, violence and in some cases murder.\textsuperscript{526} Chinese men were seen as a threat to White women, who were thought to be at risk of moral corruption.\textsuperscript{527} Chinese men on the other hand, met, managed and negotiated both platonic and intimate relations with children and women in accordance with Chinese traditional social values. Just how successful they were in accommodating Western social values in this traditional framework remains unknown. The negotiation of intimate relations by American Chinese men was a deeply personal and individual experience. Adam McKeown suspects that Chinese men who were married to White women in the United States never fully committed to integration, preferring instead to keep firm links back to China. This theory is highlighted by the Chinese Diaspora practice of the “two primary wife” or transnational polygamous marriage where White wives were a second wife, sometimes oblivious to the First wife who remained in China.\textsuperscript{528} He provides a teasing hint about the complexity of relations by relating the cultural frustration in the memoir of Situ Meitang, who lived in Boston and New York over a seventy year period. His book \textit{I Bitterly Hate Imperialistic America: Reminiscences of a Seventy Year Sojourn in the United States}, hints at the problematic negotiation required between Western and Eastern cultural traditions, gender expectations, law, property rights and practices associated

\textsuperscript{525} John Chinaman Marrying White Women, \textit{Warwick Examiner and Times}, 18 February 1893, p. 5.  
\textsuperscript{526}Zeehan and Dundas Herald, 5 September 1913, p. 3. In the article “News from America, Tragedy of Jealousy”, an incident occurred where a neighbour of an interracial couple, a White woman and a Chinese man, went into their house and murdered the husband and attempted to murder the wife. The White neighbour had previously warned them of his objection to the marriage on the grounds that he did not want a White woman marrying a Chinese man. The incident occurred in Chicago, yet the article was published in Tasmania, indicating that the subject of interracial marriage attracted interest globally. Racial violence occurred across America with incidents in Lake Michigan, Denver, Seattle, Tacoma, San Francisco, Rocky Springs and Wyoming. The number of anti-Chinese riots held after the mid 1850s was approximately 153 with a human cost of 143 Chinese murdered and 10,525 men displaced from homes and businesses.  
\textsuperscript{527}Jew, “Chinese Demons”, 389-390. White female sexuality was kept hidden and suppressed as a convenient way to ensure that Chinese men were always cast at fault, as seducers and the perpetrators of immoral and indecent acts, even if the claims were spurious.  
\textsuperscript{528}McKeown, “Transnational Chinese Families”, 98-99. He hints at intimate relations between non-Chinese women and Chinese men but emphasises that the patriline remained firmly based in China and that the American wife was in all likelihood a second wife. He speculates that many China-based wives encouraged the marriage of her husband to non-Chinese wives as a means to secure his daily attention to the responsibility of providing for his families rather than gambling or engaging in activities which would deplete his earnings. Relationships between American women and Chinese men tended to incorporate the women into the migrant groom’s local society. Not all “non-Chinese wives” realised what they were getting into. Many were shocked and dismayed upon meeting the primary wife in China. Some were even left in China against their will when the husband returned abroad. He notes this situation only occurred occasionally to wives married in America. However, newspapers sensationalized the difficulties and sided with the White woman in a pitying manner should she find herself abandoned or at risk of confinement to China.
with marriage. When combined with traditional Chinese paternalism, White-Chinese interracial marriage and cultural negotiation remains a poorly understood Diaspora attribute.\textsuperscript{529}

While evidence of statistics for Chinese – White marriages in the U.S. exists but only State by State at best, other countries which attracted British and French colonial interests had nearly none. Countries and colonies such as the British West Indies including Jamaica, Trinidad and British Guiana as well as the colonial districts of British and Dutch South Africa have nearly no figures for Chinese-White interracial marriage recorded at all. While it is known that a high rate of intermarriage occurred in the British Caribbean in the early 20\textsuperscript{th} century, it is not clear if any White women were among the partners or if the intermarriage was predominantly with African or Indigenous plantation women.\textsuperscript{530} Chinese-White intermarriage is an area which would benefit from more exploration in the context of the Chinese Diaspora. Britain, on the other hand, found itself faced with the issue of interracial marriage, when Chinese seamen began to arrive in Liverpool and London to work on the docks.

\textbf{England}

England tackled interracial marriage by rendering women stateless as means to offset any benefit marriage may bring to the woman. This was achieved through three pieces of legislation, commencing in 1870 with \textit{The Naturalisation Act 1870}. Historically, until 1870, a natural born British subject could not lose British nationality even by settling in a foreign country and naturalizing there. Marriage was considered a voluntary act and this did not affect a woman’s citizenship status. This meant a British born woman under common law did not lose her British subject status upon marriage to an alien, and conversely an alien woman marrying a British subject did not become British. The British law was not directly aimed at non-White men. In fact, the law was initiated in response to disputes about allegiance sparked by the growing global community, particularly the U.S. This meant that the indelibility of allegiance conflicted with emigration complexities of transnational citizenship status.

This legislation changed the situation for women born in the United Kingdom and deprived them of their nationality upon marriage to a foreign national. Strong legislation also provided a deterrent for intimate relations between Chinese men and White women in Britain because the law also applied to their children. Later, \textit{The British Nationality and Status of Aliens Act 1914}

\textsuperscript{529}Ibid., 76 In his memoir Situ complains that when “an overseas Chinese marries an American wife, he does not have the right to manage property that he has bought himself, but after he dies is forced to leave it to his wife.”

deemed that any British woman who married an ‘Alien’ became an ‘Alien’ herself. This meant that act of legal marriage rendered all British Subjects’ rights and privileges, normally afforded to those of British Nationality, null and void. Not only would she renounce her claim to be a British Subject through the act of interracial marriage, she put herself at risk by stepping outside the protection of the Empire. The legislation was clearly an overreaction to Chinese immigration. Population trends in the United Kingdom reveal the number of Chinese men who permanently settled in Britain, when compared to other Diaspora countries, was always low. The few who were permanent settlers lived principally in Chinese cultural precincts located at Limestone or Liverpool Chinatowns. Those who settled serviced the larger transient Chinese merchant seamen population, with numbers remaining small due to a lack of industrial opportunities to drive an immigration influx.

Difficulties in quantifying interracial unions are made clear by John Seed who laments the accuracy of British census statistics, noting that they should only be used as a guide due to data classification issues. A snapshot of Chinese in Britain can be viewed through the 1881 census figures which recorded the total male population of Chinese in London’s Limestone Chinatown as seventy men, consisting of temporary seamen, ship bound labour in the docks, and a permanent population of Chinese men in the cultural precinct consisting only of up to ten people who were spread over two shops and a boarding house. Of the possible 10 Chinese men in the permanent Chinese population, two of them were married to White wives and with families. It could be speculated that 20% of the Chinese Limestone population were engaged in interracial marriage and families with White women, but this percentage should be viewed with caution. Nearly forty years later, the 1918 census of Pennyfields, near Limestone, recorded 182 men of whom only nine had English wives. The effectiveness of both the 1870 and 1914 legislation was
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532 This left her particularly vulnerable because she was not in turn recognized as a Chinese national. This meant that British consular assistance would have been denied had she left for China and been subsequently abandoned.


535 Seed, “Limehouse blues”, 63. He notes that the inaccuracies stem from classification, as Chinese persons born in Malaysia, British Guiana or other colonial Dominions were not categorized as “Chinese” in the census, nor were children of mixed marriage and children of China born parents who were born in England. Before WWI the Chinese population in England was .5% percent.

536 Ibid., 63-67 and Blog, “The Chinese in Britain (United Kingdom), History Timeline”, http://www.zakkeith.com/articles,blogs,forums/chinese-in-britain-history-timeline.htm Mixed heritage children were subject to racism and persecution through their illegitimate birth status. To fit in, some families changed their names to more Anglo sounding names so that it was difficult to trace their interracial heritage. Families of Anglo-Chinese unions found it extremely difficult to get work and were ostracized and bullied, referred to as “Broken Blossoms”.
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outstanding; however it was limited to the United Kingdom and did not extend across the British Empire.\textsuperscript{537}

Naturalisation only conferred British subject status in the colony in which subjects lived. This meant the colonial Dominions of Canada, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa developed their own laws regarding naturalisation which, when tested, could conflict with Britain’s laws.\textsuperscript{538} Attempts to reach consensus and make legislation uniform across the British Empire occurred in 1911.\textsuperscript{539} It was conceded that all members of the British Empire were theoretically equal and derived their status from the crown. However, the question of inequity regarding the status of women who married an alien remained. This provoked outrage from women’s groups but was not addressed as an issue until the First World War, at a time when Britain was forced to protect British born women as wives of men deemed enemy aliens.\textsuperscript{540} In 1922 the National Council of Women drafted a Nationality of Married Women Bill which provided for a woman who was a British Subject to retain her nationality even if she married an alien. Support for the bill was strong but it still did not pass immediately within Commonwealth countries, with Australia and New Zealand not coming in line with the legislation until the mid-1930s.\textsuperscript{541} The combined colonies of New Zealand and Australia, or ‘Australasia’, were bound together as trans-Tasman outposts of the extensive British Empire. Together they attracted the attention of the Chinese Diaspora, with New Zealand experiencing a trickle in Chinese migration from the 1870s onwards which developed into a “continuous flow” peaking in the early 1880s.

\textbf{New Zealand}

New Zealand’s response to the arrival of Chinese men commenced with restrictive legislation introduced to limit the flow of Chinese immigration into the colony. When it came to protecting its domestic asset, women, New Zealand took a strident approach to enforcing marriage separation between Chinese men and any other race of women, including Maori and Pakeha (White) women. Anti-miscegenation laws were introduced to prevent intimate relations and marriages occurring

\textsuperscript{537} Blog, “The Chinese in Britain”.
\textsuperscript{539} Canada passed the law in 1914 but Australia did not adopt it until 1920.
\textsuperscript{540} Baldwin, “Subject to Empire”, 528.
\textsuperscript{541} The question surrounding nationality and British Subject status may account for why a few British born Queensland women applied for Australian naturalisation in the early 1930s. This is an area which requires further investigation and is outside the scope of this thesis, but it does raise questions as to how the Dominions organised their internal migration/naturalisation/immigration affairs in conjunction with expectations from the British Empire.
and as a result only a few interracial marriages took place across New Zealand when compared to Queensland and the southern colonies of Australasia in the same period.\textsuperscript{542}

The low number of marriages and unions between Chinese men and White women in New Zealand is confirmed in a study by Julia Bradshaw. She suggests that the few White women who did enter marriage and intimate relations with Chinese men experienced difficult lives. She hints that their experiences of marriage showed similarities with Australian colonial wives in that they were second wives, lived in Chinese cultural precincts, and were “generally accepted” by the Chinese male community.\textsuperscript{543} James Ng on the other hand takes a different approach and explores Chinese male reasons for interracial marriage. When talking about White woman he suggests that:

The Chinese husband, who had adventurously travelled well away … and who probably had a better than usual command of English, was isolated from Chinese peer attitudes. He therefore entered into a mixed marriage more readily. Once married, that same isolation led to the tendency to stay in the European world.\textsuperscript{544}

Both Bradshaw and Ng’s observations suggest that more work needs to be undertaken in the area of Anglo-Chinese marriage and unions to allow comparisons with the colonies of Australia.

***

\textbf{Part 2: National Trends: Australian Colonies}

\textbf{New South Wales}

Interracial marriages and intimate relations between Chinese men and White women occurred across the Australian colonies in large enough numbers to indicate that a pragmatic approach was taken when it came to selection of partners and formation of families. Contemporary scholars including Morag Loh, Paulene Rule, Sophie Couchman, Paul Macgregor and Val Lovejoy in Victoria; Janis Wilton, Kate Bagnall, and Dinah Hales in New South Wales, and Jan Ryan in Western Australia provide insights into intercultural relations across a spectrum of relationships: marriage, defacto relationships, intimate relations and paid sexual services.

Having set the scene with White British female migration patterns and comparable global interracial White-Chinese marriage relations, this section provides national colonial comparisons

\textsuperscript{542} Manying Ip, “Maori–Chinese Encounters”, 237. Manying Ip interrogates the report of the Committee on Employment of Maoris on Market Gardens, 1929, which suggests that White women and Maori girls were suspected of trading sex for money in the late 1920s.

\textsuperscript{543} Bradshaw, \textit{Golden Prospects}, 213.

\textsuperscript{544} Bagnall, \textit{Golden Shadows on a White Land}, 140-141
between Queensland, Victoria and New South Wales, where the most research has been undertaken and is currently available. It is to be noted that comparisons with Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania, while important to gain a national approach to trends, can only be referred to as generalisations because to date, no in-depth statistical study has been undertaken in those colonies. It is thought that both Western Australia and Tasmania also experienced incidences of interracial marriage between Chinese men and White women despite smaller Chinese populations.545

Defining the number of relationships between White women and Chinese men in 19th century Australia is problematic. The issue was best summed up by Bagnell, 2006, when she observed that identifying interracial couples through marriage records alone was insufficient to capture all types of relationships. In particular de facto relationships, affairs, brief liaisons and intimate relations which involved monetary exchange, remain hidden and unaccounted for.546 Her case study period, 1850 -1888, was limiting in that it did not take in the later part of the 19th and early 20th centuries. Published data sets for this period have yet to be undertaken. With no other studies of its type for NSW or any other colony, Bagnall’s thesis remains the only firm statistical analysis available for comparison with the colony of Queensland and regional North Queensland. Victorian data, on the other hand, is available from the work by Rule whose second colonial intermarriage set of data can be used to compare and contrast with the data set obtained for Queensland. At this point I remind the reader that conclusive figures for Chinese-White marriages and unions across Australia may never be available and should be viewed as “best estimates” only, as it is impossible to find every marriage, relationship or liaison between White women and Chinese men across the colonies. However, I believe that, given the robust scrutiny Bagnall, Rule and I have applied to primary, secondary and oral sources, figures contained in this thesis are both conservative and correct within a 5% margin of accuracy.

From the late 1840s, Chinese indentured workers arrived direct from Amoy to Sydney, Melbourne and after 1848, to Moreton Bay (Brisbane), to work on pastoral stations. It was the first time they were exposed to relations with White women and those who married became the first Chinese men to marry and raise non-China born families.547 New South Wales recorded the first Australian Chinese–White marriage in 1823 with the marriage of John Shying to Sarah Thompson in

545 Chinese immigration to Western Australia was very small when compared to eastern colonies, and exact data on this area is not available for the purpose of statistical comparative analysis. For Chinese in Western Australia, see various articles by Jan Ryan.
546 Bagnall, Golden Shadows on a White Land, 91.
Sydney.⁵⁴⁸ New South Wales also experienced a modest upsurge of Chinese-White marriages brought on by the gold rushes, with 37 marriages recorded in the 1850s in both urban and rural Chinese communities.⁵⁴⁹ As the colony expanded with greater arrivals of new immigrants, 77 marriages were recorded for the ten year period to 1869. A decade later in 1878, marriages were estimated to have swelled to 352 couples. Of these relationships, Bagnall identifies 171 couples who were legally married while a further 181 were identified as living in de facto relationships.⁵⁵⁰ For the entire period between 1852 and 1888, Bagnall found that there were 397 registrations of marriage between Chinese men and White women which included marriages which occurred outside NSW but where the couple migrated to NSW. By 1901, Bagnall estimated that New South Wales had over 1000 Chinese family couples.

**Victoria**

Victoria, on the other hand, did not start to record interracial marriages until the mid-1850s. Like New South Wales, these marriages were triggered by migration consequent upon the discovery of gold and by 1866 Victorian Chinese marriages were occurring at a slow but steady rate with 50-60 families identified across Victoria by the end of 1868.⁵⁵¹ Mining towns such as Ballarat attracted larger populations of couples with 24 Chinese-White marriages recorded there alone in the same year.⁵⁵² Interracial marriages continued to increase over 1866-1882. Rule estimates that by the early 1880s the Chinese Family Landscape of Victoria had reached 258 marriages, which rose to 383 by 1888.⁵⁵³ (See Table 1. p.154) By 1901 the Chinese-White family landscape has been estimated by Rule as approximately 700 marriages including marriages of first generation Australian born Chinese children.⁵⁵⁴

When the three colonies of Victoria, New South Wales and Queensland are compared to each other, it could be said that in the early years of Chinese interracial marriages, the number climbed more quickly in Victoria than the other two colonies combined. For example, for the same period New South Wales recorded 37 marriages and Queensland only 12. During this period, it is also important to note that Queensland’s overall Chinese male population was well behind that of other

---

⁵⁴⁸Bagnall, Golden Shadows on a White Land, 30.
⁵⁴⁹Ibid., 92
⁵⁵⁰Ibid., 96-97
⁵⁵¹“Vital Statistics of Victoria, 1866”, *The Argus*, 14 September 1867, p. 6. Victorian statistician, William Archer, estimated that for the period 1855 -1860 the number of Chinese – White marriages was approximately 60 for the decade. This included the 1857 marriage of John Egge and Mary Perring. See also Morag Loh, “‘You’re my diamond, mum!’”, 7.
colonies as the mining boom which later came in the late 1860s and 1870s had not yet begun. The Chinese male population of Queensland in the first decade remained at 537 compared to 24,724 in Victoria and 13,020 for New South Wales.\textsuperscript{555}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLONY</th>
<th>Queensland</th>
<th>Victoria</th>
<th>New South Wales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White women</td>
<td>Chinese men</td>
<td>% Per male population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850-1859</td>
<td>537* Est 1860</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>8 children recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860-1869</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>60 wives estimated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870-1879</td>
<td>3,304</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>185 est</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880-1890</td>
<td>11,206</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>171 est</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8574</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>283 (1866-1889) est census</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Colonial Chinese-White Marriage Populations, 1850-1889 \textsuperscript{555}

\textsuperscript{555} Ronald Laidlaw, Discovering Australian History to 1900: an evidence-based approach (Edward Arnold (Australia) Pty Ltd, 1990): 318.

\textsuperscript{556} The figures are difficult to accurately understand as it is not always clear when they are just inclusive of China born immigrants or a composite including Australian-born children. The figures focus on Chinese born men and White Immigrant or Colonial women.

Over a forty-year period, 1850-1890, Queensland’s Chinese-White marriage population for primary couples reflected the population trends of both Victoria and New South Wales. However, overall when looking at all three colonies, Chinese-White marriages per colony for Australia indicate that New South Wales had the most relationships, at 35% followed closely by Victoria at 34% and Queensland at 31% for the period 1850-1890. With only a marginal difference between all three colonies, a maximum of 4%, all three recorded a little over 350 families within the forty-year period. It is fair to say that White women married to Chinese men formed a significant part of the cultural family landscape of Chinese communities. Across all three colonies for the period 1850-1890, the average percentage of Chinese men per population marrying White women in NSW, Victoria and Queensland was between 2 - 5%. New South Wales had the lowest percentage of the Chinese population at 2.8%, Queensland at 4% and Victoria had the highest, at 5% of the Chinese male population. This suggests three aspects of the Chinese Diaspora which still need to be reviewed.

Fig. 38. Colonial Chinese – White marriage in three colonies: 1850-1890

Firstly, as suggested by Bagnall, the incidence of interracial marriages between Chinese men and White women in 19th century colonial environments were more prevalent than previously thought. Secondly, firm statistical evidence indicates an active decision-making process was undertaken by White women in the selection of a Chinese husband at a time when marrying foreigners, particularly Asian foreigners, was unpopular. This challenges researchers to revisit settlement landscapes and family formation within the Australian colonial context to include marriages which
were not mainstream to understand reasons underpinning personal departures from societal norms. Thirdly, these figures challenge researchers to approach Chinese Diaspora studies through the lens of colonial family formation. This sheds light on colonial Chinese male decision making and their experiences in the selection of non-Chinese wives and partners, and raises the question of the influence of Chinese cultural traditions in decision making for the broader transnational family. This may lead to new interpretations of what it means to have and form “family” within the Chinese Diaspora. One persistent belief which should be investigated to provide a more accurate historical representation is the belief that Chinese men preferred Irish women.

Myths and marginalized: Irish women

It has been popularly believed that women who married Chinese men were of Irish origin. This erroneous opinion developed in the earliest days of Chinese -White marriages for two reasons. Firstly, prejudice against both the Irish and Chinese took up precedents from the Californian goldfields and the Irish immigration experience in the United States. Reports came from parts of America with Chinese populations, which condemned and belittled Irish women for marrying Chinese men. Secondly, prejudice in Australia against Irish Catholics, and Irish Catholic women in particular, has resonated since convict settlement and before. Forced to submit to British rule, Irish Catholics frequently rebelled, and tensions with British Protestants fueled sectarian violence which was continued by subsequent generations of colonial born children.

If colonial born women of Irish parents couldn’t escape their heritage, there was no hope for Irish immigrant women. Not only were they female (the weaker sex), they were Irish (anti-British troublemakers) and Catholic (automatically suspect as owing allegiance to a foreign potentate, the Pope). Commentary about Irish women married to Chinese men was routinely negative, and derogatory. From the 1850s onwards, colonial newspapers reported on White wives and interracial marriage as a local curiosity as well as repeating similar articles from abroad. The *Illustrated Sydney News* of 1888, in its advocacy of restrictions on Chinese immigration, canvassed the view of Chinese family life from a White wife’s point of view. However, even before the subject’s viewpoint was mentioned, she was described as “a woman of the lower classes” with the editor’s point reinforced by making her declare “I’m an Irish Girl”. It seemed Irish women were “at fault” for their choice of husband rather than making

---

557 “John Chinaman Marrying White Woman”, *Warwick Examiner and Times*, 18 February 1893, p. 5.
558 Manning Clark, abridged by Michael Cathcart, *Manning Clark’s History of Australia*, (Melbourne University Press, 1993): 9, 26. Irish convicts were labeled “the very worst of characters” under early colonial rule.
559 *Warwick Examiner and Times*, 18 February 1893, p. 5
560 *Illustrated Sydney News*, 26 April 1888, pp. 5-7.
an active choice for a better partner. This view is captured by Rule when she noted the prevailing belief, “it was only Irish women who were sufficiently low enough on the social scale to be prepared to marry marginalized Chinese men”.  

Both Bagnall and Rule argue that during the early part of the gold rushes, during the 1850s and 1860s, many women who formed relationships with Chinese men across New South Wales and Victoria were of Irish background, having arrived direct from Ireland as part of early government incentive schemes in the late 1840s. Bagnall clarifies her argument by noting that Chinese-Celtic unions were limited to the period of the 1850s and 1860s, after which new marriage trends begin to emerge. As New South Wales’ northern districts opened up and pastoral and mining men moved north, so too did the negative attitudes towards women, race and religion. It seems that Chinese-Celtic relationships aroused the three prejudices at the one time, and left a lasting impression on White women married to Chinese men thereafter. However, despite the belief that Irish women were the only ones partnering with Chinese men, there remains no evidence to substantiate the claim. This myth has been unpacked through analysis of statistics contained in colonial Vital Statistics and census records for all three colonies.

Statistics from 1866 indicate that Chinese men married into a cross section of the community, of which Irish immigrant women were only a part. The Vital Statistics of Victoria in 1866 registered 12 interracial marriages, including 4 which had English born wives, 3 Irish, 3 colonial born and 2 from Scotland. The small number of Irish born women marrying Chinese men was confirmed in 1888 in Victoria by statistician A.E. McDermott in a letter reprinted in the South Australian Weekly Chronicle, when he outlined that out of a possible 340 White wives of Chinese men for the years 1866 – 1888 across Victoria, only 25 women or just over 10% were Irish born. The largest groups of women, he argued, came from Colonial born and English born backgrounds. Rule notes when looking at the period 1866 – 1882 that of the 258 marriages where the grooms were Chinese, the majority of White wives were identified as colonial born. This left only 75 women or less than one third of the wives of Chinese men with a birth country from the British Isles or other European places. This trend is picked up by Dinah Hales in her study of families in central New South Wales. She corroborates Rule’s observation when she notes
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561 Rule, ‘Women and marriage”, 52.  
562 Ibid. 50; and Bagnall, Golden Shadows on a White Land, 112-114.  
563 Bagnall, Golden Shadows on a White Land, 112.  
566 Rule, “Women and marriage”, 52.
that New South Wales wives were taken from a domestic pool of potential female partners rather than from recent migrant arrivals.\textsuperscript{567}

Queensland always recorded a high percentage of non-Irish born women marrying Chinese men. The Queensland trend was highlighted in the 1871 Census Report which remarked on birth places,

...the next largest number are Chinese 3,305 or 2.75 percent but among whom was only one woman. It must be borne in mind, however that in not a few cases Chinamen were married to European wives, it is popularly supposed as Irish, but in reality, the English predominate.\textsuperscript{568}

The propensity for immigrant English women to partner with a Chinese man occurred more readily in Queensland and could be attributed to a number of factors. Queensland’s departure from trends in New South Wales and Victoria could be explained by the fact that it did not have a substantial post-convict, colonial born female population. Queensland with its active direct assisted immigration scheme targeted single women from the British Isles but principally from England, in contrast to Victoria and New South Wales which focused on Ireland. When English women arrived directly from England to Queensland, especially north Queensland, they entered communities which had large Chinese cultural precincts as a result of mining, commercial or large-scale agricultural industries which kept a stable population. In particular, with north Queensland dependent on Chinese economic interests, the White community developed a more relaxed attitude to relationships with Chinese which may have extended to marriage patterns. The absence of any great number of colonial born women combined with direct immigration of single White females, along with greater acceptance of Chinese men as husbands, separated Queensland’s interracial marriage trends from those of Victoria and New South Wales.

\textsuperscript{567} Dinah Hales, “Lost Histories”, 110.
Table 2: Birth Place of White Women married to Chinese men: 1860-1892

---

Colonial Comparison taken from Colonial Vital Statistics Various Years 1861-1891.

---

569 Colonial Comparison taken from Colonial Vital Statistics Various Years 1861-1891.
Queensland Trends:
Queensland (All)

Across Queensland, in the port towns, the western pastoral communities, and north into the mining and tropical agricultural districts, Chinese men settled, partnered and raised families with White women from the mid-19th century and early 20th century. With nearly a thousand Anglo-Chinese primary marriages and unions identified across Queensland and with a third of those in north Queensland, the Chinese-White family provided an integral function within the Chinese community through the introduction of children and subsequent succession marriages through sons and daughters in what otherwise was a male dominated immigrant society. Within a seventy-year period, 1847-1920, no fewer than 918 Caucasian women married, lived with or had other intimate relations with Chinese men across Queensland. This figure consists of 504 legal marriages under The Marriage Act 1864 and 411 unions where the legal status remains unverified. These couples, some with families, lived in rural environments, on the fringes of towns at market garden areas, in Chinese cultural precincts, and within larger Chinatowns.570

Despite efforts to identify exactly where couples were living, the locations of 359 White women, or 39% of Anglo-Chinese couples across Queensland, have yet to be found. Their existence is captured from entries in the Colonial Births Register or Deaths Register, as an entry for the birth of a child marked “illegitimate” or where a birth is recorded but there is no corresponding marriage registration in the Marriage Register; no death entry for a White woman because she had taken on her lover’s last name; and no additional information had come to light in secondary sources to identify where she was living. This rather large number skews the statistics for analysis according to geographical region. It is anticipated that as the 359 women are studied more carefully, and as more information comes to light, not only will the percentages for districts change, but that the majority of these couples will be found to reflect trends already outlined in this study, including the expectation that there will be a higher percentage located in north Queensland based on the known data. However, to investigate all of the 359 couples, a task which requires verification of data to pinpoint exact domiciliary location, remains a huge undertaking and remains outside the scope of this thesis. The number of Chinese-White couples identified already in this thesis where whereabouts are known, all 559 couples, is sufficiently robust to allow reasonably accurate statistical patterns to be extrapolated.

570 Robb Database: Marriages and Unions, 1848-1920.
Findings arising out of known data confirm that the Chinese-White marriage patterns in Queensland mirrored the settlement patterns of the Chinese population generally. Across Queensland over one third of identified Chinese-White couples or 37% of White women who were married or lived with a Chinese man were identified as having lived in north Queensland. Other parts of the colony include 23% of Anglo-Chinese relationships in the inner city and metropolitan districts including Fortitude Valley, Nine Holes (Albert Street) and the Enoggera district of Brisbane; 22% in the Central District; and 18%, including some of the earliest mixed heritage couples, on the Darling Downs and across the Southern Districts including the port towns of Gympie and Maryborough. North Queensland’s Anglo-Chinese family landscape comprised 208 couples raising families compared to 129 couples in Brisbane, 122 couples in Central region and 100 couples identified across Southern Region.

Of the 504 Chinese-White official marriages under The Marriage Act 1864, 151 families or 26% were identified as married and living across north Queensland; 88 families or 15% lived in or around Brisbane; 60 families or 10% lived across the Central Districts and 48 families or 8% lived in the Southern Districts, including the Darling Downs. Removing the 41% of unknown couples from the data, it is clear that nearly half of all couples, 44%, who were legally married under The Marriage Act 1864, were living in towns and settlements across north Queensland. The high
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571 *The Brisbane Courier*, 10 September 1891, p. 3. Reference to “Nine Holes” can be found in numerous newspaper reports associated with prostitution. This includes articles about Ellen Hayes who was arrested for liaising with a Chinaman in an outhouse. She was “just visiting” Nine Holes. See also Raymond Evans, “Anti-Chinese Riot: Lower Albert Street” from Raymond Evans and Carole Ferier with Jeff Rickert (eds.) *Radical Brisbane: An Unruly history*, (Vulgar Press, Carlton North (Vic), 2004), http://www.multiculturalaustralia.edu.au/doc/evans_anti-chinese_riot.pdf

572 Location of 237 couples remains unknown at this stage.
number of legal marriages undertaken does not reflect the stereotype that women were of low moral repute if they partnered with a Chinese man, nor does it reflect rash decision making.

A similar pattern is repeated in the data for the 411 couples or families identified as informal “unions”. A resounding majority, 104 couples and families, were living across the Northern Region when compared to 66 couples identified in the Central Region; 55 couples in the Southern Region; and 49 couples located in Brisbane. Additional to these figures are 137 couples who were identified from a variety of sources but whose place of residence remains unknown. With the 32 % of unknown couples removed from the data, north Queensland again dominates the figures with 38 % of all known couples residing in Queensland.

The difference between informal union figures compared to marriages is that in Central and Southern Regions, the pastoral, agricultural and mining districts have a larger percentage of White women living with Chinese men than the metropolitan areas of Brisbane. However, with percentages of 24%, 20% and 18% respectively, there is only a small 6% margin between all three, with the low rate of women living in a de-facto or casual union with Chinese men in Brisbane a reflection more of the problems associated with registering marriages in rural and remote Queensland districts rather than any greater propensity for marriage by women living in Brisbane. In other words, data presented for Brisbane, as a key metropolitan city district, may be more reliable as a demonstration of the ratio between marriages and liaisons due to a greater likelihood of marriage registrations reaching authorities than from other parts of the colony. Should this be the case, and using Brisbane as a model, then it could be hypothesized that two thirds of the Chinese–White family landscape were legally married under The Marriage Act 1864 compared to one third of all couples living in de facto or engaged in casual relationships throughout Queensland. This hypothesis remains yet to be proven and can only be correctly assessed when all known locations of couples are identified.
When reviewing relationship status on a decade per decade basis across all four districts of the colony, it can be seen that the majority of marriages and unions occurred between 1870 and 1900 with a particular increase in north Queensland from the 1880s (see inset above). The rise in unions in the decade 1900-1909 is noted as significant on the graph above, but should be regarded as a guide only as it is a constructed figure arising from the need to enter data at a nominal point in time, for relationships where exact data was unavailable, which in this case was 1900. The period 1870-1900 which registered the highest number of marriages and unions across the colony correlates two aspects of settlement history. Not only does the increase in number of marriages mirror the expansion of settlement and industry growth across north Queensland after 1860, but the steady increase in marriages and unions mirrors colonial supported migration schemes of single young White females. These spikes also correlate to the periods previously mentioned at the beginning of the chapter, which described emigration figures out of the British Isles for the same period.

In the minds of the colonial administration, Queensland in the mid-19th century was a homo-social male society which required White women to produce a permanent population and undertake jobs in the domestic sphere so that men could be freed up to explore, develop and exploit the landscape. White, single, work ready, women direct from England were considered essential to stem the threat of White men partnering with women from other races, especially Indigenous women, or
worse, between themselves. As a result colonial authority were anxious that ships carrying marriage-eligible women should arrive quickly. Upon arrival, young women were met at the wharf by men who made offers of work, marriage or both. A woman’s financial ability to immigrate depended on assisted passage schemes either funded by the government or though remittance schemes sponsored by families and friends already residing in the colony.

Queensland’s colonial settlers were encouraged to support the expansion of the colony through family unification by depositing money into an assisted immigration fund to offset the cost of passage. Many women were supported in their passage this way, to be met on arrival by family members who had migrated earlier. However, many single immigrant women also travelled alone or with a female friend, and arrived in the colony without the support of their families, instead relying on their skills to secure employment as a means to support themselves.

Part 3: Chinese-White Family Landscape:
General patterns

Queensland and north Queensland’s Chinese-White Family Landscape cannot be characterized by one type of relationship, one type of woman, or one family experience. Decisions made by White women when partnering with Chinese men were shaped by two key influences: the causal environment which surrounded a moment in time and a woman’s response to it, contrasted with the emotional response when making decisions for survival. The first aspect, governed by demographic and environmental influences, included the place of birth, age, family trends, and societal values. Demographic circumstances, how migration was financed, age at migration and family situation upon arrival, all contributed to what happened next. Analysis of this initial information provides some insight into aspects of White female marriage patterns. In particular, the act of migration itself changed young women’s interactions with colonial society due to the absence of natal influences.

---


574 Pers comm: Ping family, Gayndah, 2003. This was the case for sisters Ellen and Jane Craig of Scotland, who were sponsored by their half-sister Jemima Wood and her Chinese husband Thomas Ashney in 1860.

575 Shang, “Hing Family Records”; Joanna Olsen and Keith Shang, With his gold in a little velvet bag (Joanna Olsen, 2013): 61. This is the case for Christina Wilkie, who, at age 17 after three months’ voyage from Plymouth, England in June 1872, secured employment as a domestic servant with John Marshall and his wife. However, unlike other White women who remained in their employment and eventually moved on and married into colonial White society, Christina met Moe Ung (romanised to George Hing) and within six weeks of her arrival in Maryborough had left her employment to marry Hing. They married on 27 October 1872 just six weeks and 4 days after Christina’s arrival. George and Christina moved north to Charters Towers where they raised a large family. She had secured employment with Marshall for 6 months as a housemaid at £20 per annum.
It could be argued that separation from the family home enabled the individual to make decisions independently, without prejudice and without the need for permission. The absence of a mother to seek advice about suitability of potential partners, lessened the likelihood of opposition to interracial marriage, and highlighted the role of female networking in the colony.

On arrival to the colony, single White migrant women turned to short term female friendships to fill the void of confidants and act as sounding boards for important decisions. As friendships developed and women began to marry, they introduced other single women to prospective eligible men. At the time this was an acceptable introduction method between the sexes and actively pursued in all communities. It was therefore not unusual for White wives of Chinese to introduce other White women to Chinese men for the purpose of marriage. Already married to Chinese men, these women were supportive to those who sought an alternative matrimonial partner.

It is not surprising that the majority of White women who married Chinese men in north Queensland came from an overseas background and arrived without family connections. Evidence can be found in many marriage certificates where female witnesses were non-related women within the Chinese community, themselves married to Chinese men. This supports the idea that non-related women played an important role in supporting young females when the decision was being made to marry Chinese men.576 For others, the presence of extended family members already in the colony, including female siblings or relations, strengthened the development of an immediate family and female support network. Having a member of the family already married to a Chinese man in the colony meant that single migrant women were introduced to the Chinese community more quickly which led to some being more likely to marry within it. Over a forty-year period, at least eight pairs of sisters married Chinese men including three sisters from the one family.577 Conversely it is suspected that Chinese brothers or

576 QBDM-MR-MF, 1884, 1884/000333, AH HOIN/ AH HONG to LOTHIAN, Jane 21 March1884; QBDM-MR-MF 1884, 1884/000348, AH CHOW to CHURCHER, Annie 10 May1884; QBDM-MR-MF 1883, 1883/000310, AH YOU, James to SOMMERVILLE Agnes 09.10. 1883. The interconnectedness of White women’s networking and influence in matrimonial affairs can be seen in the marriage of Jane Lothian from Scotland to Ah Hon from China in Cairns, 1884. She was married in the house of Ah Chow, and Ah Chow’s White wife Annie (nee Churcher) acted as witness signatory to the marriage along with another Chinese man, Ah You. James Ah You himself was already married to a White wife, Catherine Sommerville, and they all lived in the Cairns Chinatown community.

577 QBDM-MR-MF 1860, 1860/000060, CHAY, John to CRAIG, Jane, 12 September1860; Pers Comm. Heather and Stanley Ping, Gayndah, 2003, Identification of family John Deian to Ellen Craig, 23 August1860, Gayndah. Three sisters married Chinese men. Ellen was sister to Jane Craig and half sister to Jemima Wood, who married Thomas Ashney. Assisted migrant sisters Ellen and Jane Craig were sponsored by their half sister Jemima Wood of Gayndah, arrived from Scotland in the early 1860s. Both were below the age of consent and required permission from their adult sister. They married John Deian and John Chay, men who most likely had kinship relationships with Jemima’s husband Ashney, within months of the girls’ arrival and the three sisters all lived near each other in Gayndah. They supported each other to raise families, and two sisters raised the third sister’s children after her death from childbirth.
kinsmen may have introduced future White wives to each other, but the incidence of this arrangement has been more difficult to verify.

Sisters living with their Chinese husbands in the same community provided emotional support to each other in an environment which was culturally foreign, environmentally harsh and isolated from the broader community. At times of birth, sickness or even death, sisters were guaranteed help and support in family matters and could enjoy the familiar social intimacy which siblings bring with them. The likelihood of this arrangement occurring was more evident in rural and remote areas where eligible marriage partners were scarce.

Marriage figures indicate that there was a small preference by White women across Queensland, including north Queensland, to remarry back into the Chinese community after the death, separation or abandonment by the first Chinese husband. Re-marriage by women in the 19th century was a common practice for many women, who in the face of limited employment and low wages were dependant on men for economic security. In this study at least 13 White women were identified as re-marrying after the death of their Chinese husbands. Of those, 9 married a second Chinese man while 4 married back into the White community. This small sample demonstrates that White women were making active choices on the quality of men when re-partnering, suggesting that race or ethnicity was secondary to security and economic factors.

In other cases, White women sometimes engaged in extra marital affairs, taking in Chinese lovers, while married to White men, or abandoned their White husbands in favour of living with their Chinese lovers. Women who took this direction were sometimes sentenced to gaol,

---

578 See marriages: QBDM-MR-MF1886, 1886/000876, AH SOU/AH SUE, James to HARSTOFF, Alice Maria, 14 August 1886; QBDM-MR-MF1888, 1888/000178, HARSTOFF, Louis John Frederick to AH SUE, Ellen, 19 July 1888. This pattern continued with the first generation Australian Born Chinese with at least one pair of siblings marrying another pair of siblings. For example, one brother and sister from one family on the Etheridge goldfield married an Australian Born Chinese brother and sister in 1886.

579 Robb Database: Marriages and Unions, 1848-1920 and Pers. Comm. Ray Poon, Email 2002. For example: Jane Gilligan of Warwick married Lau Tien in 1860. He died two years later in 1863. Jane Tien then met and married another Chinese man, Fu Qi, in Stanthorpe and they went on raise twelve children. Further north, Annie Beechley had a daughter with James Wing in Townsville in 1885. He died a couple of years later and she then met Pang Muen Young and they moved to Cairns where they lived. They had another child not long after. They lived together for a number of years and eventually got married in a private ceremony in 1899.

580 QBDM-MR-MF 1878 , 1878/000927, CRAVINO, Emile to YAN, Eliza Alice, 3 September 1878; QBDM-BR-MF 1872, 72/00395 Charles Frederick YAN, 17 October 1872, to YAN, Eliza Jane. This is the case for Eliza Alice who had a son to her first partner, Yan, in 1872 but later on married Emille Cravino in 1878.

581 Interview Carl Richardson, Mareeba, 8 August 2002. Born on the Palmer, Mary married her first husband Hooley when she was very young. He was killed in an accident by 1886 when she was just 17. She remarried William Leswell and they moved to another mining community at Thornborough, but when their daughter was born it was obvious the child was not his and had a Chinese father instead. Two more children were born the following two years: first a White child and then another child whose father was Chinese. Leswell abandoned the family and Mary Hannah went on to marry a third husband, Harry Finn.

582 The Northern Miner, 1 October 1900, p. 2. Mrs Collins was living apart from her husband, with William Ah Mook in a humpy on Alexander Creek, Millchester. Her husband was jealous and believed she was having “intimate relations” with William Ah Mook. Things were so bad between them that she had previously sought protection from the police. Mrs Collins was injured and Mr Collins then shot himself dead.
accused of being of ill repute, despite there being no evidence of unlawful behaviour. Women were also charged under *The Vagrancy Act* when they had separated from their lawful husbands and did not have appear any visible means of support. Under these circumstances White women with mixed heritage children were often locked up and their children sent to the orphanage.

However, many White women lived with Chinese men for companionship and protection, with some women living with more than one Chinese man in their lifetime, in preference to living with a White husband.

The stereotype of White women married or living with a Chinese man being of a low moral class cannot be substantiated. However, there is overwhelming evidence of long term marriages and partnering, large and successful families, strong Christian affiliation and accounts of assistance rendered to women within the Chinese community. Yet some White women were of questionable repute with numerous convictions in the newspapers for acts of slander, assault, larceny, prostitution or public drunkenness. There were White women married to Chinese husbands who had affairs with other Chinese men, fought with other White wives of Chinese men, and made public nuisances of themselves. Not all White women had the interests of others at heart especially other White women in the period of settling when social, environmental and economic conditions remained difficult, leading some to engage in behaviour outside society norms.

White women without the benefit of a trusted family member may have been more susceptible to influences from other females who, through unscrupulous motives or coercive manipulation, contributed to poor marriage choices in the face of future uncertainty. For example, some women acted as matchmakers for Chinese men and introduced newly arrived migrant women to

---

583 *The Northern Miner*, 29 January 1891, p. 3. This is the case for Margaret Cummings in 1891, who was charged for being in a disorderly house and complaints made against her. She had separated from her husband and was living with Tommy AH BOW in Townsville. She was sentenced to three months hard labour in the Townsville gaol; see also QSA: JUS/96/ Police Court, rape case involving an alleged “prostitute”, Eliza Jane Ferris, who lived with Ah Sue, Aberdeen Creek Charters Towers, and witness details of Mary Ellen Moffatt in Ferris case, who lived with Ah Sam.

584 *The Western Champion and General Advertiser for the Central Western districts*, 4 February 1896, p. 12. Sarah Ann Haywood was charged under the *Vagrancy Act* as having no means to support herself and living off men. The police said the accused had a bad character and had been kept by a Chinaman for the past 6 months. Men had been seen coming and going from her house. She had been married for 15 years and her husband supported her, but she did not live with him. She had been living with a Chinese man for 14 months and had left him 3 months prior. She had a child by that man. Reputed as a habitual drunkard, she was sentenced to 6 months gaol in Rockhampton and her daughter was ordered to the Orphanage at Rockhampton for three years.

585 Tony Mathews, *Mayhem and Murder in Pioneering Queensland: True stories of Real Crimes and Mysteries* (Central Queensland University Press, 2000): 79-86. In 1886 Tim Tie, husband of “Kate”, shot Jimmy Ah Fook in Dulbydilla, Southern Region. Wife Kate was regarded to be a woman of loose morals which incensed Tim Tie, who thought that his fellow Chinese settler Ah Fook was having an affair with her. Tim Tie was charged with murder in the Roma Court in March 1886, and later hanged.


587 QBDM-MR-MF1896, 1896/001306, AH YOUNG/ AH YUN to COLING / COOLING, Mary Ann, 23 May1896; QPG: 1902:220 Mrs Ah Young, Roma; *Western Star and Roma Advertiser*, 23 March 1898, p. 2. Mrs Ah Young was named in a newspaper report for swimming with a Chinese man other than her husband in the drinking water reservoir of Roma.
Chinese men in the community while subtly applying pressure on new-comers to get married.588 The deliberate introduction of women to Chinese men with a view of marriage or intimate relations (by him) as the outcome, was a form of procurement and crossed several social boundaries of acceptability, particularly if it involved underage girls. At least three occasions were revealed where White women procured girls for the purpose of offering them as brides to older Chinese men. While not significant in numerical terms over the whole number of Chinese-White relationships recorded, the fact that that it occurred and the age of the young women suggests that some White women were complicit in obtaining children for sexual services.

Despite hysteria surrounding Chinese men’s intentions with White girls, there were few actual newspaper reports outlining incidences of “corruption” in Queensland. When reports of genuine incidents were published, White women were portrayed as having played an important role in the procurement, grooming or introduction of young girls and women for the purpose of marriage to Chinese men. This suggests that some White women may have had an expectation of a paid transaction for the service, either in the form of a financial recompense, goods or provisions, or somehow indebted the Chinese man with a favour to be repaid at a later date. While no instance of this sort of behaviour was observed in north Queensland, it occurred in Central and Brisbane Regions in large urban Chinese environments. All three instances occurred in private homes and two cases involved girls as young and 12 and 13 years of age.589 While there is some evidence to suggest White women were involved with the marriage or procurement of underage girls in Queensland it remains unclear to what extent it occurred. Similarly, while there is anecdotal evidence to suggest that some families sold their daughters to Chinese men for marriage, this remains anecdotal with no clearer evidence found.590

588The Darling Downs Gazette and General Advertiser, 16 March 1860, p. 5. This is the case for Mary who entered into a hastily arranged marriage when she visited her sister-in-law near Drayton. At the time she was unaware that her sister-in-law was acting as a matchmaker for a Chinese man, Josh, who had sought assistance to find a White wife. Under pressure, Mary married him in her sister-in-law’s house but later regretted the decision. Having not consummated the marriage Mary ran away, taking the clothes her husband gave her as a trousseau and which she intended to sell. In her defense when charged with larceny, she stated the sale of clothes was to pay her husband off for the clergy fees. That he had paid a clergymen to marry the couple implicated the priest in the deception. Unable to morally clear herself in the eyes of her God, other than to abstain from consummating the marriage, Mary resorted to running away.

589North Australian, 3 October 1863, p. 3; Brisbane Courier, 20 October 1893, p.3. The first case occurred in Rockhampton in September 1863. Young Mary Ann Gray was married to Samuel Sue in a ceremony in the private home of Mr Hawthorne. The witnesses included Chinese Stephen Uzah and his White wife Harriet Hiscock, who had been married a year beforehand. At the time the girl was just 13 years and 6 months old but her age had been bumped up to the legal age of consent, 21 years. In the second case, in 1893 Chinese-White couple Mr. and Mrs Ah Tow of Brisbane were charged with procuring a young White girl for a Chinese man. Elizabeth Watts, age 12 years, had been offered a “position” up country along with her young sister. Mrs. Tow was the person responsible for the offer and was making arrangements at the time of her arrest.

590Roma Family History Society, un-paginated papers 2002. It is reported through family history that Mary Ann Cooling was "sold to a Chinese gardener" for marriage. When Mary Ann was 17 years old she married a Chinese man Ah Young who was 36 years old. At the time she would have needed parental consent for marriage.
Across the border in New South Wales, Bagnall notes that there is also evidence there of some White couples selling their daughters to Chinese men with a view that the girl later will become his “wife”. This suggests that the practice, although not widespread, was not limited to Queensland. The cultural practice of purchasing a child bride, with a view of marrying her when she was of age, *San Po Tsai*, was an acceptable cultural practice in China. Bagnall argues that in New South Wales there is some evidence of the circumstance where a bride price was paid to the family in a form of dowry, albeit in rare cases. A cultural proclivity to *San Po Tsai* and its application to young White girls in a host country community could indicate that the economics of a marriage was important to some White families when providing consent to Chinese marriage partners, making the practice acceptable to them. In families where poverty was prevalent, the offer of a bride price or financial dowry may have been an important motivator to overcome racial prejudice against Chinese men as marriage partners. This theory remains untested in Queensland and requires further investigation which remains outside the scope of this thesis.

**Conclusion:**

White women migrated away from England and Ireland during the mid to late 19th century in the hope of finding a better situation for themselves in countries and colonies such as the United States, British Columbia, South America and Australasia. Migration was encouraged by colonial sponsored migrant assistance schemes as well as by reports of an elevated labour market for women. Upon arrival, women were faced with rudimentary, harsh and male dominated colonial communities, which encouraged alternative decision making when it came to the selection of a husband. It seems White women made active choices based on the quality of a man rather than his race, leading to a number of women partnering with Chinese men.

Interracial marriage between Chinese men and White women developed as an unexpected consequence to female migration. This led to countries such as the United States and colonies such as New Zealand to put in place legislation to prevent interracial marriage and miscegenation. In contrast, the colonies of Australia applied a fairer legal framework for marriages and unions to occur, which resulted in an average of 379 marriages for the three colonies of Victoria, New South Wales and Queensland combined. This suggests that the number of marriages and unions between Chinese men and White women across the colonies of

---

593 In the case of the British colony of South Africa, no information could be found regarding interracial marriage between Chinese men and White women. It is acknowledged that South Africa has descendants of early settlers but does not reveal what the primary race of mothers was.
Australia is higher than previously thought. This makes the colonies of Australia unique in their numerical incidence of interracial marriage at a transnational level when global marriages rates are compared, which should excite researchers to look at more closely to Diaspora trends from an evolving family perspective to pave way for new understandings to emerge.\textsuperscript{594}

Analysis of interracial marriages between White women and Chinese men throughout Queensland clearly demonstrates that the most marriages and unions occurred across north Queensland with peak periods for marriage and family formation occurring 1870 – 1910. This correlates with the peak emigration period of women from England and supports the evidence that women married to Chinese men in the colony were migrant women direct from the British Isles rather than colonial born. This is in contrast to both Victoria and New South Wales which record not only a higher percentage of colonial born wives but also women of Irish heritage.

The Chinese – White Family Landscape across Queensland suggests that sisters and family were important in not only assisting migration for family members to the colony, but also provided an initial introduction to Chinese men within the community and family thereafter. The large quantity of interracial marriages and relationships by White women with Chinese men across Queensland, supported by long term relationships, large families, and re-marriage with other Chinese men, suggests that women were not unhappy with their selection of partner, but were making informed decisions for themselves at a time when marrying foreigners, particularly Asian foreigners, was unpopular. While some women married to Chinese men were unscrupulous in behavior, unruly, uncouth, drunkards, and sold sexual services, there is no evidence to suggest that they were more or less prone to anti-social behavior than women who had married White men.

What is evident is that the economics of marriage, cycle of poverty and an anti-Chinese colonial environment, all played a role in determining the outcome of a life for White women who married and partnered with Chinese men. Having stepped outside the acceptable boundaries associated with marriage at a time of Empire building, that is to marry a White man, White women in interracial marriages and relationships found themselves susceptible to finger-pointing, denigration and ostracization from the wider community, leading some to engage in negative behavior, casting themselves as low class and of ill repute. On the other hand, Chinese tended to be less judgmental than White men and may have been more likely to shelter homeless

\textsuperscript{594} The lack of statistical data makes specific analysis of global trends difficult and it remains an area which would benefit from future enquiry.
White women. Chinese cultural understanding of perfectly acceptable practices such as *San Po Tsai* or marriage transaction may have been present, but misunderstood by the dominant Western culture. Instead, it may have been viewed as predatory behavior. This sheds light on the complexities of gender and cultural differences towards experiences regarding the selection of White women as wives. This may lead to new interpretations of marriage relations and practices as Overseas Chinese negotiated marriage in a host country.
“NUMBER FOUR WIFE CATCHEM BOY…”: CHINESE FEMALE DIASPORA

Introduction:
Chinese women, who migrated between 1860 and 1920 to north Queensland, did so within a framework formed by thousands of years of gendered cultural and political tradition. Their journey positioned them at the vanguard of change at home and abroad, and led to the beginnings of a truly transnational family experience, as Chinese children were born in Queensland. Chinese female migration across the globe reflected broader Diaspora trends, with the majority of women migrating to the U.S., Hawaii and the colonies of Australia. Their migration was in response to global economic trends, largely in mining and agriculture, with the colony of Queensland featuring prominently alongside California, South America and the British West Indies. Queensland emerges as one of the three most populous Chinese colonies in Australia, along with Victoria and New South Wales, and consequently one of the most important in attracting Chinese female migration. Statistical analysis of Chinese women who arrived in the colony of Queensland indicates that new arrivals were mainly in north Queensland, with a small number in the Central, Southern and Brisbane Regions. All women experienced similar circumstances and were unified by their youth, circumstances and place within the expanding transnational family. Through shared experiences, they contributed to a contemporary understanding of traditional family values and maintenance of female culture within the north Queensland community, framing what has come to be regarded as the China born Chinese Family Landscape.

This chapter will commence by providing a brief outline of the gendered cultural constraints characteristic of the filial family structure which underpinned the Chinese Female Diaspora experience in the 19th and early 20th centuries. Analysis of the statistics is guided by the framework of the filial family and the strategies which were employed to maintain compliance to traditional cultural values. Global and national trends for the Chinese Female Diaspora will be compared to those for the colony of Queensland. This information will be then compared specifically to settlement and marriage patterns across north Queensland to reveal a more rounded interpretation of the China-Born Chinese Family Landscape.
Part 1: The Filial Family

The colonial Chinese female Diaspora of the 19th and early 20th centuries saw women sent as wives, servants or chattels, to Chinese men around the globe in an effort by families to provide comfort to men, increase family wealth through birth of colonial born children, and secure future funds through intergenerational tenure in overseas destinations. Their migration was underpinned by centuries of traditional Chinese societal rules set out through Confucius’s teachings, which governed social conduct between men and women. Confucianism positioned man as the positive Yang force (bright, strong, and dominant) while the woman was the negative Yin force (dark, weak and passive). Men were superior to women, as heaven is to earth, so woman could never elevate herself enough to bring glory and prosperity to the family, other than through her role as the producer of sons. Her function was to marry, procreate, and benefit the position of her husband’s clan and lineage, thus increasing the wealth, power and prestige of his ancestors. This system favoured the wealthy, was socially hierarchical and included wife buying. It was as natural for men to maintain their dominant role, as it was natural for women to submit.

From birth, Chinese girls were considered of little value to the family and destined to leave the natal family home. For that reason, and until that point, she was regarded a drain on the family resources. It could be surmised that Chinese marriage was not about love, but was a union between two clans entered as a contractual arrangement to support the lineage system. “Matchmakers” were engaged to consider compatibilities and arrange good matches. Upon marriage, a Chinese bride served her husband and his mother. It was essential to please the mother-in-law as the women’s relationship was critical to family harmony. In many cases the relationship was fractious and it was not uncommon for abuses of daughters-in-law to occur. Producing male heirs was the key to respect within the family structure as it perpetuated the ancestor lineage. As external global opportunities to gain wealth presented themselves, the Chinese family system was

595 Julie Kristeva, About Chinese Women. (Marion Boyars Pty Ltd, Great Britain, 1977): 71
596 ibid. 67. In China, the groom to be, or his family, gave money or goods to the wife’s family as a dowry to “purchase” a wife. Rubie S. Watson, “Girls’ Houses and Working Women: Expressive Culture in the Pearl River Delta, 1900-41”, in Maria Jaschok and Suzanne Miers (eds), Women and Chinese Patriarchy: Submission, Servitude and Escape, (Hong Kong University Press, Hong Kong. 1994):30
597 The ideal woman was one who followed the three observances known as the Three Obediences and Four Virtues. This meant she owed it to her father, her husband, and her son to be submissive, industrious and domestic.
598 V.R Burkhardt, Chinese Creeds and Customs (South China Morning Post, 1972): 72.
600 Imperial law offered little protection for young wives and the official penalty for disobedience to a mother-in-law was death by strangulation.
601 Within the Confucian system a Chinese woman could achieve status in three ways: she could be the mother in law, she could be “First” wife (‘first mother’), or she could produce sons. As grandmother/ mother in law, she was the matriarch of the family; as First wife she was the potential bearer of sons, but if a young wife was unable to produce a son, a second wife might be taken, sometimes picked by the first wife and leading to wealthy families conducting polygamy with a Chinese man having up to three or four wives and a concubine to support. If not wealthy, she could arrange for the adoption of a boy.
re-organised so that the duty of men was to earn their living abroad and send home remittances to further advance the family wealth. A woman’s role within this changing environment was to help her husband achieve this objective, whatever her place in the family.

The departure of a husband and creation of the transnational marriage meant that the moral duty of a wife could only be to remain in China so she could keep order in a family system based on filial piety and ancestor worship. As Manying Ip noted in *Home Away From Home: Life Stories of Chinese Women in New Zealand*, “In traditional literature, to respect and serve your parents-in-law, was the first commandment of model womanhood”. This was even above obeying and serving a husband. Joining a husband overseas became secondary to the obedience required for staying home, caring for the family and keeping his affairs in order. Moreover, as Elizabeth Sinn observes, relocation of the primary wife to another country put the whole cultural relationship between the living, the dead, and future offspring at risk. This was a risk that many families were unwilling to take, with absent relationships providing an indemnity strategy to maintain strong core family structures. As a result, two strategies were developed by Overseas Chinese families to maintain the filial family structure in order to protect the core values of the ancestral home.

Firstly, it was advantageous for families to marry a son off before his journey. This meant that his family could ensure remittances from him through marital obligations to his wife, as well as ensure his eventual return; provide help for his aging parents; and ensure his affairs were managed in his absence. This trend was consistent across the Diaspora with early American historians estimating that up to one third of Chinese men were married before they migrated to California. Australian colonial patterns are suspected to be similar, as the Chinese immigrant population was made up of outwardly “single” men, but who were known to have wives and families in China.

Secondly, the protection of the core patriarchal Chinese family structure, which inhibited large scale female emigration of First Wives, led to alternative family arrangements being sought in order to satisfy husbands’ conjugal rights, with the added benefit of sons born in a foreign land, thus creating roots and opportunities for future financial growth. Chinese women chosen to emigrate to overseas settlement countries were in many instances not from the core family

---

602 The British Empire’s aggressive colonial expansion provided the opportunity for Chinese men to migrate by the easing of laws after the Treaty of Nanjing (1842) and Treaty of Tientsin (1858).
604 Sinn, “Bound For California”, 224.
606 *Ovens and Murray Advertiser*, Tuesday 13 October 1857, p. 3. Many of the Chinese Exemption to the Dictation Test CEDT files note that men travelling to China multiple times were going to see their wives and families.
structure (matriarch mother and First wife), but selected or bought as second wives, bonded servants (*Mui tsai*) or women deemed to be of a class considered “worthless” such as girls sold by families or stolen to be worked as “prostitutes”. Girls and women were selected, stolen and sent to countries where large populations of Chinese men were working. For example, after the discovery of gold in the United States, or commencement of large railway projects in British Columbia, Chinese women were sent there as wives, bonded servants and “prostitutes”; to the British West Indies as inducements to bind Chinese contract workers to estates and plantations; and to north Queensland as second wives to provide comfort, produce sons and look after the affairs and health of a husband in the host country. All examples benefitted the ancestral home, maintained filial structures and maximized family wealth. On the other hand, women who remained in the village household provided a continuation of traditional family values, executed their duties as First wives, and provided for the in-laws while maintaining their moral obligations.

However, the effect of providing a ‘second wife’ overseas was in fact the setting up of “two primary wife” female households. This began to impact on the traditional female hierarchy in ways which were unforeseen and which challenged the traditional family model. These changes had long term consequences within the ancestral home, as overseas wives exerted a newfound freedom as they emerged as mistresses of their own homes.

***

**Part 2: Chinese Female Diaspora**

**Settlement drivers**

The Chinese Diaspora offered Chinese men many global destinations to gain experience and secure wealth for the family with transmigration contributing to Chinese settler success. While Chinese seamen had been traveling around the world for at least 30 years before, it was not until the global gold rushes began with California in 1848 and ports opened up that men left *en masse* from China to escape poverty, take refuge from China’s social and political internal upheavals, and find a means to create wealth for their families back in China.

Chinese women commenced their migration around the western globe from 1848 onwards, when, six years before the first goldfield in California, a Chinese female servant along with two Chinese male servants arrived with their master Charles Gillespie on the San Francisco-bound brig *The Eagle*. Their arrival coincided with the discovery of the Sutter Mill gold and the two men immediately absconded from their master to try their luck while the fate of the woman remains
unknown. Three years later, a clandestine meeting was held between two curious groups of women, one Chinese, the other European at a Hong Kong location so secretive, in 1851, that even the Chinese Consul remained unaware. However, by 1855, concurrent with changing Chinese ideas about women and exposure to foreigners, two young women travelled to Paris, presumably with a diplomatic envoy, as papers described the arrival of a Chinese lady accompanied by servant and child. As a snapshot to migration, Chinese women were first recorded in San Francisco, 1848; British Columbia, 1858, the Colony of Victoria, 1859; British Guiana, 1860; Colony of Queensland, 1861; Colony of New South Wales, 1864; Cuba 1865; and New Zealand 1867. The provinces of South Africa were among the last destination countries for emigration around 1900.

Not only did mining provide the impetus for Chinese female migration, so too did the sugar industry. From 1851 onwards, increased demand for Chinese labour occurred in equatorial colonies such as Cuba, Hawaii, and the British West Indies including British Guiana, where Chinese ‘coolies’ were engaged as indentured labour. In 1862, as part of a labour drive, British recruitment agents in Hong Kong sought to encourage Chinese women to migrate as an enticement for Chinese men to sign up. A bonus of £20 was offered to be paid to each man on arrival who was accompanied by his “wife”. This scheme was taken up by some men eager to work on the plantations; however, a loophole left Chinese women vulnerable to exploitation. Upon arrival many women brought over as “wives” were abandoned, having served their purpose for the men by attracting the financial bonus. Left to fend for themselves, they were later described as

608 Empire, Friday 10 October 1851, p. 4. Early Western descriptions of a Chinese woman across South East were not recorded until at least 1852, when a Chinese woman was noted as administering her deceased husbands’ estate on a plantation in Java. See Bathurst Free Press and Mining Journal, 25 December 1852, p. 1;
609 Morton Bay Courier, 12 November 1855, p. 1.
610 Zhu, “No Need to Rush”, p. 43.
612 South Australian Register, 28 December 1859, p. 3.
615 Goldhurns Herald and Chronicle, 31 August 1864, pp. 2–3.
619 Lutz, “Chinese Emigrants, Indentured workers and Christianity”, 140. This occurred across Cuba and the British West Indies as well as British Guiana.
620 Ibid. 140-141. It is recorded in 1861 that the boat Mystery had on board a number of Chinese women as well as at least one girl, age 12, bound for British Guiana.
having “poor moral standards and “worthless” having failed to do their job, that is, to tie Chinese labour to the plantations. The practice of directly encouraging women to migrate to sugar industry countries continued. Between 1866 and 1870, Chinese women left for Hawaii, and South America and formed part of the 17,904 Chinese migrants across the British West Indies in 1884.

The pattern for migration was set. Industries and countries associated with European colonial expansion attracted both Chinese male and female migration, yet the colonial powers in Europe itself failed to advertise or offer an industry to motivate Chinese migration there. While Britain attracted Chinese seamen, from the 1850s onwards, both England and Europe failed to attract Chinese women at any time during the 19th and early 20th centuries. The scant handful who did manage to visit any European countries during this period, were associated with an official diplomat and travelled as his companion concubine, daughter or servant. Instead, it was Europe’s colonies in far flung places including across the Pacific Rim, the British West Indies and parts of Africa where their exploitative resource industries were located, that Chinese men ventured and some cases, Chinese women followed.

Fig. 42. Chinese Female Diaspora: Destination Countries: 1850 onwards
Note: Date represents the first year a Chinese woman was recorded in a destination place.

621 Lee-Loy, “The Chinese are preferred to all others”, 214-215.
623 Jung Chang, Empress Dowager Cixi: the Concubine who launched modern China,(Jonathon Cape, London, 2013)41-50; Morton Bay Courier, 12 November 1855, p. 1. France was the only destination country noted for a Chinese woman before 1900, and even then the circumstances of her arrival were association with diplomatic officials rather than with a broader immigration pattern.
Transnational Trends

Between 1851 and 1921, the largest number of Chinese women emigrants went to the U.S. and Hawaii, followed by the colonies of Australia and Canada. On a decade by decade basis the United States, Hawaii and Australia remained consistent in intake numbers and saw incremental rises each decade for all three locations. In the 1861 census, the State of California, taking in San Francisco and Los Angeles, recorded 1,784 Chinese-born females compared to 33,149 Chinese born males. This meant that 9.2% of the Chinese Californian population was made up of women. The United States female migration intake can be seen in contrast with the Chinese female population for the colonies of Australia in 1861, which recorded only 11 Chinese female immigrants to 38, 247 men (most of them in Victoria) or .02% of women in the combined Australian Chinese population. By 1884, Chinese women living in Hawaii consisted of 871 women or 5% of the Chinese population, itself representing one quarter of Hawaii’s total population. In contrast, for the same period the Chinese female population of Queensland remained at 2% of the total Chinese population or 23 per 11,206 men.

Despite their settling by Chinese men and the creation of Chinese communities and cultural precincts, the British West Indies and South Africa recorded the smallest number of Chinese women migrants. This could be due to a number of influences including a greater incidence of relationships between Chinese men and local women in the West Indies; an increased level of difficulty to migrate to these countries because of restrictions, distance and transportation problems, or because there was a reluctance to migrate to England and South Africa in the first place. South Africa, for example, attracted Chinese male labour to the Natal, Cape and Transvaal Provinces, but few Chinese women. This can be seen in the 1904 census where only 23 Chinese women were recorded compared to 2434 men. In short, the host countries which attracted most of the Chinese Female Diaspora included the west coast of the Americas, islands in the Pacific including Hawaii, Fiji and New Zealand, and the colonies of Australia. In contrast, the British West Indies, Britain, Europe and South Africa attracted very few.

Taking a snapshot of global statistics and census figures for eight destination countries 1861-1921, a noticeable trend emerges which is captured by the West coast of the United States.

---

Accone, “Ghost people”; 261.
Approximately 52% of the total number of female migrants journeyed to California for reasons that were mining based, followed by Hawaii for sugar-based migration, which attracted 34%. These two global destination countries were followed by the gold mining and agricultural colonies of Australia, (6%) and British Columbia (5%) with New Zealand, South Africa and Britain totalling a very low percentage of just 1%. The West Indies, with its low migration number, did not even have enough Chinese women to rate a percentage despite at least 123 women being recorded there in the early 1870s. Cuba’s intake of Chinese women was so insignificant it was estimated that between 1847 and 1874, there were fewer than 100 Chinese women who migrated to Cuba compared to 142,000 men who were stolen, recruited as indentured labour, or cajoled to labour on the plantations. Australia can statistically stake a claim to being one of the four most important Western colonies or countries for the Chinese Female Diaspora, which consist of: U.S.A., Hawaii, Australia and Canada.

Fig. 43. Snapshot of Global Chinese Female Diaspora: Eight Key Destinations

---


630 Kathleen Lopez, “Afro-Asian Alliances: Marriage, Godparents, and Social Status in Late Nineteenth – Century Cuba”, Afro-Hispanic Review, 27, 1(Spring, 2008):59-72. This figure did not increase. By 1899 there were only two Chinese women and 8,033 Chinese men.
The Chinese Diaspora experience in the eight destination communities around the globe was identical in its propensity for a gender imbalance between women and men, even without exclusionary laws which were later introduced in some countries. This trend reflects both the reluctance for Chinese women to leave China based on social conditions in the first place, and highlights restrictions set by some host countries to prevent Chinese female migration in order to prevent family formation.

Countries which introduced exclusionary or deterrent laws to prevent the migration of women include the United States, British Columbia, Australia and New Zealand with the United States introducing a specific law to prevent Chinese women from entering in 1875. This piece of legislation, known as the Page Law, saw a decline in Chinese female immigration by 68% and it was an effective means by which authorities kept the female migrant population at a constant low intake. Only one destination country, Hawaii, managed to close the gender gap with Chinese females registering above 15% of the total Chinese population from the turn of the century onwards. By 1921 it had reached nearly a third of the population. It could be suggested that Hawaii had the most open immigration policy towards female Chinese for the whole period. In contrast, the migration of women to the colonies of Australia remained steady but slow, due to both external and internal influences resulting in their presence only reaching 4% of the total Chinese population by 1911. Clearly, something was going wrong. Why was it that California, at twice the distance from Queensland and the colonies of Australia, could attracted far more female migrants than New Zealand, Australia, Hawaii and British Columbia combined? (See Table.3. p. 182)

---

632 McKeown, "Transnational Chinese Families", Table 1, 87.
Table 3. Australian Colonial Chinese Populations and Global Female Diaspora Trends: 1856-1921

Note: Table is derived from a variety of sources, most of which are ultimately derived from Colonial Census data, historic newspapers and select works outlined in the Bibliography.

*Chinese female Diaspora figures for the West Indies and British Guiana including Trinidad, Jamaica, British Honduras and Antigua are difficult to locate and the figures with the asterix denote the number of Chinese males introduced into the British Caribbean only.; David Chuenyan Lai, Chinatowns: Towns Within Cities in Canada, University of British Columbia Press, Vancouver 1988, p. 26
Recent studies by historians have revealed that Chinese women who migrated to California were varied in age as well as purpose. They included women who migrated as bonded girls, *mui tsai*; purchased and kidnapped women; and second wives, who were selected to migrate to San Francisco and California generally to live with their husbands, act as companions, carry out servant duties or work as “prostitutes”. The human trafficking of Chinese girls and women in mid-19th century U.S.A. has been explored by researchers including Adam McKeown, George Peffer, Huping Ling, and Elizabeth Sinn. San Francisco statistics from the 1870 census indicate that up to 71% registered Chinese women in California were women brought over by both Chinese men and women to work as “prostitutes” in an organised and systematic way. However, it is argued by Peffer that the original statistics were flawed and the percentage of women working as “prostitutes” is possibly inflated. What remains evident is that young girls and women were purchased or stolen from poor families in China for the purpose of sexual exploitation, which provoked moral outrage amongst White members of the public, resulting in the laws passed to restrict the entry of women into the United States. The enactment of the Page Law saw the female population figure, mostly working as “prostitutes”, decline to 21% by 1880.

Unlike the experiences of many women to the United States and West Indies, as unwilling participants in the Diaspora, there is no evidence to suggest that Chinese women were kidnapped or selected to work as “prostitutes” in the colonies across Australasia or the extended Pacific region. Instead, the pattern of experience by Chinese women in Australia and in particular Queensland, was seated in the “two primary wife” model. Why, then, was the Chinese female experience to California based on prostitution, while the Chinese female experience to the colonies of Australasia not?

There are two reasons which may explain this major difference in migration experience. Firstly, the geographical proximity of Australia to Hong Kong and China meant that men in Victoria, New South Wales and Queensland could more readily return back to the village and ancestral home.

---

633 Sinn, “Bound for California”.
634 McKeown, “Transnational Families”, 73
635 George Peffer, *If They Don’t Bring Their Women Here: Chinese Female Immigration Before Exclusion* (University of Illinois Press, Champaign, 1999).
637 Sinn, “Bound for California”.
638 K. Scott Wong, [Review of] “George Peffer, *If They Don’t Bring Their Women Here: Chinese Female Immigration Before Exclusion*, *Journal of American Ethnic History*, 20, 1 (Fall, 2000): 102. Peffer argues the White American census collectors could not speak the language, and were hostile and ignorant of cultural practices. He concluded their census interpretation did little to allay moral paranoia or entrenched antagonistic views towards Chinese women.
639 McKeown, “Transnational Families”, 73
than their counterparts in the United States. This in itself was a huge benefit to the transnational family, which expanded and grew solid networks across the Asia Pacific Rim region through a combination of marriage to non-Chinese women, both White and Indigenous.

Secondly, many Chinese women who migrated to California did so under conditions of coercion and deceit, or were treated as goods and chattels by predatory agents, or were used as a commodity for economic gain through prostitution and wife selling practices. These women and girls procured in Hong Kong and China came from a section of the female community which was already regarded as having little or low social value. It didn’t matter if they were unable to return to China, and they had little future prospects as a second or third wife due to their low social status. In contrast, the colonies of Australia with their close proximity to China were able to attract a higher status Chinese woman, as village-based families carefully selected Second Wives to send to overseas Chinese men for the express purpose of creating family wealth in the new country. Female Chinese migration to the colonies of Australia enriched the Chinese male community and brought new opportunities for the village family.640

***

Part 3: National Trends

Australian Colonies: Victoria and New South Wales
The Chinese Female Diaspora to Australia commenced with the gold rushes in the colonies of Victoria and New South Wales after 1851. By 1856, both colonies of Victoria and New South Wales recorded the presence of Chinese women, Victoria with 3 women and New South Wales, 6 women. Five years later the first Chinese female was recorded in Queensland.

For twenty years, the three colonies of Victoria, New South Wales and Queensland were recipients of an influx of Chinese men and a small percentage of women and bonded servant girls.641 It wasn’t until after 1881 that other colonies such as Tasmania, Western Australia, and South Australia including the area it administered as the Northern Territory, attracted any Chinese women with both Western Australia and South Australia attracting the fewest arrivals with one

640 Choi, Chinese Migration and Settlement in Australia, 9.
641 Illustrated Australian News for Home Readers, 5 October 1868, p. 5. From the beginning, immigrating wives were accompanied to Victoria by young girls who may have been muitsai. This interpretation is borne out by a report by William Young for the Victorian Parliament whereby he notes “There are not more than a dozen native women in this colony, and some of these are not wives but servants.”
each in 1881. Northern Territory, with the commercial centre of Port Darwin, a major gold field at Pine Creek and close proximity to the British port and distribution node Hong Kong, was the fourth most populous colony for Chinese women after Queensland. The Northern Territory, with its similar history of pastoralism and mining, provides a valuable comparison to north Queensland, yet the number of Chinese women to the Northern Territory never quite reached the same numbers as Queensland, probably because agriculture there was negligible. Despite this, distinct relationships developed across the two regions, through Chinese families living in Port Darwin, Thursday Island and port towns of north Queensland. These relationships intertwined cultural traditions and marriage practices extending to migration and intermarriage patterns, the procurement of *mui tsai* help through Chinese “adoption” practices, and even foot binding.

The collection and verification of statistical data for Chinese female immigration figures for the Australian colonies between 1850 and Federation is problematic at best. Colonial records for counting Chinese female members of the community are often inaccurate, contain anomalies such as inclusion of Australian born daughters in the Chinese female tally, or vary when re-stated in newspapers. While all efforts have been made to ensure the data is accurate, these figures are presented as a *best estimate* only to provide *representative statistical figures* for what was occurring in the colonies. The figures provided in Table 2, a snapshot of each colony at 10 year intervals, are mostly derived from the 1925 Commonwealth population statistics, but I have also made one or two corrections from colonial statistics which I feel are more accurate for the time.

In the period 1856-1921 the sum total of the data and resulting percentages in various locations for Chinese female immigration shows that New South Wales attracted the most at 32%, followed closely by Victoria at 29%, and Queensland at 25%. With only a 7% margin between New South Wales and Queensland, it is clear that the northern State was an important family migration destination. (See Table 4. p. 179)
### Table 4. Colonial Chinese Populations: Percentage ratio Women to Men: 1856-1921

*NOTE: This table is derived from a variety of sources, most of which come from either Commonwealth or Colonial Census data, academic theses, newspapers and year books. The figures are difficult to accurately interpret as it is not always clear when figures are inclusive of China born immigrants only or as a composite which includes Australian-born children in the household. The figures are best estimates from reliable sources and represent China-born men and women only.*
South Australia, Northern Territory, Western Australia, Tasmania

The Northern Territory, with its small but thriving Chinese community in Darwin, was the fourth most populous community of Chinese women at 11%, despite migration starting 26 years after the intake of the three East coast colonies. Both Tasmania and South Australia at 1% and 2% respectively indicate that these southern colonies were unable to attract large scale female migration, despite Tasmania having a strong mining industry and South Australia, agriculture and pastoralism; this mirrored the experience of the male Diaspora. Both colonies recorded an overall intake of fewer men and women than the male Chinese immigration figures for Victoria, New South Wales and Queensland. For Tasmania, this may be attributed to small scale tin and gold mining being the only attractions when compared with the major gold rushes of Victoria, NSW and Queensland. Western Australia is difficult to rationalise for its figures. It is clear that the practice of including Australian born daughters in annual census figures was an ongoing statistical practice when it came to census collection in Western Australia. Figures in 1901 for the census return for the Commonwealth make no delineation between age and family of women or men, with 18 women recorded for 1503 men.642 This skewed the data and led to a whopping apparent increase of 1241 women in the ten years between 1911 (recording 37 women) and 1921 (recording 1278 women). Due to this large anomaly they have not been included the colonial comparison graph below, as it distorts the statistical outcomes. However, it can be confidently stated that the Western Australian pattern of Chinese female immigration ran parallel to the Chinese female migration intake in Tasmania. (See Fig.44 p.181)

642 NAA: PP131/1 1903/262, Census return: Coloured Aliens in the Commonwealth: WA.
Fig. 44. Snapshot of Colonial Chinese Female Population 1856-1921

**Districts of Origin**

Unlike the Chinese women of north Queensland who predominantly came from Zhongshan (Chung Shan) district of Guangdong province, migrant Chinese women and girls arriving in Victoria and New South Wales emigrated predominantly from Sze Yap or Sam Yap speaking regions including Taishan (Toishan), along with a smaller number of Hakka speaking women. Both Melbourne and Sydney had large Sze Yap communities and erected community infrastructure including Temples and meeting halls as well as forming tongs to support incoming migrants. With the fears of an increasing influx of Chinese miners and the threat to economic and labour opportunities of Whites by Chinese workers, successive colonial and Commonwealth governments introduced legislation to inhibit immigration. These laws also affected Chinese women and family unification. When combined with a cultural reluctance within China against disrupting the filial family structure and the close proximity allowing men to return home to the village, it was inevitable that female Chinese migration to the colonies of Australia would always be small, particularly when compared to the robust and active migration schemes which applied to White women.

---

643 See works by Kate Bagnall, Pauline Rule, Paul Macgregor, Sophie Couchman, Keir Reeves, Val Lovejoy and Janice Wilton.
Prior to Federation, Chinese women in the community barely reached 1.6% of the total Chinese population across all colonies. The introduction of the *Commonwealth Immigration Restriction Act 1901* and in particular the positive measures introduced in clause 3m of the Act escalated the intake number in every colonial state briefly in 1901, with the exception of Victoria. Consistently since 1856 and up to Federation, more Chinese women had immigrated and joined their husbands in Victoria than in any other colony, with a peak notable in the 1880s of 164 women, but which declined every decade after. Just why Victoria reversed its trend when other states were increasing is unknown. What is known is that the *Commonwealth Immigration Restriction Act 1901* opened the door for family unification, albeit for a very brief period.

On average, colonies saw a fivefold increase in the number of women entering the colonies to join their husbands between 1901 and 1911. In the case of Queensland, Western Australia, the Northern Territory and South Australia it was up to eight times the pre-Federation figures. In contrast, there was a steady decline in the Chinese male population prior to and around Federation, with four of the seven colonies recording a decrease in the male population and only Queensland, Western Australia and South Australia showing a modest increase. This indicated that Chinese immigration was already on the wane and that restrictive laws were working. There was a delayed response in both Western Australia due to the attraction of new goldfields and the pearl-shelling industry, and north Queensland due to the large-scale Chinese investment in the banana, maize and sugar industries. However, by 1911 that was on the wane, and both colonies reflected the general negative growth around the Commonwealth within the male Chinese population.

What was increasing in the three most populous States of the Commonwealth, Victoria, NSW and Queensland, was the ratio of Chinese women to men. By 1921, Queensland had the highest female to male gender ratio, consisting of 8.93% Chinese females in the general Chinese population. There were 340 Chinese women living across the State with the majority in the north. This provides more evidence that north Queensland was a significant host destination for the Chinese Female Diaspora.

***
Queensland Trends

Immigrant Chinese women who settled in north Queensland 1860-1920 originated from Guangdong province in the Southern Pearl Delta region of China.\textsuperscript{644} There were strong family connections with Zhongshan, Guangzhou and Taishan districts as well as neighbouring Hong Kong. In many cases, women from Zhongshan (Chung Shan) spoke the distinct dialect of Loong Du or Liang Du, with a smaller number of women coming from the Four Districts of Taishan, Xinhui, Kaiping and Enping (Toishan, Sunwei, Hoiping and Yangping), speaking Sze Yap, or Sam Yap, as well as some who spoke Hakka.\textsuperscript{645} In Chung Shan, the small district of Loong Du had natal village links with Liang Du, and both districts are well represented among the descendant families who still speak this dialect in north Queensland today. When they first arrived from Zhongshan, women from Loong Du district were unable to understand women from the Taishan region but could understand, due to kinship and other alliances, women from Liang Du. This serves to illustrate that emigrating Chinese women were not one homogenous group, a fact which later had bearing on community relations.\textsuperscript{646}

Fig. 45. Natal Districts: Guangdong Province: Chinese Females to NQ: 1860-1920\textsuperscript{647}

\textsuperscript{644} This is based on analysis of kinship links and descendant family trends throughout north Queensland from over 50 oral history interviews.
\textsuperscript{645} Robb, “Out of Sight, Out of Mind”, 205
\textsuperscript{646} Interview with Vincent Lee, Cairns, 9 May 2002. Geographically located across the Pearl River from each other, the two districts developed friendly relations involving political, clan and marriage lines. Villages on the river in Liang Du received wives from villages of Loong Du and vice versa. While village men were not as conversant in multiple dialects and spoke village-specific dialects from birth, by the very act of marriage, women often spoke and continued to speak two dialects. This ensured continuity of the clan alliance system, as the daughter would be already well versed in her husbands-to-be's dialect if she married back into her mother's natal village across the river. In turn she was the linguistic bridge builder for future marital unions, often speaking her natal dialect to her female friends and children and speaking her new clan dialect to her husband and father-in-law. In north Queensland many families were raised speaking both Loong Du and Cantonese with the primary dialect at home being Loong Du. This may indicate a propensity for the new wife to speak her husband's dialect in her new Queensland clan home.
\textsuperscript{647} Death: Dying, Funerals, and Cemeteries in North America, Chinese in Northwest America Research Committee http://www.cinarc.org/Death.html
The first Chinese woman to immigrate to Queensland was recorded in 1861, just three years after the colony of Victoria and approximately eight years after the first of many Chinese women arrived on the west coast of the U.S. Early records indicate that she lived on the eastern edge of the Southern Darling Downs town of Ipswich, a rural settlement situated on the eastern edge of the pastoral belt of the Darling Downs and near the emerging port city of Brisbane.  

By 1868, eight women had arrived including three at Brisbane, two at Nanango, one in Rockhampton, one in Bowen and one in Townsville. This represented 8 females to 2621 Chinese males or .3% of the Chinese population (1 woman to every 328 men). In 1876, an upturn of mining activity in the Northern and Central goldfields saw an influx of Chinese men to the colony. In the 1876 census thirteen Chinese women were recorded, including one each in Brisbane and Enoggera, one each in Ipswich, Warwick and the Darling Downs, two in the Central Region including Gladstone and Rockhampton, and six in the Northern Region including Mackay, Townsville and Somerset, which each had one woman, and three located in Cooktown, the emerging port for the Palmer goldfield.

**North Queensland**

The importance of north Queensland from 1876 as a destination for Chinese migrant settlers is evident when the north accounted for 46% of the Chinese female population for the year 1876 with the pastoral districts of the Southern Region attracting 23%, Brisbane and district 16% and Central Region at 15%. The development of the Northern Region through the Palmer Goldfield rush, development of port towns Mackay, Townsville, and Cooktown and rapid expansion of agricultural regions, attracted Chinese men with a view to supplying goods and services or establishing businesses through kinship partnerships. These men were transnational capitalists, taking advantage of emerging business opportunities with the full security of kinship and business links behind them to other colonies and across the Pacific.

Merchant men displayed their wealth and importance to other men in the Chinese community through the importation and presence of a second wife, and her status in the Chinese community was high among the female population. Her very presence signalled success

---

649 QVP, 1869 Vol. II, “Third Census of the Colony of Queensland Taken 1868”.
650 Rains, Intersections, 388 and 389. Rains discusses in full the network, partnership and transnational linkages between the firm Wing On and Co., a prominent business in Cooktown, and key early Chinese settlers and settler families.
among men with her husband’s economic ability on display as he supported his “two primary wife” transnational family. He was likely to be a powerful community leader.

North Queensland’s Chinese male population in 1876 constituted 97% of the total colonial Chinese population or 8162 individuals compared with Central, 64, Southern, 110, and Brisbane, which had 57 Chinese men recorded in the census. With a total figure of 13 women to 10,399 men, the gender ratio of women to men across the colony was 0.125% or one woman for every 799 men.

By 1886, the Chinese male population had remained relatively static at 10,388, but the overall percentage of women had changed to .54% or one woman for approximately every 187 men. Of the 56 women over 18 years of age counted in the colony, nearly half resided in the north. The high incidence of women located in the north is attributed to the stable communities which had formed, associated with mining and with large scale agriculture which was becoming well established.

By 1891, the number of Chinese women above 15 years of age had decreased in the colony, leaving the female Chinese population at 22, mostly in the north. By 1901, due to stable economic conditions in north Queensland and the promise of more relaxed immigration conditions with Federation, the Chinese female figures had jumped considerably, to 11.45%.
This means that there were 8,783 men and a total of 192 Chinese women who were of marriageable age (above 15 years) with a little less than half of these in north Queensland. By 1901 there were approximately 83 Chinese women residing across north Queensland out of 192 Chinese women across the whole colony of Queensland. This represented a peak of 2.17%, or one Chinese female to every 45 males.\(^{651}\) After Federation, the Commonwealth Government became responsible for census collection resulting in specific regional data pertaining to north Queensland becoming difficult to locate or skewed by the possibility that Australian born daughters were lumped into the female statistics.\(^{652}\)

***

**State Distribution:**

Between 1860 and 1920 there were 146 marriages between China-born wives and Chinese husbands which accounted for 13% of all marriages, including those with non-Chinese women, White and Aboriginal.\(^{653}\) Of these China-born couples, 57% lived in north Queensland compared to 14% in Brisbane, 6% in Southern Region and 7% in Central Region. The location of 23 Chinese women, or 16% of those living in Queensland, has yet to be identified. Excluding these unknowns, the majority of Chinese women, 68%, are identified as living across north Queensland. The larger percentage found in marriage analysis is consistent with census data statistics previously discussed.

---

\(^{651}\) Census figures of population data in *QVP: Years 1861, 1871, 1876, 1886, 1891, 1901.*


North Queensland census collection was traditionally difficult, even dangerous to undertake especially on the goldfields or in remote regions. The population was transient, roads and transport difficult and White collectors were hampered by language difficulties when counting Chinese participants. In addition, Chinese women, accompanying girls, and children remained in doors in the private quarters, out of sight from the broader predominantly male community and so could go unnoticed. Population data was unreliable and, in an effort, to secure a more accurate return, the government engaged Chinese census collectors for the 1876 Census in the Palmer, Cook and South Kennedy districts at 35-40 shillings a day, taking in the Palmer Goldfield, Somerset, and Cooktown.

\(^{653}\) This figure is based on my personal database collected from Birth Deaths Marriages and other sources.
Chinese women who arrived in Queensland entered by one of three ways: either married to a husband before he left China and emigrated with him (or later joined him); married by proxy while he remained in Queensland and subsequently sent to him by his family; or sent to him and was married upon arrival, in either a Christian or Register ceremony. The propensity to marry in a Colonial based register or church-based ceremony instead of a traditional Chinese ceremony was nearly equal to traditional marriages within the seventy-year period. Over all, there were 82 women who arrived in Queensland who were already married by traditional Chinese custom prior to emigration. This compares to 60 women who had a marriage in Queensland upon arrival. The prevalence of Christian or Western marriages began to emerge from the 1880s and steadily increased until Federation and into the decade beyond. The majority of Queensland legal marriages occurred in north Queensland.

The population increase of Chinese women in Queensland is evident post Federation, 1901 to 1910. The relaxation of immigration requirements noted above enabled the merchant class to bring out a bride. Both Brisbane and north Queensland saw an increase in arrivals. However, the data also reveals that there was an increase in Queensland legal marriages under The Marriage Act 1864 over China based ones. This could be explained through three reasons. Firstly, Christianity was well established in China by 1900 and a Christian wedding in Queensland may indicate a natural change of marriage practices by Chinese citizens. Secondly, a wedding was a joyous occasion for the community. A wedding provided an occasion for public celebration, and a Christian wedding was more accessible than a traditional ceremony. Thirdly, a legal marriage...
in Queensland was a strategic measure taken to enable other processes to occur. This included the perception of assimilation in the eyes of the broader community, to elevate a community or commercial status, or to provide an all-important verification of identity in an environment where suspicions against Chinese individuals and families was rising in regards to fraudulent entry into the Commonwealth. Certainly, there were strategic advantages to legally marrying in Queensland which extended to Australian Born Children.

The Queensland marriage certificate provided an effective tool to assist in any application for naturalisation prior to 1900. Proof of marriage was a condition of naturalisation and a China based marriage, which did not generate a paper document, remained inadequate for official colonial assessment purposes. Of the 142 men with China born wives living in Queensland, 60 were legally married under The Marriage Act 1864. Just over half of these men (34) are identified as also having taken the Oath of Allegiance, usually within the first year of marriage, and becoming naturalised British subjects. Of the 82 men who had a China based traditional cultural marriage, only 12 had taken out the Oath of Allegiance and applied for naturalisation.

Fig. 49. Chinese Women: Marriage Patterns: 1860-1920

---

654 Thirty-four men married to Chinese women in Queensland were identified as having taken the Oath of Allegiance and become naturalised out of the 60 identifiable marriages entered into Births, Deaths and Marriages registers under The Marriage Act 1864.
The link between the decision to legally marry under the *Marriage Act* and taking out naturalisation, is unquestionable as a strategy employed by families to maximise opportunity and elevate status in the colonial environment. Naturalisation enabled Chinese men to purchase land and create wealth as well as be regarded along with their families as British subjects. This enabled family transmigration between Queensland and China for filial and educational purposes to occur smoothly and assisted with re-entry back into the colony. However, after 1901, the ability to naturalise was prevented by a new Commonwealth policy which refused naturalisation to Chinese applicants. Those who were already naturalised, had their certificates repealed in favour of the new system, the Certificate of Exemption to the Dictation Test. The dictation test could be applied to anyone trying to immigrate but was specifically targeting non-White groups for exclusion, and returning Chinese could be caught up in it. This particularly affected Chinese settler women and families and made re-entry difficult and often humiliating, as families went to extraordinary lengths to prove identity. This was, of course, part of the White Australia Policy.

The *Immigration Restriction Act 1901* was one of the first pieces of Commonwealth legislation passed following Federation. The overall aim of this and other related legislation was to limit non-White immigration to Australia, particularly Asian immigration, and thereby preserve the dominance of a White British society. This, and related legislation, became known as the White Australia Policy. Restrictions on China-born women and Australian born Chinese children under this legislation were stringently applied by the authorities. The implication of the restrictions combined with the potential of a refusal for re-entry into Queensland may have prompted a greater emphasis on the marriage certificate to authenticate identity. This would account for the spike in legal Western-style marriages 1901-1909. The marriage certificate along with birth certificates and references from leading White citizens became crucial for women and families visiting China in the early to mid-20th century, where every re-entry to Australia was examined closely. Women who had lived in the colony but had been married in a traditional cultural ceremony in China, found it increasingly difficult to establish identity through marriage as no certificate from China could be produced for scrutiny by increasingly zealous Customs officers.

***

**Part 4:**

*China-born Chinese Family Landscape: North Queensland*

Chinese women who journeyed to north Queensland shared many characteristics. This included age, status and circumstance. Chinese women migrants were very young, between 15 and 20
years old, contracted for marriage usually as a Second Wife, sent from China, sometimes on their own or accompanied by a child servant or someone with a kinship relationship, and sent to marry men who they had never met or did not know. In most cases the husband to be was substantially older, had spent a long period overseas, and paid off his debts: he had proven himself to be financially secure. The delayed period for marriage meant that the average age of the majority of men in north Queensland upon marriage was 43 years old.655 This meant that communities where Chinese women were located in north Queensland experienced both a gender as well as age imbalance in the 19th century and this did not level out until the 20th century.

When they arrived, most Chinese immigrant women remained hidden in the private quarters of the family business, venturing out rarely, such as when public events required a presence. This is the case when the Chinese wives entertained Lady Chermside in 1903 when her husband, Queensland’s Governor General, visited Cairns.656 Some Chinese wives were required to work in their husbands’ businesses but normally they were protected from the unfamiliar and rough colonial environment by husbands on whom they relied for everything.657 The successful arrival of children (particularly sons) meant that a wife had fulfilled her conjugal duties, and more importantly secured the extended transnational family as an asset to the ancestral lineage. In a number of cases the whole community rejoiced for the couple, who often laid on a large banquet or spread.658 Conversely, if tragedy followed a birth, the whole community mourned the loss of the child.659

“Two Primary Wife Family”
The actual percentage of First Wives who were allowed to migrate to Queensland to join their husbands is difficult to quantify and there is sufficient anecdotal evidence to suggest that the majority of women over the whole period were Second Wives in the Chinese order of marriage, First wife nearly always remaining in China.660 However, there least three instances where families or individuals took action which resulted in young Chinese women becoming First Wives under what would have been regarded as unusual Chinese marriage circumstances. The

655 Average estimate, taken from sample study using oral history accounts, dates on immigration records, and dates on death certificates or marriage records.
656 Morning Post, 12 June 1903, p. 7.
657 This is the case for Mrs. Quong Hing in Cooktown and Ah Bow on Thursday Island.
658 “Banquet by Willie Ming”, Morning Post, 16 October 1900, p. 3.
659 Morning Post, 26 October 1900, p. 3; QHDM-DR-MF 1900 C805 Herbert Low Key Ming, child of Willie Ming and Yuen Day.
660 NAA: J3115/55/1902. Chung Chang for example married twice, once to Chang Lime in 1879 and to Wong Hae in 1887.
first situation occurred when a young bonded servant was abused by her family. In this case a leading storekeeper was implored by other men in the Chinese community to pay her bond and marry her for protection. This was duly undertaken, making her among the earliest, and perhaps the first, First Wife married on Queensland soil.661

The second marriage arose when a son refused to return to China to marry. His family constantly wrote to him over an extended period imploring him to return home, saying “to have amassed great wealth and not to return home is comparable to walking in magnificent clothes at night”. After all efforts to pressure him to return “home” failed, his family arranged a marriage with the daughter of an appropriate family and the girl was married to her overseas husband by proxy662 on 14 January 1897. She was sent to him in Geraldton, north Queensland.663

The third situation occurred when a former bonded servant, Mui tsai, living with her family in Cairns was married off to a Chinese settler man when she reached the age of 16 years. This indicates that a transferral of cultural tradition, i.e. marrying off young servant women at the age of 16, was maintained in the colony and that her social value or worth in status as a servant was maintained through the marriage, as he was a gardener.664 However, in both the first and last examples, social status for both women was increased substantially as both gained legitimate status as “First Wives” in the community.

The selection and marriage of a Second Wife to an overseas Chinese man provided a neat and sustainable solution for families who could afford it. Having a Second Wife meant that balance and harmony could be maintained in the ancestral home, which in turn enabled overseas men to maintain their filial duties while increasing their wealth elsewhere. Transnational polygamy or the maintenance of “two primary wives” was a development directly attributed to the Chinese Diaspora and practiced across the globe.665

662 Taam, My Life and Work, 38-41 and Burkhardt., Chinese Creeds and Customs, 106. This principally occurred when the husband was abroad, and the bride was then sent over to him. In some areas objections were raised if another man stood in for the bride as the "proxy". Instead, a rooster was used as the substitute with the bride referred to as a "Chicken Bride".
663 Interview with Bill Sue Yek, Innisfail, 29 July 2002. Geraldton later became known as Innisfail. Having migrated to north Queensland during the Palmer gold rush and subsequently moved to Geraldton looking for an easier way to make money, Taam Sze Pui consistently refused to return home to get married. Chiu Chan Han was around 17 years old when married, when Taam was 43. An intelligent woman, she readily understood the English that her husband taught her and was well liked. In particular Taam’s English customers liked her and she took over the running of the ladies’ dresses and piece goods in his store. As a result that side of the business flourished and her presence helped build up the mercantile business.
The “two primary wife” or transnational polygamous family had several benefits. If managed well, both families could benefit from kinship and family networking and trade arrangements between them. On one hand, sons born in Queensland could be sent to the ancestral home, usually when between the ages of 4 and 10 years, for a Chinese education. On the other hand, sons from the First wife in the ancestral home could be sent to their father’s household in Queensland to learn the family business. It is not known how many China based families sent their sons to Queensland to take over their fathers’ businesses, but the practice continued well into the mid-20th century.

While the establishment and maintenance of a “two primary wife” family provided a solution for Chinese families, the selection and setting up of a Second wife away from the ancestral home had other unintended consequences which impacted on the established female structures within the traditional family.

Tensions appear to have emerged between the “two primary wives”, which may account for the reluctance by some Queensland based Chinese women to return to China. Due to the geographical separation from the primary ancestral home, the Second Wife was afforded much freedom which she otherwise would not have experienced. That is, she was free from scrutiny by her mother-in-law as well as First Wife. This freedom challenged the strict female hierarchy which ran the natal home and its production of sons. As a woman’s status grew in the overseas home she may have regarded herself as a First Wife for all intent and purposes, with any tension amplified through her greater access to the shared husband, or the production of healthy children.

A shift in the female hierarchy as a result of the “two primary wife” situation would not have gone unnoticed by women living in the ancestral home. For example, the second marriage would not have been recognized as a legitimate marriage, leaving it difficult for the returning wife when she re-entered the ancestral home to live.

666 NAA: J3136, 1906/309 James Yee Tong. For example, the son of Yee Tong of Georgetown was sent home in 1906 and did not return until November 1927, having undertaken his education in China.
667 NAA: J3115, 100. Correspondence relating to a Certificate of Domicile for Fat Kee and family, re-entering the Commonwealth. This includes Certificate of Domicile for Fat Kee and photographs of Fat Kee, his second wife Li Ha (first wife was Ha Kam) and children Lau Un, Lau Kiu and Tsoi Wing. The family entered Cooktown from Hong Kong. See also NAA: A9, A1902/69/65, titled [The persistent and successful application from] Fat Kee [to bring wife and family from China]; Fat Kee from Cooktown took the opportunity of a visit back to Hong Kong not only to visit Ha Kam, his First wife, but to also marry a second wife, Leu See, who travelled back to Cooktown with him along with his three young adult children, Lau Un (18), Lau Kiu (16) and Tsoi Wing (12). See NAA BP384/9 Birth Certificate Register - Chinese, Book 1 and NAA BP384/9 Birth Certificate Register - Chinese, Book 2.
669 This freedom was also experienced in the U.S. where Huping Ling notes that women were able to rise above the traditional female head of the household, enabling greater autonomy for the overseas woman. See Ling, “Family and Marriage”, 50-51
However, it was not just during the lifetime of a husband that managing a “two primary wife” household became difficult for families both in the ancestral home and abroad. The death of a husband meant that complex probate arrangements had to be negotiated between the China based First Wife and north Queensland based Second Wife for the distribution of assets. An example of this struggle can be seen in the relationship between two primary wives, one living in Hong Kong, the other on Thursday Island. Second Wife in particular challenged her traditional place in the Confucian family structure, having risen from humble beginnings. Tensions and difficulties began to emerge between the two families after their husband died.\(^{570}\) Prior to his death he had made out a Will. However, it was made in Queensland, on Thursday Island, and his action in itself demonstrates a cultural shift in thinking towards asset distribution. By all rights under traditional Chinese marriage law, he should have left his property and wealth to First Wife and her sons in the ancestral home in China, as it was her role and expectation to administer a husband’s estate as part of her filial duty to the family. Instead, he appointed his Second Wife as sole executrix, and bequeathed her all his estate, a move which pitted the families against each other and resulted in a lengthy court battle. It ended with Second Wife being awarded her husband’s estate. This not only vindicated her legal position as a First Wife in the “two primary wife” system, but also demonstrates the final shift in female hierarchy from a subordinate position to matriarch of the family. This example emphasises the benefits that some women achieved through migration to north Queensland, particularly as this woman started in life as a bonded child servant.\(^{571}\)

Chinese law and legal requirements for the distribution of assets of a deceased estate in a “two primary wife” transnational family, is outside the scope of this thesis, but is an area which would benefit from future investigation. It would shed light on the rights of wives and sons as recipients of assets, particularly assets divided between the women living under British common law jurisdiction including both Queensland and Hong Kong, versus traditional Chinese customary law.\(^{572}\)

\(^{570}\) Interview with Mrs. Mabel Garvey, 26 June 2002, in Robb, Out of Sight, Out of Mind, 98. Lai Foo was married to two women: First Wife, Kee Kew in Hong Kong and Second Wife, Chin Ow, who lived on Thursday Island with him.

\(^{571}\) *Townsville Daily Bulletin*, 4 September 1930, p. 6.

\(^{572}\) There are at least two cases where these intricacies are teased out. See “Lai Fook” in *Townsville Daily Bulletin*, 4 September 1930, p. 6. and for the estate of Tam Sie, “Chinese Will”, *Townsville Daily Bulletin*, 13 April 1930, p. 3.
Polygamy
Chinese polygamous tradition made the Chinese husband responsible for all wives under the one ancestral roof and was undertaken only by middle and upper class families, as money was required to maintain and sustain an extended household. Very few men who settled in Queensland were able to sustain this arrangement which is why very few true polygamous families arrived. Polygamous families, where multiple wives lived with one husband, were structured by rank and status. With migration so expensive and maintenance and protection of families difficult in Queensland, it is not surprising that only four or five Chinese polygamous marriages have been identified in Queensland within the seventy-year period, where one man lived lawfully with two or more women under a traditional Chinese marriage arrangement. Three of the families are in north Queensland, and one in the central region town of Blackall. There is also one case of a first generation Australian born Chinese man married to two wives, but little is known about him. The most well documented case of traditional polygamous families in Queensland, is the family of prominent Cairns herbalist Kwong Sue Duc, who had four wives, three of whom lived in Queensland with him.

There is no doubt that by having four wives, three living with him, Kwong was displaying his wealth and status to the community. His pride in his family was demonstrated in a newspaper announcement shortly after his arrival:

“A prolific Chinaman Kwong Sue Tack, the Chinaman with his four wives and 18 children, called in at this office to joyfully announce ‘number four wife catchem boy, half past three yesterday’. Kwong states that number one wife is in Canton and has four children. Of his 14 children in Cairns, nine are attending school.”

Kwong by all accounts exuded traditionalism. He was a respected doctor /herbalist, a civic leader of great standing, wealthy, and not only able to maintain a “two primary wife” family but in fact

---

673 Chinese in Queensland: Blackall’s Chinatown, loose pages, LEE TIM KIN SING and GOW SEE, with reference to Mrs Lee Tim Kin Sing (wife #1 of Gow See) and Mrs Lee Tim Kin Sing (wife #2, name unknown). One of his wives, presumably First Wife, had small bound feet, and the family were regarded as high class. The Second Wife was responsible for the housework.


675 Interview with Jenni Campbell, Cairns, 8 May 2001. Kwong arrived from Darwin to Cairns in 1903, where he had been living with his three wives and family of fourteen children in the late 19th century, while First Wife remained in China. On arrival in Cairns the family was immediately conspicuous due to the unusual nature of the marriage arrangement, the sheer number of wives, and the fact that Kwong Sue Duc displayed a prominent photo of the family in the front of his shop. While initially the family most likely lived together as a practical measure, they did not live together the entire period while residing in Cairns.

676 Cairns Morning Post, 20 January 1903, p. 2.
able to maintain a “four primary wife family” as Kwong eventually housed each wife and respective children in separate households, which appeared to enhance family harmony.

As a transnational Chinese man of the times, Kwong also guided his family into modernity by adopting selective practices of acculturation with his large Australian born family, while maintaining filial observances and practices. This is demonstrated in his approach to changing marriage practices for three daughters as well as the abandonment of foot binding tradition after advice from his sons. Lykin Kwong, daughter of Kwong Sue Duc, was born in Palmerston (later Port Darwin), and was the only Australian born British subject daughter in northern Australia whose feet were bound at age 2 by her mother. There is no other evidence to suggest that foot binding was ever carried out in north Queensland. However, a number of China born women with bound feet migrated to Queensland to join husbands in the 19th century.

Bound Feet
In China bound feet signified an enhanced social position, and girls were subjected to the deforming practice until it was banned in the early 20th Century. So far, ten Chinese women with bound feet have been identified as having immigrated to Queensland, with seven of the women residing in north Queensland between 1876 and 1903. Three women lived in Cairns, three lived in Cooktown, and at least one and possibly two lived on Thursday Island. The others lived in the Central Region, at Blackall, with two in the Southern Region at Roma and Toowoomba. This represents less than 1% of the overall population of migrant women who arrived in

677 Daily Mercury, 26 January 1906, p. 2; “Feminine Topics”, The Cairns Morning Post, 8 June 1907, p. 5; Methodist Church: Marriage Records, 18 November, 1891-1960; Robb, Out of Sight out of Mind, 135. In 1904, at age 16, LykinKwong was married to Lee You Leong in the Lit Sung Goong Temple after her marriage was “arranged” by her parents. She wore the traditional red embroidered wedding skirt and blouse and went on to have 11 children over the next twenty years. Her sister Elsie was married in 1907 and this too was a traditional affair. She also wore the traditional wedding attire and head veil and was taken by a carriage to her husband’s house after giving reverence to her parents. A year and a half later, sister Kwong Ah Moy was married to Lee On from Atherton in a Western Methodist ceremony, in 1909. At age 14, Ah Moy was 34 years younger than Lee On. Seven years later, younger sister Katie Kwong married in St Mary’s Anglican Church in Innisfail to James George Sang. Her wedding was much different to that of her sisters. Not only was it a Christian wedding but her marriage dress was white and Western in style

678 Interview with Roma Leong See, Cairns, 20 May 2001 and Interview with Jenni Campbell, Cairns, 8 May 2001. In Darwin, around 1890, the third wife of Kwong Sue Duc, Yuen Luk Lau, bound her eldest and first daughter's feet at around age 2. The binding of LykinKwong's feet occurred at a time when within China it was becoming very unfashionable. As Yuen Luk Lau was a traditional Chinese woman, she probably bound her first daughter's feet to enhance future marriage prospects. It is believed that pressure placed upon Kwong and Yuen Shee by Lykin's younger brothers, who had been to China, ensured that Lykin's bindings were removed. It is reputed that the brothers told Kwong that it wasn't the "done thing" any more. That is the most likely explanation, as he seemed to be a man to keep abreast of these matters. Lykin's bindings had crippled and malformed her feet, making it difficult for her to walk naturally. This gave her a lifetime of sore feet and bunions. Later on she wore children's shoes stuffed with cotton wool at the toes.

679 In an effort to enhance marriage prospects, foot binding was promoted by the lineage councils and matchmakers as a desirable asset for women and was practiced by families of means. The ten women were: North Queensland: Ah Bow, Ah Kuw, Mrs. Lee See, Chiu Chan Han, Mrs. QuongHing, Mrs. Lee Gong, Yuen Luk Lau and Mrs. Lee Yan; Blackall, Mrs Lee Kim Tim Sing; Roma, Mrs Gee Chong; and Toowoomba, Mrs Kwong Sang
Queensland but this figure may rise as it is possible that more women had bound feet. The first arrived in 1876 and the last arrived in 1903. At least three women were accompanied by a mui tsai while others had no help and relied on their husbands and children for support.

Mui Tsai

Bonded servitude or mui tsai was a widespread practice whereby young girls were sold by poor families into rich households. This practice was not only acceptable but also considered a charitable institution whereby poor families were able to safeguard to some extent the future of their daughters through the placement of a child in a more affluent household. Here, she could be considered as a household drudge and servant, a companion, san po tsai (betrothed wife) or daughter. In some cases, upon reaching a certain age, she became a concubine or was further sold to another household. Mui tsai were valuable resources for marrying daughters, not only keeping the latter company but also as the “eyes and ears” in the new household and a trusted confidant. Exploited as unpaid workers and as a form of child slavery, mui tsai had no legal rights and were in some households subject to extreme cruelty, sexual abuse, and abandonment. As Hong Kong and Singapore developed as ports of trade, so did the trade in girls increase. Western missionaries described the trade in mui tsai as form of slavery. However, in small villages where families could keep an eye on their treatment, it was regarded as a practical measure to alleviate family poverty. Certainly there was a general cultural acceptance of the practice of purchasing a bonded mui tsai and a number of Chinese women who migrated to the colonies were accompanied by a young mui tsai.

Young child servants who were most probably mui tsai accompanied their mistresses to colonies such as Queensland, Victoria, New South Wales and South Australia (Northern Territory). This is evidenced in early newspaper reports which often described the arrival of a Chinese woman as

---

680 Jaschok and Miers, Women and Chinese Patriarchy, 11.
681 Pers. Comm., Professor Yuen-fong Woon, 18 August 2002. The difference between a Mui tsai and a servant is that a Mui tsai does not get paid for her service except for the bond price, which is paid to her parents at the beginning. If the parents wanted her back they would have to pay this for her, plus interest.
682 In a society where family ascribes identity, being a mui tsai carried the stigma of not having any kin or family, therefore no “face” in society. This caused considerable shame for many women and some went to great lengths to conceal from their later family the true nature of their circumstances. However, this was a widespread cultural practice where impoverished peasantry, wars and natural disaster produced a steady supply of young girls to be sold as child servants.
683 Jaschok and Miers, Women and Chinese Patriarchy, 11.
684 The Mc Ivor Times and Rodney Advertiser, 8 September 1865, p. 2. For example, in 1865 in the colony of Victoria, Ah Kit paid £120 for a young servant Chinese girl, in the employment of another family, to be his wife. She was the bonded servant to the wife of a Chinese interpreter in Bendigo.
young and accompanied by a ‘child’. It is difficult to believe that a whole family would migrate in the 1850s, due to cultural and family traditions, and I argue that it is plausible that many early girl child arrivals were bonded servants. A report in Victoria in 1862 provides a clear indication that bonded servant females were present in the southern colonies. A small yet telling article titled “Sale of a Chinese woman” in 1865 Victoria outlines the exchange of money for a newly arrived servant girl who was on-sold by her owner, making a hefty profit of £110, to a Chinese man in Bendigo who promptly married her in the Chinese temple.

In north Queensland, at least four Chinese women arrived as bonded servant girls or mui tsai for the period 1876-1900, and five in total have been identified across the State. The first bonded servant to arrive in north Queensland came in 1875 when she accompanied her mistress to Cooktown to join the lady’s merchant husband. She was followed by a second girl a year later, also with her mistress, the wife of a prominent storekeeper, also in Cooktown. At least one mui tsai lived on the Palmer goldfield with a storekeeper family in Maytown, while another young mui tsai lived in Cairns with the wife of the principal in a prominent merchant firm, Lee Yan Brothers. Bonded mui tsai girls migrated, grew up, married and died in Queensland, arriving when very young. This is the case for the nameless 13-year-old noted as a census entry for the Cooktown district, who can be traced in north Queensland for over 25 years.

Traditional Chinese cultural practices including foot-binding and selling of children as bonded servants, were not maintained in Queensland. It could be argued that this was due to the greater love and affection that female children were showed in the Chinese community, as a rare chance...
for family life and an asset to the community. Families also experienced higher living standards than the village family, ensuring that female children did not have to be sold or have their feet bound as a solution to poverty or for social mobility. Both of these reasons were consolidated by changing attitudes back in China, especially for foot binding, which gave rise to social change in the 20th century. However, the selling of children as bonded servants in China continued to be practiced well into the 20th century. Like the presence of at least one foot binding story, there is one incident which is suspiciously like mui tsai, regarding the Chinese practice of “adoption” to alleviate a domestic problem which was undertaken in North Queensland.

A young female child from a large family on Thursday Island was “adopted” out to an influential family in Darwin in the early 1920s. It is suspected that this could well be the first recorded case of an Australian born Chinese child sent out of the family to another household as a bonded servant or a mui tsai.⁶⁹⁴ The fact that there was no extended family relationship with the adoptee family, combined with the girl’s life being spent in drudgery working “in a servant like manner” for the adoptive family through her childhood and until marriage, suggests that the decision made by her natal family to adopt their daughter out was undertaken as a means to alleviate economic stress associated with having a large family. In this instance I believe her position as a mui tsai is plausible.⁶⁹⁵ This story also reveals the special relationship between the major communities of northern Australia which, with deeper investigation, may reveal broader kinship ties, social attitudes and transnational implications as the family in question was highly active in the Chinese reform movement and held a position of high status in the Darwin Chinese community.

**Kinship networks and Marriage Patterns**

The maintenance of cultural traditions, filial piety and kinship network in an overseas household was difficult for Chinese women. Faced with a lack of traditional female transferral of knowledge in the household at times such as child rearing, women maintained established practices when it came to social perimeters for their family. The marriage of daughters and sons in particular to appropriately aligned kinship partners were one way that traditions were maintained. Throughout north Queensland, marriage patterns based on clan and village traditions were maintained for at least two generations, with some extending well into the 20th century. For

---

⁶⁹⁴Interview with anonymous informant #1, Cairns, 16 May 2002.
⁶⁹⁵Northern Territory born Moo Kim Kow (also known as Kim Foong), and her husband James Chee Quee, had a large family of ten children on Thursday Island. With so many mouths to feed, a decision was made to “adopt” out one of their daughters, Ruby, to a family in Darwin, Northern Territory sometime in the 1920s. The Hassan family was an influential family in the Darwin community, and Ruby spent many years until her marriage in 1939 working very hard for them “in a servant like manner”. It wasn’t until she got married that she was able to leave the adoptee family.
example, Australian born daughters from the Sze Yup speaking community married back into the Sze Yup community, and Chung Shan, specifically Loong Du and Liang Du families, married back into the Chung Shan community. Cross district marriage, that is men from Toishan county marrying an Australian born Chinese daughter of Zhongshan (Chungshan) parentage, did not emerge until the late 1920s and 1930s when the White Australia Policy had impacted sufficiently on a Chinese man’s ability to bring a wife out to Queensland, a decline in eligible district partners, and the Westernization of Australian born couples, who began marrying for love rather than as the result of an arranged marriage involving matchmakers.

The pattern of marriage links along district, kinship and family lines occurred across north Queensland Chinese communities and extended south to Maryborough - Gayndah, Rockhampton and Brisbane, and across to Darwin. A small sample of the marriage trends which reflect the maintenance of district, family, village, clan and kinship traditions can be seen in (Fig. 50 p. 211) This map illustrates settler families in north Queensland from the small Chungshan districts of Loong Du and Liang Du with surnames Lee, Cheng, Mow, Lum, Jong, Wong and Kwok. It highlights the maintenance of village and district connections through intergenerational marriage and extends to two generations in some cases. Marriage in north Queensland was not only entered into along district and kinship lines, but was strategically undertaken to maintain and reinforce transnational family and business networks between the ancestral village and the community in Queensland. It cemented trans-local networks with existing families also settled in Queensland. The maintenance of marriage patterns along village district lines extended sometimes to third generation Australian born Chinese, and remained in place until well after the Second World War.

696 Robb Database: Marriages and Unions: 1860-1920; BDM Q Birth Register, 1900 C1711 Ruby Beatrice Ah Moon, Ah Moon, Ah Moon Show Young. For example, in Cairns in 1900, 16-year-old maidai Chou Young, who had previously arrived in 1896 accompanying her mistress Mrs. Lee Yan from the Lee village of Lung Du, was married in a Chinese customary marriage to the much older Wong Yui Cheung (Ah Moon) from the Wong village in Lung Du. Interview with George Wah Day, Cairns, 5 April 2001. This pattern was also repeated with the marriage of Maggie Lin Ding to Lee Yan in 1912, and again with the marriage of their daughter May Lee Yan to Wong Wah Day in 1928, making two Australian born Chinese heritage daughters marrying along district lines.

697 Interview with Mary Lee, Cairns, 16 May 2002 and interview with Vincent Lee, Cairns, 9 May 2002. For example, see the marriage of Mary Jane Lippert, a first-generation mixed heritage Australian born Chinese born in Geraldton (Innisfail), who was contracted in marriage at 15 years of age to Low Gun Inn from Babinda. Low Gun Inn came from a village north of How Shan and he knew Mary Jane’s adopted father, who was from the same district. Mary Jane and Gun Inn also continued the maintenance of marriage traditions along district lines with their own second generation Australian born Chinese daughter Mary, who was married to Vincent Lee Sing Moon. He was considered a suitable partner having come from the neighbouring district of Liang Du.

698 Sandi Robb and Dr Joe Leong, Casting Seeds to the Wind: My Journey to North Queensland. Joseph Leong who was born in the Leong family village of Cao Bian, Liang Du married Chinese Australian born woman Judy Jue Sue, whose family originated from the Mow village of Soye Kai in Lung Du. Contemporary families across north Queensland, descendants of early settler Chinese families, are almost all invariably interconnected by marriage over the 130-year period. This is an emerging area of research.
Fig. 50. Representative Map: Maintenance of Confucian Marriage Patterns associated with North Queensland Families: District, Village and Kinship Links.

Conclusion

For all purposes, the migration of Chinese women to Queensland is the story of “home” as they transplanted thousands of years of family obligation, filial and marital observance, and duty. From the evidence outlined in this chapter, it is clear that Queensland was a significant destination colony for the Chinese Female Diaspora in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, especially when it is contrasted to broader global migration patterns. It has also emerged that north Queensland shares its female settler characteristics such as age, status and experience with other Australian colonies of the period: from primary wives and concubines, to bonded servants and child mui tsai.

Queensland stands as the second most favoured colony behind New South Wales for the number of women arriving to join their husbands, in front of Victoria, these being the three preferred colonies for migration. It also contributes to Australia’s overall status as one of the four most
important Western countries for the Chinese Female Diaspora of the 19th and early 20th centuries along with the U.S., Hawaii and British Columbia. Unlike the young Chinese women who were sent to the U.S. predominantly as chattels in the 19th century, Chinese women and girls who migrated to Australia were valued in the community from the moment they arrived, even if their circumstances were poor. This is particularly evident in north Queensland, where women could elevate their status and challenge established practices in the Chinese female hierarchy. Chinese women, brought up to expect a prescribed female order, found themselves challenged in family status as First Wife and Second Wife negotiated around the distance between them, the successful production of Australian born children, and filial and marital obligations.

The presence of over 80 Chinese women residing in north Queensland signalled the establishment of multiple transnational families and cemented the role of the “two primary wife” family, shared between the village and northern Australia. The establishment of the “two primary wife” family, while not exclusive to north Queensland, Queensland or Australia for that matter, formed part of a feature of the Chinese Diaspora where traditional family roles and marital expectations came under attack from problems caused by distance, and the need to respond. The subsequent birth of children in Queensland provided a means for Chinese families to establish ancestral links in Queensland, extend opportunities though the successful marriage of sons and daughters, create partnerships and networks, and develop a sustainable economy – all aimed at maintaining and increasing family wealth and the ancestral lineage: a truly transnational family.
Chapter 8

"...CO-HABITATING WITH HIS ABORIGINAL PARAMOUR": ABORIGINAL WOMEN AND CHINESE MEN

Introduction

Historical relationships and marriage patterns of Chinese men and Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander women across north Queensland are the least understood aspect of the Chinese Family Landscape. Unlike Chinese men who were able to settle with a migrant China born wife, or partner with colonial and migrant White women, family relations for Chinese men who partnered with Indigenous women were fraught with social disapproval, Government anti-miscegenation policies, and disruption of family through official removals. Attitudes by authorities towards Chinese—Indigenous relationships in Queensland were stridently negative, and these mirrored deep seated British colonial attitudes which applied across the globe. However, despite the number of restrictions faced by Chinese men when choosing to partner with an Indigenous woman, some intimate relationships managed to occur where families were formed and kinship connections for women maintained with country.

It is popularly believed that there were numerous interracial relationships between Chinese men and Aboriginal women throughout Queensland’s settlement history.699 The true extent of positive interracial interactions in general between Chinese men and Aboriginal groups is usually underrated and misunderstood, and scholarly work has failed to provide firm information which identifies the exact number of intimate relationships between Chinese men and Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander women. Much of the discussion focuses on themes of race relations, or the politics of marginalisation. This leaves the presumption of large numbers of Chinese men in relationships with Aboriginal women as speculative at best, with no real statistical evidence to verify claims. This chapter aims to explore the incidence of Chinese-Indigenous Family Landscape across north Queensland, taking into account Aboriginal law, ability by Aboriginal

699 Margaret Slocombe, Among Australia’s Pioneers: Chinese Indentured Pastoral Workers on the Northern Frontier 1848-c1880 (Balboa Press, 2014): 282; Anne Mc Grath, Illicit Love: Intercultural Sex and Marriage in the United States of America and Australia (University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln, 2015): 251-321. Historians who have taken an interest in this area include Fred Cahir, Regina Ganter, Henry Reynolds, and Hilda Mclean, yet they have only ventured into this space in the last two decades. Greater attention has been paid by scholars in anthropology including Guy Ramsay, Anna Snukal, Richard Martin and David Trigger, with more research occurring in NSW with the work of Marie Reay and more recently, Barry McGowan, Genevieve Mott and Juanita Kwok. Within Queensland’s Indigenous community there is some interest from family history researchers, such as Helen Ellems and Carol Chong. See Carol Chong, “The Chong Family History at Mungana”, in G. Grimwade, K. RainsandM. Dunk (eds), Rediscovered Past: Chinese Networks (CHINA Inc., 2016):51-65; Helen Ellems and Jana Kahabka, “My ‘Half Full Lations’: Unravelling the threads”, paper delivered at the CHINA Inc. conference, Cairns, 2014.
women to partner with a non-Aboriginal man, and the number of relationships as best can be
determined so far. This thesis provides an overview of Chinese-Aboriginal relationships only, due
to the size of the task to research all Chinese-Aboriginal marriages and marriage-like relations.
This chapter instead positions the experience of Chinese – Indigenous family formation in
Queensland within the broader context of Chinese – local marriage formation in other Australian
colonies and comparable global colonial communities. This in turn is compared to information
from other colonies, which is discussed within the framework of British and European colonial
experiences.

For the purpose of this chapter, an “Indigenous” woman is a woman who is neither Chinese nor
White but Indigenous to the country on which she is living: in Australia, either Aboriginal or
Torres Strait Islander. “Aboriginal” refers to those of full or partial Aboriginal parentage who are
accepted by their communities as Aborigines. It will be used interchangeably at times with
“Local woman” to denote that she is “Local” to the country. The difficulty in applying both
terms, whether separately or together, internationally, when making comparisons is that while the
term can be applied to women who are First Nation women or Indigenous to a colony or country,
it falls short of describing women who are non-Chinese, non-White, and not First Nations
women. For example, African women who were former slaves associated with plantation
economies; Mulatto women; or South Sea Islander women in Australia are not in this category.
Scholars in America overcome this problem by describing the variances using individual cultural
terms. I will continue where practical to observe this practice, particularly when making the
distinction between Aboriginal, Torres Strait Islander and South Sea Islander women where
necessary.

***

Part 1: Global Trends:

Legislation, regulation and exploitation

Interruption between migrating Chinese men and local Indigenous women in host countries first
commenced in the 7th Century across South-east Asia. Chinese sailors, traders and merchants
visited, traded and put down roots in places such as Siam (Thailand) and Cochin (now part of
Malaysia), as well as in kingdoms and sultanates of island nations including Timor, Sumatra,
Java, Kalimantan, Sulawesi and the Philippines. These men settled abroad to enhance economic
opportunities for their China based families, and developed commercial and kinship networks
through marriage with local women. As a result, commercial success extended across these
countries and sea routes which enabled a flow of commodities such as sandalwood, beche-de-mer and copra. Built up over generations, some bicultural Chinese-local communities developed into new ethnic groups such as the Straits Chinese Peranakan, Phuket Baba, Cook Island Tinitos and the Filipino Mestizo. Due to several cultural similarities such as with kinship systems, religious values and reverence for ancestral entities, Chinese men were able to enter interracial marriage with local women with ease.

The second phase of migration commenced in the late 17th century and continued into the early 20th century. During this period an estimated 11 million Chinese men migrated around the globe including South and North America, Africa, islands across the Pacific, and Australasia. The second phase of Chinese migration occurred in response to expansion by British and European colonial powers that competed with each other to colonize in order to extract resources. Their efforts to exploit the natural and human resources across each dominion created an opening for labour which China based families responded to. Migration and settlement in this second phase led to the marriage of Chinese men to local and Indigenous women across the Asia Pacific region, and is recorded in at least five colonies of Australia. The only exception to this pattern of marriage occurred on the Nauru and Banaba Islands.

European colonial powers, including Dutch, British, German, French, Spanish and Portuguese nations, colonized many countries and islands across South-east Asia and Oceania. The Dutch had colonized most of the islands in the Indonesian archipelago and western New Guinea, while the French had established administrative rule in Indochina, as well as the New Hebrides, New Caledonia and Tahiti. Germany administered colonies in northeast New Guinea, Micronesia, the Solomon Islands, Samoa and Nauru, while Portugal, which had formerly claimed many

702 Ibid.
704 Hong Liu, “Conceptualizing International Migration”, 414
705 Khoo, “Hokkien Chinese”, 83
706 Stanziani: 129
707 Willmott, “The Chinese Communities in the Smaller Countries”, 19
708 Ibid., 10-17
710 Ibid. All of Germany’s colonies were confiscated following its defeat in WWI and they became protectorates under the administration of other nations, including in the Pacific Japan, Britain, the U.S. and Australia.
islands in Indonesia, retained its claim over Timor and leased Macao. For its part, Spain concentrated most of its colonial interests in South America including Mexico, Peru and Cuba until the Spanish-American War of 1898. However, it also had a strategic interest in the rich trading region of the Philippines until 1898 when it was taken by and then sold to the U.S. The British Empire dominated and maintained an active interest across many regions, taking in India, British Columbia, the British West Indies and parts of Africa as well as Australasia and a number of islands across the Pacific. At its peak, the British administered dominions, colonies, protectorates and territories extending around the Pacific including Australia, New Zealand, Papua, Fiji, the Cook Islands, Gilbert Island (Kiribati), Ocean Island (Banaba), North Borneo, Burma, the Malayan peninsula and Hong Kong. They also, when the opportunity presented itself, took over administration of the Solomon Islands, New Hebrides (Vanuatu) in conjunction with the French, and (very briefly) Samoa. U.S. colonies included the Philippines, Samoa and Hawaii.

Fig. 51. Chinese Migration Patterns: Asia Pacific Region: Known location where interracial Marriages occurred

---

713 Demand for desirable commodities such as opium, tea, sugar and spices led to trade and colonial expansion in the 1840s. This sparked British instigated wars against China and around the Dutch East Indies. The demand for plantation crops such as sugar, tobacco, copra, and rubber caused a grab for land around the Pacific.
Colonizing attitudes towards Chinese-local interracial marriage: British Empire

Analysis of British colonized and settled countries around the globe indicates that the British and German Empires applied a distinctive form of cultural prejudice against other races to discourage, separate, and regulate interracial relationships. British authorities were most strident when it came to relationships between Chinese men and local Indigenous women. Colonies across the Pacific, around the Atlantic Rim, Australasia, British Columbia and British South Africa had policies and laws introduced to segregate Chinese male and Local female populations based on a range of motives, including racial eugenics, “protection” of racial purity and morality of Indigenous populations, and as a means of enforcing racial domination through population control measures. Draconian anti–miscegenation laws and administrative policies resulted in inhibited family formation, couples separated, and intimacy denied. The only region where interracial marriage was viewed as an advantage to British colonial authorities was in the older colonial administration centre of the British West Indies where the profits of plantations were built on a culture of human exploitation: slavery from the continent of Africa, and the children of those slaves. By the time Pacific Rim nations were being colonized, the British West Indies was well established as a multi-ethnic New World society.

When Chinese indentured migrants arrived in the British West Indies, from the 1850s onwards, they entered a community where marriage to local women was already easier through a general acceptance by authorities accustomed to administering a heterogeneous multicultural society.714

In this environment, a flexible approach to interracial union was taken by authorities, as a result of pressure exerted by plantation managers and owners, who endorsed interracial marriage as a means to tie imported male labour to the plantation. Marriage, it seemed, proved to be an excellent method for labour retention, as Chinese filled the labour gap which had opened up after the abolition of slavery.715

However, while the British West Indies proved tolerant in its approach to interracial marriage, the United States, with its Anglo-British background and parallel history of slave labour on

---


715 Lee Loy, “The Chinese are preferred to all others”, 206. Lee Loy notes that Chinese men in Trinidad and British Guiana were considered a key factor in the maintenance of control over the native and ex-slave population.
plantations, proved the opposite. While it was not illegal for Chinese men to marry First Nation women, Black or White women, the actual number of marriages between First Nation women and Chinese men remains speculative at best, with figures assumed to be low due to cultural, social and frontier conflict reasons.\footnote{716 Bronson and Ho, Coming Home in Gold Brocade,119.} However, from a small sample of historical newspapers reviewed for this thesis, it is clear that mixed marriages between Chinese men and First Nation women occurred from the mid-1860s onwards,\footnote{717 See Montana's The Montana Post, 19 October 1867, p. 5.; Pioche, Nevada, Lincoln County Record, 25 March 1904, unpaginated; Seattle, Washington’s The Daily Intelligencer, 1 February 1880, Image 3, and Montana’s The Anaconda Standard, 29 December 1894, p. 2.} was more prevalent after the frontier conflict period had settled down, and occurred in rural regions of the United States.\footnote{718 Daniel Leistman, “Horizontal Inter-Ethnic Relations: Chinese and American Indians in the Nineteenth Century American West”, Western Historical Quarterly, 30, 3 (Autumn, 1999): 347-349.} Intimate relations between Chinese men and First Nation women was motivated by a mutual economic benefit, companionship and attraction, all of which showed many similarities with the Queensland colonial experience, particularly in north Queensland. Further north in British Columbia, the situation remained similar with Chinese–Canadian Aboriginal relationships scarce, located in rural regions, and undertaken at times which was mutually benefit for both parties. For example, there were several women from the Musqueam nation of Vancouver, British Columbia who partnered with Chinese men in the early part of the 20th century.\footnote{719 ZoolSuleman, Vancouver Dialogues: First Nations, Urban Aboriginal and Immigrant Communities (City of Vancouver, 2011):39andMusqueam Elder, Guest Speaker address, delivered at 9th International Society for the Study of Chinese Overseas Conference (ISSCO) Vancouver, July 6-8, 2016.} Across the United States as well as British Columbia, interracial Chinese /First Nation/Aboriginal families were raised with a strong Indigenous identity, with most taking their mothers’ culture as the dominant culture.\footnote{720 Leistman, “Horizontal Inter-Ethnic Relations”, 347-349.}

**European Empires**

However, the British Empire was not the only empire to hold strongly negative views about interracial marriage. Germany also introduced laws and policies to separate Chinese men from the local female population in their colonies across the Pacific.\footnote{721 Tuatagoloa/Leung Wai, “Reflections on the experiences of the Chinese community in Samoa”, Presentation of Attorney-General of Samoa, at the “China and Pacific: The view from Oceania” Conference, National University of Samoa – Apia, Samoa, (25 February 2015): 4-5.https://www.victoria.ac.nz/chinaresearchcentre/programmes-and-projects/china-symposiums/china-and-the-pacific-the-view-from-oceania/9-Ming-Leung-Wai-Chinese-Experience-in-Samoa-paper-sp2-15-REAL-FINAL-2.pdf} As German colonial administrations transitioned to British colonial rule, segregation was enforced more rigorously. This was most evident across the Solomon Islands as well as Samoa when former British colony New Zealand took over administration during the First World War.\footnote{722 A.S. NoaSiaosi, Catching the Dragon’s Tail: The Impact of the Chinese in Samoa, Master of Arts Thesis in Pacific Studies, University of Cante, 2010: 1 and 44}
British authorities to establish strong anti-miscegenation laws in previously occupied German colonies, owing to the strict laws already in place. Both the German and British Empires displayed similar ideas regarding miscegenation, racial superiority and race relations over their local populations. In contrast, other European empires such as the French, Dutch, Spanish and Portuguese took a more relaxed attitude to Chinese-Local interracial marriage in countries they occupied around the globe.

Across the Dutch colonies of Sumatra, North Borneo, Java, and Kalimantan, as well as Portuguese Timor, and the Spanish Philippines, Chinese trade and family networks provided colonial administrations with a means to secure local assistance in the production and distribution of plantation grown resources such as cocoa, rubber, coconut and tobacco. Colonial administrators were reluctant to impose regulations against interracial marriage, for fear of upsetting the access by local village headmen to a ready and mobile Chinese indentured workforce from China. In particular, with many plantation interests across what is now the Indonesian archipelago, the Dutch left the local population to their own devices when it came to regulating interracial marriage.\(^{723}\) For colonial authorities, the benefit of interracial Chinese-Indigenous marriages could be measured in the secure trading relations developed with China through family, kinship and community relations which they brought into the colonies.\(^{724}\) These relationships were acknowledged by both the Dutch and Spanish who relied on local Chinese as intermediaries between East and West for community, commerce and Christian reform matters.

In other colonies held by Spain, France, the Netherlands and Portugal a flexible approach to interracial marriages was held wherever they colonized and they were unlikely to introduce legislation in order to maintain racial purity of populations. In places such as Timor, New Caledonia, Tahiti, Mexico, Peru, Cuba, and Dutch South Africa, populations of mixed heritage Chinese-Indigenous families were left unimpeded by legislative restrictions. Foreign colonial administrations weighed up the benefit of mixed marriage families to the local economy, preferring to exploit the benefits than lose resources to maintain an ethnic divide. However, this was not a uniform colonial policy - for example, Spain had an ambivalent approach to interracial


marriage in colonies such as Mexico and Peru, yet adopted a different administrative approach to interracial marriage in the Philippines, based on religion rather than race.

Spanish colonial authorities in the Philippines established a policy of “social compartmentalization” to keep culturally different groups separate, which was aimed at the whole community. The government opposed Chinese interracial unions with local women and restricted cohabitation and marriage. However, as a strongly Roman Catholic institution, the colonial authority concurrently demonstrated a pragmatic approach to relationships, and allowed some marriages to occur providing the man converted to Catholicism. Children born from a Chinese father to a Filipino mother were referred to as Chinese “Mestizo”. Social distinctions were determined by culture, but religion dominated the structure of society and mobility within it. The Spanish regarded conversion by Chinese to Catholicism as a satisfactory solution to the dilemma of interracial couples. In particular, Chinese commercial traders were considered an economic benefit to society. With an eye on saving souls, the Spanish regarded conversion of Chinese settlers an additional benefit for missionary work in China by providing a foothold into Chinese villages.  

Social interface of Chinese – Local marriage: reciprocity, difficulties

Colonising countries which had economies based on exploitation, used gender and labour as a means to secure economic advantage for White settlers, exposing both Chinese men and local women to deprivations. These conditions provided common ground for relationships to develop between Chinese men and Local/Indigenous women, bringing benefits of intimacy and family to the couple. As families grew, extended family networks developed and social status was elevated. Family wealth was increased when children reached a suitable age to help as additional labour. Local marriages provided Chinese men with a valuable tool to re-negotiate the terms of contract with employers once the indenture contract period had expired or, at the point of departure, enabled men to move into storekeeping more confidently due to the support of extended local family relations. Storekeepers were able to expand their commercial interests via kinship links in neighboring towns and some family networks extended across border regions.

Extended kinship links enabled the fostering of family-based relationships within the community.\textsuperscript{728} Family based social networks which nurtured business and personal relationships utilized the Chinese philosophy of \textit{guanxi}, which was applied in communities across the Atlantic countries and colonies as well as across Australasia.

\textit{Guanxi} or the Confucian modus operandi based on mutual respect for social and family ties, describes the framework of reciprocity and network connections which developed across an individual’s or family’s lifetime.\textsuperscript{729} It applied to the nuclear family, who were expected to work on behalf of the family as a whole, extended family relatives, as well as clan associations across the village and often involved the exchange of an item, a favour, or money to improve trust within a network, the goal to ensure a successful outcome. It could be achieved either directly or indirectly and it worked both horizontally amongst peers, and vertically when applied to class or status. For overseas Chinese, \textit{guanxi} provided the ability for migrants to advance their personal and commercial standing in a host community, resulting in benefits which reached beyond the colonial community and back to the village in China.\textsuperscript{730}

Interracial marriage with local women provided Chinese men with a platform for \textit{guanxi} to be applied across host colonial countries such as Mexico, Peru, and Cuba as well as in the British West Indies.\textsuperscript{731} It was also utilized throughout the Asia-Pacific region, with Manying Ip suggesting, when discussing Chinese-Maori marriages in New Zealand, that \textit{guanxi} relations were fostered by Chinese men with Maori women, as a natural extension to shared cultural values between the two groups.\textsuperscript{732} Applying Ip’s approach to Chinese-Aboriginal interracial relationships across north Queensland, it could be argued that \textit{guanxi} also existed through a shared common value and respect for elders, family identity and structured kinship relations. Chinese men put the collective welfare of wife, family and extended kinship relations above individual interests which may account for the ease with which Chinese men interacted with local Aboriginal communities in the 20\textsuperscript{th} century.

\textsuperscript{729} This philosophy takes in all aspects of relationships, both business and private.
\textsuperscript{730} Verhezen, “Prevalence of networking”.
\textsuperscript{732} Manying Ip, “Maori–Chinese Encounters”, 230. With a high respect for elders and a love for children, Chinese-Maori families shared child rearing responsibilities and cherished the family unit within a tight knit and clannish community.
Throughout South-east Asia, where interracial marriage was frequent, interracial partnering had several advantages for both parties. Local women, known for their business acumen in the domestic market, proved reliable and trusted members of a growing family business with the additional benefit of sexual relations. Chinese – Local relationships enabled women to have access to outside capital as well as economic resources, which were recycled back into the domestic economy. On island communities across Melanesia, Micronesia and Polynesia, local women were also key economic participants and in many cases, exercised considerable tolerance towards Chinese men. This is evident in the frequent marriage and relationships in Hawaii which led to an estimated population of 1200 – 1500 Chinese–Hawaiian families by 1900. Samoan women in particular considered Chinese men to be good providers and were attracted to their stability and hardworking nature.

Fig. 52. Chinese migration: Areas of Micronesia, Melanesia and Polynesia.

However, there were also drawbacks for local women when choosing a Chinese husband. Firstly, while it seemed Samoan women were able to freely make their own choices, possibly with a perceived gain for the family in mind through selection of a “superior” husband, their strategy

---

733 Andaya and Andaya, *History of Early Modern South-east Asia*, 153
734 Ip, “Maori–Chinese Encounters”, 229
735 Ali Bessie Ng, *Chinese in Fiji, Suva, Fiji*, (Institute of Pacific Studies, University of the South Pacific, 2002): 44.
did not advance their children at all.\textsuperscript{736} While mixed race children were absorbed into the Samoan kinship and family system, they were not entitled to land or chieftain titles. This left many first and subsequent mixed heritage offspring in cultural limbo. The birth of children was seen as a Samoan problem, rather than a Chinese one, and not everyone was happy with interracial marriage. While Samoan women considered Chinese men to be superior husband material to local Samoan men, Samoan men saw Chinese men as a threat to their natural conjugal rights.\textsuperscript{737} In 1917, an attempt was made to convince Samoan women to return to their rightful place alongside their men by the village headmen. Village communities enacted laws to ban women from living with Chinese men.\textsuperscript{738} Later on, Chinese–Samoan families suffered distress and disconnection when Chinese husbands and fathers were forcibly repatriated to China in the 1930s.\textsuperscript{739} This was also the case in Mexico where Chinese men faced government-imposed deportations during the 1937 Mexican anti-Chinese crisis.\textsuperscript{740}

Secondly, many Local women faced deprivation and poverty upon the death of or abandonment by Chinese husbands. This was the case for many Chinese-Local wives in Hawaii.\textsuperscript{741} In comparison, the abandonment of women and families, while a feature of some Chinese-Aboriginal families across north Queensland, appeared to occur at a later stage in the couples’ lives; usually at the point when the husband had become elderly. This suggests that his return to China was based on patrilineal ancestral obligations rather than a callous abandonment of his Queensland Aboriginal family.

Thirdly, some Local women who made the journey back to the village ancestral home with their husbands, suffered from culture shock when faced with Chinese polygamous family arrangements. This was the case for many Indigenous women from Peru who struggled to make the cultural transition into the village ancestral home.\textsuperscript{742} Many women experienced isolation and loneliness, and were particularly vulnerable when their husbands returned back overseas. This negative attribute to mixed marriage is evident in the repeated incidences of abandonment of

\textsuperscript{737}This friction in the male community was not dissimilar to the colonial Australian experience when Chinese men married White women.
\textsuperscript{738}In Queensland, decision making by colonial Protectors of Aborigines enforced traditional betrothals, putting Aboriginal men’s conjugal rights above Aboriginal women’s conjugal wants.
\textsuperscript{739}Ming, “Reflections”, 4-5.
\textsuperscript{741}McKeown, “Transnational Chinese Families”, 99.
\textsuperscript{742}This was particularly so when they found out he already had a wife in China.
Indigenous women in the early 20th century. “Dumped” in the village ancestral home with little or no means to return to South America, some Peruvian women resorted to begging on the streets of Hong Kong in order to secure passage money back to Lima.743 In contrast, women from Hawaii found themselves at ease in the Chinese family system, and readily formed friendly relationships with primary wives and mothers-in-law due to their familiarity with polygamous traditions.744 It is not known how many Australian Aboriginal women visited the ancestral home in China, nor if they were welcome or abandoned.

Queensland’s negative attitude towards Chinese-Aboriginal marriage did not emerge in isolation as a single colonial response to interracial marriage. Instead, the desire to dominate and control both the Local/ Indigenous/Aboriginal and Chinese male migrant population, through prevention and control of interracial relationships, occurred as an extension to well-established cultural biases associated with empire building itself. Deep seated, negative, cultural attitudes towards miscegenation played out across all Anglo–Saxon colonies in the 19th and 20th centuries and these attitudes shaped the way laws and policies developed thereafter. In the newly federated Australia, this ultimately led to the White Australia policy of the early 20th century: a policy partly based on Queensland’s response to Aboriginal-Chinese relations in the 1890s.

744Ibid. 319.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRY OR ISLAND</th>
<th>EUROPEAN COLONIAL ADMINISTRATION</th>
<th>INDUSTRY</th>
<th>PARTNERING WITH</th>
<th>REACTION BY ADMINISTRATION</th>
<th>LINKS TO ANCESTRAL HOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Queensland</td>
<td>1848</td>
<td>Gold, Tin</td>
<td>Gold, Sandlewood</td>
<td>Gold, Sandlewood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>1823</td>
<td>Gold</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>1848</td>
<td>Gold, Tin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MELANESIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>1855</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German Papua New Guinea</td>
<td>1884</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon Islands</td>
<td>1893</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hebrides (Vanuatu)</td>
<td>1844</td>
<td>Pearl Fishing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Caledonia</td>
<td>1846</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLYNESIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand Mauris</td>
<td>1870s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>1802</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoa</td>
<td>1850s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tahiti</td>
<td>1865</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook Islands (Tinuito)</td>
<td>1882</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICRONESIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiribati (Gilbert Is)</td>
<td>1883</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nauru</td>
<td>1886</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banaba (Ocean Is)</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH EAST ASIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timor</td>
<td>From 7th century</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumatra</td>
<td>From 21st century</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Borneo</td>
<td>1846 1881</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Java</td>
<td>1823</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalimantan</td>
<td>c1600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siam (Thailand)</td>
<td>1809</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>1594</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATLANTIC RIM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>1856</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Columbia</td>
<td>1871</td>
<td>Gold</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>1893</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>1849</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>1850s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRITISH WEST INDIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinidad</td>
<td>1806</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Guiana</td>
<td>1853</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>1875</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Global Analysis: Marriage and Partnering:
Chinese men to Women who are identified as Indigenous, Local non-White or Mulatto women.
Part 2:
Australian Colonial Comparisons

The extent of marriage between Chinese men and local Aboriginal women across north Queensland in the 19th century remains uncertain. Large scale research of Chinese –Indigenous marriage has never been undertaken, nor have the cultural constraints based on Aboriginal law been factored in to provide understanding of how, or when, these interracial relationships began to occur. Until the end of the 19th and early 20th centuries, the incidence of interracial marriages and unions between Chinese men and Aboriginal women remained very low, particularly when compared to interracial relationships between Chinese men and White women. I argue that this is because of two primary reasons: inability to form relationships due to frontier relations, and Aboriginal Customary Law.

Queensland’s interracial Chinese-Indigenous relationships did not begin to emerge until after frontier violence had ceased. Aboriginal tribes living ‘on country’ regarded both White and Chinese migrant settlers as usurpers of their land: foreigners who crossed tribal country and helped themselves to limited resources without permission. These intruders upset the balance of traditional Law and as a result were considered a force to be repelled. During this war, violence against the Aboriginal population did not diminish until populations had been “dispersed”, eradicated, decimated by disease, or pacified. Frontier violence remained active until the late 1890s in rural and remote districts of the north with detachments of Native Police active across the region. By the time colonial settlement was complete, Aboriginal populations had been diminished both physically and spiritually, and family groups split up or permanently separated. In this environment, cultural traditions regarding marriage partners, kinship and skin totem rules could not be maintained, leaving women with little option but to partner with non-Aboriginal men including Chinese.

North Queensland like the Northern Territory and Western Australia was one of the last frontiers for post-contact violence associated with colonization. Eastern states such as Victoria and New South Wales had already experienced a bloody frontier phase 40 years prior to Queensland, at a time before gold was discovered and Chinese miners arrived. To date, no evidence has emerged to suggest that interracial intimate relations, marriages or unions occurred between Chinese men

Queenslander, 25 May 1889, p. 1008. Sub-inspector Urquhart and his Aboriginal troopers were still “dispersing” Aboriginal people from their country near the Main Telegraph Station on Cape York in 1889.

“North Queensland Aborigines and Native Police”, Brisbane Courier, 16 April 1897, p. 6.

Cahir, Black Gold; Barry McGowan, Thematic history of the Chinese people in the Rutherglen/Wahgunyah region of Indigo Shire, Victoria. (Barry McGowan, June 2015): 18. Barry Mc Gowan notes concerning Aboriginal-Chinese interaction in Victoria, “By the early 1850s, when the bulk of Chinese miners were arriving in the north east goldfields, the Aboriginal people had been decimated by contact with whites, disease and alcohol.”
and Aboriginal women in Victoria\textsuperscript{748} with only a few in New South Wales. The first hint of Chinese-Aboriginal interracial relations in New South Wales did not emerge publicly until 1898, when the Aboriginal Protection Board commented, when referring to mixed race children, that some had “a Chinese taint in them”.\textsuperscript{749} New South Wales interracial relations occurred around the central, central west and far north western borderland districts, in towns and districts spanning from Cowra, Young, Orange, and Dubbo to Wellington\textsuperscript{750} and extending further north-west to the borderland districts of Walgett, Moree and Bogabilla.\textsuperscript{751} Even then it was not until the early decades of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century that Walgett had its first Chinese-Aboriginal family\textsuperscript{752} although there is anecdotal evidence that earlier marriages occurred up to forty years prior.\textsuperscript{753} Across the three eastern colonies, a general pattern of interracial relations commenced after frontier violence had settled down and culture and traditions had been disrupted. It was only then that relationships developed between the two marginalized communities.

Developed over thousands of years, Aboriginal culture was bound together in a complex set of rules and social constraints which governed marriage, community relations and tribal affiliations. Despite tremendous dislocation of culture after the arrival of colonists, Aboriginal populations in remote towns and places across western New South Wales and across northern Australia maintained some semblance of Law, particularly when it came to marriage practices. Strong matrilineal and matrilocal bias remained prevalent in rural and remote New South Wales and north Queensland, and these traditions remained until well into the 20\textsuperscript{th} century.\textsuperscript{754} However, in the late 19\textsuperscript{th} century when colonial settlement had stabilized, Aboriginal women found themselves increasingly faced with the loss of suitable partners as “promised” husbands and eligible totem/skin partners no longer existed having been decimated by years of frontier violence. Aboriginal women were faced with a difficult decision: turn away from traditional Law and partner with a non-Aboriginal man, or remain vulnerable to predatory White men who had settled and now worked the country. It was a difficult decision for Aboriginal women. Traditional marriage was governed by strict customary edicts. Those who breached the rules became at risk for ostracisation from the tribe or, in some cases, death. When it occurred, interracial marriage disrupted the heart of customary Law, clan, and kinship rules, and dislocated totem and moiety relations.

\footnotetext{\textsuperscript{748} A search of newspapers of the time in Victoria, using a number of search terms which yielded good results in the U.S. and Queensland, failed to produce any evidence of Chinese-Aboriginal marriages between 1850 and 1910.}
\footnotetext{\textsuperscript{749} "Aboriginal Protection Board", Singleton Argus, 8 November 1898, p. 2}
\footnotetext{\textsuperscript{750} Barry McGowan and Genevieve Mott, True Australians and Pioneers: Chinese Migration to the Orange, Blaney and Cabonne Shires and the Town of Wellington, report prepared for Orange City, Blaney and Cabonne Shire Councils (August 2017): 121-131.}
\footnotetext{\textsuperscript{751} Marie Reay, “A Half-Caste Aboriginal Community in North-Western New South Wales”, Oceania, 15, 4 (June, 1945): 296-323.}
\footnotetext{\textsuperscript{752} Ibid., 296-323}
\footnotetext{\textsuperscript{753} McGowan and Mott, True Australians, 127.}
When Chinese–Aboriginal interracial marriages did begin to occur, tribal marriage laws were considered violated, and the union “wrong” by community standards. Women faced rejection from their tribes and ran the risk of no longer being able to take their customary place within the clan. In response, some Aboriginal women moved away from their families in order to protect the reputation of the clan. This is evident in Walgett, New South Wales where Chinese-Aboriginal couples lived outside the Aboriginal camp and away from the rest of the community. In the Orange, Blaney and Cabonne Shire districts, mixed heritage families lived on the Chinese gardens in preference to the Aboriginal Reserves nearby. It may also explain why Opal Maginmarm left her “country” on the Brunette Downs, Northern Territory to live with her husband Sam Ah Sam on Lawn Hill Station in the Gulf country of western north Queensland in 1893. The move may also have been precipitated by the decimation of suitable marriage partners from clan territory as a result of “dispersal” actions by station owners and Native Police.

The impact of Queensland’s dispersal policies 1860-1900, by White men and Aboriginal Troopers, on Aboriginal women’s access to marriage partners and ability to maintain traditional customary marriage laws, was substantial. By the time Chinese – Aboriginal marriages were first legally registered from 1898, Aboriginal populations had been subjected to over thirty years of frontier violence. Those who were left to “come in” and settle on pastoral stations, did so in the hope that they would be able to remain on country and maintain traditional connections to the land and traditional sites in exchange for labour services. Remote station managers across the north-west Gulf districts capitalised on the situation, using Aboriginal men as ringers and boundary riders while women worked as house maids and laundry-girls. Some women also worked as “stockmen” and were very adept at horseriding. When the station Chinese cook/gardener married a local Aboriginal woman it provided another means to secure a proper labour-force. Remote station managers acted as local Justice of the Police and married their Chinese and Aboriginal employees. Stable interracial relationships proved mutually beneficial for both the station owners and the Aboriginal population on the property.

757 McGowan and Mott, True Australians, 125-26.
758 Marian K. Dent, “‘Moody’ Leon - Colourful Bush Character”, MIMAG (November 1991): 10. Opal's "country" was in the Northern Territory on Brunette Downs. It is important for scholars to seek new perspectives on Aboriginal intercultural relationships, where customary law and partner choices collide.
759 For an account of dispersals by Native Police see Jonathan Richards, The Secret War: A True History of Queensland's Native Police (University of Queensland Press, St. Lucia, 2008); and “Police Protection in the Burke District”, Queensland, 22 April 1882, p. 498.
761 QBDM-MR-MF, 1898, 1898/000218, SAM AH BOW married MAGINMARM, Opal, 14 November 1898; Marriages in the Bourke District 1898; and “Mr. T. B Macintosh”, Courier Mail, 16 December 1933, p. 18. This was the case for Sam Ah Bow and Opal Maginmarm from Lawn Hill Station who were married by Justice of the Peace, J.B MacIntosh, who was at the time manager of Lawn Hill.
An accord developed over time between Chinese men and the Aboriginal community. Both shared a social structure based on a clan system, and alliances between family groups were based on marriage and kinship structures. Gender roles were maintained as separate, and both had a cultural and spiritual reverence for the landscape, the spirits, the sea, and the environment. Aboriginal culture could be patriarchal or matriarchal in structure, yet was matriarchal when it came to children, family raising and knowledge sharing for girls. The maternal Aboriginal grandmother was not only at the pinnacle of female power but responsible for ensuring her grandchildren were raised appropriately so cultural transfer occurred and children did not to bring shame on the family. This was not unlike the role of mother-in-law in the patriarchal Confucian family. Both sets of women provided a focal centre for family and clan: a system which was amenable for a Chinese–Aboriginal interracial relationship.

However, despite synergies between Aboriginal and Chinese cultures which were acknowledged by each group, there appeared to be some initial reluctance for Chinese men to partner with Local Aboriginal women as readily as they did in other host countries. There are some considerations as to why this was so.

Firstly, Chinese men were economic migrants: focused on making sufficient money to send home to sustain the village family. As McKeown points out, “migration was just one of a variety of investment strategies designed to keep the family line solvent.” Partnering with a non-Chinese woman in a host country was an additional financial burden to the primary task at hand, and pastoral cooks/gardeners were not rich. When compared to marriage with a White woman, who provided a pathway to economic expansion through naturalisation, Aboriginal women with their low status in White society provided little economic incentive for marriage. However, the advantage of intimacy, companionship and labour for men who were unable to attract a wife in China, cannot be understated as a legitimate reason later on to take a “wife”. As a result, there was often a huge disparity of age between the man and woman.

Secondly, by 1852 in the colonies of Victoria and New South Wales, the Aboriginal population had been decimated and Aboriginal women rendered ‘invisible’ by the broader White society. Some Chinese men may have had prejudiced views against Aboriginal women’s low status in what was by then a relatively urban society. These two points, lack of women and low status, are evident

---

763 Similarly, both Chinese and Aboriginal women shared female specific traditions which Chinese men would have been sensitive to, including the traditional conjugal month of rest after the birth of a baby.
764McKeown, Transnational Chinese Families, 97
in the words of a contributor to the *Sydney Morning Herald* who reflected on the likelihood of Chinese men marrying local women in N.S.W. when he said

“The introduction of so many males into countries like our own, without a fair proportion of the opposite sex, has been remedied in our other colonies as well as other States, by the Chinese gradually intermarrying with the Aboriginal women of these countries, but there is no such resource in this country.”

At the time this statement was made, Queensland and the Northern Territory portion of South Australia were expanding and the frontier wars were yet to reach their violent peak.

Thirdly, a sustained period of Aboriginal violence and aggression towards Chinese shepherds and miners in northern Australia left an indelible impression on Chinese settler men. While generations of Asian-Aboriginal families had formed as part of the interaction with the Aboriginal community across the coast of then South Australia (Northern Territory), Arnhem Land and the West Australian Kimberley district, Chinese-Aboriginal relations across Queensland, and in particular north Queensland, were quickly defined by fear, violence, and conflict wrought by the Aboriginal clans against Chinese men. The push into northern New South Wales from the late 1840s, and after 1850 into the Darling Downs and Maranoa districts, sparked violent conflict and hostility between Aboriginal clans and White settlers. This conflict extended to newly arriving indentured Chinese shepherds. Violence expanded in intensity when Chinese men arrived on north Queensland goldfields. Chinese miners, in search of gold, quickly learned to fear for their lives as they travelled to and settled on remote goldfields such as the Gilbert and the Palmer.

Aboriginal clans across the north, seeking to rid the intruders from tribal lands, conducted fear invoking raids and violence against all settlers which resulted in retribution and “dispersals”. Newspapers of the day seized on the violence and graphically related accounts of it across the colonies. This gave rise to reports about terrifying practices exacted on innocent miners, including dismemberment and cannibalism. Rumours about cannibalism were cultivated by White miners.

---

767 Chase argues that unlike the top end of Western Australia and Northern Territory, Aborigines of Cape York peninsula had little contact with overseas visitors until the arrival of Cook and later in the mid-late 19th century. In the late 19th and early 20th centuries Cape York Aborigines interacted more with Japanese fishermen and pearl shell operators than Chinese men, who were located mostly in the Palmer and Coen goldfields as gardeners and storekeepers.
769 Anderson and Mitchell, “Kubara”, 23-24. The Kuku Yalanji and Kuku-Mini Aborigines, on whose territory the Palmer goldfield was located, responded to White and Chinese intruders with a campaign of fierce resistance.
771 “Townsville”, *Queenslander*, 17 December 1870, p. 3.
with an emphasis on the myth that Aboriginal tribes “preferred” to eat Chinese over Whites.\textsuperscript{772} This story has parallels with the Indian-Anglo-Chinese conflict in the United States where Native Americans were said to have coveted the long queues of Chinese men when taking scalps.\textsuperscript{773} Both accounts inflamed Chinese fears, which resulted in concern and paranoia.\textsuperscript{774} For example, in one of the few accounts written from a Chinese perspective, Taam Szu Piu, on recalling his journey to the Palmer Goldfield as a 17 year old, wrote that his group ‘stuck together’ “lest we should be set upon by the black natives and probably be devoured by them.”\textsuperscript{775}

Fig. 53. “Queensland Aboriginal Australians attacking Chinese Diggers on the Gilbert River”: 1873\textsuperscript{776}

Fig. 54. “The Fight at the Conglomerate: “Burking a Chinaman” 1878\textsuperscript{777}

Noel Loos, in his work regarding the invasion and resistance period of north Queensland’s colonisation, estimated that within the peak conflict and immigration period 1861 - 1897, approximately 404 deaths of colonists were recorded as a result of Aboriginal aggression. Of those killed 102, or one quarter, were Chinese men.\textsuperscript{778} These figures suggest that Chinese men were not particularly targeted as intruders, nor were they singled out for racial reasons as the cannibalism myth would have it. Under these conditions, it is not surprising that Chinese- Aboriginal relationships built on trust and reciprocation could not, and did not occur until the 1890s, when the frontier regions had become largely peaceful. At the end of the frontier war, both groups found

\textsuperscript{772} Anderson and Mitchell, “Kubara”, 26 and Geoffrey Partington, “Cannibalism: A White Colonist Fiction?”, \textit{Quadrant} (May 2008): 87-90. There remains some conjecture over the practice of Aborigines in regards to cannibalism. Historians and social observers continue to argue about the semantics of the word ‘Cannibalism’. What is known is that ritual practices based on traditional mortuary practices were carried out by some Aboriginal tribes across Queensland until the end of the late 19th century. The practice of consuming parts of the enemy or even the family, for cultural reasons, was not limited to Australia, but also practiced around the South Pacific. However, when confronted by evidence of mortuary practices at the time of settlement, White Christian settlers apportioned Western perceptions of “cannibalism”, based on moral grounds, to the actions they witnessed and as a result it has remained the subject of debate, condemnation and misunderstanding ever since.

\textsuperscript{773} Leistman, “Horizontal inter-ethnic relations”, 332 Native American Indian tribes waged a sustained war against encroaching Chinese placer (alluvial) miners, to a much greater degree than the conflict experienced across north Queensland.

\textsuperscript{774} ‘Cannibalism in the North’, \textit{The Week}, 29 August 1885, p. 7.

\textsuperscript{775} Taam, \textit{My Life and Work}, 12.


\textsuperscript{777} ‘Sketches about the Palmer, North Queensland’, “Burking a Chinaman”, \textit{The Australasian Sketcher with Pen and Pencil}, 13 April 1878, p. 5.

themselves driven together through necessity which under ordinary conditions may not have readily taken place.\textsuperscript{779}

Over time, Chinese and Indigenous communities across northern Australia developed complex social interactions across a range of areas which were mutually beneficial to the two groups.\textsuperscript{780} Chinese settlers employed Indigenous labour to work on gardens, or for odd jobs, and they worked together on station properties.\textsuperscript{781} These reflected the progression of relations which had occurred in central and northern New South Wales some 40 years prior.\textsuperscript{782} It is about this time that Aboriginal women began to partner with Chinese men. The mixing of Chinese settlers with the Aboriginal community raised alarm among White colonial authorities who feared the corruption of Aboriginals through opium addiction, loss of valuable Aboriginal labour to White employers, prostitution of women in return for food and shelter, and the creation of a “piebald race” through unrestricted miscegenation; all of which threatened White racial dominance. To remediate the problem, a series of Acts were introduced across the colonies to contain, control and manage Aboriginal populations in a way which excluded Chinese employers, partners, friends and fathers from mixing with them.

***

**Colonial Legislation, Interracial relationships: Racial Panic**

Between 1838 and 1897 legislation was introduced in New South Wales, South Australia, Victoria, Queensland and lastly Western Australia, as a response by colonial administrations to control and manage Aboriginal populations. While broad in application, and tailored to each colony, the legislation was uniform in its application as a means to control Aboriginal lives including marriage and relationships. Furthermore, depending on the colony, legislation sanctioned the removal of women and children, controlled an individual’s association with other groups, reduced property rights, restricted movement and place of abode, regulated work opportunities and last but most telling, controlled women’s sexual partners in a bid to regulate social eugenics.\textsuperscript{783} Aboriginal protection was proclaimed as the duty of “responsible government” towards its Aboriginal population, but must be considered against a backdrop of exploitation when labour was scarce in the colonies.\textsuperscript{784}

\textsuperscript{779}Guy Ramsey, “Myth, Moment”, 263.
\textsuperscript{780}Anderson, and Mitchell, “Kubara”, 32.
\textsuperscript{781}\textit{Ibid.}, 29, 31-32
\textsuperscript{782}McGowan, True Australians, 121-124.
\textsuperscript{783}For example, in Victoria under the \textit{Aboriginal Protection Act 1869}, Aboriginal women’s right to marry was restricted and they had to seek permission. The Act was also called the “half caste Act”, due to its provision for removal of mixed heritage children from their Aboriginal families in an attempt to assimilate them into White society, usually as cheap labour.
\textsuperscript{784}Ganter, \textit{Mixed Relations}, 91
The Aboriginal Protection Act 1886, introduced in Western Australia, was the first colonial restrictive Act passed as a means to regulate an Indigenous population, particularly those who were not employed in pearl-shelling. Incorporating elements from Victorian and South Australian legislation, the Western Australian Act established a Protection Board and appointed Protectors of Aborigines who oversaw all aspects of Aboriginal welfare including the regulation of the lucrative pearl-shelling industry. In an attempt to control Aboriginal women working on the Japanese pearl luggers of Broome, Aboriginal women were banned from working on the luggers, and in doing so, segregated them from the influence of Asian men. Under the auspices of the Act young girls and boys were removed from their families to be put in the care of the colonial administration, where they were trained in domestic and unskilled labour occupations to provide a ready workforce for the White population until they became adults.

From the early 20th century the push to regulate and control the Aboriginal population increased in intensity. The Aboriginal Protection Act 1886 was suspended and repealed to make way for The Aboriginals Act 1905 which made it illegal for Aboriginal women and Asian men to cohabitate or form intimate relations. With a large Malay, Japanese, Chinese and Macassar population in Broome as well as across north Australia, The Act had huge intergenerational implications for Aboriginal communities. Aboriginal women were prohibited from visiting Japanese and Malay crews on the pearl luggers when they were in port, as well as when dry docked in the creeks for repairs. Any Aboriginal woman found consorting with an Asian man was targeted for removal and this extended to her mixed heritage children as well. This policy secured the benefit that the State was aiming for: separation of troublesome non-white races; control over social eugenics to maintain White hegemony; security of a ready future workforce through control and training of mixed heritage children; and a subdued and compliant Indigenous community. Asian men, including Chinese, were required to seek approval in order to marry Aboriginal women, and approvals were rarely granted. To circumvent this restriction couples just took the risk and lived together. A policy of separation was not confined to Western Australia, but was also applied in varying degrees across northern Australia.

Until 1910-1911, Chinese-Aboriginal relations remained unobtrusive in South Australia’s Northern Territory, despite a large Indigenous and immigrant population. Statistics reveal that there were surprisingly few recorded offspring from interracial unions in the Northern Territory with only 99

---

785 Balint, “Aboriginal Women and Asian Men”, 546 -547
786 Ibid., 549
787 Ibid., 550
names registered by 1908 in the Protector of Aborigines’ “Register of Half Castes”. These figures suggest that interracial unions resulting in a child between an Aboriginal woman and a Chinese migrant man, were few. However, anxiety concerning interracial marriage was notable in the broader community. Previous attempts to regulate Chinese-Aboriginal interactions had been made through the criminal justice system. This involved prosecution under the *Crown Land Act 1890*, which enabled the governor to grant land to Aborigines while preventing the granting of land to Asians. In addition, the *Opium Act 1895* made it illegal to supply opium to Aborigines until its amendment in 1905, after which it was illegal to possess opium altogether. After Federation, stricter measures were introduced, largely driven by a southern preoccupation with the northern States’ lax approach to their multicultural communities, which led to the introduction of the *Northern Territory Aboriginals Act 1910* followed quickly by the *Aboriginals Act 1911*.

With powers to remove mixed heritage children from their Aboriginal mothers, the Northern Territory embarked on a policy of removals to separate “pure” Aborigines from mixed heritage children. With a large population of Chinese in Port Darwin, Pine Creek and Brock’s Creek, accusations were mounting that Chinese men were exploiting and abusing local women and girls. In particular, fear focused on the decimation of the female population through venereal disease and the procurement of underage girls for sexual services – something that had been done by White men since colonisation. Many mixed heritage girls and young women deemed “at risk” from Asian men were removed to government reserves, in order to protect them from sexual predation and disease. This policy was strengthened when the *Northern Territory Aboriginals Act 1910* was suspended through the repeal of the *Aboriginals Ordinance Act 1911* in 1918. In its place, the *Aboriginal Ordinance Act 1918* was introduced to “better control the welfare and protection” of Aborigines. “Half caste” institutions were set up across the Territory in a deliberate attempt to segregate “full blood” from mixed heritage Aborigines. There, girls and boys were trained in domestic and farm occupations, exactly the same as in Western Australia, before placement in employment as adults was secured under agreements (a type of indenture) to service the broader White population across the Northern Territory.

Under this legislation, no Asiatic men could employ Aboriginal labour. Despite this, a path remained open for the granting of licenses to Chinese women or women of Asiatic background. It was felt that Chinese women in particular suffered great hardship in rearing their large families.

---

791 *Northern Territory Times and Gazette*, 17 August 1918, p. 12.
792 Long, “Administration and the Part-Aboriginals of the Northern Territory”, 190.
793 Ganter, *Mixed Relations*, 119-121
when compared to their White counterparts, who had access to Aboriginal female help, and this move was an attempt to assist them.\footnote{Northern Territory Times and Gazette, 17 August 1918, p. 12.}

Under the \textit{Ordinance Act 1918}, it was illegal for anyone who was not Aboriginal to cohabitate with or marry an Indigenous woman without permission from the Aboriginal Protector. Any couples who cohabitated attracted substantial fines for breaching it:

```
“Any person, other than an aboriginal or half caste not living with his wife, who habitually consorts with a female aboriginal or half caste, or keeps one such as his mistress, or unlawfully has carnal knowledge of a female aboriginal or half caste, shall be subject to a penalty of £100, or three months imprisonment, or both. In this case the onus of proof that the offence has not been committed is upon the person charged.”\footnote{Northern Territory Times and Gazette, 17 August, p. 12.}
```

Under these conditions Chinese-Aboriginal relations were so restricted that it is presumed that few relationships were successfully able to occur. Consequently, the Northern Territory governments could be considered successful in their aim of segregating Aboriginal people from other races\footnote{Ganter, \textit{Mixed Relations}, 113, 123.} and setting up a legal framework for the removal of mixed heritage children in an effort to manipulate social eugenics.

The north Australian colonies of Western Australia and South Australia’s Northern Territory modelled their policies in the early 20\textsuperscript{th} century on Queensland’s draconian Aboriginal legislation. Queensland’s \textit{Aboriginal Protection and Restriction of Sale of Opium Act 1897} provided a template for other colonies to follow in an effort, among other aims, to control Asian interracial relationships with Aboriginal women and prevent a growing mixed heritage population. Queensland’s legislation aimed to intervene in interracial relations and it regulated who could live with whom, when and where.

***

\textbf{Part 3 : Queensland}

\textbf{Colonial Queensland legislation controlling interracial relationships}

In 1895, two years before the \textit{Aboriginal Protection and Restriction of Sale of Opium Act 1897} came into force, Archibald Meston wrote a report which laid out a methodology to improve and preserve the Aborigines of Queensland. Meston proposed that special reserves should be initiated where Aborigines could be sent where they could be educated and skilled sufficiently to be utilized as a workforce to replace South Sea Islander labour when the Queensland sugar industry phased them out.\footnote{Ann Curthoys and Clive Moore, “Working for the White People: An Historiographic Essay on Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Labour”, \textit{Labour History}, special edition ‘Aboriginal Workers’, 69 (November, 1995), p. 7} The mission and Government reserve system provided an ideal setting to achieve this
goal. Aborigines in missions could be trained in occupations such as housemaids and nursemaids, labourers, fencers and station workers. Very much focused on the north, the combined removal and mission systems under the Act solved a number of problems: humanitarian concerns about treatment of Aborigines, access to cheap labour for White employers to cope with the chronic labour shortage in the north, and racial separation between the races.

In his report, Archibald Meston indicated clear western patriarchial views of how Aboriginal girls should conduct themselves and how they should go about marriage relations with Aboriginal men showing no understanding of Aboriginal Law or partnering protocols. He wrote:

“They arrive early at a marriageable age, and unless they find a mate of their own race at that period, no abstract principles or virtue or morality inculcated by the missionaries, or anybody else will save them from intercourse with white men.”

This last point assumed two points concerning the women: that Aboriginal women were perceived as permiscuous, and secondly that women had agency to partner at will rather than through a match determined by skin, kinship and moeity protocols. He argued that misecengation for girls from an early age would “save” them from themselves and a life of “degredation and burden on the State.” Rather than regard women as the potential victims of sexual exploitation, or victims of a lack of appropriate sexual partners, he implied that Aboriginal women were the perpetrators of sexual advancements and a danger to their own “virtue” (western imagined by Meston himself). 798

Regina Ganter explores the implication of the Act on north Queensland Aboriginal sexual relations further when she notes The Aborigines Protection and Restriction of the Sale of Opium Act 1897 was very much focused on north Queensland and where most Queensland Aborigines lived, with great impact of the Act felt in industries such as pearl shelling which were conducted almost exclusively by Asian men who employed Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander labour. 799

The Act specifically targeted Chinese men through a clause inserted to prevent Chinese settlers from employing Aboriginal labour. Section 5, clause 2 of the 1901 amended Act read “a permit to employ an Aboriginal or half caste shall not be granted to any alien of the Chinese race”. It also had provisions for the Protector of Aboriginals to segregate the Chinese and Aboriginal communities. Moral righteousness as well as racism guided the administration of the Act, which was clearly reflected in the reasons stated by the Protector of Aborigines’ Annual Reports to the

799 Ganter, “Living a Immoral Life”, 13
Queensland Parliament. Aboriginal women living with Chinese men were portrayed as morally corrupt with the Northern Protector of Aborigines, W.E. Roth, making it very clear that women who resided with Chinese men were considered “prostitutes”.800

Aboriginal women were highly regulated and had no control over their bodies, location, employment, daily lives or decision making. Women found to be living unlawfully in de facto marriages with a Chinese man were summarily removed, with the patriarchal Law extending across north Queensland. Both women and children were removed to missions and Government stations from as far west as in the Burketown region,801 for the crime of being without “employment and living in the Chinese Quarters.”802 Indigenous women, it seems, were viewed as being unable to look after themselves and required “rescuing” from Chinese men.803 It also implies that ordinary family life was considered impossible between a Chinese man and an Aboriginal woman. Yet for many Chinese settlers across north-west Queensland and in the Torres Straits, Indigenous women provided the only potential sexual partners available and mutually beneficial intimate relations occurred.

Yet loving relationships between Chinese men and Aboriginal women were severely hampered by both Clause 8 and Clause 14 of the Act804 and the amended Aboriginals Protection and Restriction of the Sale of Opium Amendment Act 1901. Racial dogma at the time held the notion that children of racially mixed families would naturally hold all of the vices of their parents: a consideration which socially influenced official views when deciding whether to consent to an application or not.805 The partnering of Aboriginal women with non-Aboriginal men raised concern that a new hybrid community would develop which posed a direct threat to racial purity aspired to by the White colonial administration.806 As a result, it was seldom approved by the Protector.

800QPP, 1902, Vol. I, “Annual Report of the Chief Protector of Aborigines for the Year 1901”, pp. 1132-1139. The Chief Protector wrote, “The following list of young women and children, rescued from a life of destitution and immorality and neglect and placed in healthier and more comfortable circumstances will show that the department has not been inactive in its operations for the welfare of this section of the community.” Included in the list was a “young woman and children removed from Blackwater to Barambah for 6 months for opium smoking, prostitution and neglected conditions”.
802 QPP, 1907, Vol. II, “Annual Report of the Northern Protector of Aborigines, 1906”, p. 1270. For example, Kitty and her two children were removed from Cooktown and sent south to Yarrabah Mission. Kitty’s crime, it was reported, was that she was not employed and lived in the Chinese quarters. Some Chinese men pushed back. Willie Ah Duck, the son of Ah Duck and his Aboriginal wife of Mossman, was removed because he was living with a Chinaman (his father) under Clause 14 of the Act. The Cairns Police had been given instructions to remove him to Yarrabah on the grounds of “neglect.” Ah Duck’s response was to take the Crown to court in a case which saw the local constable speak in Ah Duck’s defence, highlighting Ah Duck’s good character, therefore challenging the claim of neglect.QSA : CPS 12E/P9, 27 Oct 1900. Willie Ah Duck vs Crown.
804 QPP, 1902, Vol. II, “A Bill to Amend ‘The Aborigines Protection and Restriction of the Sale of Opium Act 1897’”, pp. 555-560. Clause 8 of the Act stated “No marriage of a female Aboriginal with any person other than an Aboriginal shall be celebrated without the permission, in writing, of a Protector authorized by the minister to give such permission.”
805 May, Togawyers, 210. In 1901, the Commissioner for Police commenting on the affair of Goon Goo and Kitty at Herberton, wrote: “Apart from any other consideration, offspring resulting from such intercourse are, I think, by no means a desirable addition to the population”.
806 “Half-Castes”, Morning Post, 10 February 1903, p.3.
Permission to marry was, for all these reasons, difficult to secure for Chinese - Aboriginal interracial couples. The Protector of Aborigines was always suspicious of the true nature of the relationship between the couple, leading to a perception that Chinese men were luring Aboriginal women into bed with opium in return for sexual services. By 1907 attention was clearly on the illegal harbouring and employment of Indigenous workers, and fines for Chinese men were increased. In this year alone 11 fines out of 20 cases were imposed on Chinese men in in north Queensland, from Tully to the Palmer goldfield, and west to Atherton and Mareeba. Two years later in 1909, twenty Chinese men were fined for harbouring or illegally employing Indigenous people out of a possible 46 men prosecuted. The fact that these relationships were in areas where intense agriculture was underway (in particular maize and tobacco growing) was not taken into consideration. Concurrent with the increased zeal displayed in fining men harbouring Indigenous women was the decrease in permissions given to Chinese - Aboriginal couples to legally marry.

The reluctance to grant permission to Chinese men to legally marry an Aboriginal woman is evident in the granting of permission for only 3 marriages out of 32 mixed-race marriages by the Chief Northern Protector in 1901. W. E. Roth wrote

“Personally I have always exerted my influence in the direction of trying to put a stop to these mixed marriages, but cases repeatedly occur where they may be considered both expedient and justifiable”.

In 1908, out of the 41 marriages granted for interracial unions, only two were to Chinese men. This trend continued with only 1 Chinese man in Boulia granted permission to marry out of 12 applicants of other races in 1912; 1 Chinese man in 1913 out of 24 marriages; and only 3 Chinese men granted permission out of 43 approved marriages in 1914. Of the 1914 marriages, the Protector noted

“43 aboriginal and half-caste women to marry men of other races, the circumstances of each case being first carefully inquired into in the interests of the woman. Twenty-one of these marriages were to pacific islanders…the men were in regular employment and seemed attached to the women…Eleven half castes married Europeans and three Chinese half castes were allowed to marry Chinese, the remainder being cross breeds who desired to mate with other coloured aliens.”

807 QPP, 1902, Vol. I,“Annual Report of the Chief Protector of Aborigines for the Year 1901”, p.1132. In 1901 Roth wrote: “The excuses which some of the defendants so summoned, [for cohabitating with Aboriginal women] brought forward were very various: one coloured alien went so far as to state that he let the gin sleep on his premises because she was too frightened to sleep in her camp - he was fined £15 and costs”.


810 QPP, 1909, Vol. II, “Annual Report of the Chief Protector of Aborigines for the Year 1908”, p. 990. In Mossman, a report stated there were nine Aboriginal women living in the district with either “Kanakas” (South Sea Islanders) or “Chinamen”. Permission to marry Indigenous women was more likely to be granted to Malay or Pacific Islander men than Chinese men, who were instead fined for “harbouring” Aboriginal women. “Kanaka” is a broad term given to people from the South Sea Islands (SSI) brought to north Queensland as cheap labour on the sugar plantations. They were also known as Pacific Islanders and ‘Polynesians’, even though they were actually Melanesian. There was much animosity between the Islanders and Chinese men.

By 1920, the Government remained resolute in its position with\textsuperscript{812} government officials administering what had become a key national policy.\textsuperscript{813} As Julia Martinez notes,

“the level of control over marriage demonstrates that the White Australia policy was far more than a matter of immigration restriction. It was the basis for internal population control including criminalisation of miscegenation.”\textsuperscript{814}

The impact on the children of Chinese – Aboriginal couples was disastrous.

The beginning of sustained intergenerational cultural dislocation for mixed heritage Aboriginal-Chinese children commenced with the Clause 14 of the \textit{Aborigines Protection and Restriction of the Sale of Opium Amendment Act} 1901. The clause legalized instructions to forcibly remove “half-caste” children where they were deemed “at risk”, and were validated in reports by descriptions such as children, particularly girls, being “in the habit of frequenting Chinese Dens”, “Acting as spies for Chinese”, “living an immoral life harboured by a Chinaman”, “hang[ing] around Chinese farms and gardens”, “Frequents Chinese Habitations” or “Frequenting Chinese quarters for Opium and prostitution”. By officially targeting children, the very heart of the family, culturally vital in both Aboriginal and Chinese culture, officials reasoned that this would be enough to prevent intimate relations for “…as long as the Asiatic or low class European realizes that no government Action is taken with regard to his half caste children, he will continue co habiting with his Aboriginal Paramour”.\textsuperscript{815}

The legal action by the government proved catastrophic to mixed heritage children’s self-identity associated with their mother’s country, and severed ties with the landscape and spirit stories which were vital for cultural initiation and spiritual maturity. Removed mixed heritage children also suffered from the loss of a Chinese father. Children were classified according to percentage of Aboriginality and stigmatized in terms such as “half caste”, “quarter caste”, or “octoroon”. In 1934, under the ever-tightening White Australia policy, the Act was amended.\textsuperscript{816} The new provisions widened the definition of ‘Half Caste’ to include anyone who was the child or grandchild of an Aboriginal, or was the child or grand-child of two ‘half castes’, and anyone of Pacific Island extraction. In the 1920s and 1930s Torres Strait Islanders were also increasingly subjugated when it came to racially inspired colonial laws.

\textsuperscript{813}\textit{It noted “The Department is still firmly discouraging the marriage of full bloods to aliens.”}
\textsuperscript{814}Balint: 545
\textsuperscript{816}The \textit{Morning Post}, 10 February 1903, p. 3
\textsuperscript{817}Ganter, \textit{Mixed Relations}, 76-81
The islands across the Torres Straits, including the colonial administrative centre of Thursday Island, contained a uniquely multicultural society which developed in stark contrast to Queensland’s mainland. At the time, Torres Strait Islanders were considered as Pacific Islanders until 1872, including those north of the 10th latitude. The population on Thursday Island included Christian influenced Torres Strait Islanders, South Sea Islanders, Chinese and Japanese pearl shell operators and storekeepers, a diverse Asian workforce including Malays, Macassans, and Javanese as well as a White colonial administration. Census figures indicate that by 1880, Thursday Island had 214 Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders, 200 Asians (including Chinese, Japanese, Malay, and Javanese) and 28 White settlers. Within ten years, White dominance was established with 270 White people recorded, 126 Asians, 38 classified as Aboriginals and Torres Strait Islanders, and 38 South Sea Islanders. By 1901, the White community had reached 700 with over 113 Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders, 304 Japanese, 114 Chinese, 83 Filipinos and 55 Malays. The majority of the population at the time was engaged on pearl-shelling, working in associated maritime occupations, or engaged in the commercial sector.

The distinction between Torres Strait Islanders, Pacific Islanders and Aborigines, was not made until 1884 with the introduction of the *Native Labourers Protection Act 1884*. This standardized the terms of employment for those working in the maritime industries across Australia and Papua and recognised Torres Strait Islanders as a separate people. Torres Strait Islanders were exempt from the provisions of *The Aborigines Protection and Restriction of the Sale of Opium Act of 1897* when it was first introduced. However in 1904 a new Protector of Aborigines was appointed to Thursday Island and changes to the way that the Act was administrated were introduced. All Islanders across the Torres Straits were then brought under the Act with no distinction made between mainland Aborigines and Islanders. This impacted on the lives of every family which had previously been exempt from the Act, as they found that they suddenly came under the control of authorities where previously they had been ignored.

Thursday Island’s broader population defied the Protectors’ attempts to bring Torres Strait Islanders under the Act and challenges constantly arose. The difficulty lay in the fact that it was increasingly impossible to identify who was “Aboriginal” under the Act, particularly when it came down to degrees of Aboriginality which were under scrutiny. Unexpectedly, departmental

817 Torres Strait Islanders are not ethnically distinct from the Melanesians of New Guinea. Germany had north-east New Guinea until 1914 while Papua, the south-east, was briefly annexed by Queensland in 1883, later taken over by the British in 1884, and then handed to the Australian government to administer from 1906; under a League of Nations mandate Australia also administered the former German New Guinea.

818 Chase, “Kubara”, 8

819 Ganter, “Living a Immoral Life”, 18

820 The death of John Douglas, Government Resident and Police Magistrate on Thursday Island on 24 July 1904 brought about these changes. He had administered the Torres Strait since 1885.
resources became tied up as officers made attempts to defend decisions which were made from a position of moral rectitude rather than based on legislation. This led to an attempt to reign in local dissent, and amendments were made to the Act as a concession. This eventually forced the Department to repeal the 1897 Act and replace it by two separate pieces of legislation: one for mainland Aborigines and one for Torres Strait Islanders. For Torres Strait Islander women, the repeal of the Act made little difference. Permission was still required for Chinese-Torres Strait Islander marriages to occur, with the Department showing little appetite to extend its flexibility about Islander labour towards interracial marriage.821

***

Part 4:

North Queensland Chinese-Aboriginal Marriage Trends

Having laid out the difficulty Aboriginal women experienced partnering with Chinese men, and that interracial Chinese—Aboriginal families faced, it is no surprise that few relationships were able to officially occur or be left to flourish. Across Queensland for the period 1860-1920, only 28 Indigenous women were identified as married or living with a Chinese man in official documents such as the Births Deaths and Marriages register. Out of an identified 1095 primary couples (marriages and unions) whose cultural background is known, only a tiny proportion of marriages - 3% of the total across the State - were between Chinese men and Aboriginal/Indigenous women. In the Northern Region, the percentage of Chinese-Indigenous interracial couples and families was higher at 6%, but still small when compared to 66% of relationships with White women, 27% with migrant Chinese women and 1% to women with other cultural backgrounds such as Japanese or South Sea Islander. (See Chapter 5 for an overview of all marriage statistics).

The combination of cultural constraints on both Aboriginal women and Chinese men combined with the volatile frontier environment and anti-miscegenation legislation, provided an effective barrier to intimate relations. It is suspected that these figures may not fully convey the true extent of Chinese-Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander relationships, and that this area needs more research. It is suspected that more relationships will be revealed to enable a more accurate picture to emerge. However, due to the very large task associated with this area of research, and time constraints required to investigate, it remains outside the scope of this thesis.

---

821 QSA: HOM/3259/19 HOM YUEN, gardener Marbuiag Island; QSA: A/58735 Chin Fat: Letter to Protector of Aborigines seeking exemption from Aborigines Protection Act with support letter from See Kee, owner/manager of See Yick and Co. In 1919, gardener Hom Yuen was unable to marry "1/2 caste" Mabuiag Islander May Hankin on the basis that the office opposed marriages between Aborigines and Chinese 'aliens' at the time. In a move to distance themselves from mainland Aborigines and move towards self determination, an interracial Chinese-Torres Strait Islander family, the Chin Fat family, sought exemption from the Act in the 1930s.
Nearly all of the marriages and unions between Chinese men and Aboriginal and Islander women have been identified as occurring in north Queensland with the exception of a late marriage in Central Region. Figures indicate that there were no marriages in Brisbane or the Southern Region; 1 Chinese-Aboriginal family identified in the Central Region, in the early 20th century; and 19 families or 68% identified in north Queensland, including Thursday Island and the Torres Straits. Approximately 8 more couples have been identified but so far it has not been established where they lived. It is clear from the low numbers that the Chinese family landscape pattern associated with Chinese Aboriginal families is rooted in north Queensland with 95% of all the Chinese-Aboriginal families whose location is accounted for. (See Figs. 55 & 56 below.)

Marriage patterns between Chinese men and Indigenous women did not begin to make a presence until the 1890’s and the impact of legislative constraint and strict Colonial policy to keep the two races apart, was tempered by the impending Federation and possible transfer of Aboriginal affairs over to the newly created Commonwealth. Within this period, Station managers may have taken advantage of the impending uncertainty surrounding the changeover of administration from Colonies to Commonwealth, and quickly married couples. This may account for the small spikes in marriages 1899-1901. As the White Australia Policy rolled out across the former colonies, Protectors resumed positions as managers of Aboriginal people across each State and suppressed marriage requests and family reunions, seldom granting them thereafter.
In the majority of cases Chinese-Aboriginal interracial families were associated with pastoral stations where the husband worked as the gardener or cook. Other families lived on the fringe of towns in small market gardening communities, or on the rear gardens of shops in small urban areas. Chinese men who lived in these rural and remote areas were reluctant, or unable, to bring out a Chinese wife. They may not have had the financial means or inclination, as these areas were very remote, serviced by rudimentary transport and services, and conditions were extremely hot and harsh. In contrast, it is possible that one or two Chinese men took their Aboriginal wives back to China, as Willie Sou Kee from Burketown made an application to take his wife Annie and two children back to China in 1918. Not much is known about acceptance of Chinese –Aboriginal mixed heritage children in the ancestral village. For those who stayed in north Queensland, the majority of Chinese –Aboriginal first-generation children identified with their Aboriginal ancestry first, though they readily acknowledged their Chinese fathers.

Six locations in the north West Gulf Country of North Queensland, including the towns of Cloncurry, Camooweal, Burketown and Normanton had more than one Chinese Aboriginal family associated with the market garden community. Camooweal, with its small market garden cultural precinct, also had two of its families associated with shop keeping as Ah Chong and Ah Leon.

---

822 NAA: J2483, 256/44, SOU KEE, Annie; NAA: J2483, 256/45 SOU KEETommy; NAA: J2483, 256/47 SOU KEE, Willie.
juggled garden and baker businesses. Nine stations were identified across the North West as having a Chinese cook married or living with an Aboriginal wife. These stations included Delta Downs, Floraville, Lawn Hill, Delta Downs, Westmoreland, Riversleigh, Neumayer, Augustus Downs and Lorraine. Further east, Chinese-Aboriginal marriages were associated with the towns of Herberton and Kairi on the Atherton Tablelands as well as further north on the Palmer goldfield and in families associated with the Aboriginal community near Cooktown.

The relationship between the pastoral industry of the north-west Gulf country and interracial marriage patterns of Chinese–Aboriginal women is unmistakable. Chinese men were the preferred worker on pastoral stations as gardeners and cooks. Sought after for their skill in growing a continual source of food in difficult seasonal environments, they kept the station and its workers alive, nourished and healthy, which was important for the rigorous work undertaken on a daily basis. Similarly, Chinese station cooks were valued for their ability to feed the family, station workers and extended community on a constrained resource including bush tucker, as well as Western cuisine. Chinese cook/gardeners were mobile, moving from one station to another, which is evident in the career of Jimmy Ning. Jimmy Ning, married to Aboriginal woman Bessie, commenced his station cook career on the large and prosperous Lawn Hill Station before he moved with Bessie to nearby Westmoreland Station, then Augustus Downs Station before retiring to Woods Lake near Burketown. He finished his working days as a market gardener at Woods Lake.

---

825 Rains, Thesis: 112.
Over twenty-one stations and pastoral runs between 1882-1928 employed Chinese cooks or gardeners and up to 10 primary family groups have been identified as interlinked with pastoral settlement with the most prominent station, Lawn Hill and an area known as Woods Lake near Burketown supporting the marriage of at least 4 Chinese migrant men to Aboriginal women in 1898. As noted earlier, interracial marriage between the Chinese employee and Aboriginal women was supported by local Station managers who understood the benefits of Chinese – Aboriginal marriage as a means to secure workers to the region. Aboriginal women were able to remain on country, the mobile Chinese labour was more likely to stay, and daughters of such families went on to often marry other Chinese men and remain in the district and greater region.

---

827 QNB: Burketown, 1885-1928
828 QBDM-ONL: 1910/C/448, Sou, Annie Sou, (Willie Sou Kee and Annie Gee Hoy) and QBDM. Marriage Resister MF, 09/000661
Bing Chew, Minnie Ah Too.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PASTORAL STATION/LOCATION/YEARS IDENTIFIED ON PASTORAL STATIONS</th>
<th>NAME Chinese husband</th>
<th>OCCUPATION</th>
<th>Aboriginal Wife</th>
<th>YEAR MARRIED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Augustus Downs Lawn Hill Station 1893-1924</td>
<td>Sam AH BOW</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westmoreland Station Barclay Downs Lorraine Station Augustus Downs Woods Lake 1888-c.1910</td>
<td>AH SAM SAM AH SAM</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawn Hill Station 1898</td>
<td>Jimmy KOM MOY</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woods Lake</td>
<td>LEE QUAY/ AH QUEY</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burketown district Avon Downs</td>
<td>Ah MOI Jimmy/Ah MOY Charlie</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorraine Station Lawn Hill Station 1895-1910</td>
<td>Tommy AH FAT</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burketown</td>
<td>Ah Low</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wernadinga Station</td>
<td>Tommy AH GOW also known as AH NUM</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burketown</td>
<td>AH SIN</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>c 1902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normanton Ungerera Station Granada Station Camooweal Cloncurry 1888-1908</td>
<td>Charlie AH CHONG</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louie Creek near Lawn Hill Riversleigh Station Kamilleri Station Lorraine Station Talawanta Station 1917-1948</td>
<td>Yuen Kim Hook (HOOKEY)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>c1910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloncurry</td>
<td>LEE FONG</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>c1910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normanton</td>
<td>AH FOO Tommy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>c.1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woods Lakes</td>
<td>LEE MAN/ Ah Man</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croydon/Georgetown</td>
<td>AH SOO possibly “adoption” For child Minnie (Father Olford)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>c.1900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table. 6. Chinese- Aboriginal Family Landscape: North Western Gulf District

829 Information compiled from, Various entries; QNB Burketown Records, 1885-1928; TROVE newspapers various years; NAA CEDT records various families; Birth Certificate Register- Chinese Book 2 and specifically QBDM-MR-MF1898. 1898/000218

Chinese market gardeners were also active on the fringes of nearly all rural and remote towns across western and north-western Queensland. Tolerated at best by the broader White community, gardeners played a significant role in keeping communities alive through the supply of much sought after fruit and vegetables. Their presence on the fringes of towns attracted the attention of Aboriginal women who sought intimacy with Chinese men. They came for various reasons including attraction, protection, companionship and economic stability. In return, many worked around the gardens and were regarded as essential additional labour. There are a number of Chinese-Aboriginal garden communities found in this study, including those located near the towns of Cloncurry, Burketown, Camooweal and Normanton. Some couples raised many children together, including children to different fathers. Chinese men raised them as their own. Places such as Lawn Hill, Adel’s Grove, Burketown and Cloncurry saw children raised to identify with their Aboriginal identity, though some Chinese-Aboriginal children rejected their Aboriginal identity in favour of the Chinese in the hope that restriction of movement and living conditions under The Act would be more relaxed if a Chinese identity was assumed. This is demonstrated by Mrs. Chong of Woods Lake near Burketown, who identified as Chinese.

Mixed heritage daughters often married other Chinese men, which reinforced the family and kinship networks of both cultures throughout the west and Gulf district. For example, Lorna Ah Bow, the daughter of Sam Ah Bow and Opal Magimarm of Lawn Hill Station, married Leon Ah Sam in 1905. To enhance kinship relations, daughters were offered up for marriage with Chinese men according to Chinese family practice. This is the case for father Johnny Ah Gup (Kup) from Lawn Hill Station who offered his 14-year-old daughter to Wong of the merchant firm On Sing Loong, Cloncurry, through marriage broker Ah Wing of Camooweal. When the transaction failed (the girl did not marry Wong) court action ensued as Ah Gup sued for damages and breach of contract over his loss, due to costs associated with the transaction. What this demonstrates is that Chinese kinship links remained active around the region, sometimes over hundreds of kilometres, between Chinese men, and that marriage practices including the sale of daughters remained intact. Mixed heritage daughters remained a commodity which could be used to increase guanxi where possible.


Interview with Mrs. Go Sam, Atherton, 6 May 2002. This situation is demonstrated by the marriage of Go Sam to Polly in Ravenshoe. Polly lived at the back of Go Sam’s mixed business shop. Together they raised seven children, not all paternally belonging to Go Sam, and their loving relationship lasted many years. As Polly was an Indigenous woman belonging to the Djiddibal community she identified as Aboriginal and raised her children as Aboriginal Australians.

Ganter, Mixed Relations, 76-81


Not all Aboriginal-Chinese mixed heritage daughters married back into the Aboriginal or Chinese communities. A number of mixed heritage Aboriginal-Chinese girls married White men such as Sadie Ah Quey, daughter of Lee Quay and Annie, who married George William Watson, a boundary rider from Burketown, in 1923. Under the legitimate age of consent at 19, Sadie’s guardian and sister, Sarah Ah Man, provided consent to the marriage, to George who was 53 at the time. While social rules about race usually governed just who married whom, western Queensland and especially the Gulf districts were a pocket of racial fluidity for some. Maintenance of racial lines blurred in deference to class with station managers, station bookkeepers, town shopkeepers, public officials and their wives elevated to the top and a less differentiated mass of wharf workers, ringers, boundary riders, dingo and ‘roo shooters, drovers, domestic servants, cooks and gardeners forming the working class. Marriage it seemed could transcend racial lines for marginalized mixed heritage families, providing no threat was made to the ruling class of Whites around the district.

In summary, Chinese-Aboriginal families formed in communities associated with the far western pastoral districts in which they sustained long term interracial relationships. Marriages and unions were advantageous for both Chinese men and Aboriginal women. Men were able to enjoy marriage and family which otherwise they would have been without, and women were able to enjoy secure and safe lives on country where they could pass on culture and tradition to their children. The bi-cultural family which emerged between the two groups enabled extended family and kinship networks to develop across the north. Chinese–Aboriginal families were able to successfully deflect some government policies, including forced removal, because they offered Gulf Station managers a reliable workforce for the cattle industry.

**Conclusion**

Around the world, Chinese men associated with the Diaspora formed intimate relations with local Indigenous women resulting in many mixed families. North Queensland formed part of this pattern of settling, but to a much lesser degree than other parts of the globe where colonial interests were prevalent. Reaction to Chinese – local interracial marriage by dominant colonial administrations varied according to which European empire was nation building. While some were not concerned by miscegenation, such as France and Portugal, the British Empire was concerned with racial eugenics across nearly all colonies. The potential for flexibility towards interracial marriage depended on what economic gain could be made from the union, with White plantation owners in

---

835 QBDM: Marriage Register Hardcopy Original, Burke District1891/1895 WATSON, George William, AH QUEY, Sadie10 January 1923.
the Caribbean and West Indies and pastoral station owners and managers in the Gulf country of north Queensland exerting pressure on administrations to allow partnering in order to secure a reliable labour supply in a vital occupation, cook/gardener.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>Chinese husband</th>
<th>cook</th>
<th>gardener</th>
<th>Mixed Heritage bride</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lorraine Station</td>
<td>Jimmy GEE HOY</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Maggie SAVILLE</td>
<td>1898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawn Hill Station 1905</td>
<td>Leon Ah Sam</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Lorna Ah Bow (daughter of Sam Ah Bow and Opal Maganamara)</td>
<td>1905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woods Lake</td>
<td>Tommy CHONG</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Sarah Ah Sam or Ah Quorn (daughter of Ah Sam and Louie)</td>
<td>1908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta Downs, Strathmore Station</td>
<td>BING CHEW</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Minnie Ah Soo (daughter of Ah Soo mixed heritage Delta Downs station)</td>
<td>1909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croydon Cloncurry</td>
<td>TIM SEE TOO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Annie Ah Fat (daughter of Ah Fat and Lizzie)</td>
<td>1910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louie Creek Lawn Hill Kamilaroi Station 1913-1921</td>
<td>Willie SOU KEE</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Annie Gee Hoy (Daughter of Gee Hoy and Maggie) b. Wondoola Station</td>
<td>1912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loraine Station 1917</td>
<td>AH MAN</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Sarah Ah Quay (daughter of Lee Quay and Annie)</td>
<td>1914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawn Hill Station Westmoreland station Augustus Downs Wood's Lake 1901-1918</td>
<td>Jimmy NING</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Bessie Ah Sam (daughter of Ah Sam and Louie)</td>
<td>1915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riversleigh station Lawn Hill Station 1920-1928</td>
<td>Johnny AH KUP</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Dolly Ah Sam (also known as Dolly Ah Bow and Ah Cow: daughter of Ah Sam and Louie)</td>
<td>1918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avon Downs Woods Lake c1921</td>
<td>KUM SING</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Maudie Lee Quay also known as Ah Quay (daughter of Lee Quay and Annie)</td>
<td>1921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camoorweal</td>
<td>AH WING or Clim Ye Dak</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Dora Ah Fat (daughter of Ah Fat and Lizzie)</td>
<td>1929</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. Chinese –Aboriginal Family Landscape: First Generation Marriage patterns associated with Market Garden communities

Official approaches towards Chinese- Aboriginal marriage were not uniform across all colonies. Interracial interaction between Chinese settlers and the remnant populations of Aboriginal

---

communities across the colonies of Australia threatened labour supplies for upper-class White homes and enterprises, resulting in policy measures introduced in several northern colonies to keep the two groups apart. Legislation limited interaction, prevented miscegenation and maintained White racial dominance, and managed every part of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander lives, including dictating whom they could marry and it formed part of the White Australia policy of the early 20th Century. Aboriginal women, faced with the decimation of Customary Law and limitations placed on marriage with non-Aboriginal men, were unable to legally marry Chinese men in any great number and were forced to resort to clandestine relationships with the constant risk of being removed and sent to a mission. Children born from Chinese – Aboriginal relationships lived under constant threat of removal by authorities and severed from their cultural identity, both Aboriginal and Chinese. The cultural disruption caused by removal had severe consequences for generations to come.

The Chinese – Indigenous Family Landscape, taking in relationships between Chinese men and Local Aboriginal or Torre Strait Islander women, is a little understood aspect of marriage relations in Queensland, associated with the Chinese Diaspora. Compared to the number of White women who married Chinese men in the period 1860-1920, figures for interracial marriage between Chinese men and Indigenous women remain very low, with those who partnered with Aboriginal women typically being men living in rural and remote locations. Most were employed on pastoral stations or undertaking garden activities, with a smaller number of men engaged in shop keeping practices. Typically, Chinese men who took an Indigenous wife were unable to bring a wife out from China, having neither the financial means nor inclination to attract a Chinese wife to live in these remote places. Chinese – Indigenous relationships were closely tied to the Aboriginal community and only a few men took their sons to China for an education and fewer still took their wives. The majority of Chinese-Aboriginal first-generation children who lived in north Queensland identified with their Aboriginal ancestry and married back into the Aboriginal community, reinforcing close knit family ties.
Fig. 58. North Queensland: Chinese Family Landscape by Cultural Background: 1860-1920
Fig. 59. North Queensland:
Number of Families per identified town: 1860-1920
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Chapter 9

THE CHINESE FAMILY LANDSCAPE

Introduction:
The Chinese Family Landscape in its physical form provides an alternative means to understand migration and settlement patterns associated with the Chinese Diaspora to north Queensland. The presence, or absence, of wives, female partners, lovers and casual intimate acquaintances, influenced the social development of Chinatowns and cultural precincts and shaped future commercial ties through gender led allegiances, applied from within the homes and private quarters of the community through “soft economics”. The influence of women and families on communities and Chinatowns was felt right across north Queensland, and the benefit of female contributions assisted with the longevity of places by providing a vital means for renewal through children. This chapter is divided into two parts: Part 1 sets out a brief discussion of the extent of transplantation of the Confucian Chinese family and kinship structure to help explain family formation in a north Queensland environment. Part 2 explores each community by identifying the incidence of women and families in the Chinatowns and cultural precincts, and highlights some of their roles in them. It applies the knowledge outlined in previous chapters to the north Queensland cultural heritage sites of the Chinese Diaspora. A female presence is shown through mapping of Chinatowns and precincts, and this methodology clearly demonstrates that women can no longer be ignored as part of the settlement experience.

***

Part 1: Transplanting Confucian social structure to north Queensland

North Queensland’s Chinese Family Landscape commenced with the decision by many families in the ancestral home to send more than one family member together to overseas destination countries to support each other in life, work and even death. Brothers, fathers and sons, as well as extended family members and kinsmen, across a broad range of ages were sent overseas for the benefit of the family and village, with distribution to destination places targeted to maximise potential remittances. The investment of sending more than one son, or associated extended family/ clan member, to Queensland meant that concerns about safety and success could be alleviated for
families, both in the foreign land as well as at home. Upon arrival, family, kinship and clan networks quickly formed enclaves which developed into “Chinatowns” and cultural precinct communities. These operated under transplanted social principles which enabled social order to be quickly established and direct links established between north Queensland and the ancestral village. These networks assisted the making of money via mutual support and “guanxi”, as well as guaranteeing the ability of men to provide regular remittances and correspondence back to the village and family in China. Interconnectedness arising from kinship and obedience to the Confucian family structure was important to the successful development of Chinatowns and cultural precincts as the Confucian philosophy underpinned both the physical and social development of community.

At least three aspects demonstrate a transplanted kinship, district and county affiliation associated with Confucian society: the built environment, the location of community within a Chinatown, and relationships shared through mercantile and marriage partnerships. All three are present in the largest and longest running Chinatown outside Brisbane: Cairns Chinatown, as well as in the minor Chinatowns and precinct communities across the north.

From the early 1880s, Cairns “Chinatown” as it quickly became known, was a busy and thriving community. Confined to Sachs Street between Spence and Shields Streets, it was divided according to place of origin and along dialect lines. Storekeepers on the eastern side of Sachs Street were predominantly Sze Yap and Sam Yap, and storekeepers and merchants along the west were from Chongshan. The majority were from the small dialect districts of Lung Dou and neighbouring Leung Dou in Chongshan. The urban development of Chinatown was fast, as infrastructure including temples and meeting halls were established and internal order created. The first Temple, Lit Sung Goong, or “Temple of All Saints”, was erected by the Chongshan community in 1886, near Shields Street, and ten years later the Toishan community erected the Buk Ti Goong, or “Temple of the Northern Emperor”. The presence of two temples identified county affiliation for new arrivals and provided a place for kinsmen to meet to discuss community

---

837 May, Topsawyers, 64. and Robb, Cairns Chinatown, 7.
838 Cairns Post, 27 January 1887, p. 2. On 27 January 1887, the Cairns Post noted that the cost of the building, including the internal fittings and the purchase of land, came to a total of £800, which was at the time a substantial sum. It was collected from both the Geraldton [Innisfail] and Cairns communities.
matters of importance. Cairns Chinatown maintained its divisions along kin and county lines, including marriage divisions, well into the 20th century.

Mercantile relationships relied heavily on family connections with village, kin and district alliances which were then reflected in the partnerships which formed. This is evident in the merchant firm Sam Sing which was managed through a partnership between two Sze Yap families, the Yee family (Yee Gip-Yow and Yee Tung Yep), and Chiu family (Chiu Kin-Nam and Chiu Chock). On the other side of the street, Lee On Kee, a merchant firm with partners from the Lee village (Lee On, Lee Look and Lee Kee) complemented the shop keeping firm the Lee Yan Brothers, a firm of five brothers (Lee Yan, Lee Chin, Lee Wing, Lee Cheok-Yin and Lee Dung Chin) with both Lee

Cairns Chinatown: 1900

China owned or occupied

Temple

Fig. 60. Cairns Chinatown 1900 showing Lit Sung Goong and Buk Ti Goong temples. 

Transnational family networks depended on female participation by village wives, mothers, sisters and aunts, to produce, nurture and rear the next generation of overseas men. Village populations shifted to become predominantly women, with the reverse occurring in north Queensland. As noted earlier, male dominated communities were labeled as “bachelor societies” and regarded by

\[839\] Robb, *Cairns Chinatown*, 18.
\[840\] May, Topsawyers, 294-306.
\[841\] QSA: SRS4646-1-1 Cairns Municipal Rate Book 1885-1888; SRS4646-1-2 Cairns Municipal Rate Book 1889-1893; SRS4646-1-3 Cairns Municipal Rate Book 1891-1893; SRS4646-1-4 Cairns Municipal Rate Book 1893-1895; SRS4646-1-5 Cairns Municipal Rate Book 1896-1897.
the broader White society as communities of “single” men. This perception has skewed family connections, and ignored the presence of female relationships both near and far.

“Married bachelor” communities

Despite their family and kinship links to each other within the colony, and despite legal marriages to women back in the ancestral home in the village, Chinese men have been type-cast as “single” and living in “bachelor” or more recently, “married bachelor” communities across Queensland. This myth limits the way the community is viewed and ignores gender and age participation through the presence of women and children. After a thorough review of Chinatowns and precincts across north Queensland, only two towns have been identified as having a predominantly male presence over any length of time. This included Pelican Waterhole just outside Winton, and the market garden and commercial precincts of Hughenden. When the dynamics of both communities are analysed, it is evident that gendered and family interactions occurred between Chinese men and women within each community, but the stereotype hides complexity and is open to further scrutiny.

Firstly, the Pelican Waterhole market garden precinct of Winton in central western Queensland had several gardens attended by Chinese men over a period of sixty-five years. Several gardeners lived together and worked gardens in an area away from the town and it was a male only community. To the broader White population, they appeared as a “bachelor society”. However, this ignores the kinship connections they had across the region; ignores the ancestral village family where wives and children remained; and pretended that interactions with local women did not happen. Winton’s Chinese gardeners and shopkeepers returned regularly home to wives and families in China, including at least one Australian Born son returning to the ancestral village family. Of the eighteen men who applied for Certificate of Exemption to the Dictation Test, ten men made repeated applications to visit China with three making four extended visits at regular intervals in the early 20th century. This included Ah Foo, a fruiterer with the business name of Sun Kum Wah,

---

842 Wai Jane Char and Francis H. Woo, Geography of Kwangtang Province for Hawaii Residents, (Hawaii Chinese History Centre, date unknown); The Village Database, http://villagedb.friendsofroots.org/search.cgi; Williams, “Destination Qiaoxiang”, 23; Dr Joe Leong, Pers. Comm., 2015. Families and firms established networks with other families and firms which extended inter-colonially to Sydney and Melbourne, and onto key destination ports such as Honolulu, San Francisco and Vancouver.

who was also married to White woman Kate McEnroe whom he married in 1892. The process of cyclic renewal in the Chinese community at Winton continued until after WWII in 1948, when Mar Yen Shoo arrived to join his father to grow produce for the market garden which was sold in the onsite fruit and vegetable shop. He was the last Chinese gardener in central-west north Queensland.

Locally the Chinese “married bachelor” men participated in events with the rest of the Chinese community for recreation, such a gambling or celebrations such as Chinese New Year. When hawking their produce in town, they came in contact with women and children as they walked from house to house, with micro-discussions occurring and gifts such as salty plums provided to children at Christmas time. Interaction with families also occurred within the Chinese community itself, as most of the Chinese storekeepers were married to White women and had families. It is also plausible that the Chinese gardeners would have also been aware of, if not intimate with, the three Japanese prostitutes who rented premises off Charlie Ah Foo in Elderslie Street, Winton for a brief period in 1898. However, there is no evidence that the men were intimate with Aboriginal women, who had been removed from the district many years before.

---


846 Robb, Heritage Assessment, 10


848 Robb Database: Marriages and Unions, 1848-1920.

Fig. 61. Winton Commercial and Market Garden Districts: 1890-1920

Fig. 62. Winton Town Commercial District: Allotments owned by Chinese men married to White Wives: 1890-1920.

The second male only community was the market garden community of Hughenden at the end of the rail head, Western Queensland: 216 kilometers (134 miles) from Winton. It remained the only

---

“married” bachelor population for over fifty years. Only one or two women have been associated with Chinese men in the town and they did not remain very long.\(^{851}\) Consisting of three small cultural precincts, Hughenden’s Chinese community supported two large Chinese gardens and a very small commercial corner consisting of a couple of shops and a boarding house. The two garden areas were occupied by men only, consisting of See Lee’s Garden, which was worked by a syndicate of 6-8 men, and Ah Hon’s Garden, which was worked by Ah Hon with occasional hired help. Ah Hon worked his garden alone for over 52 years.\(^{852}\) The See Lee Garden was sustained and able to renew its syndicate by rotating its labour force of “married” bachelors through the village in China as well as through hiring Australian born sons from kinship linked families along the coast.\(^{853}\) This pattern of renewal continued well into the 1930s.

Similarly, to the situation in Winton, the broader White community would have considered all of the Chinese men “single”. However, many of the gardeners were married, and supported wives and families back in China. They also participated in their family’s welfare by sending remittances back home and made visits to the ancestral home and family when able. Gee Fay for example, trading under the name of See Lee, returned to China on at least three occasions to visit family over a twenty two year period, 1901 – 1922.\(^{854}\)

---

851 Robb Database: Rates and Valuations, Hughenden; Robb Database: Marriages and Unions 1848-1920; QNB Records Hughenden  
852 Robb Database: Rates and Valuations, Hughenden  
853 QSA: JUS/N1037/37/712 Inquest into death Percy SO CHOY, b. Tolga, Townsville 1937  
854 NAA: J2482 1904/114, J2483 152/144 and J2483 288/144 Gee Fay; J2483 104/73, J2483176/86 and J2483 288/42 Hong Chew; J2483 104/74, J2483 189/28 and J2483 288/44 Lee Wah. Multiple applications for Certificate of Exemptions to the Dictation Test for Gee Fay, Hong Chew and Lee Wah indicate that men returned many times to China to visit family before returning each time to Hughenden.
Male only communities are complex and misunderstood as a group of “single” men with presumably little or no interconnection and devoid of family and female interaction: a “bachelor society”. However, not only did migration occur with multiple family, kin and village connections such as brothers, uncles, and cousins, they maintained filial and husbandy duties with wives and families in China, and developed and maintained female relationships in towns with the wives and children of other Chinese men as well as customer women from the broader White population. They were, as Yuen Fong Woon notes, “married bachelors”. The cyclic pattern of renewal of syndicates provided flexibility for men to return home, while others were able to retire on gardens owned by Australian born kin or relations. There they were provided for in their dotage in exchange for a little work on the garden. The absence of women in Hughenden’s Chinese community or at Winton’s Pelican Waterhole did not hinder the formation of community.

---


857 QSA: JU/N1057/37/712 Inquest into death Percy SO CHONG, b. Tolga, Townsville 1937

858 NAA: BP25/1, YONG M – CHINESE 1899-1948 and NAA: BP25/1, CHOW MEW. For example Mow Yong worked on See Lee and Ah Hon’s gardens at Hughenden before he retired to Leong San’s gardens, Hermit Park, Townsville, in 1942. Chow Mew on the other hand worked out on stations near Longreach before retiring to Chun Tie’s gardens, Townsville.
However, female absence retarded the ability of the community to renew with locally born children.

***

Part 2: The Family Landscape, Diverse places: Cultural precincts and Chinatowns

The presence of women and children within north Queensland’s Chinese communities enabled each community to develop and grow in ways which male-only communities could not. The soft yet noticeable impact women had on the growth, tone and development of the Chinatowns and precincts has yet to be fully understood, with aspects still emerging. Yet it is clear that through the birth of sons and daughters, strategic marriages, female politics and presence of matriarchs, that the influence of “soft economics” was not only far reaching, but contributed to the longevity of north Queensland’s communities.

With its roots in the Darling Downs, the Chinese Diaspora to north Queensland was driven by pastoralism, gold and tin mining and related activities and eventually by the emerging agricultural industry. It would be expected, then, that a female settlement pattern would mirror the experiences of men. However, by mapping the location of wives and families associated with men of the Chinese Diaspora, a different pattern has emerged where women are predominately associated in areas where large scale agriculture was the major industry and not mining as is the case for Chinese men. This suggests that a gendered approach to settlement patterns can reveal differences between men’s and women’s experiences.

Between 1860 and 1920 an estimated 155 couples or 43% of Chinese men who were married or in intimate relations with Chinese, White or Aboriginal women, lived in, or were associated with, regions across north Queensland which supported agricultural industries, both large and small. In comparison, mining districts accounted for 29% or 104 couples while Port towns accounted for 23% or 84 couples. The smallest proportion of families associated with the Chinese Family Landscape across north Queensland are associated with pastoralism and found in rural and remote places in the central and north-west regions. Residing on small scale gardening precincts, or isolated as individual families, only 20 pastoral area couples were identified over the whole study. This very small number of families only accounts for 5% of the total 363 Chinese marriages and unions where the location is so far known.
When this information is broken up further into towns where numbers of families have been identified, some towns are clearly favoured over others. Cairns, with 57 primary families 1860-1920, has by far the largest number of families for the whole of north Queensland followed closely by Charters Towers with 41 families and Townsville with 36 families. This trend mirrors the overall findings that women and families are associated with the agricultural industry the most, followed by mining and port towns. Not surprisingly, given the high intensity sugar, maize, banana and orchard farming of the lush tropical east coast, the population of Chinese families remains the highest along the coast which is evidenced by the largest and longest running Chinatown in north Queensland, Cairns. The importance of port towns is shown by the populations in towns such as Townsville, Cooktown and Thursday Island. Similarly, towns in the hinterland regions with easy access to major port centres such as Charters Towers and those on the Atherton Tablelands, regardless of mining or agriculture dominance, also developed stable Chinese communities which attracted families. However, in places west of the Great Dividing Range\textsuperscript{859}, fewer women formed intimate relations with Chinese men to produce family groups.

\textsuperscript{859}This range separates the wetter coastal and near-coastal areas of Australia’s east coast from the drier inland.
It seems therefore that it was remoteness which explains why Western pastoral and isolated mining districts including Normanton, Burketown, Camooweal, Cloncurry, Richmond, Hughenden and Winton did not attract any great number of families. Primary wives to Chinese men in these areas included White women and Aboriginal women, with only three Chinese women identified in the mining towns of Georgetown and Croydon. Evidence of the small number of Chinese families in rural and remote regions is clearly observable in the population figures for the region. Between 1860 and 1920, central-western towns such as Hughenden, Winton, Richmond, and Cloncurry featured only 15 Chinese mixed heritage couples over all four towns. Similarly, further north in the Gulf region at Normanton, Burketown, Camooweal and the garden community of Lawn Hill, 17 primary family groups were recorded with nearly all women Aboriginal, from nearby traditional lands. A total of 32 primary couples were identified in this research (discounting Croydon and the Etheridge) compared to 184 couples along the east coast (discounting the mining towns). With a ratio of nearly 1:6 families located in rural and remote pastoral districts compared to the coast, it can be confidently asserted that north Queensland’s Chinese Family Landscape was not driven by pastoral or remote mining activities.

---

Fig.65. North Queensland: Location of Couple: Settlement by Industry: 1860-1920.

---

Robb Database: Marriages and Unions: 1848-1920
Cultural precincts: West and North West Queensland

A selection of cultural precincts where wives and families were present, associated with rural and remote pastoral areas across north Queensland, are outlined below. They are indicative of the range of communities in the west and north-west, and Gulf Country, of Queensland.

Camooweal

The very small town of Camooweal just 7 miles (11 kls) from the Northern Territory border was first gazetted in 1884. Primarily settled as a pastoral centre and customs post, it serviced over sixteen stations in the region in Queensland, including Lawn Hill Station, as well as areas over the border in the Northern Territory, including Brunette Downs, Barkley Downs and Avon Downs. A fortnightly coach ran to Burketown, itself one of the most isolated ports in Queensland. Camooweal developed with a stable but extremely small population consisting of approximately 60 people by 1892. Chinese first settled there in 1890 but the population remained less than 10 individuals by the late 1890s. Over half of the men were engaged in market gardening, but there were also some undertaking storekeeping and services. The Chinese settlement in Camooweal developed in two areas: a garden cultural precinct along the Georgina River on the western edge of town, accessed by a walking track from Worowna and Austral Streets, and one store in town (location unknown) providing a commercial outlet for the gardens. The garden cultural precinct along the river was worked until at least the late 1930s, and the store had turned into a store/bakery in the early 20th century.

The Chinese family landscape of Camooweal was solely a Chinese-Aboriginal affair and confined to the early 20th century. Because of the late start of the community, Aboriginal wives of Chinese men were first generation mixed heritage Chinese-Aboriginal women who lived, worked, and raised families on the garden cultural precinct. Three women associated with Camooweal include Lorna Ah Bow who was married to Leon Ah Sam (m.1905); Maggie, who was married to Charlie Chong (m 1912); and Bessie Sam who was married to Ah Ning (m. 1915).

---

862 Queensland National Bank Records, QNB Burketown 1885-1928 held at Cloncurry Museum and Historical Society. The town’s Chinese population was less than 10 in 1898 including 1 storekeeper and 1 tailor.
863 Dent, “‘Moody’ Leon”, 10.
864 QBDM-MR-MF, 1905 1905-000280, LEE-ON/LEON AH SAM/ SAM LEON, AH BOW Lorna, 25 May 1905
865 QBDM-ONL: 1912 C289 Maggie and Charlie Ah Chong
866 QBDM-ONL: 1915 C3232 Bessie Sam and Tommy Ning
expanding their commercial interests to include the bakery and store in town. Camooweal remained an extremely remote location, and the Chinese Family Landscape of Camooweal never changed from its original Chinese-Aboriginal mixed heritage.

Camooweal
Market Garden precinct

Fig. 66. Camooweal Garden Cultural precinct and Storekeeper community 1890-1925.

Normanton
Normanton on the other hand had both Chinese-Aboriginal and Chinese-White mixed heritage families. The Chinese Family Landscape of Normanton remained very small with around 6 primary families identified over a sixty-year period; nearly all were Chinese – White couples, with up to three Chinese-Aboriginal couples. Chinese –White mixed heritage couples included Mary Peterson married to Woold Ah Sam, in 1874; Hanna Elizabeth (Eliza) Garn married to Ah Den in 1883; Mary Josephine Sullivan married to Charles (‘Charley’) Hann (1884); Emily Henly married to James Ah Foo (1884), and Mary Black (Minnie) who married Jim Ah Sing in 1885.

---

869 QBDM-MR-MF 1874, 1874/000338, AH SAM Woold, PETERSON Mary, 8 January1874.
870 QBDM-MR-MF 1883, 1883/00051, AH DEN, Jimmy, GARN, Hanna Elizabeth, 5 March 1883
871 QBDM-MR-MF1884,1884/000387, HANN, Charley, SULLIVAN, Mary Josephine, 4 December1884
872 QBDM-ONL: 1885 C321 Emily Ann Henly and Ah Foo
Mary, Emily and Minnie were all migrant women from England with the disembarkation port of Cooktown a popular port to marry in before making the journey to Normanton. By 1890, at least three couples lived near one another: Minnie Ah Sing and Emily Ah Foo, who lived in Green Street, and Eliza Ah Den who lived around the corner in Little Brown Street.

Up to three Chinese-Aboriginal primary couples were found in the Normanton district including Lizzie married to Ah Fong (m. 1899); Lucy married to Ah Man (m. 1901), and Man Foo who cohabitated with an unidentified Aboriginal woman. Man Foo’s relationship reflected some Chinese-Aboriginal mixed heritage relationships where cohabitation occurred. No marriage was recorded between Man Foo and his lover, or any births registered for their two sons. Instead, it took a brush with the law to reveal the existence of son, John, and an entry in the Carpentaria Shire Council Cash Book register to record his brother H. Man Foo. With no major industry in the district, such as mining or agriculture, to attract a large population and with the pastoral industry offering only limited opportunities to Chinese men, the Chinese population of Normanton was unable to grow sufficiently to form a Chinatown. Instead, it developed a loose cultural precinct on the edge of town around Green and Little Brown Streets and flowed over onto the adjoining Crown Land where some families and Chinese men lived.

QBDM-MR-MF 1885, 1885/000162, AH SING, Jim, BLACK, Mary, 7 May 1885.
Mary Josephine and Emily married their Chinese husbands in Cooktown before departing to Normanton with them. Mary Josephine and Charley later moved to Croydon.

QBDM: Birth Register, Hardcopy original, Burke District, 1890/898 AH FOO, HENLY Emily, Cecilia Violet 26 November 1890; QBDM: Birth Register, Hardcopy original, Burke District, 1890/899, AH SING, James, BLACK, Minnie, Beatrice Eveline, 4 December 1890; and “Current Notes”, Northern Mining Register, 3 February 1892, p. 5. Minnie and Emily had children close in ages; Emily had two girls and Minnie had two boys, all under five. By the end of 1890 both had added to their families with babies born just six weeks apart. It is easy to imagine that Minnie and Emily struck up a friendship with their shared experience of migration from England, marriage to a Chinese man, and childrearing experiences. However, just how cordial and social the relationships among Normanton’s Chinese family community were, remains speculation. Certainly cracks in the community were present and evidenced by a notice placed in the local Normanton newspaper by Eliza Ah Den in 1892 which warned Ah Sing that if he made any more disturbance at her husband’s house in Little Brown-street, that she would call the police and report him as a nuisance.

QBDM-ONL: 1899, C232, Ah Fong and Lizzie
QBDM-ONL: 1901, C166, Ah Man and Lucy
Queensland Police Gazette, 1919, p. 475.
Ibid.
Carpentaria Shire Council, General Cash Book 1927-1942.
Carpentaria Shire Council, Normanton, Rate book 1886-1903.
Normanton’s Chinese family landscape shows that cultural precincts and gendered spaces changed over time as they expanded, contracted or simply moved in location. Unable to remain static, locations changed for two main reasons: family mobility and generational change. Firstly the absence of boundaries, usually associated with a Chinatown, meant that families had some flexibility when it came to location. For instance, the Ah Foo family was first recorded as living in Caroline Street in 1887, before they moved to Green Street in 1890 where Emily Ah Foo remained in the same place until at least 1924. Minnie Ah Sing’s family, first located on Crown Land adjacent to the town, was able to move to Green Street in 1890 when her financial situation improved. She moved again to Little Brown Street in 1892 where she stayed. In addition, as new first generation Australian born families moved into Normanton, the location of the cultural precincts changed once again. This occurred in the early 20th century.

---


884 Carpentaria Shire Council: Rate book 1886-1903.
While some primary settlers such as Emily Ah Foo remained at the same location over both the 19th and 20th centuries, the small cultural precinct which she was part of began to shift closer to the central business district in the 20th century. This shift reflected social changes in attitudes towards the Chinese community who had by then lived in the town for over thirty years. As well, it reflected a demand for acceptance led by the next generation of the Chinese community as they moved to Normanton. Australian born Chinese included Miss Len You and Harry Man Foo, and new arrivals from other districts – mostly from Croydon such as George Ah Mook, Tommy Chun Tie, Margaret Ah Kee and her husband Chung Fung, Johnnie Ah You, John Yet Foy, Tommy Ah Gow, and William Ah Chee, who were able to move directly into areas of town previously occupied by the broader community.885

Fig. 68. Normanton: Cultural precinct Changes associated with Chinese Family Landscape: 1920-1940.886

885 Ibid.
 Currently the only generation of “Chinese” people remembered in Normanton are the twentieth century- Australian born Chinese families in town. That is, the living memory of the town’s community does not include earlier settlement phases and only considers the Australian born Chinese as “The Chinese” of Normanton. This serves as a cautionary reminder that cultural precincts change and evolve over time and highlights the difficulty of mapping the Chinese family landscape in rural and remote towns if relying on oral history.
Cloncurry

Historically imagined as a “Chinatown” but operating more like a cultural precinct, Cloncurry Chinatown was one of two cultural precincts in Cloncurry: both genders integrated, with women and families. Located in a natural horseshoe bend between Coppermine Creek and Cloncurry River on the outskirts of town, Cloncurry Chinatown was a multi-racial cultural precinct which housed a number of families, a couple of shops and market gardens along the riverbanks. The Chinese Family Landscape included Chinese men, White wives, and Aboriginal wives, with the precinct supporting a small population of Afghan and Japanese men as well as the occasional White woman who worked as a “prostitute”.

Closer to the central business district, but sufficiently situated away from the main commercial quarter, was also a small precinct of storekeepers and private homes belonging to White wives of Chinese men. This included Mrs. Fong who had originally migrated from the Cape River goldfields, and Mrs. Bow who lived near Ramsay Street.

Unlike other comparable communities such as Burketown and Normanton, Cloncurry’s Chinese Family Landscape developed a little later than most, commencing at the turn of the 20th century as families migrated to the region from other northern Gulf areas. The community comprised of up to 6 primary families as well as a number of first-generation mixed heritage Aboriginal-Chinese families as well. Women who were the Primary wives included Alice Keys, who was married to Tommy Ah Cum (1881); Mary Ann McKey, married to Ah Gee (1910); Esther Lowry, married to Thomas Ah Sue (1865); Kate Kempson, married to Ah Yen (1910); “Catherine” who lived with James Ah You (c 1917); and Aboriginal woman Louie, who was married to Ah

---

888 One woman who lived in Cloncurry Chinatown in the 1930s was a sex worker, Rita Lawrence.
889 QSA PRE/A616: SRS5402/1/605 Mary Ann Ah Cum. Mary Ann applied for naturalisation in 1919. At the time she was living with her three daughters in Cloncurry where she had been for three years. She was a laundress and in business with her daughters. It is not known why she had to apply for naturalisation as she was an Irish migrant, and the 1914 British law depriving women married to aliens of their British subject status was only accepted in Australia in 1930 (and repealed for Australian women in 1935, and further in 1946). Baldwin, “Subject to Empire”, 528, 552, 554.
890 Robb Database: Marriages and Unions: 1848-1920
891 QBDM-MR-MF 1881, 1881/000159, AH CUM Tommy, KEYES Alice, 08.02.1881; Cloncurry Shire Council: Cemetery records, 1917-1970
893 QBDM-MR-MF 1865, 1865/000472, AH SUE Thomas m. LOWRY Esther, 15.06.1865 and Cloncurry Shire Council: Cemetery records 1917-1970
895 QSA: JUS/N624/17/92 Catherine AH YEN evidence in inquest into death of LEE FONG, 1917.
First generation mixed heritage Chinese –White or Chinese -Aboriginal daughters continued to live in the Chinatown community as well, and it survived until after the Second World War.

Fig. 69. Cloncurry “Chinatown” Cultural precinct: 1913-1933.
Fig. 70. Cloncurry “Chinatown” and Business Cultural precinct.

Fig. 71. Tommy Ah Fat

Fig. 72. Tim See Foo

Fig. 73. Cloncurry Chinatown gardens

***

108# Historical Survey Plans: Cloncurry C196.4 1883; Cloncurry C196.5 1883 ;Cloncurry C196.23 1909; Cloncurry C196.27,1934; Cloncurry, C196.19, 1907; Cloncurry C196.21 1907; Cloncurry C196.20 1911; Cloncurry 196.22 1907; Cloncurry Queensland Post Office Directories (QPD); various years 1860-1910 microfiche; Wilmetts North Queensland Almanac, Wilmetts and Co, Townsville, microfiche. Various years 1883, 1885, 1888, 1892, 1898. Microfiche; Queensland National Bank: QNB Cloncurry Branch, 1884-1945; Cloncurry Shire Council: Cemetery Records 1917-1970, held at Cloncurry Shire Council, Cloncurry; Pers Comm. Mrs. Connolly, 28.09.2007; Pers Comm. Gerry Tim, 27.09.2007; Robb Database: Rates and Valuations:1882-1940; Robb Database: Miners Rights, Market Gardens and Machine Area: 1860-1940.

109Private Collection, Pearl Connolly, Cloncurry, 2007

110Ibid.

111Memorial image taken at Chinese Cemetery Cloncurry, Robb Private Collection, 2007
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Chinatowns

Chinatowns across north Queensland were gender and age inclusive, hosting not only wives from various ethnic backgrounds but also other women who were forced to live there through poverty or the nature of their occupation as sex workers. However, unlike cultural precincts which often had a limited lifespan, Chinatowns were able to renew their populations and continue to grow as family environments well into the 20th century. Wives provided benefits to male society through intimacy, companionship, partnership and mutual assistance, and their presence imbued the community with a different tone, particularly after China born wives migrated. The presence of women enabled female traditions to develop in the community, such as practices and traditions surrounding child-birth, and child-rearing and they applied their skills and influence in the “soft economics” of community relations through matchmaking of marriage arrangements and providing a female voice in civic affairs.

Not much is really understood about the last two points, as female voice and influence within the community, through the soft economics of the private and intimate sphere, has remained invisible in any discussion about Chinese community relations. However, records show White women were vocal in the courts as witnesses and interpreters, provided midwifery services to the Chinese female community, and provided matchmaking services to Australian born daughters and sons. Chinese women greeted and hosted female civic leaders, sewed and produced gifts and presents for dignitaries, and had voice as matriarchs of the family home away from mothers – in – law. These examples suggest that there is more to be discovered about the presence and role of women and gender relations in Chinatowns and precincts. This section sets out, through a brief synopsis and mapping of Chinatowns across north Queensland, to demonstrate that were women present from the commencement of communities and that they contributed to community longevity. These places have been selected and grouped together, not by location, but by the industry most likely to attract female populations.

***

\[902\] Robb, Out of Sight, Out of Mind, 127
\[903\] Ibid.
Large Scale Agriculture:

Cairns Chinatown

Cairns, first settled in 1876, provided an alternative port to Cooktown to service the Hodgkinson goldfield, located inland west-northwest of Cairns. Cairns Chinatown developed in the early 1880s and grew to sustain the largest and longest running Queensland Chinese community outside Brisbane. With 57 primary families of mixed racial background, it was the epitome of a successful, robust, age and gender integrated community. Confined to Sachs Street, between Shields and Spence Streets, and the two blocks back from the earliest central business district on Abbott Street, Chinatown was occupied to every centimetre of its boundaries.

The first women to live in the emerging Chinatown community were White wives. They were instrumental in initiating and developing a supportive network for others who followed. White women married to Chinese men provided a conduit for the Chinese Family Landscape to develop as they introduced new women into the community, made their homes available as venues for private marriages, acted as witnesses, and acted as informal matchmakers between Chinese men and White women.

From the mid-1890s young Chinese women began to arrive in Cairns to join husbands to whom they had been contracted in marriage in China. By 1901 the Chinese population of Cairns was recorded as 1598 adults including 11 adult China born women. Census data at this time did not include White wives, so the figures are limited to Chinese wives and children of Chinese and mixed heritage families. However, census figures in 1902 also recorded 118 minors in the Chinese community, of whom at least 56 were from families with a White mother. The rest consisted of 7 children of mixed heritage families where the mother was an Aboriginal woman and approximately 55 children where both parents were migrant Chinese. In 1901, the Cairns Chinese community had 1 Chinese female for every 13.5 Chinese males compared to 9683 Chinese males across the whole colony to 532 Chinese females, or 1 Chinese female to every 18 males. This last figure includes all female Chinese with the majority being girls under the age of 15.

---

904 QSA: JUS/N541/13/667 Inquest of Chinese gardener: wife gave evidence, Cape River, 1913
905 QBDM-MR-MF 1884, 1884/000333, AH HOIN/ AH HONG m. LOTHIAN, Jane, 21 March 1884. For example, Ah Hon and his wife Jane Lothian made their house available and acted as witnesses for the wedding of Ah Chow and Annie Churcher, in May 1884.
The first Chinese woman to arrive to Cairn was Mrs. Lee Yan and her mui tsai, Chou Young, in 1895. Yuen Day, the wife of Kwok Yin Ming, followed not long after her. Migrant Chinese wives relied totally on their husbands for support, in contrast to the village female community which included other women in the household such as another wife and/or mother-in-law. White women instead offered support and friendship to the young Chinese arrivals, which was crucial at times of childbirth and early child rearing. Women such as English born Bessie Dykes, married to Chun Kwon Kee in 1886, provided midwifery services to the Chinese community: a position which not only carried great responsibility for the safe delivery of babies but was well respected. The incidence of both White and Chinese women in Cairns Chinatown is evident in 1900 with 11

Fig. 74. Cairns Chinatown: Allotments associated with Chinese Family Landscape: 1900

White and Chinese wives were also joined by another marginalized group of women, “prostitutes”, who were forced to live in Chinatown, the only place where White owners would rent to them.

---

908 Cairns Argus, 29 August 1895, p. 2. Noted in the “local news” section: “A remarkable event is to be celebrated tomorrow, viz the birth of the first thoroughbred Chinese boy in Cairns. Mrs. Lee Yan arrived from China about a year ago, and with the advent of a son, Mr. Lee Yan, who is one of the leading storekeepers, is delighted, and his countrymen rejoice with him.”
909 North Queensland Register, 17 February 1897, p. 41.
910 QBDM-MR-MF, 1886 1886/001023, QUONG KEE Harry, KWONG KEE, DYKES Elizabeth, 15 November 1886.
911 Robb, Cairns Chinatown, p.37 & 38
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Single White sex workers lived in Cairns Chinatown from 1888. They were joined from 1893 by Japanese women who worked as laundrywomen and sex workers. By 1898, 16 Japanese women were listed as living in the Cairns region with the majority identified as “prostitutes”. Including the Japanese and White sex workers in the community, it is estimated that approximately 80 women resided in Chinatown between 1860 and 1920. Up to 80% of the total Chinatown allotment area was gender inclusive, revealing the true extent of the Chinatown’s Female Landscape associated with a major port town.

The Cairns Chinatown was an active Chinese community until the mid-20th century. Its longevity was owed to the diversity and adaptability of the community within, and its ability to capitalize on extended kinship relationships through business partnerships, work opportunities, and marriage arrangements across the region. The cross regional approach to family consolidation through kinship connections also extended to the adoption of illegitimate mixed heritage Chinese children from women who had abandoned them in what is a hidden aspect of Chinese communities. Women not only actively participated in society, but also actively provided voice and protection for the community. For example, Mrs. Young (formerly Mrs. Patrick Waugh Hing, nee Mary O’Halloran) provided many years of service to the community as an interpreter in the courts for cases involving Chinese men. She also provided protection for young women in the community providing accommodation in return for household work in a boarding house she ran.
Family types & women in Cairns Chinatown:

Fig. 75. Cairns Chinatown: Ethnic background of Women by Allotment: 1900

Fig. 76. Lit Sung Goong with Community children

Fig. 77. Cairns Chinatown: Japanese Woman resident c. 1902

---


Mackay Chinatown

Although settled in 1861, Mackay did not emerge as a prosperous sugar producing district until the early 1880s, having spent the previous two decades battling crop diseases and labour shortages.\(^{922}\) By then the Mackay Chinese settlement had commenced, with a small community recorded in 1868 of 13 Chinese.\(^{923}\) The community steadily grew: by 1871 it had 35 men; in 1876 it had a population of 58 Chinese men and one woman; in 1886 it had 510 men only; by 1891 had fallen to 263 men and two women (one aged between 15 – 20 years while the other was between 20-25 years). By the end of the century, Mackay’s Chinese population had diminished to 194 including one woman.\(^{924}\) After 1887 it became vulnerable to new gold discoveries including rushes to nearby places such as Mt Britton.\(^{925}\)

However, despite official census figure portraying a minimal Chinese Family Landscape, up to 14 primary families have been identified as living in the Mackay district. This included 12 mixed heritage families of Chinese – White couples and two families where both couples were China born. All, with the exception of two White women, had arrived before 1890. The first Chinese migrant wife was recorded in the 1876 Census, though after that, no trace of her can be found. It is plausible she went on to one of the goldfields. However, in 1890 two Chinese women were identified in Mackay Chinatown: Tye Tee, who was married to Ah Tye, a clerk in the merchant firm Sin Soon Wah, in 1890,\(^{926}\) and Ti Yu, who married Gee Wah and moved down from Charters Towers.\(^{927}\) In addition to the 14 families, there were 9 Japanese women living in Chinatown in 1897, some of whom may have worked as “prostitutes” while others were the wives of prominent Japanese men.\(^{928}\) Like most Chinatowns across north Queensland, Mackay Chinatown included several Japanese shops and businesses and the Japanese community was quite large in Mackay and surrounding districts, attracted as workers in the sugar industry. The Japanese population tended to

\(^{922}\) Rockhampton Bulletin, 13 November 1875, p. 2; Queenslander, 15 January 1876, p. 1. Chinese labour on the plantations commenced in 1876, with forty men arriving from Cooktown to commence work on the Pioneer Plantation as an alternative to South Sea Islanders. However, the Chinese men cleared out for the new goldfields at Clermont just two months later.


\(^{924}\) Queensland Census Reports: 1871, 1876, 1886, 1891 and 1901.

\(^{925}\) Mackay Mercury and South Kennedy Advertiser, 27 January 1887, p. 2.

\(^{926}\) Western Champion, 22 April 1890, p. 4.

\(^{927}\) NAA: BP234/1, SB1930/3438 Mrs. Nellie Gee Wah - Application for admission of her three children. They first lived in Charters Towers before they moved down in 1903 to Mackay, where they had a shopkeeping business. A victim of domestic violence, Ti Yu ran away in 1909 with her daughter Nellie, leaving her two boys behind. She travelled under the pseudonym Mrs. Ross to Thursday Island, where she was hidden by the women before her departure for China.

\(^{928}\) QSA POL/J1; PRV10729/1/5 Japanese women, c. 1897.
the support and assistance of its own through a Japanese Club which was located in Nelson Street.929

Mackay Chinatown, located between Nelson and Macalister Streets on the northern end of town and taking in a section of Victoria Street, started to gain notoriety in the mid-1880s as a place of vice and entertainment.930 Popular with sugar plantation workers, South Sea Islander, Japanese, Indian and Malay men from outlying districts regularly visited the cultural precinct for recreation: gambling and visiting “prostitutes” who lived and worked in the cultural precinct. Boarding houses, little rooms lined with bunk beds, and private spaces for opium smoking, were crammed in among shops, in an intensively occupied built up area. It physically covered nearly one whole town section block and incorporated three or four little laneways for access within the middle of blocks. The Chinese population was robust enough to construct a temple and community hall which opened in 1903.931 The community lasted until the 1930s when the council enacted its final decisions to have most of it demolished 932 and the stain of Chinatown removed from Mackay: a position they had been working on since 1912.933

929 Recollections by Cedric Andrew, held by Mackay Historical Society and Museum Inc.
930 Mackay Mercury and South Kennedy Advertiser, 20 February 1886, p. 2
931 Recollections of Cedric Andrew.
Fig. 78. Mackay Chinatown circa. 1900

Historical Survey Plans: Mackay, M.91.2, 1863; Mackay, M.91.8, 1865; Mackay, Victoria Street, M914, 1864; Mackay, K124636, 1878; Mackay, Macalister Street, RP 700757, 1898; Mackay, Albert Street, RP 700795, 1898; Mackay, Wood Street, RP 700793, 1898; Mackay, Wood St, Lane, RP 700842, 1900; Mackay, Sydney Street, RP 700837, 1900; Mackay, Victoria Street, RP 700823, 1900; Mackay, Section 13, all 2 & 3, Yuen Geut, RP 700745, 1900; Mackay, Nelson Street, Lane, RP 700744, 1900; Mackay, Macalister Street, RP 700763, 1900; Mackay, Macalister Street, RP 700762, 1900; Mackay, Victoria Street, Yuen Geut, RP 700756, 1900; Mackay, Nelson Street, Ah Sue; RP 700746, 1900; Mackay, Section 28, Lane, RP 700850, 1900; Mackay, Nelson Street, Lane, RP 700732, 1910; Mackay, Wellington Street, RP 700709, 1913; Mackay, Victoria Street, Lane, RP 700840, 1918; Mackay, Lane, RP700753, 1922; Robb Database: Rates and Valuations:1882-1940; Robb Database: Miners Rights, Market Gardens and Machine Area: 1860-1940 CPS 10B/26 Register of Firms Mackay, 1903-1933; JUS/N1021/37/21 Inquest death Peter KING LEE Herbalist, Mackay, 1937; JUS/N997/35/415 Inquest death by opium poisoning of old CHINESE MAN, Mackay, 1935; Moore, Clive, 
Chinese sugar workers quickly formed a Chinese cultural precinct when they arrived to work on Geraldton’s emerging plantations in 1887. Just a few months after the first men arrived, Geraldton’s population of Chinese was considerable at 400 men and growing every day. Chinese settlers quickly moved into establishing the more lucrative Chinese-led banana industry, which provided the perfect impetus for a Chinatown to grow. By 1901, Geraldton’s Chinatown population had doubled with 850 Chinese men, and many more throughout the region on farms and small settlements such as South Johnstone. However, from that point on the population began to decline, and by the end of the decade had reduced to 700. Chinatown began to contract. The Chinese banana industry had collapsed due to cyclones, southern State fruit fly regulations, discriminatory legislation, and pressure from increased competition from White growers, leaving prominent banana grower Tam Sie to estimate in 1913 that over a thousand banana growers had moved to the Tablelands to grow corn instead. The death knell to the large community came in

---

935 Mackay Historical Society and Museum Inc. Image number unknown, received 2003, Glen Hall Assistant Research Officer, Mackay
936 Queensland, 24 December 1887, p. 1011. The town was renamed Innisfail in 1910 because of confusion with Geraldton, W.A.
937 QSA POL/2/2 Chinese Census Records, District of Cairns.
938 May, Topsawyers, 14.
March 1918 when a cyclone all but wiped out Chinatown along with the rest of Innisfail. While the Chinese community limped along until WWII, it had effectively contracted to one street.

Located back from the main commercial centre but extending around a whole section of town, Geraldton’s Chinatown extended from the top of Edith and Owen Streets, along Ernest and Lily Streets. It occupied much of the land down to the river and tramway, with the whole area occupied by shops and dwellings, outbuildings and sheds which, on the lower lying land, were accessed by timber walkways. Around 1891 the community constructed a temple on the high point of Edith and Owen Streets. Gambling houses and lodging places, as well as key-hole lodgings occupied by single White “prostitutes”, were concentrated along Ernest and Lily Streets, in the area of town most prone to seasonal flooding from the nearby South Johnstone River.

Geraldton/Innisfail’s Chinatown supported 18 primary families between 1887-1920, including both China born and White wives. In addition to women married to Chinese men there were also 13 Japanese women reputedly working as “prostitutes” from 1897, and by 1900 a number of single White women as well. The very large sugar cane industry surrounding Innisfail attracted prostitution, as male White workers migrated north looking for seasonal work, especially cane cutting. Cashed up and looking for recreational activities, they were catered to for drinking, gambling and prostitution in Chinatown. However, unlike Cairns Chinatown where the allotments were owned by men and occupied by men and women, many of Geraldton’s allotments were owned by women.

Of the 23 Chinese-owned allotments identified in 1910, up to one third were registered under the name of the wife of a Chinese settler. Land was owned by the wife of one of the most prominent men in Geraldton/Innisfail, Tam Sie, and two of her sisters who were married to other Chinese men. All three women were the daughters of Australian born mixed heritage parents George Hing Robb Database: Marriages and Unions 1848-1920; BDM Qld. Birth Register, 1900, C1711, Ruby Beatrice Ah Moon; NAA: J3136/1907/149 Jong Quan Po; NAA: J3136/1907/150 Leong Gee; NAA: J3136/1907/151 Mary Jane; QSA JUS / 31 Inquest into death of Arnold Lee Bow; QBDM-MR-MF 1902/02/000249, JONG QUAN POW /JONG QUAN PO m. LEONG GEE 2 January 1902; NAA: BP342/1, 9857/299/1903; NAA BP384/9, Birth Certificate Register; Townsville Daily Bulletin, 7 December 1912, p. 2. Key China born couples included Ah Moon and his wife Chou Young (1899), Lee Bow and his wife Sun Hee (1900), Taam Pui (Tom See Poy) and his wife Chan Han (1901), Jong Quan Po and Leong Gee (1902), Leong Hong and his wife Ah Cum (1904), and Woon Loong and Mrs.Woong Loong (1912).

QSA: POL/J1, PRV10729/1/5 Japanese women, c. 1897; Truth, 12 July 1903, p. 6.

It is not fully understood yet whether wives were just paper owners with the allotments purchased by husbands, or if women were purchasing the allotments for themselves. Across North Queensland there had already been a pattern established in other places such as in Cairns, where Chinese men purchased land and registered it in their wives’ or children’s names, regardless of whether they were naturalised or not. This was an effective way of stopping assets being seized if the main businesses went bankrupt.
and Christina Wilke from Charters Towers. The land was owned by Jessie Hing, married to Tam Sie, Eliza Hing, married to Que Fook (the family changed their name to Carr), and Charlotte Hing, married to Thomas Hong. Only one allotment was owned by a primary White wife, Louisa Crofton, who married Sin Dak in 1886. Louisa owned land just outside Chinatown but lived within walking distance of it. Chinese families in Innisfail appear to have been racially accepted, a position which was enhanced by one leading woman, Chan Han, the wife of Taam Sze Pui who owned a well-respected business, was also a merchant store, which

---

Fig. 80. Innisfail Chinatown: c.1910 allotments owned or occupied by women.
Lower Herbert River District: Chinatowns and cultural precincts

Although settled by White settlers in 1865, it was not until 1879 that the first Chinese arrived in the Lower Herbert River district as a party of Chinese employed to clear land for one of the plantation owners. The Chinese population started to increase from 1882 as more men arrived. Employed as labourers, sugar baggers, and land clearers they were also employed to lay small gauge tramlines, drain fields, and build roads. As the region grew, Chinese men moved beyond laboring for small farmers, and worked as cooks in hotels and as fishermen supplying fish to the broader community, until they eventually moved into leasing small acreages of land to grow sugarcane or commence market gardening. Some branched out into storekeeping in the towns and hamlets which were scattered throughout the district, most of them along the Herbert River which connected them all. By 1882 the Chinese population in the Lower Herbert Valley was estimated at 300 men and growing. Ripple Creek Plantation recorded 100 Chinese workers and Victoria Plantation, 350 men in 1883. By 1889, a tramway connected Ingham and Dungeness along the river, a distance of 14 miles (22.50 klms), and assisting further development. By then it was estimated that the district supported between 500-600 Chinese. By 1900 the Chinese settler population had grown to approximately 1095 who were engaged in sugar-mills, providing goods or services, or growing and supplying food.

The Lower Herbert River Valley takes in a large area extending from Lucinda on the coast to beyond Trebonne at the bottom of Mt Fox on the Great Dividing Range. From 1884, most Chinese storekeepers and merchants moved into the two towns, Ingham and Halifax. The communities in both towns grew in different ways to each other with Halifax emerging as the major spiritual and clan centre and Ingham emerging as the major commercial centre. Where Halifax had a Chinatown, temple and railway barracks for Chinese workers, and was aimed at a Chinese clientele, Ingham’s merchants and storekeepers, located on the edge of the main business district in East Ingham, provided goods and produce to both the Chinese and broader White community.

---

949 Brisbane Courier, 29 January 1879, p.5. This proved to be very unsuccessful for the plantation owners as the men gave up the work soon after arriving.
950 Brisbane Courier, 25 February 1886, p.3.
951 See Census reports for 1886 and 1891, QV & P 1887 and 1892.
952 Brisbane Courier, 6 September 1882, p.4.
953 Pugh’s Almanac for 1884; Queenslander, 15 September 1883, p. 431; Brisbane Courier, 10 May 1883, p.6. In 1884 Victoria Plantation had 300 and other plantations employed 340.
954 Illustrated Sydney News, 4 April 1889, p.27.
955 QV & P 1887 Vol. 1: 981.
956 Census Report for the year 1901; Pugh’s Almanac 1884-1927. This included firms Jang Lee and Co. (Wong Heng), Houng Lee and Co., Houng Yuen and Co., and Wong Lee and Co.
Halifax

Halifax Chinatown was located on the edge of the small town of Halifax. It lay opposite the tram stop where the railway barracks had been constructed for the team of Chinese men employed by CSR to build and maintain its tramway from Ingham to Victoria Plantation and on to the district’s first port, Dungeness.  

Chinatown consisted of the Buk Ti Goong temple with a meeting hall to its left, constructed in a similar style to many of the temples across north Queensland. Constructed presumably just before or just after 1900, the temple remained in existence until at least 1929, when the market garden on which it stood was sold and it was pulled down.

---

958 Alec S. Kemp, History of the Herbert River, ms. Hinchinbrook Shire Council Library. The temple was described as “a beautiful building in the Chinese style with overlapping gabled roof and beautifully painted inside and out in peacock blue, gold and purple. The walls inside were decorated in the style of old China – dragons, beautiful trees and fantastic birds of colourful plumage, subject only to China.”
959 *Herbert River Express*, 1 November 1929.
The Halifax Chinese Family Landscape supported up to 10 families, nine couples of which were mixed Chinese-White heritage. Prominent families in the Halifax included that of Lizzie Casey and William Low Chong, who romanised their names to Casey. There was also one China born couple, Mar Gee and his wife Ah Gang. Halifax also supported a small number of White women who worked as prostitutes and Halifax was home to 3 Japanese women, also typecast as “prostitutes”.

Chinese men who arrived in the 1880s who went on to raise families in the district include: Ah Bow, Mar Kee, Hong, Lee Look Hop, Ah Lee, Gow, Wan Chap, and Chow Yip.

QBDM-MR-MF 1903, 1903/002132, MAR GEE m. AH GANG, 17 December 1903.
QSA POL/J1; PRV10729/1/5 Japanese women, c. 1897.

Fig.82. Halifax Chinatown: C. 1900 showing area occupied by women

---
Gairloch Chinatown (Cowden)

Further inland, situated outside the larger town of Ingham, was Cowden Chinatown on the banks of the Herbert River: a distance of about 5.5 miles or nearly 9 kilometres from Ingham and near the Gairloch bridge. This provided sufficient distance from town to enable recreational activities to occur without scrutiny, but was also far enough away to prevent help from being available when needed.\textsuperscript{965} The few White women who lived in the community were particularly vulnerable to the distance it took to get help from town. Prone to flooding, mosquitoes and sandflies, it was also troubled by poor sanitation, disease, and potential violence at any point, and at least two women died before help could reach them: the first a White de facto wife who accidently overdosed on her partner’s opium water, (a popular product used by Chinese men to keep malaria mosquitoes at bay), and the second a Japanese woman who died at the hands of her jealous Japanese husband, in a case of domestic violence.\textsuperscript{966}

Ingham Commercial cultural precinct

A small commercial cultural precinct developed in East Ingham where Chinese shopkeepers and bakers had stores along Lannercost Street and Palm Street, flanked by market gardens along Palm Creek. Ingham’s Chinese storekeepers catered to the whole community and were present in the town from 1885, unsurprisingly in the most flood-prone portion.\textsuperscript{967} While never expanding beyond four or five firms at any one point, they each continued for some years in Ingham and were able to continue into the 20\textsuperscript{th} century either through the arrival of sons from China to learn the family business, or from Australian sons born in the Herbert River district.\textsuperscript{968}

Mobility throughout the Herbert River district between the plantations, towns and smaller riverside communities was high among families from the very beginning. Families followed work opportunities arising from the plantations, transitioning from labouring to market gardening and on to storekeeping, with workplace flexibility demonstrated by the Gow and Moon families who

\textsuperscript{965} QSA JUS/N120/85/ Report by Police Magistrate Pennefather on Ingham, and Report by Dr. W.C.C. Macdonald on Ingham gaol.
\textsuperscript{966} Ibid.; BDM Qld. Birth Register online, 1882, C3861 Ada Maria Postill, William Edwin, Elizabeth Estunado Dubberley; BDM Qld. Death Register Online, 1882, C1606, Ada Maria Postill, William Postill, Elizabeth Estunado Dubberley. This is the case for Elizabeth Postill, the de-facto wife of Young Sun, a jeweller who lived in Gairloch Chinatown. Elizabeth Estunado Dubberley, legally married to Edwin William Postill in 1880, had given birth to a daughter Ada in 1882, who died not long after birth. Just when they separated remains unknown, but she took up with Young Sun and three years later was living in Chinatown at Gairloch. In 1885 while feeling poorly at home, Elizabeth mistakenly drank her de facto husband’s opium water which he kept next to the bed. Young Sun, distraught at finding Elizabeth near death, ran into town to fetch the doctor, but she died before help could arrive.
\textsuperscript{967} Ingham State School Centenary 1885 - 1995, held in Hinchinbrook Shire Council Library Local History collection.
\textsuperscript{968} Pugh’s Almanac 1884-1927. Ingham’s key stores included merchant firms Jang Lee and Co. (Wong Heng), Houng Lee and Co., Houng Yuen and Co., and Wong Lee and Co.
worked around the district over a number of years. Australian born children of mixed heritage families such as those of Ah Bow and Munson remained in the district, with daughters marrying back into the Chinese community, often marrying Chinese men much older than themselves. After the 1920s Chinese businesses were run by second generation Australian born children who diversified and expanded their family’s commercial firms. By then intermarriage with the broader community had commenced, most notably with the new dominant group – Italian migrants.

Fig. 83. East Ingham Chinese precinct showing, Houng Yuen & Co. to the right: 1916

---

970 QBDM-MR-MF 1899, 1899/000375, MUNSON m. AH BOW, Ellen Bridget Florence, 14 March 1899.
971 QBDM-MR-MF 1891, 1891/000352, LOOK HOP, Thomas/LEE LOUK HOP m. AH BOW, Eliza Jane, 5 June 1891.
Fig. 84. Ingham Chinese Commercial Cultural precinct including Cowden/Gairloch Chinatown: 1886-1930s.

**Mining Areas:**

**Charters Towers**

Charters Towers, first settled in 1871, developed as the most successful gold mining town in north Queensland. By 1900 the Chinese population of Charters Towers and surrounding goldfield had grown to 500 residents, spread across three separate communities: Gard’s Lane in Charters Towers itself, and two other urban nodes within the city: Queenton and Millchester. The district’s population was diverse and large enough to support the construction of two temples, which suggests two dialect groups. However, when dignitaries such as the Governor General visited the city, the Chinese community presented itself as one united community.

Across Charters Towers there were up to 51 women living in the combined Chinese community, including just four Chinese wives. From the first arrival, Sue See, wife of Lee Liy, to the last,
Sou Lin, wife of Ah Lin/Lin Kee, there was a lengthy period of 20 years.\textsuperscript{978} Attitudes to marriage on the mining field were fluid and demonstrated by a number of instances where White married women left their Chinese or White husbands to move in with other men.\textsuperscript{979} This can be observed in the name change for Mrs. Mary Phillips (nee Tully) who became Mrs. Ah Lin or Lin Ding when she moved in with her lover Kwok Ling Ding.\textsuperscript{980} As they did elsewhere, the female community assisted one another and strong friendships were formed. This was easy for one pair of women as they were sisters. Elizabeth Peckham, wife to hotelier Swee Sang\textsuperscript{981} and Mrs. Ah Chee, a boarding house keeper, both had prior experience with mining communities, having migrated north first from Sofala in NSW and then Crocodile Creek diggings in Queensland.\textsuperscript{982} Mrs. Christina Hing, married to Moe Ung, raised a large family and endeared herself to the community, providing female support by “sponsoring” members of the Chinese community, including children of mixed and Chinese heritage, for baptism to the Church of England.\textsuperscript{983}

From 1915 mining across the region went into decline which accelerated in the 1920s. The lack of China born wives in the Charters Towers region, combined with Australian born Chinese daughters moving away to marry Chinese men in other northern communities, meant that the Charters Towers Chinese Family Landscape collapsed earlier than other comparable towns.

\textsuperscript{978}Anglican Church Records held at the St James Cathedral Archives: Marriages, Charters Towers; NAA: B384/9 Book 1; QSA SCT/CF10 3030 Lee Liy Wing On, Mililcheter, \textit{Queensland Times, Ipswich Herald and General Advertiser}, 29 May 1875, p. 2; NAA: BP234/1, SB1930/3438, Mrs. Nellie Gee Wah - Application for admission of her three children. Sue See was the wife of merchant Lee Liy, a partner in Wing On and Co in Mililcheter. She was the first Chinese woman to arrive in north Queensland, and the first Chinese woman on the Charters Towers Goldfield. She was also the first Chinese woman in north Queensland to have an Australian born child. Unfortunately she was also the first Chinese mother to lose a daughter when her daughter Milly, aged 3 months, died from measles. The couple left permanently for Cooktown where they remained for some years. Sou Lin, wife of Lin Kee, and Ah Moy, wife of Ah Hon, arrived twenty years later in the mid 1890s while Ti Yu, the wife of Gee Wah, was the last China born wife to arrive in Charters Towers, having moved to Chinatown from Mackay after the birth of their first child Nellie in 1901.

\textsuperscript{979}Lin Foy, “The Pangs and the Lin Foys”, Charters Towers’ White wives formed a long-standing and robust fraternity of women which extended to other towns as the north opened up. There was a particular affinity between the women of Charters Towers and Cairns.

\textsuperscript{980}Northern Miner, 24 April 1893, p.3; \textit{Northern Miner}, 25 August 1899, p. 3; NAA, BP:/Birth Certificate Register, Book 1, 1901, Margaret Anne Ah Lin (or Phillips), illegitimate, born Charters Towers 22 August 1898, BC 22877. She went to China in February 1901 and returned on 10 May 1910.

\textsuperscript{981}Northern Miner, 16 November 1880, p. 2.

\textsuperscript{982}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{983}QBDM-MR-MF, 1872 72/000414, HING, George MOE UNG married to WILKIE, Christina, 27 October1872;Charters Towers Baptism Records, North Queensland Diocesan Archives. She stood sponsor for the conditional baptisms of Mabel Sun Kee, daughter of Minnie Boatwright and Sun Kline Kee, as well as Nellie Gee Wah, daughter of Ti Yu and Gee Wah and Willie Ah Lin, son of Ah Lin/Lin Kee and Ah Low/ Sou Lin. Mrs. Hing was responsible for ensuring the spiritual welfare of the baptised children under the terms of the English Church.
Gard’s Lane Chinatown, Charters Towers

Charters Towers Chinatown, located between Mossman and Deane Streets, occupied an area of town known as Gard's Lane (Lee Street) and was only a short distance from the main commercial district, Gill Street. Chinatown incorporated two unnamed laneways which provided an effective barrier against prying eyes and law enforcement, and where recreational activities such as gambling and prostitution could be conducted with some impunity. Allotments were occupied with timber and tin boarding houses with communal kitchens, shops with living quarters out the back, double storied merchant stores and make-shift lean-tos and in-fill abodes. Little courtyards and privies were located at the rear of allotments while a rapid population growth saw earlier buildings, built before roads were properly surveyed, located in the middle of one laneway. Gardner's Lane Chinatown was an intensively occupied cultural precinct containing eating houses, lodging houses, recreational places and diverse shops all catering to a predominantly Chinese clientele. In contrast,
major merchant houses and hotels catering to both a Chinese and White clientele were located on Mossman Street. This includes Swee Sang’s Canton Hotel and merchant firm On War Jang on Mossman Street. Mrs. Ah Chin had her boarding house fronting Deane Street.

Charters Towers Gard’s Lane Chinatown provided a home to most of the Chinese women as well as a few White wives and up to 14 Japanese women. Some families lived along the major traffic routes of Mossman Street and Deane Street,\(^986\) while the Japanese group worked as prostitutes in shops which fronted the main thoroughfare.\(^987\) Japanese women conducted “comfort” business in little rooms rented off Chinese men and they shared facilities as well as a community kitchen in the household.\(^988\)

---

\(^{986}\)Northern Miner, 1 November 1876, p. 3.; Robb Database: Rates and Valuations.

\(^{987}\)Seventy Women Gasp in Horror”, Truth, 10 May 1903, p. 5; Diane Menghetti, I remember: memories of Charters Towers (History Dept., James Cook University, Townsville, 1989): 61. This included Lulu, a monocycle riding Japanese “prostitute” who was reputed to ride her cycle around Charters Towers in her kimono. Upon her retirement and intended return to Japan, she was detained in Townsville and re-routed to Fantome Island, a place for infectious diseases, where she died from a venereal disease.

\(^{988}\)Historical Survey Plan: Charters Towers, Deane Street, CT1824, 1872; Charters Towers, Deane Street, CT18217, 1878; Charters Towers, Deane Street, CT18218, 1878; Charters Towers, Deane Street, CT18227, 1881; Charters Towers, Lee Street, CT1824, 1876; Charters Towers, Mossman Street, RP700193; Charters Towers, Mossman Street, CT1824, 1872; Charters Towers, Mossman Street, CT18227, 1881; Charters Towers, Mossman Street, RP700192, 1891; Robb Database: Rates and Valuations:1882-1940; WBD 11A/2: Charters Towers Waterworks Board 1887-1890; “ Alien Quarters”, North Queensland Register, Monday, 4 May 1903, p. 39; QSA,SRS1806/1/1: Charters Towers Boys School Admission Register; QSA, SRS1808/1/1: Charters Towers Girls School Admission Register, 1896-1903; Queensland Post Office Directories (QPD): various years 1860-1910 microfiche; Willmetts North Queensland Almanac, Willmetts and Co, Townsville, microfiche. various years: 1883, 1885, 1888, 1892, 1898. Microfiche.

\(^{989}\)Seventy Women Gasp in Horror”, Truth, Sunday 10 May 1903, p. 5.

---

Fig. 86. Charters Towers Chinatown: 1880- 1905\(^989\)  
Fig.87. Japanese woman Gard’s Lane\(^990\)

---

\(^{990}\)Northern Miner. 1 November 1876, p. 3.; Robb Database: Rates and Valuations.
Queenton
Queenton incorporated a considerable market garden area with a small cultural precinct of shops which developed around Sam Street, near the main cemetery. Queenton serviced a large number of gardening leases along Buchanan Creek, and it was conveniently located near the main Charters Towers railway station where produce could be railed out. Between Charters Towers Gard’s Lane and Millchester, Market Garden Leases (MGL) could be found along Sandy Creek, Aberdeen Creek, Dearies Creek, Queenslander Creek, Millchester Creek, Gladstone Creek, Mossman Creek, Porphyry Creek and other areas closer to Charters Towers Chinatown itself. The Queenton Chinese garden cultural precinct had the main temple near it, suggesting it was well supported by the gardeners. Many women legally married or otherwise lived with Chinese gardeners in and around Queenton, with at least two families at Porphyry Creek, two couples along Aberdeen Creek, and others in unknown location such as Biddy O’ Flaherty and her Chinese husband Lop-Ti-Lo who married in the Queenton Chinese temple in 1877.991 Women were engaged in traditionally female occupations including egg and poultry selling (Eliza Ferris)992 and dairying (Sarah Ah Chin).993 In addition, single women shared space in houses, and humpies where they sold services to men.994 The last occupation made women particularly vulnerable and women deliberately sought “protection” in the Chinese community as rape and attempted rape by White men were commonplace.995

Millchester
A little further out, some 2 ½ miles (nearly 4 klms) from Charters Towers, the small settlement of Millchester developed next to the longest-running crushing mill on the field, the Venus Battery. It is worth noting that stamp batteries were very noisy and this may have made the surrounding residential area undesirable. A small Chinese commercial cultural precinct developed off Jardine Street, the main street, which incorporated a hotel, shops and herbalist’s store as well as a temple. A sizable population of Chinese settlers lived at Millchester and it incorporated up to 10 families. Millchester had at least three prominent families: the merchant firm partner of Wing On and Co.,

991 Northern Miner, 5 September 1877, p. 3.
992 QSA: CRS/157/96, Rape of Eliza Ferris by Thomas Lester, Charters Towers, 1896; North Queensland Register, 1 July 1896, p.18. Widow Eliza Ferris, egg and poultry farmer, lived in a humpy at Aberdeen Creek about 2 miles from Millchester with James AH SUE.
993QBDM-BR-ONL: 1875, C2837 Milly, daughter of Liy Lee and Sue See; QBDM-BR-ONL: 1896, C6289, Bessie Lin, daughter of Ah Lin and Shue; and QSA, QUE/N2; PRV11288/1/2 Valuation Registers- Queenton Shire Council.
994Northern Miner, 29 January 1891. A case was brought by the police against four women charged under the Vagrancy Act: Jemima Brown, Mary Ann Coutts, Margaret Cummings and Bessie Whittle, alleged prostitutes. Margaret was noted as living with Tommy AH BOW in a disorderly house where complaints were made against her. She was at the time separated from her husband. She was sentenced to three months hard labour in the Townsville gaol and the other women 6 months hard labour.
995North Queensland Register, 1 July 1896, p. 1; QSA: CRS/157/96 Rape of Eliza Ferris by Thomas Lester, Charters Towers, 1896.
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Lee Liy and his Chinese wife Sue See\textsuperscript{996}; hotelier Wan Chap and his wife Maria Welsh, who married in 1869 and who had the New York Hotel;\textsuperscript{997} and shopkeeper/ herbalist and civic leader, William Lam Pan. Lam Pan was by far the most prominent person across all three Chinese communities and, due to a proficiency in English, represented the Chinese community in matters relating to the courts, deputations to visiting Governors- General, and fulfilling filial duties for his kinsmen by seeking assistance for exhumations from the nearby Chinese cemetery.\textsuperscript{998} Lam Pan married two White women: Mary Jane McDonnell, married in 1876 and died five years later in 1881,\textsuperscript{999} and the policeman’s daughter Sarah Molony in 1884.\textsuperscript{1000} Not only was he married to two White women in north Queensland, he also managed to maintain a family in China.\textsuperscript{1001}

\textsuperscript{996}Queensland Times, Ipswich Herald and General Advertiser, 29 May 1875, p. 2: Lee Liy Wing On, Millchester.
\textsuperscript{997}Willmetts North Queensland Almanac, Millchester, 1883-1888.
\textsuperscript{998}QSA: HOM/A22/04405/29 Exhumation Millchester.
\textsuperscript{999}“Family Notices”, Northern Miner, 18 June 1881, p. 3.
\textsuperscript{1000}QBDM-MR-MF 1876, 1876/000442, LAM PAN m. MCDONNELL Mary Jane, 8 August1876; QBDM-MR-MF 1884, 1884/000858, PAN/LAM PAN William, MALONEY, Sarah 8 July 1884.
\textsuperscript{1001}NAA: BP342/1, 475/603/1900 Lam Pan - Correspondence relating to re-entry permit into Queensland.
Fig. 88. Millchester Commercial Cultural precinct including Temple 1890 – 1900

1876 Historical Survey Plans: Millchester, M1756, 1876; Millchester, MP15104, 1876; Millchester, MP28707, 1877;
Cape River Chinatown

The Cape River goldfield was proclaimed in 1868 and quickly attracted the attention of miners from the Crocodile Creek diggings, who moved north in search of gold. Among some of the first to arrive were Ah Sowie and his Irish born wife Bridget Feghan, who arrived in July 1868. Within six months one of the first children to be born on the field was welcomed: their first daughter Mary Ann. Cape River diggings, and the nearby town of Pentland, was a small remote community which supported up to 12 mixed heritage primary families 1860-1920. Some, such as the Ah Sowie family, stayed only a short while before moving on, while others such as William Ah Hee, married to Mary Rodda Bailey, and George Ah Pan, married to Mary Murphy, remained in the district until they were laid to rest in bush graves.

With roads rudimentary and basic services non-existent, pregnancy and birth for women was fraught with concern. Charters Towers, the nearest large centre, was 66 miles (107 klm) or one day’s travel away, making the journey for heavily pregnant Mary Ah Hee or Mary Ah Pan dangerous and uncomfortable. In these circumstances’ women departed for the laying-in hospital in Charters Towers up to two months before the birth of a child and remained there sometimes two months after. This meant Chinese husbands were left at home to care for children while managing businesses and/or gardens. When faced with tragedy, wives and husbands were forced to deal with terrible family circumstances as best they could. This was the case for Ah Hee who had to bury his stillborn baby in between attending to his beloved dying wife, while comforting his four children, in 1912. While couples in larger centres experienced the benefits of a large Chinese Family
Landscape, couples in remote locations had to cope and face family life and tragedy in isolation.  

Fig. 89a & 89 b. Cape River: Graves of Ah Hee and Mary Rhoda Ah Hee

Ravenswood Chinatown

From the moment it was discovered, Ravenswood Goldfield was a popular destination for those seeking gold due to its accessible location near the provisioning ports of both Townsville and Bowen. By 1873, Chinese men were arriving directly from Hong Kong to Townsville bound for Ravenswood, making it the first goldfield in north Queensland to attract the attention of overseas Chinese. Ravenswood, like the Cape River goldfields, was a stepping stone for many families, with most moving on to other places such as Charters Towers shortly after arrival. Barely two years after its discovery, was Ravenswood described as a mini-China with the Rockhampton Bulletin derisively referring to Ravenswood as “The Flowery Land. - One is tempted to ask in some parts of Ravenswood whether one is in an English colony, or in a Chinese town, the pig-tails are so plentiful.” A sizable Chinatown developed on the edge of town with Chinese stores in the main street. Along the waterways, market gardens leases were taken up. By 1874 a temple was constructed, making it the third temple in north Queensland after Gilberton (1871) and Millchester (1873). By 1875, the goldfield had attracted a population of over 2000 Chinese miners, gardeners and storekeepers, although this number dropped significantly to 300 by 1901.

---

1008 This may have put some couples off travelling to extremely remote areas such as the Gilbert River diggings. Although Chinese miners travelled north to the Gilbert River, there remains no evidence to suggest that any families followed them. The Gilbert goldfield’s failure to attract Chinese mixed heritage families could be attributed to its very remote and dangerous location and abandonment in 1873 after only four years’ settlement, combined with the more accessible Etheridge and Ravenswood Goldfields opening up.

1009 James Cook University Images: 11147 & 11150.

1008 Mackay Mercury and South Kennedy Advertiser, Saturday 1 February 1873, p. 3.


1013 Historical Survey MP17906.

Ravenswood’s Chinese Family Landscape supported 7 Chinese primary families consisting of 3 China born couples and 4 who were mixed heritage marriages. The first Chinese woman to live in Ravenswood was Ah See, the wife of storekeeper Ah Pong. She arrived and was married in Queensland in 1884. She remained the only Chinese woman in Ravenswood for approximately twenty years until Young See, the wife of Lee Gow, and Lee Moy, the wife of Jang Lum Kee, arrived. All Chinese families lived in Ravenswood until such time as their children required a Chinese education.

Nearly all of the mixed heritage couples who arrived stayed a couple of years and quickly moved on to other goldfields such as Charters Towers. For example, Swee Sang and family arrived in Ravenswood, 1874 and set up a hotel, only to move to Charters Towers a year later. White wives in Ravenswood included Irish born Mary Herlihy, who was married to Thomas Sun Lee Sing in 1887, Elizabeth Linton, who was married to Charlie Ah Sing in 1890, and Sarah Gale/Peaus who had married William Ah Chin in Sofala, New South Wales in 1862. Mining, while a lucrative occupation for some, left others, especially families, on the move chasing an income, and Ravenswood had two disadvantages: it was not an alluvial mining centre, and the ore was hard to treat, leading to an overall decline in population and therefore economic opportunities. All three mining fields, Ravenswood, Cape River and Charters Towers, reflected the transient nature of populations on mining fields as families moved from field to field, following the rushes. When the Palmer Goldfield was discovered in 1873, everything in north Queensland changed.

---

1014 “Notes”, The Western Champion and General Advertiser for the Central-Western Districts, 19 March 1901, p. 3.
1015 QBDM-MR-MF 1884, 1884/001700 AH PONG m. AH SEE, 14 February 1884; QSA, WOR/N14-N15-N16, Ravenswood Divisional Board: Form of Valuation Return, 1882. Ah Pong owned land and a store in 1883 and Ah See arrived in 1884. Together they raised three children in Ravenswood until the turn of the century.
1016 QBDM-BR-ONL: 1901, C6790, Lee Hem Lee Gow; QSA: SRS1613/1/1: Ravenswood School Admission Register, 1876.
1017 QBDM-BR-ONL: 1901, C6300, Gem Lum Kee; QSA: SRS1613/1/1: Ravenswood School Admission Register, 1876.
1018 School Admission Register, Information held by Ravenswood Historical Society: Samuel Swee Sang, Age 5, enrolled in the Ravenswood State School, 1874. Father noted as a Publician. They lived near the Church of England. A year later he had purchased the Canton Hotel in Charters Towers. Transfer of license for Canton Hotel from Sam You to Sue Sang (Swee Sang), Northern Miner, 22 Sept 1875, p. 2.
1019 QBDM-MR-MF 1887, 1887/001016, SUN LEE SING, Thomas LIM LEE SING/ LEE SING m. HERLIHY, Mary, 22 September 1887.
1020 QBDM-MR-MF 1890 , 1890/001277, AH SING, Charlie m. LINTON, Elizabeth 19 November 1890.
1021 QBDM-ONL: 3016/1862 Chin A, and Sarah, Sofala; QBDM-BR-ONL: 1863, Emily Mary born Sofala, NSW; QBDM-BR-ONL: 1875, C2844, Sarah daughter of Ah Chin and Sarah Gale.
Fig. 90 Ravenswood Chinatown, Commercial Centre and Garden Areas

Fig. 91. Ravenswood Chinatown: Shop Jang Lum Kee and Temple: 1911

1022 Ravenswood, Chinaman Huts, Chinatown, MP17951, 1884; Ravenswood, R16218, 1885; Ravenswood, R16220 1886; Ravenswood, MPH25916 1890; Ravenswood, MPH25907, 1890; Ravenswood, MPH4657, 1894; Ravenswood, MPH4716, 1901; Ravenswood, MP15827, 1901; Ravenswood, MP15814, 1901; Ravenswood, MP15826, 1902; Ravenswood, MP15830, 1903; Ravenswood, MP15825, 1903; Ravenswood, MP15829, 1904; Ravenswood, MP15836, 1914; Ravenswood, MP15845, 1936; Ravenswood, township, Ah Pong, R16210, 1889; QSA, WOR/N14-N15-N16: Ravenswood Divisional Board—Form of Valuation Return 1882; QSA, WOR/N14-N15-N16; Ravenswood Divisional Board Correspondence, 1883-1914; QSA, MWO11/N3: Ravenswood -Register of Business Licences, 1888-1908; QSA, MWO11/N5: Ravenswood - Register of Miners Rights, 1900-1908 ; QSA, MWO11/N6: Ravenswood -Register of Miners Rights, 1888-1890; QSA, MWO 11/15: PRV10576 - 1 – 2: Postage Book and Registration of Applications for Market Gardens – Ravenswood 1881-1882; QSA, MWO 11/N1: Return of Miners Rights & Business Licences Ravenswood-1870; QSA, COL/063: Ravenswood Divisional Board Correspondence, 1880-1883; QSA, COL/063: Ravenswood Divisional Board— Form of Valuation Return, 1882; QSA, SRS1613/1/1: Ravenswood School Admission Register, 1876. Queensland Post Office Directories (QPD): various years 1860-1910 microfiche; Willmetts North Queensland Almanac, Willmetts and Co, Townsville, microfiche. Various years: 1883, 1885, 1888, 1892, 1898. Microfiche.

**Palmer River Goldfields**

The Palmer gold rush was brought into existence by enthusiastic reports from James Venture Mulligan in September 1873 and quickly attracted the attention of Chinese men in north Queensland. Within three months an entrepreneurial Chinese gardener was busy planting vegetables in anticipation of the rush that would come.\(^{1024}\) The importance of the Palmer Goldfield lies in its role as the first Queensland goldfield to attract large numbers of overseas Chinese men to Queensland, because unlike Ravenswood and Charters Towers, it was a particularly rich alluvial rush. The population of Chinese men on the goldfield in the first three years has been estimated at approximately 18,000 including 2 Chinese women.\(^{1025}\) Chinese men arrived directly from Hong Kong to the new port of Cooktown, where they provisioned and overlanded to the burgeoning goldfield.

The Palmer Goldfield took in many small settlements and three main towns including Maytown, Byerstown and Palmerville. Both Maytown and Palmerville attracted stable Chinese communities with Maytown becoming the largest commercial centre. Up to three temples were erected on the goldfield, at Palmerville,\(^{1026}\) Maytown,\(^{1027}\) and on the opposite bank of the river near Uhr’s Camp.\(^{1028}\) This suggests that temples were constructed along district lines supported by at least two different dialect groups.\(^{1029}\) Key men on the Palmer goldfield included Gee Kee and James Ah Fun, who ran provisioning stores in Maytown, and the merchant firm, Wing On in Palmerville, managed by Lee Liy (formerly at Millchester).\(^{1030}\) James Ah Fun purchased a number of allotments on the northern side of Maytown and erected tin and bark humpies which he subsequently sublet to countrymen as shops and lodging houses.\(^{1031}\) All three men were married, but only Ah Fun and Gee Kee resided with their Chinese wives in Maytown. After the late 1870s, the population began to dwindle having suffered from drought, declining gold production, malnutrition, and sickness in the community. Supplies to the region were irregular and violence from both the White and Aboriginal communities was always a threat. As agricultural

---

\(^{1024}\) *Queenslander*, 13 December 1873, p. 2.

\(^{1025}\) Kirkman, *Palmer Goldfield*, 199.

\(^{1026}\) “Trip to the Palmer River”, *The Age*, 24 September 1878, p.3. It was erected in 1874.

\(^{1027}\) Kirkman, *Palmer Goldfield*, 200.

\(^{1028}\) *Queenslander*, 21 December 1878, p.370.

\(^{1029}\) Kirkman, *Palmer Goldfield*, 227-229; “The New Steamer Illawarra”, *Australian Town and Country Journal*, 31 August 1878, p. 24. This is further evidenced by a violent event which occurred between Chinese men from Macao and Chinese men from Hong Kong in August 1878, when territorial tensions boiled over into a violent dispute resulting in the death of several men.

\(^{1030}\) Rains, Intersections, 96.

\(^{1031}\) *Queenslander*, 6 November 1886, p. 726; Historical Survey M1953, 1882.
opportunities opened up around the emerging port settlements of Cairns and Salisbury (Port Douglas), as well as the new Hodgkinson Goldfields, Chinese miners diverted their attention to other regions.\textsuperscript{1032}

A female presence on the Palmer goldfield was felt just five months after discovery in February 1874, when the first group of women set out from Georgetown on the Etheridge goldfield by foot and wagon across the unchartered landscape to the Palmer River: a distance of 250 miles (402klms).\textsuperscript{1033} Two years later, three White wives of Chinese men were living in the community: Kate Knowles Ennis, who co-habituated with Ah Bin; Sarah Ah Chin, formerly from Ravenswood; and Sarah Ah Bow. Both Sarah Ah Chin and Sarah Ah Bow lived in the Chinese camp associated with the Maytown community, while Kate Ennis and Ah Bin lived at Revolver Point.\textsuperscript{1034} Both Sarah’s knew each other and it was likely they also knew Kate Ah Bin.\textsuperscript{1035} At least two of the women worked as midwives to women whose husbands were prominent in the community.\textsuperscript{1036} In total, the Palmer field’s Chinese Family Landscape consisted of 5 primary families including 3 mixed heritage families and 2 families with Chinese wives. Nearly all lived in Maytown and the White wives of Chinese men would have known of Won Kew and Wun Toong Yuan. It is plausible that one of the Sarah’s, both experienced midwives, attended to Won Kew in 1883 when she gave birth to twins: a boy, Quon Chong and girl, Melend - the first all-Chinese children in the community.\textsuperscript{1037}

The relationship between the two Chinese women was complex, defined and described by their place in society. One was a mistress and the other a bonded servant. Together they represented some of the earliest elements of the north Queensland experience for Chinese women: young, isolated, finding their way in a foreign land, and with the complexities of redefining their roles in the family landscape. Ah Fun’s wife Won Kew was not a friend to her mui tsai Wun Toong Yuan, and both were dependent on the male storekeeper Ah Fun.\textsuperscript{1038} Like many situations for mui tsai

\begin{itemize}
  \item Others simply returned to China.
  \item \textit{Northern Argus}, 14 February 1874, p. 3
  \item Kirkman, Palmer Goldfield, 206; QBDM-BR-MF 1873, 73/000587 Albert, 5 February 1873 AH PIN m. ENNIS, Catherine Knowles.
  \item Kirkman, Palmer Goldfield, 206
  \item ibid.
  \item QBDM-BR-ONL: 1883, C6616, Melend, daughter of James Ah Fun and Won Kew; QBDM-BR-ONL: 1883, C6617 Quon Chong, son of James Ah Fun and Won Kew.
  \item They arrived in Maytown in 1882 and the following year Mrs. Ah Fun (Won Kew) gave birth to twins. To understand the complexity of identifying migrant Chinese women in north Queensland’s community, it is worth noting that Wun Toong Yuan was also
\end{itemize}
Wun Toong Yuan suffered from physical abuse only to be later released from her contract through a marriage well above her status to storekeeper Gee Kee. This marriage highlights the ability for migrating Chinese women to step outside the traditional family structure and create new roles for herself and future daughters far away from the female powerbase in the ancestral home. In 1886, Ah Fun and his wife departed with their children to China, but their connection with north Queensland did not end there. Their daughter Melend later returned as the wife of Chinese settler Wah Poo, manager of merchant firm Hip On and Co., Cooktown in 1911.  

---

Fig. 92. Maytown Chinatown: Chinese Owned Allotments: 1882

Fig. 93. Edwardstown Later renamed Maytown: 1872

---

recorded variously as Ah Faun, Hoong Fong, Houng Faun, Won Hoong Fong, Won Hung Faun, May Hung Faun, Hang Fang and Hanny Fanny.


Georgetown Chinatown

First settled in 1864 as a pastoral district, it was not until six years later in 1870 that gold was discovered and the Etheridge Goldfield proclaimed, and Georgetown established. The Etheridge Goldfield comprised of several towns and settlements including Western Creek, Mt Hogan, Cumberland, Castleton, Finnegan’s, Percyville, Charleston, Durham, Lane’s Creek, and Marquis. Within its boundaries were incorporated smaller goldfields: Green Hills, the Gilbert Goldfield, Balcooma, and Kidston. It also took in market garden areas along a number of rivers and creeks including the Etheridge River, Percy River, Delaney River, Goldsmith’s Creek, Lane’s Creek, Queenslander Creek, Alexander Creek, and Four Mile Creek. From 1872, Chinese gardeners, miners and two storekeepers, Wing On and Co. and Yet War, had established themselves at Western Creek. Not long after, Wing On and Co. moved to Georgetown despite resistance from established White storekeepers. The Etheridge Chinese population at this stage consisted of two storekeepers, two gardeners at Georgetown and a number of Chinese miners working at Western Creek. The population grew to 203 in 1886 and stabilized around this number from then on. In 1891 the Chinese population was estimated at 197, of whom 4 were married. By 1902, the Chinese population had dropped to 142, with the majority of them working as gardeners. Market gardening was a dominant Chinese occupation in the region and it continued well into the 20th century.

A Chinatown developed in Georgetown, on the outskirts of town, and very quickly grew to provide opium shops, boarding houses, stores, a butcher and bakers. Men provided services as labourers, a carter, and gardeners. By 1880, Chinatown had the first of three temples constructed. The first was located on the corner of North and High Streets; the second was relocated around the corner in Low Street by 1892, and the third opened with fanfare in 1905. Following the

---

1042 Bolton, Thousand Miles Away, 11-14.
1043 Etheridge Divisional Board Registers, 1882 and Etheridge Shire Council Rates and Valuations registers, multiple years.
1044 Queensland, 9 March 1872, p. 10 and Queensland, 30 March 1872, p.10.
1045 Queensland, 24 February 1872, p.11.
1046 Census Records for years 1886, 1891.
1047 Morning Post, 10 January 1902, p.2.
1048 Etheridge Shire Council, Rate Cash Book 1882-1886 [valuation]; Etheridge Shire Council, Rate Cash Book 1888-1896; Etheridge Shire Council, Letterbook 1911-1913; Etheridge Shire Council, Valuation Register and Rate book 1916.
1049 Queensland, 20 March 1880, p. 37. “John’ is keeping the high festival of the new year, and wakes the silent watches of the night by crackers and uncouth novices of fire. Here he has a Joss-house, with a gaudy standard floating in front.” Note: no physical evidence of temples remains. The last one pulled down in the mid 1950s and the collection sent south to Hill End NSW.
1050 Etheridge Shire Council, Rate Book, 1882-1884 and 1888-1896.
pattern set by many Chinese men across north Queensland, it was prominent community men Tom Tip, Yee Tong and Lim Kin who worked to gather funds and secure the erection of the temple, furnishing it with imported altars and furniture. Further afield in a remote area of the Etheridge, Mt Hogan also had a bush temple which was present from 1888 until at least 1896, on land owned by prominent Townsville merchant firm On War Chong.

The Chinese Family Landscape of Georgetown consisted of 9 primary families before 1900 with only three Chinese–White mixed heritage couples to live in the Georgetown region for any length of time. The other two couples moved onto other goldfields after 1875. Up to 6 China born migrant couples lived in the region over a thirty-year period, though only 3 Chinese families remained permanently for any length of time. This included those of Ah Fook, the wife of Tom Tip (1885); Ah Cum, the wife of Ah Gee (1890); and Hoy How, the wife of Yee Tong (1894). Georgetown, and the neighboring town of Croydon situated 89 miles (143 klms) west of Georgetown, shared a special connection based on their location and remoteness. This was evident in the connections between families in the Chinese community. In addition, midwife Agnes How Chong, the wife of James Ah Sue in Mt Hogan, attended the births of several Chun Tie and Yet Foy couples, travelling considerable distance to attend to them. James Ah Sue and his first generation Australian born wife, Agnes How Chong, were a well-known couple on the Etheridge where they were hoteliers and storekeepers at Mt Hogan. Not only did they
successfully raise eight children on the Etheridge, but James Ah Sue was closely associated with

Georgetown 1890-1910

Fig. 94. Georgetown Chinatown: 1890 - 1910

Fig. 95. Georgetown Chinatown, Garden and Cemetery Areas: 1890- 1910

---

1060 Historical Survey Plans: Georgetown, G1884; Georgetown, G1885; Georgetown, M19438, 1882; Georgetown, IS204094, 1965; Georgetown, MPH22959, 1968; Robb Database: Rates and Valuations:1882-1940; Etheridge Shire Council: Burial Register & Monumental Inscription Database, Georgetown held at Etheridge Shire Council; QSA, MWO/14B/31: Mining Warden: Etheridge; Register of applications various; market garden areas, Ethridge District 1888-1907; QSA, MWO/14B/40, Mining Warden Georgetown, Register of applications various; market garden areas 1887-1890; QSA, MWO/14B/41 PRV10316, Mining Warden Etheridge, Register of applications various; market garden areas 1880-1912; Queensland Post Office Directories (QPD):various years 1860-1910 microfiche; Willmetts North Queensland Almanac, Willmetts and Co, Townsville, microfiche. Various years 1883, 1885, 1888, 1892, 1898. Microfiche.
Croydon Chinatown

The Croydon Goldfield, discovered 1885, is comprised of the town of Croydon, surrounded by the smaller settlements of Golden Gate, The Gorge, Finnegan’s, Golden Valley, Jubilee Camp, Mountain Maid, Homeward Bound, Esmeralda, and Tabletop. As it was a hard rock mining field, very few Chinese were able to mine and men instead turned to auxiliary services in occupations synonymous with goldfields such as supply of goods: gardeners, shopkeepers, butchers, and bakers, and supply of services: cooks, packers and labourers. Only Charley Hann, married to Mary Sullivan, was able to mine with any freedom or success, and he became known as an excellent gold and tin miner and admired as a man of great expertise. By 1896 there were an estimated 243 Chinese residents including women and children living on the goldfield. In 1902 the population had dropped to 201, and by the end of WWI had dwindled away to just 36 persons - mostly old men and Australian born first generation Chinese settlers.

Two years after its discovery, two small Chinese camps had sprung up, one consisting of several bark huts and tents at the back of Nerstad’s Hotel and a second camp across the creek which also included Javanese and Malays. The larger one soon developed into a Chinatown taking in a whole surveyed section between Chester and Charles Streets, and bounded by Edward and Kelman.

---

1062 Robb Database: Rates and Valuations:1882-1940; QSA, MWO/14B/31: Mining Warden: Etheridge; Register of applications various; market garden areas, Etheridge District 1888-1907; QSA, MWO/14B/40, Mining Warden Georgetown, Register of applications various; market garden areas 1887-1890; QSA, MWO/14B/41 PRV10316, Mining Warden Etheridge, Register of applications various; market garden areas 1880-1912. The community interacted with the large population of market gardeners who lived throughout the district. Early settlers such as storekeeper Yee Tong is buried in the Chinese portion of the cemetery. Currently this portion of the cemetery has been turned into an agistment paddock and horses are sometimes run on it. This section of the cemetery although part of the original surveyed reserve, has been separated from the main cemetery which has been fenced in with a white fence. The exact whereabouts of the Chinese portion of the cemetery is not widely known to the current generation of Georgetown residents. This lost section has up to 5 children buried there.

1065 Unlike the Etheridge, which was a large field made up of many smaller mining fields, some with towns (e.g. Cumberland, Einasleigh, Kidston, Forsayth) which briefly became bigger than Georgetown, Croydon was more compact, with one big town and several smaller satellite towns – the only threat to Croydon was Golden Gate, and then only briefly.

1066 Capricornian, 30 October 1886, p. 25. From the moment it was proclaimed, anti-Chinese sentiment was high with a “Roll Up” called in October 1886, resulting in several Chinese bush huts destroyed, and the community threatened and harassed.

1067 Two years after its discovery, two small Chinese camps had sprung up, one consisting of several bark huts and tents at the back of Nerstad’s Hotel and a second camp across the creek which also included Javanese and Malays. The larger one soon developed into a Chinatown taking in a whole surveyed section between Chester and Charles Streets, and bounded by Edward and Kelman.

1068 Two years after its discovery, two small Chinese camps had sprung up, one consisting of several bark huts and tents at the back of Nerstad’s Hotel and a second camp across the creek which also included Javanese and Malays. The larger one soon developed into a Chinatown taking in a whole surveyed section between Chester and Charles Streets, and bounded by Edward and Kelman.
Streets. A temple was built by the community in 1888, but was replaced just over 10 years later by a second temple in 1897, presumably due to the building being eaten by termites or having burnt down, was the case with most replacement temples. Chinatown extended out over a public purpose reserve on the other side of Charles Street, taking in a section of land of approximately 5 acres (2 hectares). A market garden cultural precinct developed, and this was watered by a small seasonal waterway which transacted the area bounded by Kelman Street. In addition to Chinatown, a small commercial cultural precinct formed along Sircom Street which was occupied by Chinese storekeepers Chun Tie and Yet Foy. Yet Foy himself also worked independently as a packer, carrying goods to outlying towns including Tabletop.

Croydon’s Chinatown and Chinese Family Landscape was a large and diverse community which included up to 14 couples as well as White and Japanese single women who lived in the community and worked as “prostitutes”. The community had 9 mixed heritage couples including Tommy Ah Cum and Alice Keyes (m.1881), Charley Hann and Mary Josephine Sullivan (m.1884), William Ah Chee and Annie Holland (m. 1885), and another White woman, Mrs. Sue Kee. At least two of the Chinese men had met and married White women in Cooktown first before taking them west, while others such as Ah Foo and Caroline Tups moved inland from Townsville. In addition, a small number of single women, such as Kate Connolly, lived in Chinatown and formed casual intimate relationships with Chinese men.

Three Chinese men were married to China born women including Yet Foy married to Luk Yet Ho (1883); Chun Tie, also known as Chin Tie, married to Yuen Qui Fa (1894); and Ah You, who married mixed heritage Lillie Ah Gow (1901). The first Chinese woman in Croydon arrived within five years of its settlement. Luk Yet Ho, also known as Ah How, arrived from

1070Daily Northern Argus, 15 February 1888, p. 4.
1071Northern Miner, 3 August 1897, p.2.
1072QBDM-MR-MF 1881, 1881/000159, AH CUM, Tommy, KEYES, Alice, 8 February 1881.
1073QBDM-ONL: 1885, C297 Annie Holland and William Ah Chee.
1074QSA, CPS14A/M20 Croydon Petty Cash Book, Mrs. Sue Kee alias Kathryn Damari.
1075Ah Foo/ Henly and Hann/ Sullivan.
1076QBDM-MR-MF1875, 1875/00048, AH FOOR/James AH FOO m. TUPS, Caroline, 18 February 1875; NAA BP342/1 9857/299/1903 James Ah Foo.
1077Queenslander, 23 November 1895, p. 967; QBDM-DR-ONL 1896 C441 CONNELLY, Kate; QBDM-BR-ONL 1892, C969 Kate Ah Muck, daughter of Ah Muck and Kate Connolly; QBDM-DR-ONL: 1892 C408 Kate Ah Muck, daughter of AH MUCK, Tommy and CONNELLY, Kate. Kate Connolly was a married woman but separated from her carrier husband after the death of her baby in 1890. She formed an intimate relationship with Chinatown resident, Ah Muck. In early 1892 she had a daughter to Ah Muck but this baby died as well. Kate Connolly died of an opium overdose in 1895.
1078QBDM-MR-MF 1884, 1884/000321, YET HOY / YET FOY m. AH HOW/LUK YET HO, 17 January 1884.
1079QBDM-MR-MF1894, 660.94, CHUN TIE m. YUEN QUI FA, 1894.
1080QBDM-MR-MF 1901, 1901/000449, AH YOU, Jimmy m. AH GOW, Lillie, 18 October 1901.
Cooktown having lived briefly on the Palmer goldfield. By 1897 there were approximately 14 Japanese women living and working as comfort women in Croydon. One of them, Onatsu Kashiyama, went on to marry a Chinese man Ah Mook in 1900. Theirs was not the only unusual relationship. At least one Chinese man married an Aboriginal woman, when Bing Chew married mixed heritage Minnie Ah Too in 1909. Bing Chew had a garden on the corner of Sircom and Kelman Streets, and was later employed as a station cook on one of the nearby stations. Together he and Minnie lived at Oakland Park Station which is situated 25 miles (40 klm) from Croydon.

Fig. 96. Yet Hoy, Luk Yet Ho and Family: Croydon Chinatown.
Port Towns:

Cooktown Chinatown

In March 1874, six months after the Palmer Goldfield was proclaimed, Cooktown was established as the port. It was the first town in north Queensland to be associated with any large scale Chinese female Diaspora, and it developed as a prominent centre. The closest port until then was Townsville, nearly 400 miles (635 klm) from the Palmer Goldfield. By July 1874, Lee Liy’s Chinese merchant firm, Wing On and Co., had erected a large store and established a network of provisioning stores for Chinese miners across two major ports and several northern diggings, taking in Townsville, Millchester, the Etheridge, the Palmer goldfield and Cooktown. Cooktown’s Wing On and Co. was owned by partners Lee Liy and Lee Gong in conjunction with another partner, Sun Kum On, who lived in George Street, Sydney. The firm had direct links to

---

1087 Historical Survey Plans: Croydon, MP15914, 1888; Croydon, MPH15915, 1888; Croydon, MPH22328, 1888; Croydon, MPH22298, 1890; Croydon, MPH22301, 1891; Croydon, SY28, 1898; Robb Database: Rates and Valuations: 1882-1940; Queensland Post Office Directories (QPD): various years 1860-1910 microfiche; Willmetts North Queensland Almanac, Willmetts and Co, Townsville, microfiche: various years 1883, 1885, 1888, 1892, 1898. Microfiche: QSA, CPS 14A/44 CROYDON: Register BDM sent to Normanton District Office by Court House Registrar; 1900-1908; QSA, CPS 14A/M20: Croydon June 1892-Aug 1893; QSA, CPS 14A/61 Small Debts Court, Draft Minute Book, Croydon, 1886-1887; QSA, DCT/14 A/12 Northern District Court, Minute Book, Croydon, 1889-1910; MWO14A/65/162, Mining Warden Register of applications market garden areas, Croydon, 1887-1890; QSA, MWO14A/67: Mining Warden; Croydon; Register of applications market garden areas, Croydon, 1890-1911; QSA, MWO14A/69 Mining, Warden, Index to register of applications for market garden and tailings areas - Mining Warden, Etheridge and Croydon, 1886-1911.

1088 Newcastle Chronicle, 27 November 1873, p. 3.


1090 Cooktown Courier, 22 September 1875, p. 2.
Sydney and on to Hong Kong, which indicates that networks could be far reaching for businessmen.

By 1878 a distinct Chinese cultural precinct had formed on the north side of Adelaide Street which developed into a Chinatown. As a large and diverse Chinese population, at its peak it supported two Chinese temples, both which were built by 1880. Overall it may have had up to four temples constructed: two of which were replacement temples after calamities befell the first. The presence of two temples indicated that two districts and clan affiliations were present.

Between 1874 and 1920, up to 23 primary couples lived in Cooktown including China born, White and Aboriginal wives. Unlike the mining communities of Charters Towers, Ravenswood, Cape River, the Etheridge and Palmer goldfields, where China born wives remained in the minority and White wives in the majority, Cooktown’s Chinese female migrant population outnumbered White wives three to one. At least 18 families have been identified in Cooktown including some Chinese women who arrived as mui tsai. In contrast, only 6-7 mixed heritage Chinese-White families were identified, including Elizabeth Thomas, the wife of hotelier Ah Nee See Wah. This makes Cooktown’s female settlement pattern unique when compared to other north Queensland settlements.

The first Chinese woman to arrive in Cooktown on 26th March 1875 was “Mrs. Wing On” who was possibly Mrs. Sun Kum On from Sydney. She was shortly followed by Sue See, the wife of Lee Liy, after they had relocated from Millchester. Two months later in May 1875, Mrs. Lee Gong arrived directly from China with a mui tsai, making her the first woman to do so for north Queensland. A year later storekeeper Quong Hing (Wong Hing/ Kwong Hing) was joined by his migrant wife Chen Moy and young mui tsai, sent as an assistant to her mistress who had bound

1091 South Australian Advertiser, 2 January 1880, p. 6.
1092 Rains, Intersections, 179-180.
1093 “A Ramble About Chinatown”, Queensland Times, Ipswich Herald and General Advertiser, 4 May 1882, p. 3: “There are two joss houses in Adelaide-street: one represents Cantons, and the other Hong Kong, the surroundings and altar in the former being decorated on a grander scale than those in the latter, and "Joss" is a better looking man. In the Hong Kong Joss house the decorations are rather "shady", compared with those of Canton, and old "Joss" does not wear such a bright appearance.”
1094 Robb Database: Marriages and Unions, 1848-1920. Since compiling the thesis database, up to five additional families have been identified in Cooktown but not included in statistics.
1095 Robb Database: Marriages and Unions, 1848-1920.
1096 QBDM-MR-MF 1875, 1875/000072, AH NEE SEE WAH m. THOMAS, Elizabeth A. 27 March 1875.
1097 Rains, Intersections, 388. Wing On and Co. was the business name of the merchant firm. With three manager partners, her identity must be assumed to be Mrs. Sun Kum On because she arrived from Sydney where her husband had his business.
1098 Cooktown Herald, 27 March 1875, p. 2; Rains, Intersections, 388.
1099 Cooktown Herald, 22 May 1875, p. 2.
feet. In all, between 1875 and 1900 over 11 China born wives, a number of them accompanied by young *mui tsai*, arrived in Cooktown. The Chinese Family Landscape continued to grow as children were born in the community, commencing in 1877 when Chen Moy gave birth to her first child, Loie Toy.

In addition to both Chinese and White wives there were at least 3 mixed heritage Chinese-Aboriginal families, including Ah Sin and Topsy, Charlie Ah Kee and Polly, and Low Kee and an unidentified Aboriginal woman. As was the problem across north Queensland, many Aboriginal women’s births were not registered, making identification of couples difficult. This is evidenced by the birth of Edward Low Kee, son of Low Kee and an unidentified Aboriginal wife in 1914, whose birth only came to light when his father unexpectedly died within hours of returning to China with Edward. This left Edward orphaned in Cooktown and ultimately under the protection of the local Protector of Aborigines, as he was a minor at the time. Rains notes that Chinese-Aboriginal intimate relations were difficult to measure, but suggest that unions may have been present in the outlying Chinese camps and gardens across the north in Cooktown’s hinterland.

Single White women living in and around Chinatown who worked as “prostitutes” and laundresses struggled with frequent acts of sexual violence against them. They were vilified in the community for their occupation, and in the courts for living in Chinatown. This is the case for Annie Lang who was accused of perjury in a case of multiple cases of sexual assault against her, in the Cooktown Court. In addition to White comfort women, at least four Japanese women are presumed to have resided in Chinatown and were classified by police as women of “ill-fame”, in line with other Japanese women across the north.

---

1100 The *Cooktown Herald*, 13 September 1876, p. 2.
1101 QBDM-BR-MF 1877, 1877/000654, Lote Toy, 8 April 1877, son of HING WONG and CHEN MOY.
1102 QPG 1911/411, Topsy and QBDM-BR-ONL: 1902, C2/109, Dolly Ah Sin, daughter of Ah Sin and Topsy.
1103 QSA Inquest JUS /590/36, 1936, Death of Charlie Ah Kee.
1104 NAA: J2483, 415/84 Low Kee; NAA: J2483, 415/29 Edward Low Kee.
1105 NAA: J2483, 415/29 Edward Low Kee. It is not known what happened to him thereafter, or his mother.
1106 Rains, Intersections, 112.
1107 QSA: A/18484, Depositions Regina vs Annie Lang for perjury.
1108 QSA; POL/J1; PRV10729/1/5 Japanese women, 1897.
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Fig. 98. Cooktown Chinatown, Garden and Cemetery area.\textsuperscript{1109}

\textsuperscript{1109} Map partly based on Rains, Thesis: 168 in conjunction with Historical Survey Plan: Cooktown, Charlotte Street, C17965, 1882; QSA, SRS 1630/1/1 Admission Register Girls School, Cooktown, 1919-1921; QSA, COL/A338/82/3150 Sam ASHEW application for Certificate of Naturalisation, Cooktown, 1882; QSA, COL/B1 1872/3451 AH CHIN application for Certificate of Naturalisation, Cooktown, 1875; QSA, COL/B1 1876/3769 WONG HING application for Certificate of Naturalisation, Cooktown, 1876; QSA, SCT/CF10 1879 CHUNG CHANG Certificate of Naturalisation, Cooktown, 1879; QSA, COL/A338/82/3166 CHIN PACK application for Certificate of Naturalisation, Cooktown, 1882; QSA, CPS 13 E/ R2, CPS Register of Business licences, Cooktown, 1889-1912; QSA, CPS 13E/R 2: Clerk of Petty Sessions Ah Chong, Kennedy River, Cooktown; QSA, CPS 13E/R 2: Clerk of Petty Sessions Ah Ting, Kennedy River, Cooktown; QSA, CPS 13 E/6 Clerk of Petty Sessions, Register of Firms: Cooktown, April 1906- Aug. 1915; Queensland Post Office Directories (QPD): various years 1860-1910 microfiche; Willmetts North Queensland Almanac, Willmetts and Co, Townsville, microfiche: various years 1883, 1885, 1888, 1892, 1898. microfiche
Thursday Island: Chinese Community

Thursday Island developed as a prominent customs port and the gateway for many migrants to Queensland. Its position in the Torres Straits was bolstered by the beche de mer, pearl and trochus shell industry which had developed from the 1840s and the port shipped hundreds of tons of sandalwood and beche-de-mer to Chinese markets. Situated on the most heavily used shipping route from South East Asia and the British Isles, Thursday Island became an excellent host destination for Chinese settlers to establish businesses, expand commercial interests and make use of kinship and extended family relationships which reached across northern Australia and beyond to the village in China. Thursday Island was home to a broad and diverse population from across South East Asia, recorded in 1893 at 1400 people taking in twelve different nationalities including 61 Chinese. Despite their being the sixth largest ethnic population behind the Japanese, White concerns were still expressed about Chinese migrants “crowding out other races”.\footnote{1110}{\textit{Sydney Mail and New South Wales Advertiser}, Saturday 8 July 1893, p. 64. This included nationalities such as Manila men (Filipino), Japanese, Malay, Cingalese (Sri Lankan), Javanese, Indians and Chinese.} This was an unfounded fear because by 1901, the Chinese population had only increased to 91, and the population was never large enough to form a Chinatown. Families and businesses remained interspersed throughout the community.\footnote{1111}{\textit{"Population"}, Week, 31 July 1903, p. 24. The Chinese population still remained consistently lower than other Asian nationalities, having dropped to approximately a quarter the population of the Japanese, which had increased to 334, including 34 Japanese women. Most of these women worked as prostitutes to service Japanese pearl divers, crewmen and boat owners.}

Thursday Island’s Chinese Family Landscape grew to sustain a moderate community of 16 families. Showing similarities to Cooktown, Thursday Island had a higher percentage of China born women than White wives, most likely as a result to its close proximity to Hong Kong and regular sea transport there. The community consisted of 7 mixed heritage couples and 9 China born couples. White wives included Bridget O’Dwyer, married to boarding house keeper Jimmy Ah Sue,\footnote{1112}{QSA: A/18963 AH SUE. Ah Sue was registered as a boarding house keeper for a large boarding house which could hold up to 17 persons.} Charlotte Andrews, married to George Bow;\footnote{1113}{QSA: JUS/A59 AH SANG vs Bridget AH SUE for unlawfully beating child Amelia Ah Sang, Thursday Island. Mrs. Charlotte Ah Bow was summonsed to court as a witness in a case against Mrs. Bridget Ah Sue for indecent language.} and Mary Whyte, who was married to Ah Sange.\footnote{1114}{\textit{Brisbane Courier}, 3 June 1902, p. 4. While it is not known how long Bridget and Charlotte remained on Thursday Island, Mary worked as a baker for many years supplying the Thursday Island Gaol with bread, in which she gave “every satisfaction”.} As the local baker on the island, Mary Ah Sange’s relationship was one of the longest-lasting mixed heritage relationships on the island.
The first Chinese woman to arrive on Thursday Island was 22 year old Chun Ayee in 1893, who was married to King Nam, a merchant storekeeper in Normanby Street. As the first Chinese wife on Thursday Island, and the first Chinese woman to give birth to a child where both parents were Chinese, her death from suicide in 1894 came as a shock to the Chinese community, particularly when it was revealed that she had begged to return to China.1115 After her death King Nam went back to China and brought out a second wife, Wong Sam in 1897, but they remained only a few months before returning to China for good.1116 It took a further four years after King Nam’s tragedy before the next Chinese women was to arrive, in 1898. Thursday Island, it seems, was considered a difficult place for Chinese women. Mrs. Hop Who Sing, on the other hand, was able to withstand the island’s isolation, having previous experienced similar conditions in Palmerston (Darwin) where she had her first five children.1117 She remained the only Chinese woman on Thursday Island until the turn of the century, after which up to 5 Chinese women arrived from Hong Kong and China in response to the relaxed conditions for female migration under the new Commonwealth Immigration Act 1901.1118 While most women returned to the village to visit family with their husbands, others were reluctant to do so. This is the case for Chin Ow, the wife of Lai Foo, who made it clear that she never wanted to return to Hong Kong or meet First wife, Kee Kew, having been mistreated as a child and former mui tsai.1119

It is clear that a triangular relationship developed between the Chinese communities of Thursday Island, Cooktown and Port Darwin/Palmerston in the Northern Territory. Businesses traded between the three communities and links were consolidated between families through marriage arrangements. Australian born daughters, born in the Northern Territory in places such a Palmerston, Brocks Creek and Pine Creek, were matched with men who had commercial interests on Thursday Island or at Cooktown. For example, James Chee Quee and Cheung Yet, both Thursday Island businessmen, married Northern Territory Australian born girls Moo Kim Kow and Moo Fung.1120 In addition, the large family of Chee Quee “adopted” out one of their daughters

---

1115QSA, JUS/N226/94/337Inquest into suicide by opium, Ayee CHUN wife of KING NAM, Thursday Island, 1894. She overdosed on her husband’s opium.
1116North Queensland Register, 8 September 1897, p. 22. King Nam had suffered a business downturn after the 1893-4 bank crashes from which he could not recover, and he did not wish to risk his family again.
1117NAA: J2483, 105/22 Hop Who Sing; NAA: J2483, 105/23 Mrs. Hop Who Sing; NAA: J2483, 105/27 Ah Line Who Sing; NAA: J2483, 105/28 Ah Ting Who Sing; NAA: J2483, 105/29, Sue Hang Hop Who Sing; NAA: J2483, 105/30, Ah Hone Hop Who Sing.
1118Robb Database: Marriages and Unions, 1848 – 1920.
1119Interview with Mrs. Mabel Garvey, 26 June 2002, in Robb, Out of Sight, Out of Mind, 98. Also known as Chin On or Mary Lai Fook.
1120NAA: CEDT A1/1923 /3544 Moo Fung; see also J2483 359/20; J2483 65/26; J2483 218/34; J3136/1908/262. Not long after Cheung Yet arrived, Wong Yet his wife of two years died from a sudden illness leaving Cheung Yet a widower. He subsequently was
to the prominent Darwin family, the Hassan family. The young girl worked hard her whole young life, in a slave-like arrangement which was very similar to conditions that female children as bonded servants worked to be a coincidence, possibly making her the first and only *mui tsai* to be traded in northern Australia if not Australia.\textsuperscript{1121}

The full extent of the interaction between these three northern Australian regions is not yet fully understood but it broadened over time to include marriage relations between Australian born children of key families in the 20\textsuperscript{th} century. For example, brother and sister Ernest and Evangeline Hang Gong, children of the prominent Darwin family Lee Hang Gong and Sarah Bowman, married Edward (Kong Lit) and Maizie (Sou Young) of the prominent family of Kwong Sue Duk and second wife Chen Ngor Kwei, who had migrated to Cairns in 1903 from Port Darwin.

In Queensland, the relationship between Cooktown and Thursday Island was very close. Chinese women who initially arrived in Cooktown found themselves moving to Thursday Island within a couple of years. This was the case for Ah Bow, the young wife of Hor Lin Sing.\textsuperscript{1122} Others arrived to an established family arrangement as was the case for Yong Leong, who was married to Lai Fook in Cooktown, and Chin Ow, who was married to brother Lai Foo on Thursday Island.\textsuperscript{1123} Together, the families managed successful merchant stores at Cooktown and on Thursday Island, and the men also co-owned a fleet of pearl shell luggers who worked the Torres Straits. The fluid migration and business network within the Chinese Family Landscape, which developed across this northern triangle and extended to other towns in north Queensland, provides an excellent example of the importance of strategic marriage relations and prevalence of transnational Chinese societal traditions.

\begin{flushright}
\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{1121} NAA: A1, 1928/9742 Moo Kim Kow; NAA: BP4/3, Quee James Chee; Interview: Client #1, Cairns, 16 May 2002, in Robb Out of Sight, Out of Mind.98.
\textsuperscript{1122} Interview with Estelle Kingsley, Cairns, 2 May 2001.
\textsuperscript{1123} QBDM-MR-MF, 1902, 02/00379, LAI FOOK m. YONG LEONG, Mary, 17 May 1902; *Townsville Daily Bulletin*, 4 September 1930, p. 6; “Pearling Prosecutions”, *Cairns Post*, 2 June 1911, p. 3. The brothers were in partnership in a pearl shell fleet stationed at Thursday Island and each owned a large merchant store.
\end{flushright}
Townsville: Chinese Community

Townsville’s Chinese community commenced within five months of Townsville’s settlement, in 1864, when Chinese men established gardens along Ross Creek. Townsville’s reputation as a key port for provisioning emerging goldfields was quickly established in 1866: first with the discovery of the Star River diggings and then Cape River, Ravenswood, the Gilbert, Charters Towers and Etheridge gold fields. In the first four years of settlement, just before the gold rushes began, Townsville had attracted only a handful of Chinese men. This figure grew to 12 Chinese men and one Chinese woman in 1868; 53 Chinese men in 1871; 77 Chinese men and one Chinese woman in 1876; and 522 men and three Chinese women by 1886. The Chinese Family Landscape by the mid-1880s also included 11 children. By 1891 the Chinese community had stabilized, with a population of 479 Chinese men and 6 women. By the end of the decade, four Chinese women had departed, leaving only 2 Chinese women. In addition, there were up to 42 local born Australian Chinese children including 28 boys and 14 girls.

---

1124 “Early History in Bank Records”, Townsville Daily Bulletin, 11 July 1968, p.19; Port Denison Times, 21 July 1866, p.2. Chinese men were noted to be gardening on the banks of the Ross River and near the lagoon which was situated in an area which quickly became known as Kissing Point. The article stated “There is ground on the river Ross equal to any in Queensland for garden cultivation. We have already some radishes, the produce of the Chinaman's garden, as good and large as any grown.” Dorothy Gibson Wilde, Gateway to a Golden Land (James Cook University, 1984): 27.


1127 QPP, 1892 and 1902, Census Records for the years 1891 and 1901.
With what was a robust population of Chinese, the development of the community sets it at odds with the other communities across north Queensland: it did not develop a “Chinatown”. This phenomenon appears to have occurred due to an immediate integration of the Chinese community into the broader community from its earliest settlement days, and interspersal of merchants and shopkeepers in the main commercial district along Flinders Street, Flinders Lane and Hanran Street with White businesses.\(^{1128}\) It is more apt to describe the community as having a “Chinese Quarter”, located in Flinders Lane, which while having several characteristics of a Chinatown such as recreational places, gambling, alcohol, opium, lodging houses and women working as “prostitutes”, did not develop into a self-contained community but was a mixture of small neat houses and shops interspersed among major White industries including a wheelwright and timber yard.

![Fig. 100 Townsville Chinese district Flinders Lane and Hanran Street, c.1890\(^{1129}\)](image)

Between 1864 and 1920 there were at least 36 primary couples associated with the Townsville Chinese Family Landscape. This included 28 mixed heritage couples and 8 China born couples with no Aboriginal wives identified at all. At least one married couple had migrated north from New South Wales Fun Jow and Mary Maher,\(^{1130}\) with the majority of couples marrying in Townsville after 1870. Several White women were married to market gardeners while others to

---

\(^{1128}\)Robb Database: Rates and Valuations: 1882-1940. See Bibliography Smaller communities of market gardeners and shop keepers established themselves in urban areas, as well as on the outskirts of town which at the time was in the local government Division of Thuringowa.

\(^{1129}\)Image: UQFL243_b1_0189a & UQFL243_b1_0188a Fryer Library, Townsville

\(^{1130}\)Kevin Wong Hoy, “Becoming British subjects 1879-1903: Chinese in North Queensland”, submitted as Master of Arts degree La Trobe University, Melbourne 2006, p 101. Fun Joe married Margaret Maher in 1861 in Bathurst NSW. At age 55 he took his Oath of Allegiance in Townsville 1879.
storekeepers, cooks, a fisherman and a boarding house keeper. Townsville’s White wives came from a variety of migration backgrounds including women from England, Ireland, Germany and Denmark with very few colonial-born. This is demonstrated by entrepreneur Irish migrant Mary Piggott who married Andrew Leon in 1869; Danish migrant Margaretha Anderson, who married boarding house keeper William Ah Shin in 1873; Swiss migrant Caroline Tups, who married storekeeper/gardener Tommy Ah Foo in 1875; German migrant Minna Schelke, who married gardener/fisherman Ap Lee Sin in 1876; as well as English migrants Sarah Hadley, who married storekeeper James Ah Ching in 1879 and Lucy Lord who married cook Harry Ah See in 1881.

Couples were dispersed among the broader community and lived in Flinders Lane and Hanra Street, as well as on Ross Island, South Townsville: the poor and flood prone quarter of town. Single White women, some working as “prostitutes” also lived and worked alongside Chinese stores and residences but only one Japanese woman was identified in Flinders Lane in 1899: presumably working as a sex worker - but this is not verified.

The first Chinese woman to arrive in Townsville was recorded in 1868 but very little other than a lone statistic is known about her. The next to arrive is thought to be Sue See, wife of Lee Liy of Wing On and Co. in 1874, but she quickly departed with her husband for Millchester. It wasn’t until 1879 that the first of two Chinese women arrived and remained in Townsville with their merchant husbands: Chang Tie, wife of Sue Fong (m. 1879) and Wah Quay, wife Ah Ming (m. 1879).
While Chang Tie was the first Chinese woman to give birth in Townsville, Wah Quay (also known as Moon Sing) was the first Chinese woman to die. She is also the first woman to be exhumed in Queensland.

Only a few merchant men were joined by their Chinese migrant wives, though the majority of men sent regular remittances back to the ancestral village via a prominent broker in Shekki. Most returned on a temporary basis leaving kin or family members to look after the Townsville business. This arrangement occurred for example for Flinders Street merchant firm Kwong Hing Loong, which comprised of brothers Ju Hop and Ju Bing, along with kinsman Chu Quong. Each man took turns to visit his family in China for months at a time, while the others looked after the firm. This provided security for the business, knowing it was in safe hands, and continued revenue as the business was in constant operation.

Fig. 101. Townsville Commercial precinct including “Chinese Quarters”: 1880-1901

---

1142 QSA, COL/A435 Ah Ming, Request for Exhumation of remains for his wife Wah Quay and baby Mary Ann. Only three women had their bones exhumed and sent back to China, including one White wife in Central Queensland.

1143 BDM Qld: Birth Register online, 1881, C6292, Mary Ann Ah Ming, daughter of Ah Ming and WahGuie. She and her still-born baby were later exhumed by her husband and sent back to China.

1144 QSA, COL/A435 AH MING, Request for Exhumation remains for wife Wah Quay and baby.

1145 NAA: J3115/21, Quong Chong 1902; QBDM-BR-ONL: 1900, C6227, George Lun son of Wing Lun, and Jocie; “Fatal Accident”, Northern Miner, 10 April 1922, p. 2; NAA J25, 1958/2431, Louie Tim So and wife Ah Sam. Prominent China born women in Townsville included Choy Lee, wife of Quong Chong (1899), former mui tsai to Mrs. Lee Yan; Chou Young, who was married to Ah Moon (m. 1899); Chock Lum, wife of Wing Lum (m. China c1899); former Croydon resident Qui Fa, wife of Chun Tie (m. 1896), and Ah Sam, wife of merchant Tim So (m. China c1920). Quong Chong was age 33 when his first son Sidney William was born in Townsville in 1901. His wife Lee Choy was 10 years younger than himself and was attended by Mrs. Beaton. At the time they already had a daughter, Lily Mary. They had been married in Canton, China on 10 February 1899. Quong Chong was a grocer.

1146 NAA: BP342/1/9837/299/ 1903, Correspondence: Jue Hop.

1147 Historical Survey Plans: Townsville, Flinders Street West, RP701839, 1918; Townsville, Flinders Street West, T11823. 1873; Townsville, Flinders Street West, T11853, 1880; Townsville, Flinders Street West, RP707864, 1906; Townsville, Flinders Street,
Conclusion

The Chinese Family Landscape was represented in every Chinatown and cultural precinct across north Queensland. Chinese settler men in north Queensland living together in Chinatown and precincts communities were mistakenly regarded by the broader community as “single” men living in bachelor communities when in fact, many were married with family obligations. This also
ignores family migrations which occurred in the form of brothers, cousins and fathers and sons. The presence of women shaped settlement patterns in ways which may not have otherwise developed, and strengthened business relations, often influencing the built environment through the creation of private spaces, family quarters and homes occupied by women and children. The influence of gender driven “soft economics” from within the family home, through comments, matchmaking of daughters to older single men or Australian born sons along kinship lines, is little understood yet it contributed to the creation of new business partnerships and opportunities and is evidenced in the growth of Chinatowns and renewal of community. By mapping women and family associated with Chinese settlement across north Queensland’s towns and communities, and by showing Chinatowns and cultural precincts with their Chinese Family Landscape, it is clear that a gendered approach is a legitimate mechanism to understand the Chinese Diaspora to Queensland.
Chapter 10

CONCLUSION

Introduction

The presence of women and families contributed to the successful development, growth, longevity and renewal process of Chinatowns, precincts, and string communities throughout north Queensland between 1860 and 1920. By investigating, quantifying and exploring marriage and relationship arrangements of Chinese settler men, through statistical and spatial analysis, new and broader understandings of the Chinese Diaspora have emerged. This thesis is underpinned by a feminist theoretical framework, which positions women and families at the forefront of historical enquiry and provides a means to further explore how the three key industries, pastoralism, mining and agriculture, influenced settlement patterns. Information obtained through this research provides a convincing argument for a more gender-integrated approach to Chinese settlement history and calls for the meaning of “family” to be reviewed to provide alternative models for kinships to be investigated. Wives, mothers, friends and lovers of migrant Chinese men formed the Chinese Family Landscape. They were not only associated with communities across the north, but their contribution to community development extended beyond local, regional, and colonial levels to form a broader transnational family landscape with direct links back to the ancestral village. With the patriarchal family network extending across the seas and growing branches across north Queensland, it provided the Queensland colonial community an opportunity for growth, population renewal, and integration into the destination society, well into the 20th century.

This thesis, positioned as it is within a national and international colonial settlement framework, demonstrates that Chinese family networks contributed substantially to the development and longevity of Chinatowns and precincts in those colonies. By using Chuenyan Lai’s Chinatown model, but through the lens of the Confucian family and a gender inclusive viewpoint, this thesis demonstrates that family and kinship, women and children were integral elements to community structure, inter community relationships and community renewal. Gendered elements are demonstrated in all Chinatown and precinct examples as well as the smaller lineal networks called String communities. In particular, the thesis shows nodal String communities relied on individual personal and kinship relationships, which were fostered and developed across rural and remote
landscapes through connections of marriage, along with commercial and legal relationships, which supported and strengthened local ties across rural and remote regions as well as back to the village in China. Most literature on the overseas Chinese is silent on the full reach of the Confucian family structure, yet it underpinned migration itself.

**Transplanted territory: The full reach of the Confucian Family**

This thesis affirms established scholarly observations that the paternalistic Confucian family model, which underpinned family, village and kinship relationships in China, was applied to emerging Chinese communities in colonies and other countries and underpinned all aspects of social organisation in an overseas community. Kinship relationships were utilized advantageously by Chinese settlers across colonial environments including north Queensland, to quickly establish a network of local, regional and transnational commercial and benevolent relationships, provide familiar structures to community, and provide the basis by which self-contained TangrenJie or Chinatowns could be established to quickly meet economic and cultural objectives.

The Chinese family framework underpinned the Chinese Diaspora to north Queensland and is evidenced by the migration of brothers, fathers and sons, and uncles with nephews. Emerging from the traditional Chinese family framework was a colonial Chinese Family Landscape across north Queensland, which demonstrated that the introduction of women to emerging communities enabled Chinatowns and precincts to be strengthened, maintained and to grow in ways that could not happen in other comparable host destinations. The presence of women and the politics of the private sphere enabled “soft economics” to develop as female networks formed. Women’s participation from the private sphere brought prestige to members of the community, enhanced commercial relationships and led to strategic marriage arrangements. Most importantly, a transplanted Chinese family network provided the opportunity for community renewal, via Queensland born daughters, who were predominantly married off to aging kinship settlers or sons of other prominent kin or clan families. This practice did not end until well into the 20th century.

The Confucian family framework and the rules of Chinese marriage were maintained, adapted, modified and even exploited as a strategy to magnify success within a host country and this is demonstrated in the adaptation of marriage rules to accommodate three new types of family: the Separated Family, The Two Primary Wife Family and the Interracial Family. The first adaptation to the Chinese marriage model, which was easily accommodated into the Confucian family, was
the practice of an early marriage of men to Chinese women, prior to a sojourn overseas. Newlywed wives became established as the “Primary Wife” or “First Wife” in the village home, as a means to secure remittances from the overseas husband and remind him of his filial obligations.

The Separated Family is evidenced by the regular, but intermittent return visit by Chinese settler men to the family village for a period to visit wives, long enough to produce children, and attend to filial responsibilities before returning to the host country to resume the role of making money and sending remittances “home”. This type of marital arrangement maintained the patriarchal balance and established female power structures, preserving Mother-in-Law as the head of the female household under which the First wife and her children were positioned. The marriage of young men prior to an overseas sojourn modified the traditional framework yet maintained the Confucian family model. This model enabled the traditional female structure within the Confucian family home to remain in place but led to couples separated for long periods of time, children raised without fathers, and the family home reliant on an external income source.

Separated Families occurred across the globe and the practice was repeated inter-generationally when sons were sent overseas upon reaching adulthood, to replace aging fathers who then returned home to wives whom they barely knew. This type of marriage remained hidden to Western host communities who remained ignorant of the cultural practice. It led to the incorrect assumption across north Queensland that the vast majority of Chinese men were “single”. The practice of establishing Separated Families led to the formation of male only “married bachelor” societies in host countries and colonies such as the United States and British Columbia. In contrast, communities in the colony of Queensland, and across north Queensland, while hosting many men associated with Separated Families, never fully developed into “married bachelor” societies as some women, wives and prostitutes invariably lived in these communities. Hughenden, located in north-western Queensland, was the only example known as satisfying the criteria for a “married bachelor” society in this study.

The second family type, which indicated an adaptation to the Confucian Chinese family and emerged in response to the Chinese Diaspora, was the “Two Primary Wife” family. This family type conveniently expanded the Confucian family framework using the already acceptable practice

1148 Until new evidence comes to light, this is thought to be the most prominent community type.
of polygamy, whereby two Chinese wives were married to the same man, yet were located in two separate places: one established in the home village household under the usual arrangements, and the other installed in the host country. The second wife, procured usually by the family, was provided for overseas sons for companionship, to attend to his conjugal rights under the contract of marriage, and to keep house for him. With First Wife firmly positioned in the ancestral home, remittances remained guaranteed under this arrangement. While polygamy, or the taking of a concubine or series of concubines as Second, Third or Fourth wife, was accommodated within the Confucian family framework, the ability for consecutive wives, after the First or Primary Wife, to rise in status within the family structure was, under ordinary circumstances, unachievable due to established female power structures. However, women chosen and sent as Second Wife to Queensland, as part of the Chinese Female Diaspora, found themselves advantageously positioned and able to achieve an elevated family status.

Many migrant Chinese women, through the act of migration, found themselves elevated from the position of Second Wife /Concubine to “First Wife” status by proxy in the colonial environment. This proved a direct challenge to the well-established female power structure within the Confucian household, which in some cases led to female conflict. Second Wives who had migrated to north Queensland, and former Mui tsai girls who had subsequently married in Queensland, rose in status in ways which would not have been achievable in China. Their heightened status in the household and north Queensland community provided a direct threat to the village family structure and First Wife in China, particularly if she produced many Australian born Chinese who were therefore British subjects and assets to the transnational family. The “Two Primary Wife” family was present in north Queensland and mirrored the experiences noted for other destination countries and colonies including the United States, Hawaii and British Columbia.

The last family type, the Interracial Family, emerged as a direct result of the Chinese Diaspora. It is both complex in form and diverse in marriage type, and not only used the adaption of the Confucian family model, the “Two Primary Wife” family, but also expanded the terms of “appropriate” marriage partner to include non-Chinese women taken both as wives and lovers.

Marriage in host countries by Chinese men to non-Chinese women brought non-Chinese women into the Confucian Chinese Family for the first time. Not only was this new to all involved, it was controversial to both cultural communities and exploitative in its convenience and benefit to
Chinese men, although the gains were not limited to men alone. Marriage between Chinese men and non-Chinese women included White women, Indigenous women, women deemed as “Local” mixed race and “Mulatto” women, with the selection of wives determined by Chinese male circumstance, class, and status in the community. It was also practiced across the globe. Marriage or the partnering by Chinese men with non-Chinese women depended to some extent on the host colonies’ local administrative attitude towards mixed marriages. The colonial powers of France, Spain and Portugal were more tolerant towards Chinese interracial marriage (on the basis that it was advantageous to their colonial objectives) than those of Great Britain and Germany, who were more concerned with purity of race. In particular, Britain and Germany saw the offspring of interracial marriage as a potential “threat” to their racial superiority in both population numbers and labour objectives.

In every British colony established, the Empire exhibited miscegenaphobia when it came to Chinese interracial marriage, particularly if it involved Black, “Mulatto” or “Local” women. On one hand, many colonies enacted laws aimed at keeping the races apart which inhibited Chinese interracial marriage. This was also the case in Queensland where legislation preventing the marriage of Aboriginal women to Chinese men was introduced in the 1890s, at a crucial time when Aboriginal women were already experiencing a severe shortage of suitable totem partners after decades of frontier conflict. Those who were able to marry Chinese men did so in rural and remote regions, away from authority’s arbitrary permissions, aided by station owners and managers who saw the marriage as an advantage to their operational needs, keeping both parties on the station.

To date very little is known about the degree of acceptance for Indigenous, “Local” or “Mulatto” women within the Confucian family structure or the ancestral family home. The few reports written about Indigenous women who migrated to the village in China focus on Peruvian or Hawaiian women, and do shed little light on Australian Aboriginal partners. This is an area which would benefit from future research to understand Chinese perspectives on interracial relationships and the changes it brought about to the Confucian family framework.

On the other hand, when it came to interracial marriage between Chinese men and White women in the colonies of Australia, there was little in the way of obstructionist legislation. Pressure on White women to desist from interracial relationships with Chinese men came from within the community itself, with those who did marry becoming the subject of social ostracism, isolation,
ridicule, and physical and verbal abuse. It is clear from the number of couples which formed between 1860 and 1920, that White women were not coerced or forced into partnerships with Chinese men but made strategic decisions to enter relationships for reasons of physical and financial security, intimacy, and companionship. Some even had the luxury of love.

Legal marriage to White women under the *Marriage Act* provided several benefits for Chinese men in addition to intimate relations and a family life. Naturalisation depended on proof of legal marriage as part of its criteria, and marriage to White women satisfied this requirement. Legal marriage enabled men to achieve naturalisation, purchase land, accrue assets and elevate status in the colonial environment. It was a successful strategy employed by families to maximise opportunities to create wealth as new British subjects. The subsequent birth of Australian born British subject children provided a ready succession plan in the host colony, which strengthened opportunities for the ancestral family back in China. Mixed heritage sons and daughters enabled inter-generational business and kinship relations and investments to grow, and their presence not only maintained extended transnational family support back to China but secured a future in north Queensland. Naturalisation and the elevated status it projected enabled a relatively smooth family transmigration process, assisting with re-entry back into the colony from China, when families returned from fulfilling filial and educational visits.

Intercultural exchange occurred on both sides with some White women learning Cantonese, and they went on to advocate for or provide interpreting services for the community in courts, and travelled to China. However, many also remained ignorant about Chinese cultural marriage practices and their role in the Confucian family. Although cognisant of their role in a patriarchal society, whether European or Chinese, many were unprepared for the discovery of a First Wife in China, or were overwhelmed with sorrow when their husbands took their mixed heritage children back to China and failed to return, or found themselves without the means of support when abandoned. Interracial marriage between Chinese men and White women in Australia is complex and this thesis has been limited in its ability to address the full social implications of this type of interracial relationship. This study has confined itself to a principally quantitative analysis and a fuller examination of the topic is yet to be done.

In host countries, the successful adaptation of the Confucian family model influenced kinship interaction, community formation and social relations. The introduction of Chinese, White and
Indigenous women as wives and lovers in Chinatowns, precincts and String Communities, went on to strengthen the emerging male kinship, clan and district networks at trans-local and transnational level and enabled the formation of a new Chinese Family Landscape across north Queensland.

**Limitations and Intentions:**

This thesis has been a long process to harvest enough data from both the standard historical and alternative sources to establish the most credible quantitative database for statistical mapping purposes. The extent of collection, verification and cross-referencing of large amounts of information has been an arduous task requiring skill, perseverance and patience. While all care has been taken to ensure that marriage numbers of Queensland’s Chinese Family Landscape are correct, it is recognised that this thesis provides only an estimate of statistical data: a comprehensive, but still flawed snapshot providing figures, which will remain in flux until every couple has been fully investigated, location verified, and relationship status confirmed. The database is the most comprehensive set of data available in Queensland, which presents 1095 primary couples over 1847-1920, with 315 in North Queensland alone. It is believed that the figures provide a reasonable snapshot of settlement patterns and are consistent with the major growth of industries and other population drivers at the time.

This study has also been limited in its ability to provide comprehensive colonial and global comparisons between the marriage patterns, which occurred across Queensland, and north Queensland, the rest of Australia, and other comparable countries and colonies around the world. Only statistics and information from Victoria and New South Wales can be used as comparisons, while the same in Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania remain incomplete, making it difficult to discern national trends. Both Western Australia and Tasmania with their smaller Chinese populations have not yet attracted as much academic attention for Chinese Family relations, and a national approach to the Chinese Family Landscape in the Australian colonies has yet to be undertaken.

Meaningful, reliable statistical data in the international arena also remains lacking. It is either targeted towards and dependant on a niche focus group (such as Chinese migrant women), sporadic, with only brief mentions of White and Indigenous women, or hinted at such as allusions to White prostitutes in the community. Data from overseas Chinese migrant settlements used in the thesis is limited to the current figures mentioned in academic sources and representative only. The
incompleteness of these figures is acknowledged as a limitation to the thesis and will be subject to change should future researchers focus more widely on female participation in Chinatowns and precincts rather than on limited groups. Figures outlining the Chinese Family Landscape in international communities remain unreliable, as only migrant Chinese women have attracted attention as a research subject. To date, no comprehensive study has been undertaken to quantify the extent of White women’s marriages, casual intimate relationships, or other interactions with Chinese men, and any data available remains highly subjective.

In contrast, interracial marriage between Chinese men and Indigenous women is far more advanced in areas of the U.S.-Mexican borderland regions, South America, and former British West Indies than in the greater U.S.A. or former British Columbia, or Australia. In Australia, there is a deficit of information and understanding of relationships with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders in the colonies, especially in north Queensland and no extended reflection about Chinese activities compounding Aboriginal dispossession. A gendered approach to family relations and community formation remains missing. The deficit of Indigenous voices in the settlement narrative is acknowledged by academics across Australia, the U.S. and Canada as an issue which should be addressed. Across the Pacific, in the U.S. and Canada, Hu De Hart and Yu have appealed for a greater focus on Indigenous interracial relationships as a means to understand family formation, cultural exchange and the integrative interracial family within blended host communities. Both believe that the understanding, acknowledgement and dissemination of stories associated with these untold histories is essential to address ongoing issues of racism and discrimination. Interracial marriage remains an emerging area of study, which should attract Western academic researcher attention to break the silence concerning Chinese-Indigenous marriage relations and to integrate hidden stories into established historical narratives.

Research Questions and Key findings:

Chinese communities emerged in north Queensland from 1861, in response to one or more of three major settlement drivers: pastoralism, mining or agriculture. While pastoralism attracted a small but stable community of men, usually scattered throughout the north-west of north Queensland in

---

1149 For example Chinese female migration, with its emphasis on legislation, prostitution, exploitation, quantity and interaction with Christian women, has remained the focus of investigation across the US.

1150 Other disciplines including Anthropology are advanced in this area through the genealogical research of Trigger, Snukal and Ramsay. Historians tend to focus on race relations such as historians Gantor and Reynolds, but not dispossession.

1151 Anthropologists Trigger and Martin, and historian Maclean, are attempting to address this inequity with their focus on Burketown in the Gulf of Carpentaria, while Martinez has written extensively about Chinese/Aboriginal interracial relations in the Darwin region.
rural and remote areas, it was the more lucrative mining and agriculture industries which attracted the largest populations of Overseas Chinese. These industries gave rise to the formation the largest and longest running Chinese community outside Brisbane: Cairns Chinatown. The greater degree of urbanisation in these two industries, along with the ports established to service them, provided opportunities for goods and service industries readily available to Chinese, such as shop keeping and market gardening.

Commencing with recruitment into pastoral expansion, Chinese settlement moved north from the Darling Downs, following pastoral capitalists who wanted to take advantage of the emerging northern frontier. From 1861 onwards, settlement of the Kennedy and Cook districts was rapid, and accelerated with the discovery of gold at Cape River. Chinese settlers not engaged in mining activities set a precedent by setting up provisioning stores, butchers, bakeries and market gardens. The Palmer gold rush saw the arrival of an estimated 18,000 Chinese migrant men, signalling the first single-purpose large-scale Chinese Diaspora experience in Queensland.

As the Palmer goldfield waned and new regions opened up for economic exploitation between Cooktown and Townsville, the rich fertile lands of the east coast were recognised by agriculturally experienced Chinese men. They quickly went on to establish the sugar industry in Cairns, the banana industry in Port Douglas and Geraldton/ Innisfail, and the maize industry on the Atherton Tablelands, setting up north Queensland’s extended Chinese agricultural communities. Much of their success lay in their ability to attract a ready labour force through organised kinship migration direct from the village and the application of guanxi: the reciprocal order of kinship and friendship obligation. All three industries, pastoralism, mining and agriculture, enabled north Queensland as a host destination to attract a steady stream of overseas migration. However, despite the popular belief across Queensland that mining attracted the most migration by Chinese men, this thesis has found instead that it was agriculture which provided the most stable industry and therefore most employment to Chinese men between 1860 and 1920. Agriculture, both large and small scale, also endured the longest. While mining booms came and went, agriculture was more stable, enduring until the mid-20th century. Agriculture and agriculture-related activities were also the main industry over the study period for family formation and creation of a Chinese Family Landscape.
Settlement patterns and community formation:
Across north Queensland, “Chinatowns”, precincts, and small nodal communities developed, as Chinese migrants sought to transfer and recreate familiar community structures in a foreign and often hostile environment. A “Chinatown” provided a means to establish cultural, social and political organisation, and maintain a semblance of familiarity, at a time when uncertainty was normal. North Queensland’s construction of “Chinatowns” provided a “pseudo village” environment as a means to manage local affairs along Chinese cultural lines. “Chinatowns” enabled benevolent societies, political organisations, community hospitals, meeting halls and temples, to be established without close White scrutiny and were organised along district affiliations to collectively manage Chinese business. The construction of “Chinatowns” provided a successful strategy for Overseas Chinese to use a collective force to achieve desired outcomes, with this strategy applied across the globe as a method to provide support and infrastructure to large populations of migrant men.

This thesis explores the theory behind the construction “Chinatown”. On one hand “Chinatown” can be described as a transnational extension of the Chinese village: a transplanted territory which is noted for its replication of social, cultural and political infrastructure which enabled self-contained communities within the wider community to develop. On the other hand, “Chinatown” has been constructed within the imaginative space of the broader White population: a label used to describe a particular migrant group and the space they occupied. “Chinatown” provided a physical metaphor, which positioned its population as “the Other” which was controlled and confined away from the “respectable” White urban community, one also in the White imagination, and always relegated to the fringes of town. All of the theories incorporated in this thesis have assisted in the understanding of Chinese community formation, and the consequent physical landscapes which developed across Queensland and north Queensland. They have provided excellent tools to contrast with other host destination colonies across Australia, including New South Wales and Victoria, as well as providing a global contrast with British Columbia and the United States. They have contributed to the following key findings.

Across north Queensland between 1860 and 1920, at least 18 “Chinatowns” developed in towns associated with mining, agriculture and ports. These communities displayed many or all of the identified elements associated with Chinatown formation, with Cairns Chinatown emerging as the largest and most complete Chinatown outside Brisbane. The principal indicators of a Chinatown
community, the temple and hospital, were present in north Queensland with temples found in 26 locations across the north and a further 8 temples located elsewhere in the colony. When compared to the colonies of New South Wales and Victoria, Queensland has fewer temples discovered to date than the more populated colonies. Within Queensland, the majority of temples were found in north Queensland. Rather than focus on the built environment as a measure of definition, and to provide a broader international context, the Chinese Family Landscape in North Queensland has been placed in an international context by utilising Canadian scholar David Chuenyan Lai’s four morphological stages framework for “Chinatowns” to be explored.

By using Lai’s theory, which divides Chinatown development into a budding stage; a blooming, or booming stage; a withering stage; and finally, either a dying or reviving stage, it has been found that no north Queensland Chinatown has fully succeeded in transposing over all stages to continue into the 21st century. In fact, no original Chinatown has survived across Queensland, unlike the British Columbian experience outlined by Lai. He notes that the BC community remained as a “bachelor society”, whereas women and families have always been present in Queensland’s colonial “Chinatown” communities from their inception. From the 1880s onwards, north Queensland’s Chinese communities mirrored the experience set out by Lai as one of a blooming stage. As they developed, they continued in a booming stage only to enter a withering stage as hostile legislation was imposed and local conditions became less favourable. Most north Queensland large Chinatowns including Mackay, Halifax, Atherton, Cairns and Innisfail entered a decline or dying stage, offering limited assistance to residents as aging members of the community began to die, or returned to China. While the structural elements of the community suffered extreme and uniform decline by the 1930s, the family structures, strengthened through marriages across the region, remained intact.

Unlike the situation in British Columbia, none of the Chinatowns across north Queensland managed to survive, revive or be reinvented to enjoy an extended and renewed lifespan as a Chinese self-contained community. However, this thesis has unexpectedly identified another occasion where the term “Chinatown” has been used to describe a non-Chinese population, which may be useful for situations where First Nation or Indigenous cultures are being investigated. “Chinatown” was used as an identifier by a family group living in a created non-Chinese environment at a Government administered Aboriginal settlement in Central Queensland. The word itself took on a new meaning as a third party, in order to maintain Aboriginal identity,
appropriated it. By taking the term “Chinatown” as a unique identifier for Aboriginal self-identity in a community where identity was constantly under threat, new meanings of the term have emerged. On the other hand, precincts or smaller communities, which often occurred in rural and remote areas and included interracial marriage with Aboriginal women, formed another type of community, which has been explored in the context of this thesis.

Precincts, consisting individuals, small groups, or small syndicates of men, emerged across north Queensland, particularly in rural and remote areas. Precincts were associated with pastoral districts and in places where the Chinese population was too small or unable to support the construction of a “Chinatown”. Precincts were usually confined to a couple of shops, a small section of street, or a market garden area. The idea of precincts builds on American scholar Huping Ling’s call to re-conceptualize the terms for the Chinese communities in order to understand the range of Chinese settlement experiences. The term “precinct” provides an alternative framework to understand the diversity of community types, which formed outside “Chinatowns” as well as an additional mechanism to examine the extent of marriage and family formation in an alternative community setting.

As part of this thesis, 17 such precincts across north Queensland were examined as representative examples of a type of community associated with Chinese settlement patterns, with market gardening and small business precincts in particular explored. Precincts ranged from small clusters of 2-3 shops such as in Richmond and Winton, to large garden areas such as Cloncurry and Camooweal, and were located in both urban and rural areas. Market Garden precincts were associated with pastoralism, mining, and port towns. While the study of precincts enables smaller community types to be explored, particularly as they developed much closer relationships with the broader community in towns and settlements through the supply of fresh produce, it became clear as the thesis progressed that something else was also occurring at a micro level which led to a new theory being formed.

It emerged as an inappropriate descriptor to continue to refer to the smaller extended community relationships across great distances as individual precincts, as the terminology did not fit with the linkages which were present through marriage and business relationships. Instead a new term was needed to articulate the community of connected individuals which at first glance seemed to
connect in seemingly unrelated circumstances but which emerged as a new type of community: The String Community.

The String Community provides a lineal model in which individual people with interconnected relationships with each other, either commercial, through marriage or legal connections, develop as nodes in a community located over great distances between towns and settlements. String Communities may be what is described as “Borderland communities” in Mexico/America or the kinship and marriage relationships across Diaspora countries in South East Asia where the forces of *guanxi* are applied. String communities existed in north Queensland and formed in response to chain migration settlement of family members such as fathers and sons, sets of brothers, or uncles and nephews, separated by long distances. Linkages between rural and remote settlers, who at first glance appear to be unrelated, can be better understood by exploring their relationships through this model. By scrutinising individual Chinese community types through a lineal String Community model, kinship, family, or marriage relationships may become clearer. The String Community model provides a useful means to analyse the Chinese Family Landscape as it emerges in individual Chinese settlement experiences and is best articulated by the migration and marriage patterns by the Leong family from *Caobian* village in Liang Du, Chungshan (Zhongshan) province.

**Gendered Analysis:**
Statistical information in both official and unofficial data sources reveal that there were over one thousand primary families and couples identified across the colony of Queensland, over a seventy-year period. While the location of one third of host families has yet to be established, it is evident that nearly half of all known families lived in north Queensland from Mackay up to the Torres Strait Islands and out to the Northern Territory border, and as far south as Boulia and Winton in the central west. This makes north Queensland the most significant settlement region for the whole colony, followed in importance by Brisbane, and then Southern Region and Central Region. These figures correspond to key historical settlement patterns, with the Northern Region host to the industry’s most favourable to Chinese immigrants: alluvial mining, tropical agriculture, and to a lesser extent, pastoralism. Types of intimate relations formed were broad and varied in age, ethnicity and circumstance. They included women who were legally married to Chinese men, women living with a Chinese man in a de-facto relationship, women who had casual relationships
resulting in the birth of a child, and women in intimate relationships with Chinese men such as companionship, or illegal intimate relations such as use of prostitutes.

North Queensland, when compared to other Australian colonies, had very similar marriage types and broadly speaking, reflected similar historical patterns of settlement including pastoralism and mining. Very similar marriage figures emerged for all the colonies of Victoria, New South Wales and Queensland. Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania, on the other hand, while having prominent mining and pastoral industries, did not attract the same population of Chinese men nor develop the same Chinese Family Landscape. With further research it is expected that the Northern Territory, in particular the community of Port Darwin and the Pine Creek region, will reveal marriage patterns comparable to Queensland which will elevate the importance of northern Australia as a destination for Overseas Chinese. As no global study has been undertaken to explore the Chinese Family Landscape in other host destination places, such as the United States, British Columbia, South America or the former British West Indies region, a statistical analysis of primary families is recommended in order to make any comment on their comparability to Queensland and other colonies of Australia.

North Queensland’s Chinese Family Landscape quickly developed alongside the expansion of settlement as an ethnically diverse community, which can be categorised into three key types of families: Chinese /Chinese families; Chinese / White families; and Chinese/Indigenous families. While these family types were not unique to Queensland or north Queensland, they present some localised similarities and variances when compared with other countries and colonies including Victoria and New South Wales. The similarities between the eastern colonies included family types of Chinese/ Chinese and Chinese/ White interrelationships with the main difference being a greater incidence of Chinese / Aboriginal relationships in the north. Queensland’s Chinese /Indigenous relationships reflected northern Australian settlement patterns in colonies such as Western Australia (Broome), and the Northern Territory (Darwin/ Pine Creek).

In this study, Queensland has emerged as a key Australian colony to attract Chinese migrant women, and integrate White women and Aboriginal women, to make up the Chinese Family Landscape, with the first two groups of women forming the most usual type of wife. Queensland’s close proximity to Hong Kong provided an opportunity for many Chinese men, to engage in a different experience to their United States or British Columbia counterparts. There was no need to
exploit Chinese women as migrant prostitutes or purchased wives, as physical access to China was easy due to proximity and established transport routes. In addition, White women were willing and legally able to marry.

Major findings are that interracial Chinese/White couples made up the largest proportion of marriages across Queensland in the period 1860-1920, making up over three quarters of all marriages and relationships for the whole of the colony. Of those, well over half were located in north Queensland, reinforcing the importance of the north in the colony. The thesis also confirms that it was literate migrant English women who were the most usual group of women marrying and partnering with Chinese men, rather than illiterate Irish girls, who remain the popular stereotype in both the colony of Victoria and on the Californian goldfields. However, not all White women involved with Chinese men were migrant English girls, with a number of women also colonial born or from European countries such as Germany, Denmark and Poland. This suggests that women were making individual choices of marriage based on the quality of the man, regardless of race. It confirms key findings by both Bagnall and Rule, that interracial marriage and intimate relations between Chinese men and White women, in mid to late 19th century colonial Australia, were more prevalent than previously thought. This challenges researchers to revisit family formation, places and settlement landscapes within the colonial context to investigate marriages and unions, which were atypical in the dominant narrative of European settlement.

This thesis confirms, as previously discussed, that interracial marriage between Chinese men and White women may have been favoured as a strategic means to further Chinese family interests in the colonial Australian environment. The high proportion of interracial marriages suggests that the investigation of new aspects of colonial family formation, through gender and cultural considerations, sheds new light on Chinese male attitudes and experiences in the colonies. The high incidence of marriage and partnering with White women suggests that new interpretations of what it means to have and form “family” within the Chinese Diaspora can emerge.

Arising out of all of this, is the discovery that the colonies of Australia and particularly Queensland are unique in their position as having the highest percentage of interracial Chinese/White marriages associated with the Chinese Diaspora. In contrast, the United States and British Columbia have recorded very few Chinese/White interracial relationships and marriages. However, I would like to point out that this position could be challenged by further research. I
suspect targeted research into the Chinese Family Landscape and Chinese communities in North America and British Columbia will reveal a different picture. Until then, Australia’s position as the leader in interracial Chinese/White interracial marriage in the 19th century, particularly in Queensland and north Queensland, is an exciting new revelation associated with the Chinese Diaspora.

The next largest group of women married to Chinese men were migrant Chinese women. Young Chinese women, sent over as Second Wives or as mui tsai, made up just over a quarter of the wives in the Chinese Family Landscape in north Queensland. Despite north Queensland attracting a relatively large Chinese female population in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, the overall number, when compared to other Australian colonies, was the third largest Chinese female population behind Victoria and New South Wales. After all three east coast colonies came the Northern Territory of South Australia, including Port Darwin and the mining district of Pine Creek, although they remained substantially lower in Chinese female migration for wives, behind the national colonial average. North Queensland’s Chinese migrant women have been identified in the majority as migrating from the small region of Chungshan, predominantly Long Du and Liang Du districts. This is evidenced by the continuation of traditional marriage patterns along county lines across north Queensland for first and second-generation Australian born daughters for these areas, which reflected the village clusters that many agricultural men migrated from. However, the north also had men from Sze Yup, Sam Yup and Hakka speaking regions as well, with connections to Sydney, New South Wales and Melbourne, Victoria.

Young women sent to north Queensland as wives were married upon arrival to betrothed merchant class men. Mui tsai also normally ended up as wives to merchants, taking a little longer to marry. With an average age of 16 years, Chinese women were often married to much older men. Migrant Chinese women were sent by a village family, due to the requirement for First Wife to remain in the village and attend to the man’s parents and his children. It was Second Wife’s duty in colonial Queensland to attend to her husband’s conjugal needs, and assist him where possible (particularly through the birth of children), to build wealth in the host environment. Migrant Chinese women formed part of the evolving “two primary wife” family, and were elevated in status to First Wife because of migration. As a result, they often enjoyed improved domestic conditions through enhanced personal autonomy in their “own” family home. Former bonded servants, mui tsai, were also able to elevate their status in north Queensland upon marriage to settler Chinese men. Some
Second Wives refused to return to China, and challenged the traditional marriage laws upon the death of a husband.

Chinese female migration to the Australian colonies in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, was consistent with the general global female Diaspora, which occurred at the time - but only in the sense that women migrated in response to Chinese male migration. Chinese women were, willingly and unwillingly sent across the globe to settle in places such as the West Coast of the Americas, British Columbia, Pacific islands such as Hawaii, Fiji and New Zealand, and the colonies of Australia. However, not all destination places received migrant Chinese women, with the British West Indies, Britain, Europe and South Africa failing to attract Chinese female migration in significant numbers. Australia emerges as one of the top four preferred Western colonial destination countries: USA, Hawaii, Australia and Canada. Circumstances underpinning Chinese female migration varied significantly between the countries. The colonies of Australia including Queensland received Chinese female migrants as wives and mui tsai girls, as an extension to the traditional family framework, utilising wives as a vehicle to contribute to strong transnational connections between north Queensland and the ancestral village home. By contrast, women who migrated to the United States were often those who had been kidnapped, cajoled or purchased before migration to service the Chinese male population as prostitutes or purchased wives. Queensland’s Chinese Female Diaspora was established solidly as a legitimate marriage solution to further the village family and settlement objectives, rather than to produce a commodity with little transnational social value.

The third group of women associated with north Queensland’s Chinese men were Indigenous and other non-European women. This group of families accounted for only 3% of the whole Chinese Family Landscape population, rising only slightly to less than a tenth of the overall population including Chinese and White family configurations for the whole period under study. To date, most of these marriage patterns have been found occurring in rural and remote areas where a more relaxed attitude to interracial marriage prevailed. Only a few Torres Strait Islanders were found to have partnered with or married Chinese men, and only a couple of South Sea Islander women and one or two Japanese women. Due to marriage figures for the last three groups being so low, they can be considered exceptions to the rule rather than the norm.
By the time Aboriginal women were willingly, purposefully and legally forming relationships with Chinese men they had been faced with severe disruption to Law, culture, initiation opportunities and transmission of traditional knowledge. They collectively faced reduced numbers of appropriate skin and totem partners within their own communities, and became severed from traditional Law through the loss of female knowledge after years of White “dispersal” actions, kidnappings and official removals. The effects of north Queensland’s relentless frontier wars on Aboriginal women and marriage Law combined with the fractured nature of Aboriginal culture itself has not to date been investigated when it comes to understanding Aboriginal women’s response to it. This thesis has attempted to introduce a new approach to understanding Aboriginal women’s perspectives when forming partnerships with non-Aboriginal men such as Chinese men, and to understand the events which potentially shaped female decision making. While Asian/Aboriginal sexual interactions had already been established over hundreds of years prior to White settlement, through seasonal interactions with visiting Macassan, Timor Leste and Chinese beche-de-mer and sandalwood collectors across the greater archipelago region, this fact alone does not explain the partnering of Chinese/Aboriginal couples in the late 19th and early 20th centuries.

Chinese/Aboriginal relationships have not been fully explored in this thesis due to the size and scale of the investigation required. However, from the statistical sample which emerged while using the same methodology as for White and Chinese women, it is clear that Chinese men were most likely to partner with Aboriginal women in the far Western Gulf districts on stations and communities on the fringes of towns, in remote and isolated areas. The low incidence of partnering with a Chinese man and the location of couples is consistent with investigations in New South Wales, with broader similarities discerned for First Nations women in British Columbia. Investigation of which Aboriginal women were able to partner with Chinese men in the 19th century should consider why these relationships were able to occur despite traditional Law and structures associated with Aboriginal or Indigenous cultures regarding Marriage customs. This is an area which would benefit from further investigation using a range of alternative quantitative and qualitative sources. It is expected that the statistics presented in this thesis will change as new information comes to light and it is hoped that a researcher will take up the challenge.

**Chinese Family Landscape:**

Across north Queensland, all three groups of women, White, Chinese and Indigenous women, experienced marriage, intimate relations and settlement differently to each other based on cultural
background, acceptance by community, and settlement area. White women were associated with all three major industries, pastoralism, mining and agriculture. They were associated very early with Chinese men by partnering with indentured labourers brought over as early as 1848 to work the emerging pastoral districts of the Darling Downs and Wide Bay-Burnett districts. As settlement extended northward after 1860, couples moved north to the new districts of Kennedy and Cook including the port towns of Bowen, Cardwell, Townsville and Normanton. When gold was discovered, Chinese/White families moved to goldfields and interracial marriages became more frequent across the north as newly arrived women from Britain and Europe disembarked in Townsville, Cooktown or Cairns. White women settled wherever their husbands conducted business. They partnered with men engaged in a broad range of occupations across all three industry areas, and were present in all pastoral districts, gold mining fields and agricultural communities. White women mirrored to a great extent the general pattern of the broader Chinese settlement experience and remained the largest family group represented in the Chinese Family Landscape.

Chinese women emerged as the second largest group of wives and were largely associated with port towns, and agricultural communities. Unlike White wives whose husbands were engaged in a range of occupations, Chinese women were married to merchant men or important shopkeepers, and they were brought over to provide for his conjugal rights as a husband and to confer elevated status as a trophy wife for him in the community. This position was not available to White wives. Although present in Queensland from as early as 1870s onwards, it was not until the mid-1890s that the greatest number of Chinese wives arrived. Unlike Chinese men who migrated in response to indentured labour, then gold rushes and finally regular work in agriculture, Chinese women were seldom associated with settlement patterns other than established agricultural economies or port towns which provided goods and services to a broader region. The settlement experience of Chinese women is different to White women because Chinese wives for most part arrived to established Chinese communities, whereas White wives were for most part at the frontier of settlement. There were a few exceptions to this rule, but generally it appears families were reluctant to send young Chinese wives over to their husbands to uncertain frontier conditions while men themselves may not have been in a financial or established position to attract a wife. As a result patterns of settlement associated with Chinese female migration differ from their husbands’ experiences.
The pattern of settlement associated with Aboriginal-Chinese families, whether the women were married or in intimate relations with Chinese men, was limited for most part to pastoral districts located west and north-west in the Gulf country near the Northern Territory border. Aboriginal women married to men who worked on stations as gardeners and/or cooks, or were engaged in small shop keeping practices in the small pastoral towns, were unable to improve in social status unlike their Chinese or White counterparts. Aboriginal wives were attached to lower working-class men who did not belong to the merchant, wealthy storekeeper or land-owning class. However, for cultural reasons the couples were able to remain on or close to the wife’s “Country” for all of their married lives and this was an advantage for Aboriginal women. The pattern of occurrence for these families is interlinked with her cultural background, unlike White women or Chinese migrant women, though if a woman engaged in an unsanctioned /illegal relationship with a Chinese man (as many did), she ran the risk of removal by authorities to a mission away from her spiritual and cultural landscape.

North Queensland’s Chinese Family Landscape followed the settlement patterns set down by the broader Chinese male migration experience, which was largely determined by economics. However, while White women were associated with all three industries, pastoralism, mining and agriculture, Chinese women were associated with agriculture and only a few with mining, and Aboriginal wives nearly exclusively with the pastoral districts. The majority of families were located on the east coast in port towns or agricultural communities, while only a few women were associated with remote districts. This suggests that by looking at a gendered approach to settlement patterns, new interpretations may emerge when women and families are included in the broader Chinese migrant narrative.

The thriving Chinese Family Landscape across north Queensland has highlighted the northern district of the colony as a key destination. This revelation contributes meaningfully to the national and international narrative by highlighting the influence “family” had on community, and community longevity, for Overseas Chinese. This thesis has demonstrated that women and families were linked to all “Chinatown” communities as well as precincts and string communities, with only one gardening settlement, Hughenden, forming as a purely “married bachelor” society. A gendered approach to the Chinese Diaspora has found that there are few differences in the influences of key settlement industries between men and women as to why they were present in certain towns and places. The only exception which can be allowed to this statement remains the
great influx of Chinese men associated with the Palmer goldfield, but even then, the Chinese Family Landscape was present and contributing to renewal. Through the use of raw statistics in combination with a spatial approach, i.e. mapping places, to research and analyse the Chinese Family Landscape, women were found to be present in the early stages of community development, and continued to remain present until self-contained communities could no longer be sustained.

Between 1860 and 1920, the Chinese Family Landscape involving primary Chinese settler marriages and unions across north Queensland outperformed the family landscapes of Southern, Central and Brisbane Regions in terms of numbers and longevity. The Chinese Family Landscape across north Queensland was both thriving and varied, with couples reflecting the influence of the environment and economic landscape, which influenced type of family formation. In Queensland, women and families had limited influence on the physical development of Chinatowns and precincts, yet their presence was able to contribute through a subtler means, which is under-played as a significant factor impacting on community longevity. The influence of the private sphere through the female presence “normalised” the community for men, and contributed to the psychological transplantation of the village setting. Women in the community were able to apply their influence through “soft economics” which played out in the family quarters and female networks, which developed in “Chinatowns” and precincts. Application of “soft economics” impacted on kinship and commercial relationships within the community and extended back to relationships in the village in China.

Most of all, women provided the means for community renewal because they literally gave birth to community longevity by providing a renewal process from within the Chinese community. The birth and subsequent marriage of daughters enabled north Queensland Chinese communities to sustain themselves well into the 20th century and beyond. This aspect of the Chinese Family Landscape remains evident today in the large numbers of descendants of Chinese settler families across north Queensland.

**Areas for future research:**

In the course of researching and writing this thesis, a number of areas have emerged which warrant future investigation specific to Queensland. These four areas are little explored, have the potential to reveal new insights, and in some cases align with other disciplines, which will expand
interpretations of the Chinese Diaspora. These five areas consist of one general area for exploration, but one which looks as a broader impact on Diaspora narratives, and four others which are gender specific. The first area for recommended research relates to the bigger impact of race relations surrounding dispossession of Aboriginal lands through Chinese based activities. Other key areas which specifically relate to this topic include: a gendered approach to filial and spiritual observance; cultural pluralism and Family Law rights; criminological outcomes within the Chinese Diaspora; and child settler studies. The last area of enquiry which has transcultural implications is the mapping of key individuals and families who settled in Queensland back to the village in China to establish the definite pattern of settlement from Guangdong regional perspective and to integrate women’s experiences within a holistic transnational approach to family formation and maintenance. This last point requires the cooperation of Overseas Chinese Bureau and key local and retired historians in a collaborative approach to capture as much information from within the village remnants, before the last of the qiaoxiang generation left in the village are no longer are alive.\textsuperscript{1152}

The first area of enquiry remains a much larger question to be investigated and one which may be controversial to some. With the 19th and early 20th century Chinese population being the largest migrant population outside the White population to settle in colonial Queensland, the narrative of dispossession of Aboriginal lands through Chinese based activities has not been explored in the broader context of thinking about colonising. This thesis, through its investigation of major settlement drivers such as mining, pastoralism, agriculture and port commercial based activities, has discovered that Chinese men were part of broader colonial activities, which threatened Aboriginal people, led to reprisals, and excluded Aboriginal people from their Country, and this in itself has never been expressed or identified as an area for acknowledgement or scholarly focus. Chinese settlement in colonial Queensland in the 19th century occurred at the time when the Frontier Wars began from 1851 onwards and led to the dispossession from land and killing of Aborigines across the colony. Some of the most violent massacres occurred in north Queensland, and while there is little evidence to suggest that men of the Chinese Diaspora was associated with these activities, the migrant Chinese community cannot be exempted, having profited directly by the dispossession and removal of Aborigines so they could undertake mining and agricultural based activities on former Aboriginal land. This is an area for future scholarly enquiry.

The second key area of enquiry, a “gendered approach to filial and spiritual observance”, has three components for future enquiry. It arose after investigation into the construction, use and purpose of Chinese temples across north Queensland found that studies into this area focused on male uses only. This aspect of the Chinese Diaspora attracts much scholarly attention, and information is publicly available and reflected in this thesis regarding temples and temple use in the Queensland community. However, the more they were investigated, and the more I questioned leading scholars, it became clear that Queensland and Australian temples were being researched with a singularly male bias centering on construction itself, names of donors (predominantly male), and male activities associated with the meeting hall. Very little information is available regarding how, and how often, Chinese and non-Chinese women used the temple space, how engaged they were with community decisions being reached in that space, and what physical attributes supported their participation. Concurrent to understanding the temple, it was evident that there was a scholarly deficit in understanding the incidence and usage of the family altar in the private quarters of the shop/home as a means for filial observance by the migrant settler and more specifically, the migrant female settler.

The third aspect of a “gendered approach to filial and spiritual observance” is the need for investigation into the community purpose of temples across north Queensland as a means to manage filial obligations concerning exhumation practices. In particular, I recommend that any enquiry be undertaken as a gender-integrated approach to reveal different approaches to exhumation, understand female (and child) exhumation back to China, and explore new areas such as exhumation of White wives.

The third area of enquiry, “cultural pluralism and Family Law rights”, emerged as an area for future investigation when researching the “two primary wife family”. The death of a settler husband opened for some families a “can of worms” as transnational families (either Chinese-Chinese or Chinese-White) attempted to negotiate probate and division of property in a dual nationality family legal system governed by British Law rather than Chinese Common Law. This area of research will reveal the extent by which the Confucian family model was challenged by overseas settlement, as Chinese settler women in Queensland argued for their share in the distribution of family assets, having been raised from Second Wife, or concubine, to the equivalent of First Wife status. It will also reveal the extent by which the transnational Chinese family
circumvented legal systems by themselves, to arrive at an agreed resolution. The second aspect of this area of enquiry should take in the legal position of White wives and Indigenous wives and provisions made for them by their Chinese husbands in the event of their deaths. By casting a legal eye over this little-known area, new interpretations of family interactions will emerge.

The fourth area of enquiry which remained outside the scope of this thesis, but which emerged as a strong potential area for social history research, is the investigation into “criminological outcomes within the Chinese Diaspora”. It became clear in my research that a number of women, across all three racial groups, experienced periods of loneliness, verbal and physical violence from the community, domestic violence within the family home, abandonment by the husband, or as the ultimate exit from a bad situation, suicide. Investigation into this dark history will balance the view that Chinese men were considered kind, benevolent husbands and provide a more clear-eyed view of life for women in the 19th and 20th centuries within the Chinese family landscape.

In addition to delving into the darker corners of Chinese settler marriage history, investigation into poverty, legal persecution, and institutionalisation of White and Indigenous women associated with Chinese men, will reveal how these outcomes impacted negatively on their lives. Women with few social or financial opportunities and resources resorted to prostitution, were rendered destitute, or ended up in gaol and benevolent asylums. In addition, investigation into the extended impact of these outcomes will reveal that both White and Indigenous mixed heritage children were forcibly removed, sent to government or mission institutions, experienced social dysfunction, entered ongoing engagement with the law and officialdom, and experienced a life of dislocation from communities.

The fifth and final area of enquiry, “child settler studies”, has two components for future investigation: investigation into Chinese migrant “minors”, and child adoption experiences and consequent exploitation of “minors”. The first component is anticipated to be a topic as large as this thesis itself. During the course of research, it has emerged that a number of men arrived as children or “minors” to the colony of Queensland. As “child settlers” or children under 14 years of age, boys accompanied older male kinsmen or village family members, while girls arrived as mui tsai with families and mistresses. Very little research had been undertaken regarding Chinese child migration or child settlement experiences and it is suggested that “child settler studies” will be a new frontier for scholarly research. Like gendered approaches to history, the investigation of child
settlers will reveal unknown aspects of transnational family migration associated with the Chinese Diaspora.

Research for this thesis also revealed that there were a number of incidences where Chinese men and couples “adopted” White or mixed heritage children who did not have any blood relationship to themselves. They attempted to raise these children as their own and in some instances took them back to China. Again, this is a very little understood area of Chinese Diaspora and Queensland colonial history which would benefit from future investigation.

The second and less obvious component of “child settler studies” explores a darker side to child history through the investigation of child exploitation within Chinese colonial settlement and the Chinese Diaspora. For some child migrants, assumed to be mostly girls, migration to the colony commenced years before in their lives when they were sold by poor parents to more affluent families in a financial arrangement known as bonded servitude or mui tsai. Research in north Queensland hinted at the maintenance of this tradition within the colony but the extent of it across Australia, or its extension back to the village in China, remains unknown. Others were promised as san po tsai or child brides to men much older and the incidence of this tradition in the colony also remains unexplored, though strategic marriage to minors was observed.

One aspect, which raised the most questions concerns the incidence of White adult women procuring female “minors” for the purpose of marriage to older Chinese men. This behaviour suggests that some White women were exploitative of their own sex, for unknown gains. While not a common aspect of “child settler studies”, behaviour by White women as “agents” for Chinese men was also observed in American newspapers which suggest that this type of predatory behaviour was not limited to the colony of Queensland. Furthermore, as noted by Bagnall for New South Wales, marriages being sanctioned by White parents between their underage White daughters and older Chinese men, suggests that the economics of marriage was important where poverty was involved. Both of these examples indicate that female minors in some environments were at risk of exploitation and that further investigation is warranted.

**Conclusion:**
This thesis is not a social history of women in the Chinese community, nor a social history of the Chinese community itself. Instead it has sought, through statistics, exploration of the nature of the
Chinese family landscape in north Queensland through its relationship with key industries, and drawn up a spatial representation of Chinese communities. In doing so it demonstrates that it is no longer satisfactory in the 21st century to continue to write, speak and interpret the Chinese Diaspora without acknowledging the presence and role of women and family in the community. At an international and national academic level, those who continue a patriarchal approach to the study of Overseas Chinese limit their understanding of community formation and miss important aspects of inter-community relations which gender inclusiveness brings. Nor at local level is it appropriate to continue the practice of deliberate exclusion of Chinese settlement stories within local historical narratives. Those who do so serve only to maintain the program of the White Australia policy, which was abandoned over 40 years ago.

This thesis has found that “family” and family relationships underpin all aspects of the Chinese Diaspora from the home village in China to formation of Chinatowns and precincts. Family also contributed to smaller nodal networks which developed, which are referred to as String Communities. By positioning the Chinese Diaspora as a transplanted and adapted Chinese Family Landscape based on kinship, clan and community traditions, new understandings of overseas Chinese community formation can occur and expand to include non–Chinese women such as White, Aboriginal and other local women. Those who continue to render women invisible in destination narratives, remain at risk of presenting a one-sided approach to settlement history and do not benefit from understanding the importance of the “soft economics” which played out within the private spaces of shops, merchant houses, residences and female run businesses.

From the information presented in this thesis it is clear that women, families, and children were present in Chinese communities across north Queensland and contributed to the formation, renewal and longevity of Chinatowns and precincts. The methodological integration of statistics gained from extensive analysis of primary sources and spatial mapping has proved a satisfactory tool to recalibrate the narratives associated with the Chinese Diaspora to north Queensland. I hope that this method inspires other researchers to apply a gender and family integrated approach to other aspects of Chinese Diaspora history. I predict that the new frontier of research concerning the Chinese Diaspora to Queensland will be investigation into age and displacement. To date, child migration in any form has been overlooked in the narrative, leaving Chinese boys and girls under the age of fourteen underrepresented. In addition, the complex historical outcomes associated with children of mixed heritage couples who were forcibly removed by authorities acting on imagined
child kidnappings, alleged vagrancy of mothers, and racial profiling of fathers, provides a small but rich area of research which can be investigated using a criminological framework. These are frontier research areas of the future and one in which I hope to be involved.
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| NAA: J2483, 145/65 | PANG SYE |
| NAA: J2483, 145/72 | LEE LIY/Lee Lay |
| NAA: J2483, 145/90 | GUM ON, Frederick |
| NAA: J2483, 145/91 | SING CHOY, Harry |
| NAA: J2483, 145/92 | KUM YOW, Tommy |
| NAA: J2483, 146/98 | HOP KEE |
| NAA: J2483, 152/16 | SHAW Young |
| NAA: J2483, 152/23 | AH SAM Tommy |
| NAA: J2483, 152/35 | HEANG, George Henry |
| NAA: J2483, 16/24 | FAT KEE |
| NAA: J2483, 16/25 | FAT KEE, (Mrs. Fat Kee Leu See) |
| NAA: J2483, 16/26 | FAT KEE, Mary |
FAT KEE, Alice
NAA: J2483, 16/27

FAT KEE, Lucy
NAA: J2483, 16/28

YEE KEE, George
NAA: J2483, 16/43

LEE SEE CHONG
NAA: J2483, 17/37

LEE SYE, George William
NAA: J2483, 170/31

LEE SYE, Albert Edward
NAA: J2483, 170/33

JU YORK SUN
NAA: J2483, 170/40

JU YORK SUN, Albert
NAA: J2483, 170/41

SEE CHIN, Jan See Chin
NAA: J2483, 174/28

SEE CHIN (wife Maud See and child Irene See Chin)
NAA: J2483, 174/30

SEE CHIN, Norma Aimee
NAA: J2483, 174/31

SEE CHIN, Edna Maude
NAA: J2483, 174/32

SEE CHIN, Phillis Grace
NAA: J2483, 174/33

SEE CHIN, Eunice Yvonne
NAA: J2483, 174/34

SEE CHIN, Percy Reginald
NAA: J2483, 174/35

MAH HING, William
NAA: J2483, 174/49

AH CHING, Philip Henry Victor
NAA: J2483, 176/48

QUONG CHONG, Mary Lily
NAA: J2483, 18/48

QUONG CHONG, Sudbet William
NAA: J2483, 18/49

HING GUM (Son of SAM WAR)
NAA: J2483, 18/80

AH WEEL, Willie
NAA: J2483, 183/76

YUEN SANG, Harry
NAA: J2483, 184/16

LUNG, Alice Florence (nee Li You)
NAA: J2483, 184/53

LUNG, Lester Henry Alfred
NAA: J2483, 184/54
NAA: J2483, 184/55  LUNG, James Douglas
NAA: J2483, 184/61  AH CHING, Sid
NAA: J2483, 184/62  AH HOW, Albert
NAA: J2483, 185/57  AH MOO, Willie
NAA: J2483, 185/71  JU MING
NAA: J2483, 189/27  AH HON
NAA: J2483, 189/60  YIN FOO, George
NAA: J2483, 189/61  YIN FOO, (Mrs. Christina)
NAA: J2483, 189/62  YIN FOO, Frederick
NAA: J2483, 189/63  YIN FOO, Herbert Allen
NAA: J2483, 189/64  YIN FOO, Norman
NAA: J2483, 189/65  YIN FOO, Arthur William
NAA: J2483, 189/67  YIN FOO, Alexander Charles
NAA: J2483, 189/68  YIN FOO, Clarence George
NAA: J2483, 189/82  CHUN WAH
NAA: J2483, 19/90  JOE KONG
NAA: J2483, 190/074  AH SEE
NAA: J2483, 190/24  SEE KEE, William
NAA: J2483, 1903/14  GEE CHONG
NAA: J2483, 191/15  CHONG FOO
NAA: J2483, 191/31  CASEY, Joseph
NAA: J2483, 191/32  CASEY, Nellie
NAA: J2483, 191/60  MAN FOOK
NAA: J2483, 191/63  LEE LIY, Francis Charles Cecil
NAA: J2483, 191/81  GUM FOO, David
NAA: J2483, 192/31  CHING, Bue How
NAA: J2483, 192/32  CHING, Lin Kee
NAA: J2483, 192/33  CHING, Choy Lin
NAA: J2483, 192/34  CHING, Choy Lan
NAA: J2483, 192/35  CHING, Sing Ho
NAA: J2483, 192/37  CHING, Choy Young
NAA: J2483, 192/38  CHING, Ching Sum
NAA: J2483, 192/41  CHING, Choy Cook
NAA: J2483, 192/41  MAR GEE
NAA: J2483, 192/42  CHING, Yong Kee
NAA: J2483, 193/11  HANG FONG, Dickson
NAA: J2483, 193/12  HANG FONG, Wah Son
NAA: J2483, 193/35  AH KEE, V.N.D Garside
NAA: J2483, 193/36  AH KEE
NAA: J2483, 193/54  KEE, Louis
NAA: J2483, 193/64  AH HOE, Katie
NAA: J2483, 193/65  SO CHOY, Minnie Ah Gin
NAA: J2483, 193/66  AH HOON, Nellie
NAA: J2483, 193/67  AH CHOY, Charles
NAA: J2483, 193/85  CHOY SHOW
NAA: J2483, 2/14   CHUN TIE, Thomas
NAA: J2483, 2/62   FONG, William S
NAA: J2483, 219/76  AH LUM
NAA: J2483, 219/86  KWONG, George Murphy
NAA: J2483, 225/53  AH CHIN, Charlie
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NAA: J2483, 225/54</td>
<td>YOU SING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAA: J2483, 225/57</td>
<td>MAHN LEONG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAA: J2483, 225/72</td>
<td>YET HOY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAA: J2483, 225/73</td>
<td>YET HOY, Quon Yake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAA: J2483, 225/74</td>
<td>RATHJEN, John Charles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAA: J2483, 226/100</td>
<td>LAI FOOK, Lily (Way Yung)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAA: J2483, 226/35</td>
<td>CHING ONE HO, One Ho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAA: J2483, 226/38</td>
<td>CHING SUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAA: J2483, 226/42</td>
<td>CHING, Young Kee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAA: J2483, 226/99</td>
<td>LAI FOOK, Florrie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAA: J2483, 227/2</td>
<td>LAI FOOK, George (Lai Tak Yen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAA: J2483, 227/28</td>
<td>WAH SHONG, Robert (Jow Sing Wah Shong)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAA: J2483, 227/52</td>
<td>MAY GOO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAA: J2483, 227/53</td>
<td>ONE KING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAA: J2483, 227/99</td>
<td>CHUN TIE, Willie (Ing Yen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAA: J2483, 231/33</td>
<td>KWONG SO LEUNG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAA: J2483, 231/52</td>
<td>KOM MOY, Ah Chee Kom Moy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAA: J2483, 232/47</td>
<td>CHUN TIE, Mary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAA: J2483, 232/49</td>
<td>CHUN TIE, Charlie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAA: J2483, 232/51</td>
<td>CHUN TIE, Frank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAA: J2483, 233/56</td>
<td>LEE GOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAA: J2483, 233/58</td>
<td>LEE GOW, George</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAA: J2483, 233/59</td>
<td>LEE GOW, Amy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAA: J2483, 233/60</td>
<td>LEE GOW, Jow Lee Gow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAA: J2483, 233/80</td>
<td>LOOK HOP, John William</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NAA: J2483, 233/98  LEE HONG
NAA: J2483, 237/16  SEE KEE, Arthur
NAA: J2483, 237/17  SEE KEE, Bennett
NAA: J2483, 237/69  GAIN, Wong Jack
NAA: J2483, 238/18  CHOY LARN, Margaret
NAA: J2483, 238/28  AH MOOK, Kashyama Onatsu
NAA: J2483, 238/32  AH MOOK, William
NAA: J2483, 238/32  AH MOOK, Lily
NAA: J2483, 238/36  AH DIN, Dolly
NAA: J2483, 239/66  MEE FOOK, Edward
NAA: J2483, 239/67  MEE FOOK, Gertie
NAA: J2483, 239/68  MEE FOOK, George Ying Fit
NAA: J2483, 256/16  SHOW YIU
NAA: J2483, 256/16  SHOW YIU, Annie
NAA: J2483, 256/17  SHOW YIU, Archibald Roy
NAA: J2483, 256/23  LEONG, George
NAA: J2483, 256/24  LEONG, Monica
NAA: J2483, 256/25  LEONG, Mabel
NAA: J2483, 256/25  LEONG, Mary Theresa
NAA: J2483, 256/25  LEONG, Catherine
NAA: J2483, 256/28  LEONG, Rita Francis
NAA: J2483, 256/44  SOU KEE, Annie
NAA: J2483, 256/45  SOU KEE, Tommy
NAA: J2483, 256/47  SOU KEE, Willie
NAA: J2483, 257/004  LEE JOW
NAA: J2483, 257/23  KOM MOY, George
NAA: J2483, 257/5  LEE JOW, Gladys Lillian Charlotte
NAA: J2483, 257/6  LEE JOW, William Fred
NAA: J2483, 257/77  LEE JOW, Arthur Sydney
NAA: J2483, 257/95  NOCK, George
NAA: J2483, 257/96  NOCK, (Mrs. Chin Tuguoy)
NAA: J2483, 257/97  NOCK, Hauley
NAA: J2483, 257/98  NOCK, Willie
NAA: J2483, 257/99  NOCK, George
NAA: J2483, 258/16  WING LUN, George (Wing Line)
NAA: J2483, 258/3  GEE KEE, Albert
NAA: J2483, 263/10  HOCKTEIN, Ah Moy
NAA: J2483, 263/15  WAH POO, Peter
NAA: J2483, 263/2  AKE, Willie
NAA: J2483, 263/23  WAH POO
NAA: J2483, 263/3  AKE, Minnie Grace
NAA: J2483, 263/4  AKE, Hilda Maria
NAA: J2483, 263/9  HOCKTEIN (Mrs. Mon Que Hocktein)
NAA: J2483, 264/ 56  LEE SYE, Alice
NAA: J2483, 264/21  WAR JANG
NAA: J2483, 264/55  LEE SYE, Stanley Marshall
NAA: J2483, 264/57  LEE SYE, Leslie Jack
NAA: J2483, 264/58  LEE SYE, Percy Wilfred
NAA: J2483, 264/59  LEE SYE, Edward
NAA: J2483, 264/61  LEE YOU, Joy
LEE YOU, May
TUNG YEP, Yee Tung Yep
TUNG YEP, Nellie
TUNG YEP (Mrs. Tung Yep, Maggie Yee)
SERGEEF, Mary
AH HEANG, George
SEE CHONG, Edward Arthur
CHONG, Charlie
LEE KEE (Mrs. Lee Kee)
GOON CHEW, Goon Chu
YUM TONG, William Josh
SEE POY, Gilbert
YIN FOO, Charles
FONG LEE, Leslie
QUING BOO, Albert
QUING BOO, Margaret
QUING BOO, Charles Henry
QUING BOO, Margaret Quing Boo & baby
QUING BOO, May (baby)
GAIN, Hubert Charles
GAIN, Victor Thomas
GAIN, Thomas
QUIN LEM, Gertrude
ZAN, Georgina (nee Ah Hee)
SO CHOY, Sing Quay
NAA: J2483, 299/071  LAI FOOK, William (Lai Kwong Yen)
NAA: J2483, 299/082  AH CHING, James Ishmael Stanley
NAA: J2483, 299/091  MEE SING, (Ing Fong)
NAA: J2483, 299/092  MEE SING, Annie
NAA: J2483, 299/093  MEE SING, May
NAA: J2483, 299/094  MEE SING, Maggie
NAA: J2483, 299/095  MEE SING, Mabel
NAA: J2483, 299/79  LEE YOU, Annie Margaret
NAA: J2483, 3/59  SUN SHUN LEE, (Florence Jessie)
NAA: J2483, 310/040  SEE HOE, Alan
NAA: J2483, 311/055  CHEE QUEE, (child)
NAA: J2483, 311/055  CHEE QUEE, (Mrs. Chee Quee, Moo Kim Kow and child)
NAA: J2483, 311/056  CHEE QUEE, Pauline
NAA: J2483, 311/057  CHEE QUEE, Alberta
NAA: J2483, 311/058  CHEE FOOK, Ernest
NAA: J2483, 311/088  LONG, Edward Clarence
NAA: J2483, 312/021  AH CHING
NAA: J2483, 322/053  KING FOOK
NAA: J2483, 323/048  AH CUM, Bessie
NAA: J2483, 323/049  AH CUM, Charles
NAA: J2483, 323/050  AH CUM, Joseph Pang
NAA: J2483, 323/051  AH CUM, May
NAA: J2483, 324/005  LAI FOO, Harry
NAA: J2483, 324/006  LAI FOO, Linda
NAA: J2483, 324/007  LAI FOO, Ellen
NAA: J2483, 324/008  LAI FOO, Quoy Yong
NAA: J2483, 324/009  LAI FOO, Irene
NAA: J2483, 324/010  LAI FOO, George
NAA: J2483, 334/056  LAI FOO
NAA: J2483, 336/045  WAH SANG, George (Dorchin)
NAA: J2483, 336/074  YEE CHONG YAM, (as Philip YEE)
NAA: J2483, 344/087  CHOY YING, (Mrs. Choy Ying)
NAA: J2483, 344/089  AH LIN, William
NAA: J2483, 344/090  AH LIN, Annie
NAA: J2483, 359/23  LEE GEE, Frank
NAA: J2483, 359/31  KWONG SANG, William Morris Rowland
NAA: J2483, 359/38  HANG GONG, (Maisie Kwong So Loung)
NAA: J2483, 360/92  HOW CHIN, Cissy (Mrs. Wing Lum)
NAA: J2483, 361/14  WING LUN, Mary
NAA: J2483, 365/100  KWONG, (Mrs. Florence May)
NAA: J2483, 365/24  SEE HOE, For Quai
NAA: J2483, 365/25  SEE HOE, Edna
NAA: J2483, 365/26  SEE HOE, Arthur
NAA: J2483, 365/38  SEE HOE, Ah Tiy
NAA: J2483, 366/052  LOW CHOY, George
NAA: J2483, 366/33  CHIN CHECK
NAA: J2483, 384/98  AH CHONG, Bruce
NAA: J2483, 384/99  AH CHONG, Charlie
NAA: J2483, 390/21  MEE SING, Ing Fong
NAA: J2483, 390/37  LEONG MUN, Charles
NAA: J2483, 390/92  WING LUN Mrs. Wing Lun (nee Joce Line or Joce Foon See)
NAA: J2483, 391/45  LOOK HOP, Elizabeth Jane
NAA: J2483, 392/70  AH SAM, Jim
NAA: J2483, 408/47  AH MOO, Willie
NAA: J2483, 409/29  HOW CHIN, William
NAA: J2483, 409/78  WING LUN, William
NAA: J2483, 409/88  CHUN TIE, Tommy (Chin Yan Yow)
NAA: J2483, 41/21  WAH SANG
NAA: J2483, 410/5  CHIN CHOCK, Charlie
NAA: J2483, 414/24  HOW CHIN Lin Fay, (Mrs. How Lum)
NAA: J2483, 414/25  HOW CHIN, Way Lee
NAA: J2483, 414/29  HOEY, Ah Hoey
NAA: J2483, 414/59  DUNG YOW, Georgina Young
NAA: J2483, 414/60  DUNG YOW, Frank
NAA: J2483, 414/61  DUNG YOW, Allen
NAA: J2483, 414/67  FONG, Hanarko
NAA: J2483, 414/80  LOOK HOP, Thomas Edward James
NAA: J2483, 414/84  NOCK, Edward
NAA: J2483, 415/29  LOW KEE, Edward
NAA: J2483, 415/49  AH KEE, George
NAA: J2483, 415/81  FUN, Charlie (Charlie Fun Hop Sing)
NAA: J2483, 415/84  LOW KEE
NAA: J2483, 42/34  KWONG CHIN SEE Wife of Kwong Sue Duk
NAA: J2483, 42/86  CHING DO, William
NAA: J2483, 42/87  CHING DO, Joseph Fred
NAA: J2483, 42/88  CHING DO, Lewis Edward
NAA: J2483, 42/89  CHING DO, William John (Quong Jack)
NAA: J2483, 42/90  CHING DO, Ruby Ethel
NAA: J2483, 42/91  CHING DO, Florence Jessie
NAA: J2483, 42/92  CHING DO, Mabel Anne
NAA: J2483, 428/3  GAIN, Mrs. Rose (nee Ah Cow)
NAA: J2483, 429/20  LEE LIY, Frank
NAA: J2483, 429/57  SANG YEE, George
NAA: J2483, 430/64  GOOT SIM
NAA: J2483, 430/78  CHUN TIE
NAA: J2483, 431/12  SAM MOY (Mrs. Sam Moy)
NAA: J2483, 431/32  LOW CHOY, Mary Jane
NAA: J2483, 438/45  AH MOON
NAA: J2483, 438/88  YEE SIN, Jimmy
NAA: J2483, 439/52  SEE CHIN, Dorothy Jean
NAA: J2483, 440/73  SO CHOY, Emily May
NAA: J2483, 440/79  SO CHOY, Sue Choy
NAA: J2483, 456/16  MAR, Willie
NAA: J2483, 456/2  LEONG George (Way In)
NAA: J2483, 456/3  LEONG, Patricia (Mrs. Ah Pat)
NAA: J2483, 456/4  LEONG Charles (Good Lun)
NAA: J2483, 457/32  HOP YEK, Louis George
NAA: J2483, 457/7  FONG YAN (Diamond)
NAA: J2483, 457/75  KWONG SANG
NAA: J2483, 457/76  YUEN KEE
NAA: J2483, 457/94  DAY SUM, (Mrs. Lucy)
NAA: J2483, 457/96  DAY SUM
NAA: J2483, 458/34  CHOCKMAN
NAA: J2483, 458/49  LUM WAN, William
NAA: J2483, 458/83  KONG BOW
NAA: J2483, 465/024  AH KEE, John Henry
NAA: J2483, 466/72  FONG ON, Chai Hee
NAA: J2483, 467/12  CAMPBELL, Dorothy Margaret
NAA: J2483, 480,049  TUNG YEP, Thomas
NAA: J2483, 480/31  BERG, George
NAA: J2483, 481/034  LEE MOON
NAA: J2483, 481/76  LEONG CHONG
NAA: J2483, 482/32  LUM KIN
NAA: J2483, 496/80  SO CHOY, Mavis Olive
NAA: J2483, 497/04  WONG HOY (Mrs. May Maud)
NAA: J2483, 497/44  SHUN WAH, Aggie Ann Ju Yorkee
NAA: J2483, 497/45  SHUN WAH, Jean Rose Ju Yorkee
NAA: J2483, 497/46  SHUN WAH, Roy /Ronald Ju Yorkee
NAA: J2483, 497/57  SHUN WAH (YORKEE), Sam Moy (Mrs. Sun Shun Wah)
NAA: J2483, 497/60  SHUN WAH, Gum Yee
NAA: J2483, 498/11  GOOT SIM, (also known as Mabel Chan)
NAA: J2483, 498/55  CHUN TIE, Margaret (also known as Margaret Choy Lam)
NAA: J2483, 514/37  TIM SO, Susie
NAA: J2483, 514/38  TIM SO, Doreen
NAA: J2483, 514/39  TIM SO, Freddie
TIM SO, Lily
YOUNG AH
MAH HING, Charlie
AH LIN, Quia Sang Ah Lin (William)
QUIN YEN, Mrs. Maud
FONG ON
SO CHOY, Minnie Ah Gin So Choy
LOOK HOP, Ellen Victoria
MAH HING
YUEN DOW /AH CUM, Yuen Dow
CHIN CHONG (Mrs. Chin Chong nee Nellie Yee Tong)
JOE KONG, Katie
YOUNG, Mrs. Ellen
CHUN TIE, (Qui Fa or Gee See)
SIN DEK KEE
SUN SHUN LEE, Edward
SUN SHUN LEE, Ellen
SUN SHUN LEE, Amy
SUN SHUN LEE
AH MOOK
AH MOOK, Annie
AH MOOK, Onatsu Kashyama)
CHUN TIE, James (Ing Yun)
CHUN TIE (Mrs. Qui Chun Tie and infant Ing Yun)
CHUN TIE, Ing Way
NAA: J2483, 78/5  CHUN TIE, Ing Jock
NAA: J2483, 78/68  AH PONG, Joe
NAA: J2483, 92/75  MOO SHANG
NAA: J2483, 92/45  AH SANGE, Francis Augustine
NAA: J2483, 92/46  AH SANGE, William
NAA: J2483, 92/47  AH SANGE, Fung
NAA: J2483, 92/84  HOW CHIN, Charley
NAA: J2483, 93/71  LUM SING, Eva Minetta
NAA: J2483, 93/72  LUM SING, Annie Louisa
NAA: J2483, 93/73  LUM SING, Hilda Maude
NAA: J2483, 93/74  LUM SING, Ethel May
NAA: J2483, 93/75  LUM SING, Grace Caroline
NAA: J2483, 93/88  CHIN PACK
NAA: J2483, J2483/29  LOY, Yuen Loy
NAA: J2483, 114/69  AH KEE, James
NAA: J2483, 152/91  HING, Patrick
NAA: J2483, 176/47  AH CHING, James
NAA: J2483, 183/77  FORDAY, Willie
NAA: J2483, 192/38  TANG YEE, Samuel Herbert
NAA: J2483, 193/54  AH KEE, Louis Kee
NAA: J2483, 193/84  CHOY SHOW, Robert
NAA: J2483, 263/17  WAH POO, Helena
NAA: J2483, 385/64  SOU SAN, Ellie
NAA: J2483, 440/74  SO CHOY/ SUE CHOY, (Mrs. Ah Hoe Sow Choy)
NAA: J2483, 458/73  CHONG FUNG, Tommy
NAA: J2483, 476/75  PANG YIN, Phillip
NAA: J2483/193/11  NAN /HANG FONG, Dickson
NAA: J2483/225/56  MAN CONG
NAA: J2483/227/3  LAI FOOK, Ellen Nellie (Yet Yung)
NAA: J2483/227/4  LAI FOOK, May (Shuying)
NAA: J2483/257/59  NAN, Lena
NAA: J2483/257/62  NAN, Beatrice
NAA: J2483/257/63  NAN, Allen Francis
NAA: J2483/259/58  NAN, Ella Francis
NAA: J2483/365/30  SUNG YEE
NAA: J2483/365/33  LEE SYE, Edward
NAA: J2483/365/47  SUNG YEE, Horace
NAA: J2483/365/48  SUNG YEE, Ernest
NAA: J2483/440/72  SO CHOY (Sing Quay)
NAA: J2483/66/81  YUEN SANG, Harry
NAA: J2483, J2481, 1899/294  KOM MOY
NAA: J2484, 298/004  QUIN LEM, Charles Conway
NAA: J2484, 344, 086  AH LIN
NAA: J2484, 344, 087  AH LIN (Mrs. Choy Ying)
NAA: J2484, 344, 089  AH LIN, William
NAA: J2484, 344, 091  AH LIN, Harry
NAA: J2484, 346/99  CHUNG YET
NAA: J2484, 359/20  AH YET, Cissy
NAA: J2484, 359/20  AH YET, Moo Fung
NAA: J2484, 482/99  CHIN, Sum Dong
NAA: J2484, 496/16    QUIN LEM, Chong Quin Lem
NAA: J2484, 498/31    CHIN, Loong Kang
NAA: J2484, 514/20    CHIN DAW
NAA: J2484, 535/15    PANG QUEE, Mabel
NAA: J2493 257/67    KWONG, Elsie (You Fen)
NAA: J25, 1958/2431   TIM SO, Louie (Wife Ah Sam)
NAA: J25, 1961/3948   YUEN KIM HOOK, A. Hookey
NAA: J25, 1968/1876   SEE KEE Tsang (Tsing) See Kee
NAA: J2773, 1037/1930  YUEN DOW, Maurice
NAA: J2773, 12/1930    SING, Doreen Joan
NAA: J2773, 12/1930    SING, Dorothy Margaret Campbell daughter of Mrs. Munson
NAA: J2773, 12/1930    SING, Gwendolin Mary
NAA: J2773, 12/1930    SING, Mrs. M.G
NAA: J2773, 184/1929   LUM WAN, William
NAA: J2773, 184/1929   LUM WAN Alfred Thomas
NAA: J2773, 2438/1917  LOOK HOP, John William
NAA: J2773, 498/1924   AH CHONG, Bruce
NAA: J2773, 817/1930   AH MOON, Edie
NAA: J2773, 817/1930   AH MOON, Gladys
NAA: J2773, 817/1930   AH MOON, Phyllis Jean
NAA: J2773, 817/1930   AH MOON, Willie
NAA: J2773/2490/1917  AH FOO, James
NAA: J3115 81         TAI YET HING, Family
NAA: J3115, 138       MOW HING
NAA: J3115, 156       SEE POY, Herbert
NAA: J3115, 39  KING SHAN
NAA: J3115/36  LEE WOOD
NAA: J3115/6  FAT KEE
NAA: J3115/21/1902  QUONG CHONG
NAA: J3136, 1906/251  TAI YET HING, Family
NAA: J3136, 1906/106  GEE KEE, John Hannock
NAA: J3136, 1906/107  GEE KEE, Henry
NAA: J3136, 1906/108  GEE KEE, William
NAA: J3136, 1906/109  GEE KEE, Albert Edward
NAA: J3136, 1906/110  GEE KEE, Ellen
NAA: J3136, 1906/111  GEE KEE, May Maude
NAA: J3136, 1906/162  KWONG CHIN SEE (Wife of Kwong Sue Duc)
NAA: J3136, 1906/193  HODGES, Vivian Sydney
NAA: J3136, 1906/307  YEE TONG, Nellie
NAA: J3136, 1906/308  WING CHONG (Son of Yee Tong)
NAA: J3136, 1906/308  YEE TONG, Florrie
NAA: J3136, 1906/309  YEE TONG, James
NAA: J3136, 1906/310  WING CHON
NAA: J3136, 1907/127  LOOK HOP
NAA: J3136, 1907/149  JONG QUAN POW
NAA: J3136, 1907/150  LEONG GEE (Mrs. Jong Quan Pow)
NAA: J3136, 1907/151  LIPPETT, Mary Jane
NAA: J3136, 1907/205  AH SANGE, John Joseph
NAA: J3136, 1907/337  HOW, Charley
NAA: J3136, 1907/426  AH LIE, (Wife of SEE CHIN)
NAA: J3136, 1907/493  CHING, Edwin
NAA: J3136, 1907/519  LAI FOO, Chin Ow (wife of Lai Foo)
NAA: J3136, 1907/525  AH SHAY, William Charles
NAA: J3136, 1908/114  AH YUNG, Frederick (son of Ah Pong)
NAA: J3136, 1908/124  MAH HING, Spence
NAA: J3136, 1908/20  FONG DIE
NAA: J3136, 1908/206  LOOK HOP, (Elizabeth Jane and child)
NAA: J3136, 1908/38  AH SAM
NAA: J3136, 1908/5  SEE POY (Chun Han and child Gilbert)
NAA: J3136, 1908/50  SEE CHIN
NAA: J3136, 1908/6  SEE POY, May
NAA: J3136, 1908/7  SEE POY, Johnstone
NAA: J3136, 1908/8  SEE POY, Ida
NAA: J483, 482/81  CHUN TIE, Qui Fa (Mrs. Chun Tie)
NAA: J773, 1037/1930  YUEN DOW, Elsie
NAA: ST84 1 1909/20/21/30  SUNG YEE Family

ii.) Birth Certificate Registers, Files with Birth Certificates, Documents Other (Identification)

NAA BP384/9 Birth Certificate Register - Chinese, Book 1
NAA: 04215  AH CHIN, Annie, Normanton.
NAA: A1 1912 17072 Memorandum External Affairs
NAA: A9, A1902/69/65, [application from] Fat Kee [to bring wife and family from China]
NAA: BP25/1 Mrs. SAM LEE SEE (Lee Chin Wai Pui), Cairns
NAA: BP25/1LEE TIN KIN, Chinese Deaths, Blackall
NAA: BP342/1 9857/299/1903, Margaret Ah Foo, Birth Register, Certificate, Townsville
NAA: BP342/1/9857/299/1903, Correspondence: Jue Hop
NAA: D596, 1923/4232 White Wives of Chinese and their Children, 1923
NAA: J2482 1904/114, J2483 152/144 & J2483 288/144 GEEFAY
NAA: J2483 104/73, J2483176/86 & J2483 288/42 HONG CHEW
NAA: J2483 104/74, J2483 189/28 & J2483 288/44 LEE WAH
NAA: J2483 169/68 SUN KUM WAH Charlie (of Winton 1914-1916)
NAA: J2483 170/53 SUN KUM WAH Ah Foo (of Winton 1915-1917)
NAA: J2483 257/78 SUN KUM WAH Charlie (of Winton 1918-1921)
NAA: J2483 359/20 Moo Fung and child Cissy Ah Yet, 1923-24
NAA: J2483 65/26 Cheung Yet 1912
NAA: J2483 218/34 Cheung Yet (Thursday Island) 1916
NAA: J3136/1908/262 Cheung Yet 1908-9
NAA: J25, 1949/2743, HOOK WAH JANG, James Jue Sue (Death)
NAA: J2773, 228/37, QUONG CHONG AND SEE POY Customs and Excise correspondence on William Sidney Quong Chong and family
NAA: J2773, 3058167; William LAM PAN re Sugar Bounty
NAA: J3115/75/1903, 1899 copy of a birth certificate for George Sue Fong of Townsville
NAA: J3115 143, AH SEE, William, Registration of Birth, Townsville
NAA: J3115, 100, Correspondence relating to a Certificate of Domicile for Fat Kee and family
NAA: J3115, 157, Correspondence, statements and newspaper clippings relating to the prosecution of Willie GOONCHIU, Patrick WAUGH HING, Cairns, Birth Register Certificate
NAA: J3115, 55, CHUNG CHANG, Montague, Baptismal Certificate
NAA: J3115/75, George FONG SUE, Townsville, Birth Certificate
NAA: J3115/78 Birth certificate and correspondence relating to the application for a Certificate of Domicile for William Andrew Leon of Townsville.
iii.) Alien Registration Certificate 1916

NAA: BP/3 /9365/CHINESE, FOO, Alien Registration Certificate, No. 6
NAA: BP4/3 CHINESE, Hoy Jimmy Gee, Alien Registration Certificate, No. 85
NAA: BP4/3 CHINESE, Gee Hoy Maggie, Alien Registration Certificate, No. 8
NAA: BP4/3 CHINESE, Bow K, Alien Registration Certificate, No. 30
NAA: BP4/3 CHINESE, KEE ANNIE SOU, Alien Registration Certificate, No. 4
NAA: BP4/3 CHINESE, KEE WILLIE SOU, Alien Registration Certificate, No. 5
NAA: BP4/3 CHINESE, CHEE QUEE, Alien Registration Certificate, No. 90
NAA: BP4/3 CHINESE, KIM AH, Alien Registration Certificate, No. 10
NAA: BP4/3 CHINESE, MAN AH, Alien Registration Certificate, No. 11
NAA: BP4/3 CHINESE, SUE W.A., Alien Registration Certificate, No. 9
NAA: BP4/3 CHINESE, SAM AH., Alien Registration Certificate, No. 1
NAA: BP4/3 CHINESE, AH SAM BA, Alien Registration Certificate, No. 2
NAA: BP4/3 CHINESE, CHONG SARAH, Alien Registration Certificate, No. 16
NAA: BP4/3 CHINESE, AH GOW, Alien Registration Certificate, No. 14
NAA: BP4/3 CHINESE, CHIN LOI SIN, Alien Registration Certificate, No. 7
NAA: BP4/3 CHINESE, CHONG, Alien Registration Certificate, No.15
NAA: BP4/3 CHINESE, HOOKEY, Alien Registration Certificate, No.13
NAA: BP4/3 CHINESE, KEM LIN, Alien Registration Certificate, No.1
NAA: PP131/1 1903/262, Census return, Coloured Aliens in Commonwealth: WA.

STATE

NEW SOUTH WALES
a. *Births Deaths and Marriages ONLINE*

BDM NSW: 2925/1849 V18492925 34A, Father William, Mother Esther, son Wing William

BDM NSW: 2081/1849 V18492081 34A, Father William, Mother Esther, son Wing David

BDM NSW: 993/1847 V1847993 55, Father William, Esther, son Wing Robert

**QUEENSLAND**

a. *Queensland Births, Deaths and Marriages (QBDM)*

i.) Microfiche (MF) QBDM-M-MF

QBDM-MR-MF 1856 1859/B000008 TE YONG, TUCKER Mary, 21.04.1856
QBDM-MR-MF 1859 1859/B000030 YAT SAN, HAYES Eliza
QBDM-MR-MF 1859 1859/B000938 SAM, HAYES Eliza, 25.08.1856
QBDM-MR-MF 1859 1859/B000444 WAN, MITCHELL Mary, 9.10.1856
QBDM-MR-MF 1859 1859/B00113 SIN John, HAYES Mary, 13.04.1857
QBDM-MR-MF 1859 1859/B00177 GEE James, DWYER Mary, 28.10.1858
QBDM-MR-MF 1859 1859/000353 YECK YAB, RICHARDSON Margaret, 27.08.1858
QBDM-MR-MF 1859 1859/000244 SIN John, POULSON Margaret, 2.06.1859
QBDM-MR-MF 1859 1859 000235 KIM John, ROBINSON Naomi, 18.04.1859
QBDM-MR-MF 1859 1859/000325 TEE KIM, RICHARDSON Janette, 10.11.1856
QBDM-MR-MF 1859 1859/000357 TOE, BEAL Elizabeth, 24.12.1859
QBDM-MR-MF 1859 1859/000327 KEUGH James KEW, CASKELL Maria, 5.02.1857
QBDM-MR-MF 1860 1860/000199 LAU TEEN Thomas, GILLIGAN Jane, 20.02.1860
QBDM-MR-MF 1860 1860/000060 CHAY John, CRAIG Jane, 12.09.1860
QBDM-MR-MF 1860 1860/000059 DEIAN John, CRAIG Ellen, 23.08.1860
QBDM-MR-MF 1861 1861/000168 KAOMI, BEER Agnes, 29.05.1861
QBDM-MR-MF 1862 1862/000202 CHIAM James, GORTON Sophia, 14.10.1862
QBDM-MR-MF 1862 1862/000218 KONG DEE, STEWARD Mary, 3.07.1862
QBDM-MR-MF 1863 1863/000176 HAND Samuel, CROSS Eliza, 29.12.1863
QBDM-MR-MF 1863 1863/B000498 YOUDEY George, CAIN Jane, 16.04.1863
QBDM-MR-MF 1863 1863/000404 SUE Samuel, GRAY Mary Ann, 13.09.1863
QBDM-MR-MF 1864 1864/000143 GEE John, PIERCE Elizabeth, 30.01.1864
QBDM-MR-MF 1864 1864/000027 YOE James, FOLEY Mary, 15.09.1864
QBDM-MR-MF 1865 1865/000472 AH SUE Thomas, LOWRY Esther, 15.06.1865
QBDM-MR-MF 1865 1865/000392 BOW George, ANDREW Charlotte, 30.12.1865
QBDM-MR-MF 1865 1865/000472 AH SUE Tommy, ANDREW Charlotte, 15.06.1865
QBDM-MR-MF 1865 1865/B001437 HEN DAN, SCOTT Ellen, 27.09.1865
QBDM-MR-MF 1865 1865/B001202 SANG John, MC IVOR Margaret, 10.02.1865
QBDM-MR-MF 1865 1865/B001236 YOUNG George, LONG Eliza, 22.03.1865
QBDM-MR-MF 1865 1865/000152 SIN WON Martin, GREEN Nancy, 28.08.1865
QBDM-MR-MF 1865 1865/000438 SAM Aimee, CASEY Harriet, 21.02.1865
QBDM-MR-MF 1865 1865/000617 SUE John, WATKINS Francis, 08.05.1865
QBDM-MR-MF 1865 1865/000121 GUAN, GREENWAY Ellen, 13.02.1865
QBDM-MR-MF 1865 1865/000472 AH SUE Jemmy VESSAY Evelina, 19.01.1865
QBDM-MR-MF 1866 1866/000582 JIM SAM LEE, LENEHAN Mary, 31.10.1866
QBDM-MR-MF 1866 1866/000662 GEE Jerran, COOK Lucy, 22.03.1866
QBDM-MR-MF 1866 1866/000565 AH FOO Jamie GORDON Mary Anne, 23.10.1866
QBDM-MR-MF 1866 1866/000477 HEAT Daniel HE HON Elizabeth, 16.07.1866
QBDM-MR-MF 1866 1866/000445 PON SON, RITCHIE Margaret, 16.07.1866
QBDM-MR-MF 1866 1866/000056 SAM James, QUIN Ann, 13.01.1866
QBDM-MR-MF 1866 1866/000410 NUE HIRAM, DUGGAN Margaret, 22.09.1866
QBDM-MR-MF 1866 1866/000548 TEEFEY William, HOLLAND Ellen, 15.12.1866
QBDM-MR-MF 1867 1867/000150 MINON Peter, TAYLOR Agnes, 20.04.1867
QBDM-MR-MF 1867 1867/000458 AH MOOK, O'CONNOR Rose, 18.06.1867
QBDM-MR-MF 1867 1867/000086 JETT YOUNG, BROWN Mary, 09.03.1867
QBDM-MR-MF 1867 1867/000435 AH FOO, MARTIN Mary-Ann, 20.03.1867
QBDM-MR-MF 1867 1867/000387 PIN John, KELLY Ellen, 18.01.1867
QBDM-MR-MF 1867 1867/000028 SEUNG RobertL, EHAN Mary, 20.01.1867
QBDM-MR-MF 1867 1867/000284 SHAY John, CATLING Ellen, 18.08.1867
QBDM-MR-MF 1867 1867/000189 YOU LIE, STANSFIELD Annie, 02.01.1867
QBDM-MR-MF 1867 1867/000173 TAN YAN, NALLY Ann, 10.01.1867
QBDM-MR-MF 1867 1867/000175  CHAN DAN, Mc GLOKEY Margaret, 28.01.1867
QBDM-MR-MF 1867 23.67  LEUNG Robert, Mc LAUGHLIN Mary, 1867
QBDM-MR-MF 1867 1867/000210  SING John, RITCHIE Margaret,  5.02.1867
QBDM-MR-MF 1867 1867/000193  TONG DU, KENNOW Sarah,  16.04.1867
QBDM-MR-MF 1867 1867/000178  TONG O, SMITH Margaret, 28.03.1867
QBDM-MR-MF 1868 1868/000419  KIE Johnston, HARVEY Selina, 17.12.1867
QBDM-MR-MF 1868 1868/000547  SOWIE Tommy, FEGAN Bridget,  8.07.1868
QBDM-MR-MF 1868 1868/B002583  SYE John, SMITH Eliza, 20.11.1868
QBDM-MR-MF 1868 1868/000272  AH WAY, MENNING Minna, 1.07.1868
QBDM-MR-MF 1868 1868/000468  HONG Frederick, BOURKE Catherine, 1868
QBDM-MR-MF 1868 1868/000272  HONG Frederick, BOURKE Catherine, 1868
QBDM-MR-MF 1868 1868/000390  MOY James, GOOCH Charlotte, 10.11.1868
QBDM-MR-MF 1868 1868/00295  AH SUE George, MILLS Mary-Ann, 02.03.1869
QBDM-MR-MF 1869 1869/000395  AH SUE George, MILLS Mary-Ann, 02.03.1869
QBDM-MR-MF 1869 1869/000104  SING John, HEFFERNAH Ellen, 10.06.1869
QBDM-MR-MF 1869 1869/000131  LUCK Samuel, SEWELL Mary, 14.09.1869
QBDM-MR-MF 1869 1869/000462  DAVIS William, SEE Ann,  20.06.1869
QBDM-MR-MF 1870 1870/B002928  ANG Charles, EVANS Margaret, 26.03.1870
QBDM-MR-MF 1870 1870/B002927  SING James, ROBERTSON Mary-Ann, 26.03.1870
QBDM-MR-MF 1870 1870/000518  JUNG ONG LI, JACOBS Emma, 15.07.1870
QBDM-MR-MF 1870 1870/000441  AH YOU W.  HARRIS Catherine,  7.09.1870
QBDM-MR-MF 1870 1870/000607  AH DEEN W.  FLYNN Catherine,  5.02.1870
QBDM-MR-MF 1870 1870/000298  GEE William, SHARP Kate, 28.08.1870
QBDM-MR-MF 1870 1870/000442  GONG SEE, KRAATZ Caroline, 20.09.1870
QBDM-MR-MF 1870 523.70  HONG Frederick, BURKE Catherine
QBDM-MR-MF 1871 1871/B003430  AH CHOW, BROWN Lily Mary, 12.12.1871
QBDM-MR-MF 1871 1871/B000347  GNOON SEEN FUNG, CURRY Elizabeth, 5.09.1871
MOODY W., HOW Julie Ann Keen, 12.01.1871
ZILLMAN John, HOWS Ann M., 29.06.1871
GEE T. S., WILLMAN Elizabeth, 01.06.1871
KIM SANI LUNY, GIBSON Annie, 15.08.1871
SAMP SON, HEWITSON Sarah, 22.09.1871
TAY Thomas, HANNET Jemima, 6.7.1871
CHING SUE Charles, SHAW Maria, 20.09.1871
AH YIN, STEWART Sarah Jane, 26.04.1871
PEE SEE, BODDY Mary, 13.08.1871
SEE W., ROWLEY Mary Ann, 4.07.1871
LEE MAN, SCHOLFIELD Lucy, 23.09.1871
HING John Olsen, SIMENSEN Maren, 09.09.1871
TIN foo, ARMSTRONG Mary Jane, 10.9.1872
MOE UNG HING George, WILKIE Christina, 27.10.1872
WATSON John, AH PAN Mary, 28.08.1872
SAN YOU, MACHIN Mary, 30.9.1872
FOOK, ROBERTSON Elizabeth, 21.12.1872
AH KING William, EVANS Elizabeth, 03.08.1872
AH YOW Charles, GOYER Mary, 29.07.1872
LONG, LANNARTH Mary, 31.12.1877
JONG Jellie, BEYNON Elizabeth, 23.07.1872
UN SPECIFIED, DALLAGHIN Mary Ann, 27.02.1872
/SEE JONG, McGRATH Bridget, 11.04.1872
AH POO, MERCER Catherine, 07.12.1872
AH SHIN William, ANDERSON Margaretha, 15.09.1873
AH TONG, FLETCHER Sarah, 1.01.1873
LOO MENG, McKINLAY WOOD Mary, 8.05.1873
CHEW James, NEAL Jane, 26.12.1873
LIHOU, PETIT Sophia, 26.07.1873
SHUE George, FERRON Margaret, 27.08.1873
YAN John, RAY Anne Jane, 30.12.1873
ING YOUNG, SHOKAY Rebecca, 11.02.1873
PAGE John, KEONG Mary, 7.08.1873
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name 1</th>
<th>Name 2</th>
<th>Date Format</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>1876</td>
<td>LUM QUIE, REID Sarah</td>
<td>19.09.1876</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>1876</td>
<td>CHRISTIE Robert, HOW Charlotte</td>
<td>1879</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>1877</td>
<td>AH LING, ROSE Julia Harriet</td>
<td>25.09.1877</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>1877/B005217</td>
<td>SOY WANG, REACH Eliza</td>
<td>1.04.1877</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>1877/B005834</td>
<td>TEW Arthur, LIPPIART Elizabeth</td>
<td>18.11.1877</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>1877/B005655</td>
<td>AH GIN T., CULLUM Annette</td>
<td>12.05.1877</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>1877/B005892</td>
<td>CHEN TOY C., CLARKE Esther</td>
<td>20.12.1877</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>1877/B005558</td>
<td>WONG CHOW, CHAVASSE Francis Edith</td>
<td>17.03.1877</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>1877/B005834</td>
<td>SING MON, PELON Elizabeth</td>
<td>6.03.1877</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>1877/000049</td>
<td>TEE Adam, MYERS Mary Ann</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>1877/000008</td>
<td>AH CHING James, HADLEY Sarah</td>
<td>7.05.1878</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>1877/000482</td>
<td>ROBERTS J. T., AH PAN Elizbeth</td>
<td>29.03.1878</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>1877/000933</td>
<td>AH LEE, CHURCH Annie</td>
<td>4.10.1877</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>1877/000947</td>
<td>A CHUM, TAYLOR Ann</td>
<td>29.03.1877</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>1877/000947</td>
<td>CHOWN Thomas, GRIFFITHS Caroline</td>
<td>18.12.1877</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>1877/000074</td>
<td>KIM W. J., HADDICK Sarah</td>
<td>7.05.1877</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>1878</td>
<td>CHEIN POW, PAN SHONG</td>
<td>19.07.1878</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>1878/0001042</td>
<td>AH CHING James, HADLEY Sarah</td>
<td>7.05.1878</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>1878/000482</td>
<td>ROBERTS J. T., AH PAN Elizbeth</td>
<td>29.03.1878</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>1878/000933</td>
<td>AH LEE, CHURCH Annie</td>
<td>4.10.1877</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>1878/000947</td>
<td>A CHUM, TAYLOR Ann</td>
<td>29.03.1877</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>1878/000947</td>
<td>CHOWN Thomas, GRIFFITHS Caroline</td>
<td>18.12.1877</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>1878/000008</td>
<td>AH CHING James, HADLEY Sarah</td>
<td>7.05.1878</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>1878/000482</td>
<td>ROBERTS J. T., AH PAN Elizbeth</td>
<td>29.03.1878</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>1878/000933</td>
<td>AH LEE, CHURCH Annie</td>
<td>4.10.1877</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>1878/000947</td>
<td>A CHUM, TAYLOR Ann</td>
<td>29.03.1877</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>1878/000008</td>
<td>AH CHING James, HADLEY Sarah</td>
<td>7.05.1878</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>1878/000482</td>
<td>ROBERTS J. T., AH PAN Elizbeth</td>
<td>29.03.1878</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>1878/000933</td>
<td>AH LEE, CHURCH Annie</td>
<td>4.10.1877</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>1878/000947</td>
<td>A CHUM, TAYLOR Ann</td>
<td>29.03.1877</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WING James, ENGLAND Caroline, 3.11.1879
AH DEE, PEARSON Elizabeth, 18.08.1879
SAM YOUNG, CONGDON Annie, 9.12.1879
KING YEEN, MATHEWS Margaret, 11.13/1879
AH MOY, WILTON Jane Ann, 11.09.1879
AH KOY James, O'CALLAGHAN Winifred, 10.11.1879
AH WI John, HUBER Maria, 17.02.1879
HIP YOUNG, GREEN Sarah, 11.03.1879
MAH HOP, MULVERHILL Bridget, 1879
AH BUE, SCOTT BROWN Margaret, 02.07.1882
QBDM-MR-MF 1882 1882/000837  SIN PUE, COBLEY Bessie, 19.09.1882
QBDM-MR-MF 1882 1882/001235  SING YEE WAH, FORSTER SMITH Mary-Ann, 24.07.1882
QBDM-MR-MF 1882 1882/000312  AH SHUE, TUCKER Mary, 29.11.1882
QBDM-MR-MF 1882 1882/000281  CHIN PACK, JU SIN, 16.05.1882
QBDM-MR-MF 1882 1882/000296  AH COW, CHING HOW, 3.10.1882
QBDM-MR-MF 1882 1882/000314  AH CHUNG, SCARISBRICK Fanny, 30.12.1882
QBDM-MR-MF 1882 1882/001195  SEE CHONG HOMES, SMITH Grace Gallant, 21.02.1882
QBDM-MR-MF 1882 1882/B007960  CHONG BOW, KING Emily-Jane, 6.10.1882
QBDM-MR-MF 1882 1882/B007878  MENG John, KELLY Bridget, 15.08.1882
QBDM-MR-MF 1882 1882/001326  TONG KUE F., CLARKE Harriett, 12.08.1882
QBDM-MR-MF 1882 1882/000727  BASKET J., AH PAN Catherine, 21.09.1882
QBDM-MR-MF 1882 1882/001426  FUN Joseph, WARD Mary, 19.10.1882
QBDM-MR-MF 1882 1882/000320  BEATZ Julius E., MING Elizabeth, 1882
QBDM-MR-MF 1882 1882/000158  PHOW, GOVEY Lucy, 28.07.1882
QBDM-MR-MF 1882 1882/000051  AH KYONG, CHRISTENSEN Else, 06.02.1882
QBDM-MR-MF 1883 1883/000310  AH YOU James, SOMMERVILLE Agnes, 09.10.1883
QBDM-MR-MF 1883 1883/000451  LEE CHONG, FOWLER Elizabeth, 07.05.1883
QBDM-MR-MF 1883 1883/000294  CAN TING J., VAUGHAN Ellen, 05.06.1883
QBDM-MR-MF 1883 1883/000354  WOOD James, LING Joanna, 23.09.1883
QBDM-MR-MF 1883 1883/001637  SUE James, HOW-CHONG Agnes, 08.05.1883
QBDM-MR-MF 1883 1883/001590  AH SUE J., O'DWYER Bridget, 15.01.1883
QBDM-MR-MF 1883 1883/001010  KONG BOW, DOYLE Rose, 4.12.1883
QBDM-MR-MF 1883 1883/B008382  HOW Joseph, HOWES Mary, 14.07.1883
QBDM-MR-MF 1883 1883/B008172  CAMPBELL William, CHUE Harriet Jane, 2.03.1883
QBDM-MR-MF 1883 1883/000511  KOCHO Joseph, SPALDING Sarah Jane, 17.10.1883
QBDM-MR-MF 1883 1883/B003286  CHONGHAI, O'DONNELL Norah, 23.05.1883
QBDM-MR-MF 1883 1883/001426  SING John, PUGH Mary Ann, 09.07.1883
QBDM-MR-MF 1883 1883/000255  McKenzie Robert, ANG WONG Frances Madeline, 22.04.1883
QBDM-MR-MF 1883 1883/000051  AH DEN Jimmy, GARN Hanna Elizabeth, 05.03.1883
QBDM-MR-MF 1883 1265.83 SIBLEY John C., MEE Jane Maude, 1883
QBDM-MR-MF 1883 1883/00394 OPHIR John, KIM Sarah, 13.12.1883
QBDM-MR-MF 1883 1883/001623 TEN WAH, GODDEN Emily, 3.04.1883
QBDM-MR-MF 1884 1884/00333 AH HOIN/ AH HONG, LOTHIAN Jane, 21.03.1884
QBDM-MR-MF 1884 1884/00348 AH CHOW, CHURCHER Annie, 10.05.1884
QBDM-MR-MF 1884 1884/001886 LEE WAH SHANG, NOON Jane, 21.02.1884
QBDM-MR-MF 1884 1884/000317 LONG THEE/ LONG KEE, AH LUK, 05.01.1884
QBDM-MR-MF 1884 1884/000387 HANN Charley, SULLIVAN Mary Josephine, 4.12.1884
QBDM-MR-MF 1884 1884/00341 AH CHUNG, SCARISBRICK Fanny, 20.04.1884
QBDM-MR-MF 1884 1884/001445 TAM GEE KEE, HANG FANN, 28.07.1884
QBDM-MR-MF 1884 1884/000321 YET HOY/ YET FOY, AH HO/ LUK YET HO, 17.01.1884
QBDM-MR-MF 1884 1884/000858 LAM PAN W., MALONEY Sarah, 08.07.1884
QBDM-MR-MF 1884 1884/001700 AH PONG, AH SEE, 14.02.1884
QBDM-MR-MF 1884 1884/001753 LONG KEY, CUDDEFORD Amelia Sarah, 14.05.1884
QBDM-MR-MF 1884 1884/001712 FEE/FIE/FOY Tommy, MAY Catherine, 10.3.1884
QBDM-MR-MF 1884 1884/000873 KUM SING, FEENDELY Mary, 09.09.1884
QBDM-MR-MF 1884 1884/001649 CHI Henry, OLE Mary Annie, 28.07.1884
QBDM-MR-MF 1884 1884/000896 SING KING, WHELAN Ellen, 02.06.1884
QBDM-MR-MF 1884 1884/000448 AH SAM, SMITH Unity, 28.06.1884
QBDM-MR-MF 1884 1884/001200 MAH HING, KOK SEE, 21.05.1884
QBDM-MR-MF 1884 1884/000176 PING John, JONG PING, DEIAN Mary Jane, 15.10.1884
QBDM-MR-MF 1884 1884/000180 CHAY John, DAVIS Elizabeth, 31.12.1884
QBDM-MR-MF 1884 1884/001666 AH SUE, NEWMAN Bridget, 12.12.1884
QBDM-MR-MF 1884 1884/001735 LING Henry, THOMPSON Jessie, 12.04.1884
QBDM-MR-MF 1884 1884/000521 SEE/YOUNG SEE Charles, DIBBLES Catherine, 05.07.1884
QBDM-MR-MF 1884 1884/000464 NG OUIE William, SPAWTON Zillah, 21.01.1884
QBDM-MR-MF 1884 1884/001679 NEE James, DAVIS Elizabeth, 1.01.1884
QBDM-MR-MF 1884 1884/001914 HOLMES Henry Ambrose, SUE Mary, 4.11.1884
QBDM-MR-MF 1884 1884/000014 SEE Charles, BASSETT Ann, 04.10.1884
QBDM-MR-MF 1884 1884/001582 LOU Edward, RIORDAN Mary Margaret, 08.10.1884
QBDM-MR-MF 1885 1885/001315 AH /LETT Charles, PAYNE Martha Mitchell, 28.01.1885
QBDM-MR-MF 1885 1885/00339 QUANN TIM John, LOO SING Jane, 16.06.1885
QBDM-MR-MF 1885 1885/001829 TAYLOR Albert, AH PAN Agnes, 30.07.1885
QBDM-MR-MF 1885 1885/001808 AH CHEE William, HOLLAND Annie, 14.07.1885
QBDM-MR-MF 1885 1885/001808 SIP TOM /TOM TIP, AH FOO/ AH FOOK, 08.06.1885
QBDM-MR-MF 1885 1885/000162 AH SING J sim, BLACK Mary, 07.05.1885
QBDM-MR-MF 1885 1885/000199 GUIE SAM, HOOPER Isabella, 3.10.1885
QBDM-MR-MF 1885 1885/001286 AH SEE, DHUN Maggie/Margaret, 01.05.1885
QBDM-MR-MF 1885 1885/000094 CHONG QUORK William, O'GORMAN Mary, 31.03.1885
QBDM-MR-MF 1885 1885/001980 SEE Thomas, COCKING Elizabeth Jane, 10.06.1885
QBDM-MR-MF 1886 1886/001023 QUONG KEE/ KWONG KEE, DYKES Elizabeth, 15.11.1886
QBDM-MR-MF 1886 1886/001808 SING DAK Thomas, CROFTON Louisa, 13.12.1886
QBDM-MR-MF 1886 1886/000876 AH SOU/AH SUE James, HARSTOFF Alice Maria, 14.08.1886
QBDM-MR-MF 1886 1886/001655 AH CHING Charles, CRANG Agnes, 20.01.1886
QBDM-MR-MF 1886 1886/001478 AH YOUNG Tommy, CHUE QUEE Lucy, 13.05.1886
QBDM-MR-MF 1886 1886/001812 VIRACHT John Herman, LING Jessie, 24.12.1886
QBDM-MR-MF 1886 1886/00038 AH SAM, EGAN Bridget, 14.09.1886
QBDM-MR-MF 1886 1886/00005 CHINN William Henry, SMITH Louisa Mary, 7.07.1886
QBDM-MR-MF 1886 830.86 CHICK William Walter, FARENDENS Mary, 1886
LEE William, WOODHOUSE Isabelle, 1886
LEE Henry, DALE Margaret Jane, 1886
GEE William, MARSH Rachael, 8.03.1886
SING, BANKS Sarah, 13.09.1886
QUEE LAU, AH YING, 22.05.1886
POULSON Frederick Lovell, CHOWN Lucy Caroline
AH PAN Henry Joseph, TAYLOR Marion, 12.01.1888
JAN BUNG CHONG, PLUMMER Harriett, 15.08.1887
WILKE John, WAN CHAP Mary Jane, 23.06.1887
LEWIN AH NIN/NIN LEWIN, SPARROW Grace
SUN LEE SING/LIM LEE SING/LEE SING Thomas, HERLIHY Mary, 22.09.1887
AH SANG / AH SANGE, WHITE/WHYTE Mary, 14.09.1887
AH FOU / AH FON James, MEACHAM Catherine, 31.08.1887
YOU SAN, FORDHAM Annie, 21.03.1887
LEONG FOO, BUCKLER Elizabeth, 12.10.1887
SAM WAH, SHEPHERD Mary, 7.12.1887
APPO SAM, SINGH Alice, 13.06.1887
LOKHIN/LOK LIN, WATSON Daisy, 5.12.1887
GEE AH GEE Charles, RANDALL Harriet Sarah, 14.09.1887
MING WONG, GASCOINE Elizabeth, 13.01.1887
WAH HANG William, HELMSLEY FAIRFIELD Eliza, 3.11.1887
WATSON William, AH WAY Kate, 01.03.1888
LIN CHONG/TIN CHONG, PARKER Annie, 21.12.1888
HARSTOFF Louis John Frederick, AH SUE Ellen, 19.07.1888
MIN ON Joseph, AH SUE Elizabeth, 29.10.1888
LEE QUONG Alfred, JINKS Ada Elizabeth, 18.12.1888
POCKINGTON Frank, HOW Miriam Julia Hinton, 1888
SING CHOW George, AH NEE Jinny, 9.09.1888
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QBDM-MR-MF</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Entry ID</th>
<th>Names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>1888/B012187</td>
<td>AH QUEE Walter, SMITH Margaret, 13.03.1888</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>1888/B0123369</td>
<td>KEONG Patrick Benjamin, ALLENS Caroline Amelia, 28.05.1888</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>1888/000515</td>
<td>AH John Charles, MOORE Kathleen, 11.06.1888</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>1834.88</td>
<td>AY LING Alfred George, STUBBINGS Kate, 1888</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>1888/000469</td>
<td>WAH CHONG, WERNICK Lillian Von, 10.07.1888</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>1888/001056</td>
<td>GEE George Henry, CLOCK Margaret Pringle, 22.12.1888</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>1888/001065</td>
<td>CHING Philip Michelmore, WILTSHERE Ellen, 5.01.1888</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>1888/002089</td>
<td>CAMPBELL Alexander, QUEE Elizabeth, 13.02.1888</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>193.88</td>
<td>LEE Francis, LONG Elizabeth, 1888</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>1888/0002007</td>
<td>GRAY Thomas, CHAY Helen, 18.01.1888</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>1888/001006</td>
<td>TAYLOR Tomas, CHINN Violet, 8.08.1888</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>1888/000677</td>
<td>TUCK GWY Willie, WHITTLE Sarah Jane, 31.10.1888</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>1888/000235</td>
<td>GOR EN, SUEY Jane, 14.11.1888</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>1889/002161</td>
<td>CHING DO William, LEEDS Annie, 4.12.1889</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>1101.89</td>
<td>AH YOUNG, STEPHENSON Elizabeth, 1889</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>1889/00397</td>
<td>TAM George, WHITMAN Emily Kate, 21.09.1889</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>1889/000889</td>
<td>AH JOY Thomas, ROBERTSON Catherine, 15.06.1889</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>1889/001304</td>
<td>AH FOO, COWLAND Elizabeth, 4.09.1889</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>1889/001100</td>
<td>TAYLOR John, AH PAN Mary Ann, 16.05.1889</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>1889/000160</td>
<td>RIGBY William Henry, AH SUE Mary Jane, 23.12.1889</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>1889/000387</td>
<td>SAM YIN TATHAM Annie 30.01.1889</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>1889/013232</td>
<td>MAK Robert, WAI Ellen, 29.04.1889</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>1889/013471</td>
<td>YOUNG Ernest Alfred, LEONARD Everslie Ada, 13.08.1889</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>1889/013471</td>
<td>SPEARITT Arthur, AH WHY Ellen, 1889</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>1889/000547</td>
<td>YEO Charles, SIN WON Esther, 3.07.1889</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>1889/001937</td>
<td>TONG SING, SEE YOUNG BOW, 23.07.1889</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>1889/001787</td>
<td>AH SING, PETERS Nikolena, 8.03.1889</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>1889/000744</td>
<td>ROWE Henry, ONGHEEN Mary Jane, 08.10.1889</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>1889/000646</td>
<td>LOW GINN James, COREY Annie Elizabeth, 28.10.1889</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>301.9</td>
<td>CHOW YIP Harry, ECCLES Sarah Ann, 1890</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>1890/001433</td>
<td>AH GEE, AH SUM/AH CUM, 16.08.1890</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QBDM-MR-MF 1890 1890/001397 AH TIE /AH TYE, TIE YEE / TYE TEE, 15.03.1890
QBDM-MR-MF 1890 216.9 AH SING Charles, PUNNETT Margaret Jane, 1890
QBDM-MR-MF 1890 1890/000435 PAN AH WAY/PANG AH WAY, GOODWILLIE Jane, 20.08.1890
QBDM-MR-MF 1890 1890/001277 AH SING Charlie, LINTON Elizabeth, 19.11.1890
QBDM-MR-MF 1890 1890/002207 AH CHONG, THOMPSON Jane Simpson, 19.12.1890
QBDM-MR-MF 1890 1890/002141 AH CHOW, TOWNSEND Emily, 25.06.1890
QBDM-MR-MF 1890 1890/001406 AH FOO, RITCHIE Charlotte, 9.05.1890
QBDM-MR-MF 1890 1890/000752 WAY Ernest William, RUTHERFORD Sarah, 27.05.1890
QBDM-MR-MF 1890 1890/000892 AH HEA William Joseph, WALL Kate, 2.03.1890
QBDM-MR-MF 1890 1890/00150 AH KEET/LEES, STONE Julia, 19.11.1890
QBDM-MR-MF 1890 1890/001850 WATUNABO TAKEO, AH YAH Katie, 31.07.1891
QBDM-MR-MF 1890 1890/001190 AH QUI, BROWN Julia, 8.08.1891
QBDM-MR-MF 1890 1890/001192 AH CHONG Willie, O'BRIAN Mary, 29.7.1891
QBDM-MR-MF 1890 1890/001882 AH CHONG, YIN Elizabeth Isabella, 1890
QBDM-MR-MF 1890 1890/000435 PAN AH WAY/PANG AH WAY, GOODWILLIE Jane, 20.08.1890
QBDM-MR-MF 1890 1890/001277 AH SING Charlie, LINTON Elizabeth, 19.11.1890
QBDM-MR-MF 1890 1890/002207 AH CHONG, THOMPSON Jane Simpson, 19.12.1890
QBDM-MR-MF 1890 1890/002141 AH CHOW, TOWNSEND Emily, 25.06.1890
QBDM-MR-MF 1890 1890/001406 AH FOO, RITCHIE Charlotte, 9.05.1890
QBDM-MR-MF 1890 1890/000752 WAY Ernest William, RUTHERFORD Sarah, 27.05.1890
QBDM-MR-MF 1890 1890/000892 AH HEA William Joseph, WALL Kate, 2.03.1890
QBDM-MR-MF 1890 1890/00150 AH KEET/LEES, STONE Julia, 19.11.1890
QBDM-MR-MF 1890 1890/001850 WATUNABO TAKEO, AH YAH Katie, 31.07.1891
QBDM-MR-MF 1890 1890/001190 AH QUI, BROWN Julia, 8.08.1891
QBDM-MR-MF 1890 1890/001192 AH CHONG Willie, O'BRIAN Mary, 29.7.1891
QBDM-MR-MF 1890 1890/001882 AH CHONG, YIN Elizabeth Isabella, 1890
QBDM-MR-MF 1890 1890/000435 PAN AH WAY/PANG AH WAY, GOODWILLIE Jane, 20.08.1890
QBDM-MR-MF 1890 1890/001277 AH SING Charlie, LINTON Elizabeth, 19.11.1890
QBDM-MR-MF 1890 1890/002207 AH CHONG, THOMPSON Jane Simpson, 19.12.1890
QBDM-MR-MF 1890 1890/002141 AH CHOW, TOWNSEND Emily, 25.06.1890
QBDM-MR-MF 1890 1890/001406 AH FOO, RITCHIE Charlotte, 9.05.1890
QBDM-MR-MF 1890 1890/000752 WAY Ernest William, RUTHERFORD Sarah, 27.05.1890
QBDM-MR-MF 1890 1890/000892 AH HEA William Joseph, WALL Kate, 2.03.1890
QBDM-MR-MF 1890 1890/00150 AH KEET/LEES, STONE Julia, 19.11.1890
QBDM-MR-MF 1890 1890/001850 WATUNABO TAKEO, AH YAH Katie, 31.07.1891
QBDM-MR-MF 1890 1890/001190 AH QUI, BROWN Julia, 8.08.1891
QBDM-MR-MF 1890 1890/001192 AH CHONG Willie, O'BRIAN Mary, 29.7.1891
QBDM-MR-MF 1890 1890/001882 AH CHONG, YIN Elizabeth Isabella, 1890
QBDM-MR-MF 1891 315.91 YEE LEE Tommy, COX Eliza, 1891
QBDM-MR-MF 1891 1751.91 DING YAH, MARTIN Eleanor M., 1895
QBDM-MR-MF 1892 916.92 YORK SAM, LANGER Augusta Emma, 1892
QBDM-MR-MF 1892 1806 SAM NEE, HENRY Ada, 1892
QBDM-MR-MF 1892 1877 WAY GUM, ELLIOTT Eva Sarah Sophia, 1892
QBDM-MR-MF 1892 1291 CHUNG Tho mas, WILLIAMS Lydia, 1892
QBDM-MR-MF 1892 1041.92 FONG SAM, McKEY Mary Ann, 1892
QBDM-MR-MF 1892 1892/B015631 AH CHONG TOM, WILLIAMS Margaret Ellen, 1892
QBDM-MR-MF 1892 1406.9 JOE DUCK George, CAMPBELL Sophia Margaret, 1892
QBDM-MR-MF 1892 1381 LEE TUCK Charley, ANDERSON Catherine, 1892
QBDM-MR-MF 1892 1185.93 WAY Walter Edwin, WRIGHT Maggie Bell, 1892
QBDM-MR-MF 1892 1278.93 YOW Joseph, ISSOAN Eliza, 1892
QBDM-MR-MF 1892 123.93 KING QUONG YOCK/ QUAN YOCK, KING CASTELL 1893
QBDM-MR-MF 1892 1278.93 KING QUONG YOCK/ QUAN YOCK, KING CASTELL 1893
QBDM-MR-MF 1892 264.93 KING QUONG YOCK/ QUAN YOCK, KING CASTELL 1893
QBDM-MR-MF 1893 1077.93 QUE SEE Thomas, BOWE Elizabeth, 1893
QBDM-MR-MF 1893 956.93 SUN KLINE KEE, BOATWRIGHT Minnie, 1893
QBDM-MR-MF 1893 1680.93 SAM YOUNG, HENNESSY Katherine, 11.11.1893
QBDM-MR-MF 1893 1644.93 LEUNG KING NAM, CHUN A YEE/ AYEE, 1893
QBDM-MR-MF 1893 152.93 LUM KING CROWE Polly, 1893
QBDM-MR-MF 1893 1893/000478 AH DOY, CLARKE Delia, 6.02.1893
QBDM-MR-MF 1893 1893/000080 AH GEE, FOWLER Anne Louise, 4.05.1893
QBDM-MR-MF 1893 1893/001533 AH QUIN, HUN Margaret, 22.06.1893
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>QBDM-MR-MF</th>
<th>QBDM-1893</th>
<th>Name of Person 1/2</th>
<th>Name of Person 3/4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1893</td>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>1911.93</td>
<td>FRUITY JUNG/JANG FUTTY, PARKER Margaret</td>
<td>1893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893</td>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>1613.93</td>
<td>LING Wilfred Henry, TRIFFITT Margaret Louisa, 1893</td>
<td>1893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893</td>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>1569.93</td>
<td>CHIEN, LLOYD Kate, 1893</td>
<td>1893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893</td>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>993.93</td>
<td>MEE, BARRETT Lizzie, 1893</td>
<td>1893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893</td>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>1893/001084</td>
<td>WILLIAMS Charles, AH PAN Marion, 6.12.1893</td>
<td>1893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893</td>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>1893/000197</td>
<td>GILMOUR Peter, AH SUE Sarah Emily, 27.05.1893</td>
<td>1893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893</td>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>1894/000382</td>
<td>AH SHAY, Charles CAMERON Ada, 17.09.1894</td>
<td>1893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894</td>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>660.94</td>
<td>CHEN, YUEN QUI FA, 1894</td>
<td>1894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894</td>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>438.94</td>
<td>WONG HING George, SMALES Elizabeth, 1894</td>
<td>1894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894</td>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>1624.94</td>
<td>CHEW James, JONES Asenath C., 1894</td>
<td>1894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894</td>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>1894/001910</td>
<td>PHILLIPS John, AH YOU Fanny, 2.10.1894</td>
<td>1894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>447.95</td>
<td>LOW CHONG William, CASEY Lizzie, 1895</td>
<td>1895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>1895/001295</td>
<td>AH YUEN, STEEL Mary Ellen Victoria, 3.07.1895</td>
<td>1895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>1895/001126</td>
<td>BURBRIDGE James, AH MOOK Margaret, 16.06.1895</td>
<td>1895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>102.95</td>
<td>SAM LAY QUE, CARTER Margaret, 1894</td>
<td>1895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>1895/001331</td>
<td>YEUN CHAN Willie/CHAN YAN, JEFFERY Alice M., 1895</td>
<td>1895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>1895/001311</td>
<td>AH CHIN Jimmy, BOOT Hannah M., 16.11.1895</td>
<td>1895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>1139.95</td>
<td>AH LUM Charles, FINNISEY Eugene R., 1895</td>
<td>1895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>509.95</td>
<td>MOW WONG, DICKINSON Emily, 1895</td>
<td>1895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>1895/000195</td>
<td>DOYLE Alfred Harford, AH SUE Isabella, 22.12.1895</td>
<td>1895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>1895/000019</td>
<td>CAMERON Peter, AFFOO Annie Maria, 8.06.1895</td>
<td>1895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896</td>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>430.96</td>
<td>SUM CHEW /LUM CHEW William, ARCHIE Harriet. 1896</td>
<td>1896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896</td>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>972.96</td>
<td>DE LONG Thomas, WALSH Mary A., 1896</td>
<td>1896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896</td>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>1896/001306</td>
<td>AH YOUNG/AH YUN, COLING/COOLING Mary Ann, 23.05.1896</td>
<td>1896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896</td>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>1896/000759</td>
<td>AH WUN, WATT Sarah T., 4.05.1896</td>
<td>1896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896</td>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>1896/002067</td>
<td>AH SAM, HUGHES Ester Jane, 27.02.1896</td>
<td>1896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896</td>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>1896/00216</td>
<td>WARWICK Robert, AH SUE Emma, 22.01.1896</td>
<td>1896</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QBDM-MR-MF 1897 1897/000002 McINERNEY Peter, AFFOO Mary Ann, 26.12.1896
QBDM-MR-MF 1897 1897/000302 LEONG/AH LEONG /LEE LEONG, SAM CHEUNG Mary, 12.06.1897
QBDM-MR-MF 1897 1897/001017 AH HEE William, BAILEY Mary R. (Rodda), 22.02.1897
QBDM-MR-MF 1897 1897/001095 BALL Samuel, AH CHIN Louisa, 13.04.1897
QBDM-MR-MF 1897 1897/001174 RAISCH Gottlob, AH MOOK Catherine Lilly, 23.04.1898
QBDM-MR-MF 1897 1897/001210 AH SAM, LOUIE, 13.06.1898
QBDM-MR-MF 1897 1897/001218 SAM AH BOW, MAGINMARM Opal, 14.11.1898
QBDM-MR-MF 1897 1897/00221 AH MOI Jimmy, Maggie, 8.08.1898
QBDM-MR-MF 1898 1898/001174 AH FAT MORKS, HOLLANDS Birdalane, 3.06.1899
QBDM-MR-MF 1898 1898/001179 YOUNG James, DYKES Bella, 1898
QBDM-MR-MF 1898 1898/001801 AH QUEE, AH FOO Rosie, 30.03.1899
QBDM-MR-MF 1898 1898/00212 AH QUAY, Annie, 27.05.1899
QBDM-MR-MF 1899 1899/000242 AH KEE James NG KEE, YET FOY Margaret, 4.10.1899
QBDM-MR-MF 1899 1899/000649 WAY DICK William, AH POON Agnes, 10.08.1899
QBDM-MR-MF 1899 1899/000649 AH YOUNG Tommy, WEYFAR/WEYFER Maria, 24.11.1899
QBDM-MR-MF 1899 1899/001801 AH QUEE, AH FOO Rosie, 30.03.1899
QBDM-MR-MF 1899 1899/001801 AH FOO Henry Sydney, MURPHY Katherine Aline, 1898
QBDM-MR-MF 1899 1899/001914 AH SIN Joseph, MUTH/MORNING/MITCH Annie, 23.11.1898
QBDM-MR-MF 1899 1899/001914 AH YOUNG Tommy, WEYFAR/WEYFER Maria, 24.11.1898
QBDM-MR-MF 1899 1899/002262 JOYCE Peter, AH YON Mary, 09.07.1898
QBDM-MR-MF 1899 1899/002313 AH HOUSSAN, Dolly, 25.05.1899
QBDM-MR-MF 1899 315 CHIN CHOY, MULGRAM Nelly, 1898
QBDM-MR-MF 1899 1899/001801 AH QUEE, AH FOO Rosie, 30.03.1898
QBDM-MR-MF 1899 1899/00212 AH QUAY, Annie, 27.05.1898
QBDM-MR-MF 1899 1899/000649 TAYLOR Walter, AH WAN Elizabeth Annie, 3.02.1899
QBDM-MR-MF 1899 1899/000649 PANG YOUNG/ Pang Muen Young, BEECHLEY Annie, 1899
QBDM-MR-MF 1899 1899/001432 MITCHELL Patrick, AH CHIN Sarah, 22.11.1899
QBDM-MR-MF 1899 1899/5.000242 AH KEE James NG KEE, YET FOY Margaret, 4.10.1899
QBDM-MR-MF 1899 1899/5.000242
QBDM-MR-MF 1899 1899/000375  MUNSON, AH BOW Ellen Bridget Florence, 14.03.1899
QBDM-MR-MF 1899 1899/000232  AH FONG, Lizzie, 2.06.1899
QBDM-MR-MF 1899 1899/000514  LEE KOO, SEE CHONG HOMES Elizabeth, 3.6.1899
QBDM-MR-MF 1899 1899/000162  AH LONG Thomas, DON PON Eliza, 7.11.1899
QBDM-MR-MF 1900 1900/000218  AH MOOK John, KASHIYAMA Onatsu, 15.05.1900
QBDM-MR-MF 1900 1900/000162  AHMAT Charlie, JOHNSON Bridget, 15.06.1899
QBDM-MR-MF 1900 1900/000162  AH FOO Charles Frederick, TIDY Harriet Elizabeth, 28.03.1900
QBDM-MR-MF 1900 1900/001247  GEE WAH, TI YU, 28.06.1900
QBDM-MR-MF 1900 1900/000032  BAUER Joseph Anton, AH WAN Florence Maud, 25.10.1900
QBDM-MR-MF 1901 1901/000279  HIE SAM, MARSHALL Katherine Caroline, 07.02.1900
QBDM-MR-MF 1901 1901/000283  CHEN FONG YAN, AH HEE Georgina, 29.07.1901
QBDM-MR-MF 1901 1901/000288  SUN SHUM LEE, HEE SUM, 12.06.1901
QBDM-MR-MF 1901 1901/000296  CHAN TINCHIN, TINAH YIN, 7.10.1901
QBDM-MR-MF 1901 1901/000285  AH LIN Jimmy, MA SEE, 26.08.1901
QBDM-MR-MF 1901 1901/000270  GOON GOO, Kitty, 04.10.1901
QBDM-MR-MF 1901 1901/000270  TOM SEE POY/TAAM SZE PUI, TUE CHUNG HAN
SEE /POY CHIU CHAN HAN, 01.07.1901
QBDM-MR-MF 1901 1901/000166  AH MAN, Lucy, 04.03.1901
QBDM-MR-MF 1901 1901/000449  AH YOU Jimmy, AH GOW Lillie, 18.10.1901
QBDM-MR-MF 1901 1901/000454  FOOK MEE FOOK, MOON QUEN /QUIN, 28.11.1901
QBDM-MR-MF 1901 1901/001478  AH NUM, Maggie, 16.12.1901
QBDM-MR-MF 1901 1901/001478  SEE SAM KEE, CASEY Theresa, 02.04.1901
QBDM-MR-MF 1901 1901/001464  SHOW PAN, FONG SEE, 27.11.1901
QBDM-MR-MF 1901 1901/001308  QUAY SUE WAH, CHOONG TONG HING, 11.09.01
QBDM-MR-MF 1901 1901/000870  CHAN MARK William, AH GIN Margaret Jane, 25.02.1901
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QBDM-MR-MF</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>000140</td>
<td>CHING SUM / C.S. HOP KEE, SIN SEE, 06.12.1901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>001417</td>
<td>BUE OM BUE/OM BUE, FENNER Charlotte Bertha, 16.01.1901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>000282</td>
<td>KUM YUCK Tommy, LUM SEE, 15.08.1901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>002357</td>
<td>SAM LAN, Fanny, 1.10.1901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>000840</td>
<td>KEE Charlie, MEE HOW, 23.09.1901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>000061</td>
<td>POON Charley, TANNA Mina, 05.02.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>000895</td>
<td>McLEOD Alexander, AH CHAY Loretto, 2.04.1901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>001940</td>
<td>AH LIM, LONG Maude Elizabeth, 12.03.1901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>000454</td>
<td>AH NUM Tommy, Maggie, 16.12.1901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>000259</td>
<td>JAN SEE CHIN, AH YOUNG Maud, 18.02.1902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>000255</td>
<td>WONG FONG, LON SEE, 10.03.1902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>000246</td>
<td>SAM SING, GUE LUN, 14.01.1902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>000278</td>
<td>HUSSEY Gilbert Frank, AH CHING Evelyn, 15.05.1902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>000265</td>
<td>AH TONG, AH WARN /LEONG AH WAN, 6.04.1902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>000379</td>
<td>LAI FOOK, YONG LEONG Mary, 17.05.1902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>000249</td>
<td>JONG QUAN POW/JONG QUAN PO, LEONG GEE, 02.01.1902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>000402</td>
<td>WONG SEE HOE, AH TIY /LUN WAI MUI, 22.07.1902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>000403</td>
<td>AH SAM, YUN SAM, 22.07.1902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>002052</td>
<td>TAI YET HING, WONG SHEE, 14.05.1902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>001363</td>
<td>METCALFE Christopher, AH MOOK Evelina, 19.10.1902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>001898</td>
<td>CHAN LOW, SEE AH, 11.06.1902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td>000262</td>
<td>CHIN AH COY, LAM SEE/ LEE CHONG, 01.07.1902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td>000704</td>
<td>KWONG SANG, AH ENG LONG, 7.10.1902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td>000355</td>
<td>AH LEE, Biddy, 20.06.1902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td>002229</td>
<td>AH ONE Charles, DONE Mary Elizabeth, 01.05.1902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td>000157</td>
<td>HEE George, Dinah, 9.04.1902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td>000539</td>
<td>MOW Patrick, COSTIGAN Elizabeth, 09.01.1902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td>000020</td>
<td>WALSH James, AH BEN Mabel Jessie Turnbull, 22.10.1902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td>000252</td>
<td>LEE CHIN, AH LIE YOUNG/ AH LIE YOUNG AH TIE, 07.02.1903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QBDM-MR-MF</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td>000253</td>
<td>TAM GEE WAH, SAN GOCH LAN, 11.02.1903</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QBDM-MR-MF 1903 1903/000397  AH SING Charlie, AH SAM Helen / Ellen, 14.10.1903
QBDM-MR-MF 1903 1903/000299  CHEN QUING BOO, AH FOO Margaret, 14.09.1903
QBDM-MR-MF 1903 1903/B002989  HOW CHIN Charley, LIN FAY, 29.12/1903
QBDM-MR-MF 1903 1903/002132  MAR GEE, AH GANG, 17.12.1903
QBDM-MR-MF 1903 1903/B002721  CULVERHOUSE Clement George, AH SAM Catherine, 13.08.1903
QBDM-MR-MF 1903 1903/001/898  AH MAT, GEATA Flora, 17.01.1903
QBDM-MR-MF 1903 1903/000050  HEE Tommy, MARTIN Annie Hilda, 11.06.1903
QBDM-MR-MF 1903 1903/002204  AH MAN, TUN WAH Amelia, 12.05.1903
QBDM-MR-MF 1903 1903/001777  AH KEE, AH QUCE Rosie, 12.06.1903
QBDM-MR-MF 1904 1904/000410  FAT KEE, LEU SEE (LI HA), 14.10.1904
QBDM-MR-MF 1904 1904/000406  CHIN HOCKTEIN, AH KIEN, 13.07.1904
QBDM-MR-MF 1904 1904/000407  ONE KING, GOO MAY/MAY GOO, 13.07.1904
QBDM-MR-MF 1904 1904/000409  AH LIN, CHOY YING, 14.10.1904
QBDM-MR-MF 1904 1904/001986  WAH SANG, LIN FAH, 18.04.1904
QBDM-MR-MF 1904 1904/000161  AH GIM, Minnie, 13.02.1904
QBDM-MR-MF 1904 1904/000208  POOK Percy William, CAHILL Mary, 11.02.1904
QBDM-MR-MF 1905 1905/B003824  SHAY Bernard, CRUIKSHANK Elizabeth Grey, 24.04.1905
QBDM-MR-MF 1905 1905/003947  YIT SUEY, GRANT Georgina, 12.06.1905
QBDM-MR-MF 1905 1905/002052  AH MOO Charles Joseph, MORAN Kate, 30/01.1905
QBDM-MR-MF 1905 1905/000466  AH SAM Thomas, MASTERS Lily Ada, 04.11.05
QBDM-MR-MF 1905 1905/000455  SPRING Philip Walter Johnson, AH SAM Alice, 12.07.1905
| QBDM-MR-MF  | 1906 | 1906/B004320 | AH FOO, ALBERTSON Beatrice May Fedora, 31.01.1906 |
| QBDM-MR-MF  | 1906 | 1906/B004392 | LEE CHONG, LOW SEE, 27.02.1906 |
| QBDM-MR-MF  | 1906 | 1906/000038 | AH YOU, MAH HING Mary, 14.04.1906 |
| QBDM-MR-MF  | 1906 | 1906/001661 | AMOUK, COLLINS Norah, 20.10.1906 |
| QBDM-MR-MF  | 1906 | 1906/000348 | ANDERSON Frederick McComb, AH YOU Emma, 24.04.1906 |
| QBDM-MR-MF  | 1906 | 1906/001526 | CHOY Willie, LARSEN/LARSINE Christina, 1.11.1906 |
| QBDM-MR-MF  | 1906 | 1906/001591 | TONGUE Charles, CHANNELLER Maude, 14.07.1906 |
| QBDM-MR-MF  | 1906 | 1906/001841 | WONG GONG, Lizzie, 14.06.1906 |
| QBDM-MR-MF  | 1906 | 1906/001409 | AH KONG Jim, FEDORA Beatrice May, 23.01.1907 |
| QBDM-MR-MF  | 1907 | 1907/B005348 | CHIN Charlie, EDGAR Ethel Alice, 14.03.1907 |
| QBDM-MR-MF  | 1907 | 1907/B005803 | LOW FOON, BUN Elizabeth, 23.08.1907 |
| QBDM-MR-MF  | 1907 | 1907/B005829 | BATES George, AH GIN Ada Elizabeth, 21.08.1907 |
| QBDM-MR-MF  | 1907 | 1907/B05228 | AH KONG Jim, FEDORA Beatrice May, 23.01.1907 |
| QBDM-MR-MF  | 1907 | 1907/001758 | JON LEE, THICK Annie Isadora, 24.07.1907 |
| QBDM-MR-MF  | 1907 | 1907/001940 | SOLOMON John, AHOO Elizabeth, 7.03.1907 |
| QBDM-MR-MF  | 1908 | 1908/001016 | MARNOCCH David, AH CHOW Elizabeth Francis, 6.06.1908 |
| QBDM-MR-MF  | 1908 | 1908/000460 | LEE ON, AH MOY KWONG, 2.11.1908 |
| QBDM-MR-MF  | 1908 | 1908/002775 | LEE WOOD George, AH FOY Christina Mary, 20.10.1908 |
| QBDM-MR-MF  | 1908 | 1908/B006673 | JANG CHONG HOON, HAY Minnie Ada, 14.07.1908 |
| QBDM-MR-MF  | 1908 | 1908/B007085 | LEE KOO James, GORDON Elizabeth Jane, 2.12.1908 |
| QBDM-MR-MF  | 1908 | 1908/001563 | AH MIT / AH MAT, GUNDA Louisa, 14.02.1908 |
| QBDM-MR-MF  | 1908 | 1908/002226 | AH MOO Charles Joseph, MILLS Albertina, 21.09.1908 |
| QBDM-MR-MF  | 1908 | 1908/000393 | CHONG Tommy, AH QUOM Sarah, 17.11.1908 |
| QBDM-MR-MF  | 1909 | 1909/B007168 | YOUNG Walter, AH FOOV Elizabeth Alice, 30.12.1908 |
SUE SEE Charlie, AH SING Beatrice, 02.12.1909
HEWETSON William John, AH HEE Susan, 25.03.1909
AH GEIM MAY FUM/FUM Theresa May 15.02.1909
BING CHEW Tommy, AH SOO Minnie, 11.09.1909
AH GAIN Thomas, AH COW Rose, 23.12.1909
YONG FAT Charlie, AH GEE Ethel, 17.06.1909
AH LIN Jimmy, COE Harriet, 11.12.1909
AH SAM/AH SAM AH SAM, Wari Yegami, 08.05.1909
SEE CHIN, HOY HIP, 25.01.1910
SAM YAPP William, HURLEY Mary Bridget, 20.01.1909
MASON William James, AH CHING Georgina Mamuier, 16.11.1909
LOW LEONG James, AH KAY Mary Ellen Cecilia, 13.05.1909
AH GEE, FONG Mary Ann, 14.12.1910
AH YEN Jimmy, KEMPSON Katie, 15.08.1910
TIM SEE FOO, AH SAM Annie, 26.09.1910
QUONG CHONG, AH FOY Maud, 15.02.1910
AH SEE William Henry, AH FOY Susan Grace, 21.04.1910
AH MOW Thomas, BALL Annie, 20.09.1910
AH CHAY Stephen, HEMMLING Laetitia Emilina, 5.01.1910
GLASSON Lister/Lisle Walton, AH BEN Rosanna, 20.08.1910
ALBRIGHT Thomas Andrew, AHCHOW Annie May, 08.02.1911
YIN Jim, SUE SEE, 27.02.1911
GARVEY James Henry Christopher, AH LOY Margaret, 6.02.1911
NAKASHIMA Itaro, AH FOY Ellen, 25.05.1911
ii.) Death Register – Microfiche (QBDM-DR-MF)

QBDM-DR-MF 1859 1859/001813 Susan SHING
QBDM-DR-MF 1868 1868/002322 William AH YEEN
QBDM-DR-MF 1871 1871/000848 Ann AH SAM
QBDM-DR-MF 1871 1871/000851 AH HING
QBDM-DR-MF 1871 1871 Mary Ann AH FONG
QBDM-DR-MF 1872 1872/001270 Mary AH CHING
QBDM-DR-MF 1874 1874/001045 James HING
Louisa LING
Janey SING
Margaret SUE FERN
unnamed male baby GOE
unnamed male baby SAM ACHY
Tommy PAT GIN
Unnamed child AH THONG
Samuel Arthur WING
Jimmy AH FOO
Edgar HOW
Samuel William LIN
Ivy CHY NAN
Emily AH SAM ZEE
Alfred LEE QUONG
Mary Louise S
Selina SING
Flora Gin SIN
Mary CHENLY
Ah ONE
Ellen Norah CHONG
William YOUNG SING
Henry FAT AH FAT
Annies AH LUI/LIN
Frederick Ernest SUE
Catherine AH FOO
AH BOW
Ellen FAW HOP
William AH BOO
Tommy AH FAT
AH BOW
Annie AH SAM
AH FAT SAM
QBDM-DR-MF 1898 1898/010028 May AFFOO
QBDM-DR-MF 1898 1898/004662 unnamed (m) AH SAM
QBDM-DR-MF 1900 1900/003396 Charles Henry AH CHEE
QBDM-DR-MF 1900 1900/000805 Herbert Low Key MING
QBDM-DR-MF 1903 1903/003339 Herbert Key MING
QBDM-DR-MF 1908 1908/003339 Willie AH FOO
QBDM-DR-MF 1911 1911/005040 William Hector AH SING

iii.) Birth Register – Microfiche (QBDM-BR-MF)
QBDM-BR-MF 1847 Robert WING
QBDM-BR-MF 1859 1859/001571 Albert HOW
QBDM-BR-MF 1860 1860/000540 Samuel Thomas CHEEK
QBDM-BR-MF 1865 1865/000410 James CHI TAN
QBDM-BR-MF 1865 1866/001550 Agnes AH PAN
QBDM-BR-MF 1865 1865/000983 James MOW
QBDM-BR-MF 1865 1865/000077 Annie HING
QBDM-BR-MF 1866 1866/00221 William LING
QBDM-BR-MF 1866 1866/001435 Ann Jane GHEE James
QBDM-BR-MF 1867 1867/001816 Joseph AH JUNG
QBDM-BR-MF 1867 1867/001537 William Lawrence TONG
QBDM-BR-MF 1868 1868/002287 John SUE
QBDM-BR-MF 1868 1868/001474 Honora LEE
QBDM-BR-MF 1868 1869/001587 George AH PAT
QBDM-BR-MF 1869 1869/002425 Emma TAN WATT
QBDM-BR-MF 1870 1870/000565 Charles William WAY James
QBDM-BR-MF 1871 1871/003607 Esther AUNG SAM YAUP
QBDM-BR-MF 1871 1871/003009 Henry KIM William
QBDM-BR-MF 1871 1872/000364 Ian KIN
QBDM-BR-MF 1871 1871/003051 Mary Matilda Catherine AH REN
QBDM-BR-MF 1872 1872/000166 Mary Ann AH YET
QBDM-BR-MF 1872 1872/002659 Thomas AH YOU
QBDM-BR-MF  1872  1873/000002  Mary KYE
QBDM-BR-MF  1872  1872/00395  Charles Frederick YAN
QBDM-BR-MF  1873  1873/000587  Albert AH PIN
QBDM-BR-MF  1873  1873/002490  William AH SIN
QBDM-BR-MF  1874  1874/004601  Kate SING
QBDM-BR-MF  1874  1874/003433  Amoy Henry JYE
QBDM-BR-MF  1875  1875/003123  Alexander YEEN TUNG
QBDM-BR-MF  1875  1875/00446&1875/00044 Charles Alyung and Samuel Foong FOU/
QBDM-BR-MF  1875  1875/003579  Richard Davis LEON
QBDM-BR-MF  1876  1876/005290  Patrick Martin LEE CHUNG
QBDM-BR-MF  1877  1877/000654  Lote Toy HING WONG
QBDM-BR-MF  1877  1877/00676  Sue To You CHUNG
QBDM-BR-MF  1877  1877/003217  Bridget LEE LAN
QBDM-BR-MF  1878  1878/003381  Lai Foo TAI WAROO
QBDM-BR-MF  1878  1878/003426  Amy Louisa TONG
QBDM-BR-MF  1881  1881/003793  Edith AH SAM
QBDM-BR-MF  1880  1880/000829  James AH KOY
QBDM-BR-MF  1881  1881/003194  Phillip FOY
QBDM-BR-MF  1882  1882/006252  Catherine Jane HONG
QBDM-BR-MF  1882  1882/004864  Mathilda LINGS
QBDM-BR-MF  1883  1883/005422  Ada LONG
QBDM-BR-MF  1883  1883/000708  Laura SAM
QBDM-BR-MF  1883  1883/00482  James AH SING
QBDM-BR-MF  1883  1883/0074249  Hang James FOO
QBDM-BR-MF  1883  1883/007248  Elizabeth Kate SING QUAY
QBDM-BR-MF  1884  1884/007897  Frances Elizabeth WONG KANG
QBDM-BR-MF  1884  1884/001620  See LOO CHAN YOU
QBDM-BR-MF  1884  1884/005175  Annie Elizabeth YEBON
QBDM-BR-MF  1884  1884/004274  Sarah Jane AH SEE
QBDM-BR-MF  1884  1884/004278  James Sydney Edgar FOY
QBDM-BR-MF 1884 1884/001206 Gua COWALL
QBDM-BR-MF 1884 1884/005819 Jim TUNG CHU
QBDM-BR-MF 1885 1885/004942 Jack VIN
QBDM-BR-MF 1885 Maude WING
QBDM-BR-MF 1885 1885/00553 Fanny AH SUE
QBDM-BR-MF 1885 1885/000027 Ernest Sam WAH SAM
QBDM-BR-MF 1885 1885/005709 Florence May HIE
QBDM-BR-MF 1885 1885/000706 Frank Cheu Yuen Bong CHEU WAUGH
QBDM-BR-MF 1886 1886/009346 Bernard BOW
QBDM-BR-MF 1886 1886/003509 William Frederick Low CHEU
QBDM-BR-MF 1886 1886/005314 Peter SHUE
QBDM-BR-MF 1886 1886/000644 Sarah LING
QBDM-BR-MF 1887 1887/010476 Harry WHANG HOWRA Harry
QBDM-BR-MF 1888 1888/011547 William AH FOU
QBDM-BR-MF 1888 1888/011784 William HOW
QBDM-BR-MF 1888 1936/008503 Anna Beatrice SAM (late register)
QBDM-BR-MF 1891 1891/002172&1891/002171 Alfred and Charles AH MAT/AHMET
QBDM-BR-MF 1891 1891/000189 Alfred AH YOUNG
QBDM-BR-MF 1892 1906/000946MB Fred AH YOE
QBDM-BR-MF 1892 1892/011034 George AH TOO
QBDM-BR-MF 1895 1895/010429 William Ernest AH QUEE
QBDM-BR-MF 1895 1895/010825 Yat Foon AH HOO
QBDM-BR-MF 1897 Margaret AH ZUEE
QBDM-BR-MF 1898 1900/001119 LR Willie AH DUCK (late register)
QBDM-BR-MF 1898 1898/006670 Sophia AH LIN
QBDM-BR-MF 1899 1899/008940 Sim Choy AH GEE / AH KEE
QBDM-BR-MF 1900 1900/001711 Ruby Beatrice AH MOON
QBDM-BR-MF 1901 1901/001428 Eva Maud AH SHEW
QBDM-BR-MF 1901 1901/002818 Tommy AH HOW
QBDM-BR-MF 1901 1901/004325 May Agnes AH PAN
QBDM-BR-MF 1902 1902/001601 Alma AFFOO
QBDM-BR-MF 1905 1905/001925 Agnes Maria AH FOO
QBDM-BR-MF 1905 1905/000801 William AH GOW
QBDM-BR-MF 1906 1906/000061 Elsie Beatrice AH QUEE
QBDM-BR-MF 1907 1907/010038 Harold AH GOW CHANG SAM
QBDM-BR-MF 1907 1907/007326 Joseph William BARNES
QBDM-BR-MF 1909 1909/000132 John Oliver AH WAN
QBDM-BR-MF 1909 1909/002475 Jane AH QUAN
QBDM-BR-MF 1911 1911/010764 Alvera Patresa Wall mother Gertrude AH SANG
QBDM-BR-MF 1913 1913/000194 Walter AH WAN
QBDM-BR-MF 1914 1914/000709 James AH LUN

b.) *Queensland -Births Deaths and Marriages (QBDM) Online (ONL)*

i.) *Marriage Register*  QBDM-MR-ONL

QBDM-ONL: 1874 C571 Thomas Sin Kin (Lim Kin) and Naomi Brittain
QBDM-ONL: 1875C72 See Wah Ah Nee and Elizabeth Ann Thomas
QBDM-ONL: 1876 C442 Lam Pan and Mary Jane McDonnell
QBDM-ONL: 1877 B5701 James Underwood and Kate Connelly
QBDM-ONL: 1881 C159 Tommy Ah Cum and Alice Keyes
QBDM-ONL: 1884 C858 Sarah Maloney and William Lam Pan
QBDM-ONL: 1885 C321 Emily Ann Henly and Ah Foo
QBDM-ONL: 1885C297 Annie Holland and William Ah Chee
QBDM-ONL: 1890 C1208 Eliza Hing and Willie Que Fook
QBDM-ONL: 1892 C1041 Sam Fong and Mary Ann McKey
QBDM-ONL: 1892 C1041 Sam Fong and Mary Ann McKey (second marriage)
QBDM-ONL: 1892 C882 Kate McEnroe and Charley Ah Foo
QBDM-ONL: 1892 C1087 Charlotte Hing and Tommy Chai Hong
QBDM-ONL: 1894 C660 Chun Tie and Qui Fa
QBDM-ONL: 1897 C300 Jessie Hing and Tam Sie
QBDM-ONL: 1899 C232 Ah Fong and Lizzie
QBDM-ONL: 1900 C218 John Ah Mook and Kashijama Onatsu
QBDM-ONL: 1901 C166 Ah Man and Lucy
QBDM-ONL: 1910 C448 Sou and Annie Sou
QBDM-ONL: 1912 C289 Maggie and Charlie Ah Chong
QBDM-ONL: 1915 C3232 Bessie Sam and Tommy Ning
QBDM-ONL: 1915 C2274 Charles Sing and Gwendoline Mary Look Hop
QBDM-ONL: 1924 C192 Zilla Erba and Joseph Casey
QBDM-ONL: 1925 C2206 Nellie Casey and Rupert Daly Lee
QBDM-ONL: C3014 Clim Ye Dak, otherwise known as Ah Wing, and Dora Ah Fat
QBDM-ONL: C3016/1862 Chin A, and Sarah, NSW, Sofala
QBDM-ONL: 1930 George Henry Sue and May Henrietta James
QBDM-ONL: Harry Chun Tie and Dolly Houn Lae
QBDM-ONL: William Lum Mow and Agnes Hubertine Bruer
QBDM-ONL: George Chun Tie and Ann Yun Gil
QBDM-ONL: George Chun Tie (second marriage) and Ivy Grace Wong
QBDM-ONL: 1918 C1888 Bow and Kup

ii.) Death Register QBDM-DR-ONL
QBDM-DR-ONL: 1896 C441 Kate Connelly
QBDM-DR-ONL: 1882 C1606 Ada Maria Postill
QBDM-DR-ONL: 1892 C408 Kate Ah Muck
QBDM-DR-ONL: 1901 C166 Lucy Ah Man
QBDM-DR-ONL: 1917 C724 Antonia Law Yee nee Salkieurisz
QBDM-DR-ONL: 1952 C/1650 John Chong Man Foo

iii.) Birth Register QBDM-BR-ONL
QBDM-BR-ONL: 1854 BBP2678 Robert Wing
QBDM-BR-ONL: 1854 BBP295 David Wing
QBDM-BR-ONL: 1854 BBP354 William Wing
QBDM-BR-ONL: 1863 Emily Mary
QBDM-BR-ONL: 1875 C2837 Milly Liy Lee
QBDM-BR-ONL: 1875 C2844 Sarah Ah Chin
QBDM-BR-ONL: 1877 C654 Loie Toy Hing
QBDM-BR-ONL: 1878 B23682 James Underwood
QBDM-BR-ONL: 1881 C6292 Mary Ann Ah Ming
QBDM-BR-ONL: 1882 C3861 Ada Maria Postill
QBDM-BR-ONL: 1883 C6616 Melend Ah Fun
QBDM-BR-ONL: 1883 C6617 Quon Chong Ah Fun
QBDM-BR-ONL: 1886 C752 Kate (twin) Connelly
QBDM-BR-ONL: 1886 C753 Mary (twin) Connely
QBDM-BR-ONL: 1886 C9346 Bernard Kong Bow
QBDM-BR-ONL: 1888 C7138 William Kong Bow
QBDM-BR-ONL: 1892 C969 Kate Ah Muck
QBDM-BR-ONL: 1895 C12840 John Peters
QBDM-BR-ONL: 1896 C6289 Bessie Lin
QBDM-BR-ONL: 1900 C171, Ruby Beatrice Ah Moon
QBDM-BR-ONL: 1900 C6227 George Lun
QBDM-BR-ONL: 1901 C6300 Gem Lum Kee
QBDM-BR-ONL: 1901 C6790 Lee Hem Lee Gow
QBDM-BR-ONL: 1902 C2109 Dolly Ah Sin

Queensland -Births, Deaths and Marriages – Family History (QBDM-FH)

NOTE: Hardcopy provided by families and other individuals- loose sheets: (LS)  QBDM-FH-LS

QBDM-FH 1890, Birth Register, Cecilia Violet 26.11.1890  hardcopy original, Burke District 1890/898 AH FOO HENLY Emily 1890
QBDM-FH 1890, Birth Register, Alice 28.11.1890 hardcopy original, Burke District 1891/895 AH CHEE William HOLLAND Annie 1890
QBDM-FH 1890, Birth Register, Beatrice Eveline 4.12.1890 hardcopy original, Burke District 1890/899 AH SING James BLACK Minnie 1890
QBDM-FH 1898, Birth Register, Robert Samuel 26.03.1898 hardcopy original, 1918/01397 AH SAM Louie (Aboriginal [sic]) 1898
QBDM-FH 1900, Birth Register, Annie 20.09.1900 hardcopy original, 1918/01400 AH MOI Jimmy Maggie (half caste Aboriginal [sic]) 1900
QBDM-FH 1901, Birth Register, Nellie 18.04.1901 hardcopy original, 1918/01399 AH SAM Louie (Aboriginal [sic]) 1901
QBDM-FH 1905, Birth Register, Kitty 26.03.1905 hardcopy original, 1918/01402 AH MOI Jimmy Maggie (half caste Aboriginal [sic]) 1905
QBDM-FH 1907, Birth Register, George 18/01/1907 hardcopy original, 1918/01403 AH MOI Jimmy Maggie (half caste Aboriginal [sic]) 1907

QBDM-FH 1907, Birth Register, Charlie 20.07.1902 hardcopy original, 1918/01401 AH MOI Jimmy Maggie (half caste Aboriginal [sic]) 1907

QBDM-FH 1910, Birth Register, George 29.03.1910 hardcopy original, 1918/01399 AH SAM Louie (Aboriginal [sic]) 1910

QBDM-FH 1871 Death Register, Hardcopy original sighted 1871/000848 AH SAM Ann, 1871

QBDM-FH 1915 Death Register, Hardcopy original sighted 1915 C460/5227015, HANN Charley

QBDM-FH 1929 Death Register, Hardcopy original sighted, 1929/C4108 GEE OHY Jimmy, Cloncurry, 1929

QBDM-FH 1932 Death Register, Hardcopy original sighted 1932/C3788 SAM AH BOWLawn Hill

QBDM-FH 1955 Death Register, Hardcopy original sighted 1955/368/1773 AH GOW Tommy

QBDM-FH 1961 Death Register, hardcopy, 1961/C370/1 HOOK Yuen Kim Cloncurry 1961

QBDM-FH 1979 Death Register, Hardcopy original sighted 1979/523/6956 AH GOW GeorgeNormanton

QBDM-FH: 1898 Marriage Register 8. 08. 1898Hardcopy original, Burke District 1898/221 AH MOI Jimmy and Maggie (Aboriginal half-caste [sic])

QBDM-FH 1900 Marriage Register, 22.02.1900 hardcopy 1900/777 AH LOW Tommy and Dora 1900

QBDM-FH 1901 Marriage Register, 16 .12.1901 hardcopy 1901/454 AH NUM Tommy and Maggie

QBDM-FH 1914 Marriage Register 20/01/1914 hardcopy original, Burke District, 1914/303, AH MANN (widower) and AH QUAY Sarah 1914

QBDM-FH 1923 Marriage Register 10/01/1923, Hardcopy Original, Burke District 1891/895 WATSON GeorgeWilliam and AH QUEY Sadie1923

QBDM-FH-LS 1884, 84/000333. Marriage Certificate of Ah Hoin and Jane Lothian


Historical Surveys and Plans
Accessed by permission from Department of Environment and Heritage 2005-2013

Atherton
RP702464, 1902
Atherton
RP702465, 1903
Atherton
NR5026, 1968
Atherton, Chinese Hut
N15728, 1882
Atherton, Chinese Huts
N157319, 1887
Atherton, Cultivation, N157326, 1886
Burketown, B1364, 1884
Burketown, B1365, 1884
Burketown, B13611, 1895
Burketown, IS71790, 1978

Cairns, Edge Hill, C19810, 1877
Cairns, Edge Hill, N157222, 1885
Cairns, Edge Hill, C153131, 1886
Cairns, Edge Hill, C19842, 1899
Cairns, Edge Hill, AH CHING, C157276, 1883
Cairns, Edge Hill, AH CHING, RP7183888, 1961
Cairns, Edge Hill, AH HON, RP70958, 1937
Cairns, Edge Hill, AH HON, C153287, 1891
Cairns, Edge Hill, AH HON, RP701462, 1914
Cairns, Edge Hill, Botanic Gardens, C157275, 1883
Cairns, Edge Hill, S. AH CHING, NR339, 1907
Cairns, Redlynch, C157231, 1883
Cairns, Redlynch, RP703137, 1886
Cairns, Redlynch, C153203, 1887
Cairns, Redlynch, C153289, 1891
Cairns, Redlynch, RP703155, 1905
Cairns, Sachs Street, C19820, 1885
Cairns, Stratford, Chinese garden, 87 NR1384
Cairns, Stratford, Chinese garden, N157362, 1888
Cairns, Stratford, Lily Bank, N157472, 1891

Camooweal, C3933, 1895
Camooweal, C3932, 1896
Camooweal, C3934, 1914
Camooweal, W04, 1917
Camooweal, W013, 1948
Camooweal, Chinese Gardens, C3931, 1888

Carrington, K103619, 1892
Carrington, N157522, 1894
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carrington</td>
<td>MPH24785, 1909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrington</td>
<td>MPH24793, 1909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrington, Chinese Gardens</td>
<td>C2921, 1884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charters Towers, Bluff Road</td>
<td>CT1822, 1874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charters Towers, Bluff Road</td>
<td>MPH21012, 1892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charters Towers, Bluff Road</td>
<td>MPH21129, 1896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charters Towers, Bluff Road</td>
<td>MPH1144, 1914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charters Towers, Bluff Road</td>
<td>MPH 13536, 1894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charters Towers, Brilliant Deeps, CH garden</td>
<td>MPH 13708, 1899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charters Towers, Deane Street</td>
<td>CT1824, 1872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charters Towers, Deane Street</td>
<td>RP700196, 1876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charters Towers, Deane Street</td>
<td>CT18217, 1878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charters Towers, Deane Street</td>
<td>CT18218, 1878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charters Towers, Deane Street</td>
<td>CT18227, 1881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charters Towers, Lee Street</td>
<td>CT1824, 1876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charters Towers, Lee Street</td>
<td>RP720880, 1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charters Towers, Mossman Street</td>
<td>RP700193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charters Towers, Mossman Street</td>
<td>CT1824, 1872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charters Towers, Mossman Street</td>
<td>CT18227, 1881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charters Towers, Mossman Street</td>
<td>RP700192, 1891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charters Towers, Mossman Street</td>
<td>RP720880, 1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charters Towers, Mossman Street</td>
<td>CT182115, 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charters Towers, SWEE SANG</td>
<td>20248, GFH.80, 1878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charters Towers, SUE FONG</td>
<td>20237, GFH. 75, 1878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charters Towers, HONG SHING PONG</td>
<td>13015, RA.2579 1893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charters Towers, AH FOO Jimmy</td>
<td>00320, GFH2774, 1892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charters Towers, SIN ON LEE</td>
<td>13013 RA. 2571, 1893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charters Towers, AH POO</td>
<td>13006, RA. 2568, 1893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charters Towers, AH HON</td>
<td>13005, RA. 2569, 1893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charters Towers, L &amp; S. AH CHIN</td>
<td>13565, RA 3525,1893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charters Towers, CHINAMAN</td>
<td>00582, GFL.4108, 1894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charters Towers, Minni TANG YEE</td>
<td>00575, GFL. 4106,1894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charters Towers, GA. AH SAM</td>
<td>21159, GFL. 5046, 1896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charters Towers, LUM SIK; AH KEE</td>
<td>01197, RA. 2671, 1896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charters Towers, E. WONG SHUN</td>
<td>08900, GFL..5062.98, 1896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charters Towers, Charlie AH SING</td>
<td>00653, GFL.4676, 1896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charters Towers, CHINAMAN HUT</td>
<td>00720, GFL. 4539, 1897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charters Towers, Sam Street, JIM SANG</td>
<td>13080 RA. 2685, 1898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charters Towers, LUM SIK</td>
<td>13097, RA, 2684, 1898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charters Towers, AH FUNG</td>
<td>13083, RA. 1506 1899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charters Towers, CHINAMAN GARDEN</td>
<td>MA. 41 1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charters Towers, Brisk Street</td>
<td>13097, R.A. 2703.4.5 1901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charters Towers, George HING</td>
<td>00821, GFL.6689, 1901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charters Towers, S.TANGYEE</td>
<td>01018, MHL.4150, 1907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charters Towers, CHINAMANS GRDN</td>
<td>01022, GFL.7433 1907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charters Towers, CHINAMAN</td>
<td>01038, GFL. 7567 1908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charters Towers, S. TANG YEE</td>
<td>01018, GFL. 7385, 1908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charters Towers, C. PHI</td>
<td>01083, 7764 GFL. 1910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charters Towers, E.WONG SHUN</td>
<td>01093, GFL. 7803.4, 1911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charters Towers, CHINESE GARDEN</td>
<td>13766, GFL 7867, 1911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charters Towers, AH TUNG</td>
<td>13780, MGA. 225/230, 1913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charters Towers, E.WONG SHUN</td>
<td>01146, MHL, 7986, 1914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charters Towers, SAM LEE</td>
<td>01320, MGA 246, 1923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charters Towers, CHINESE GARDEN</td>
<td>01353, MPH 9218, 1927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charters Towers, BLUFF ROAD</td>
<td>21012, GFL 2813, 1892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charters Towers, AH GUI, MGA.1</td>
<td>MP16754, GFL2248, 1892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charters Towers, SAM STREET</td>
<td>13536, GFL. 2589, 1893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charters Towers, BLUFF ROAD</td>
<td>21129, MHL.21129, 1896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charters Towers, AH LIN, CHINESE GARDEN</td>
<td>MA. 171, 1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charters Towers, CHINESE GARDENS</td>
<td>MPH16731, 1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charters Towers, WONG KING</td>
<td>GML. 521, 1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charters Towers, CEMETERY</td>
<td>MP16729, 1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charters Towers, SAM STREET</td>
<td>01144, MHL.8060, 1914</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cloncurry</td>
<td>C196.4, 1883</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloncurry</td>
<td>196.5, 1883</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloncurry</td>
<td>C196.19, 1907</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloncurry</td>
<td>C196.20, 1907</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloncurry</td>
<td>C196.23 1909</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloncurry</td>
<td>C196.21, 1909</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloncurry</td>
<td>C196.20 1911</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloncurry</td>
<td>C196.27, 1934</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooktown, Charlotte Street</td>
<td>C17965</td>
<td>1882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croydon</td>
<td>MP15914</td>
<td>1888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croydon</td>
<td>MPH15915</td>
<td>1888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croydon</td>
<td>MPH22328</td>
<td>1888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croydon</td>
<td>MPH22298</td>
<td>1890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croydon</td>
<td>MPH22301</td>
<td>1891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croydon</td>
<td>SY28</td>
<td>1898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown</td>
<td>G1884</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown</td>
<td>G1885</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown</td>
<td>MPH14038</td>
<td>1882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown</td>
<td>IS204094</td>
<td>1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown</td>
<td>MPH22959</td>
<td>1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown</td>
<td>GB111</td>
<td>1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilberton</td>
<td>VR1</td>
<td>1906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilberton</td>
<td>VR3</td>
<td>1906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halifax</td>
<td>CWL 293</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halifax</td>
<td>RP703785</td>
<td>1808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halifax</td>
<td>K124395</td>
<td>1874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halifax</td>
<td>CAR12420</td>
<td>1882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halifax</td>
<td>H2841</td>
<td>1883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halifax</td>
<td>CAR124142</td>
<td>1885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halifax</td>
<td>RP703786</td>
<td>1885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halifax</td>
<td>RP703779</td>
<td>1886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halifax</td>
<td>RP703790</td>
<td>1886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halifax</td>
<td>RP703792</td>
<td>1886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halifax</td>
<td>RP703793</td>
<td>1888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halifax</td>
<td>H2843</td>
<td>1892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halifax</td>
<td>CAR124254</td>
<td>1894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halifax</td>
<td>H2842</td>
<td>1894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halifax</td>
<td>H2844</td>
<td>1895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halifax</td>
<td>H2847</td>
<td>1906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halifax</td>
<td>H2848</td>
<td>1909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halifax</td>
<td>CWL293, 1910</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halifax</td>
<td>RP703782, 1913</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halifax</td>
<td>RP709294, 1936</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halifax</td>
<td>CWL1327 1951</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halifax</td>
<td>RP14565, 1953</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halifax, adjoining Chinatown</td>
<td>RP709996,1938</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halifax, adjoining Chinatown</td>
<td>K124834, 1880</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halifax, adjoining Chinatown</td>
<td>RP703780, 1905</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halifax, adjoining Chinatown</td>
<td>RP703784, 1922</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halifax, adjoining Chinatown</td>
<td>RP703784, 1930</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halifax, Old cemetery</td>
<td>H2845, 1896</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herberton</td>
<td>H2531, 1881</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hughenden</td>
<td>H2031, 1877</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hughenden</td>
<td>RP700432, 1891</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hughenden</td>
<td>RP700434, 1892</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hughenden, Cemetery</td>
<td>C8150, 1885</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hughenden, Tie Hop shop</td>
<td>H2036, 1880</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingham</td>
<td>RP70369, 1882</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingham</td>
<td>RP703700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingham</td>
<td>K124216, 1876</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingham</td>
<td>12242V0, 1872</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingham</td>
<td>12243V0, 1881</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingham, Cordelia</td>
<td>K12498, 1877</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innisfail, Edith Street</td>
<td>I28126, 1897</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innisfail, Edith Street</td>
<td>RP710261, 1936</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innisfail, Edith Street, See Poy</td>
<td>I2812, 1884</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innisfail, Edith Street, See Poy</td>
<td>RP706804, 1925</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innisfail, Edith Street, See Poy</td>
<td>RP707397, 1926</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innisfail, Edith Street, See Poy</td>
<td>RP706804, 1927</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innisfail, Edith Street, See Poy</td>
<td>RP710838, 1941</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innisfail, Edith Street, See Poy</td>
<td>RP711731, 1946</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innisfail, Edith Street, “Joss House”</td>
<td>I28136, 1904</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innisfail, Edith Street, Tam Sie, Q. Fook</td>
<td>I28133, 1903</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Innisfail, Edith Street, Temple  I28124, 1895
Innisfail, Lily Street  I28115, 1891
Innisfail, Lily Street, precinct  I28133, 1903
Innisfail, Lily Street, precinct, Temple  RP711875, 1946
Innisfail, Owen Street  I28171, 1926
Innisfail, Owen Street  RP707772, 1926
Innisfail, See Poy  I2817, 1884
Innisfail, See Poy  RP 716736, 1956
Irvinebank  I3142, 1885

Kairi  N157169, 1885
Kairi, Huts and Barns  N1246, 1919

Mackay  M.91.2, 1863
Mackay  M.91.8, 1865
Mackay, Victoria Street  M914, 1864
Mackay  K124636, 1878
Mackay, Macalister Street  RP700757, 1898
Mackay, Albert Street  RP 700795, 1898
Mackay, Wood Street  RP 700793, 1898
Mackay, Wood St, Lane  RP 700842, 1900
Mackay, Sydney Street  RP 700837, 1900
Mackay, Victoria Street  RP 700823, 1900
Mackay, Section 13, all 2& 3, Yuen Geut  RP 700745, 1900
Mackay, Nelson Street, Lane  RP 700744, 1900
Mackay, Macalister Street  RP 700763, 1900
Mackay, Macalister Street  RP 700762, 1900
Mackay, Victoria Street, You Gee  RP 700756, 1900
Mackay, Nelson Street, Ah Sue  RP 700746, 1900
Mackay, Section 28, Lane  RP700850, 1909
Mackay, Nelson Street, Lane  RP700732, 1910
Mackay, Wellington Street  RP700709, 1913
Mackay, Victoria Street, Lane  RP700840, 1918
Mackay, Lane  RP700753, 1922

Maytown  MP14383, 1855
Maytown  M1951, 1879
Maytown
M1955, 1884
Maytown
MP282285, 1884
Maytown
MP282286, 1884
Maytown
RA2455, 1981

Millchester
M1756, 1876
Millchester
MP15104, 1876
Millchester
MP28707, 1877
Millchester
MP29366, 1896
Millchester
15104, CT 1385, 1873
Millchester, Lease 163
28682, 1876
Millchester, Huts
28707 GFL191, 1877
Millchester
29234, GML 1273, 1890
Millchester, Special Lease 477
D124.2 1893
Millchester, Chinese Cemetery
15171, 1895
Millchester, Chinese Cemetery
29255, GML1317 1897
Millchester, Chinese Garden MGA57
MP16390, 1900
Millchester, Ah Sam
MA.31. MP16683, 1900
Millchester
15404, GML.1934, 1903
Millchester, Chinese cemetery
MP29234, 1890
Millchester, Chinese cemetery
MP29255, 1891
Millchester, Chinese cemetery
MP15409, 1902
Millchester, Chinese cemetery
MP29396, 1902
Millchester, Chinese cemetery
MP29440, 1904
Millchester, Chinese cemetery
MPH1315, 1923
Millchester, Chinese cemetery
MP293 94, 1902
Millchester, Lam Pan
MP28644, 1875
Millchester, Lam Pan
MP28703, 1877
Millchester, Lam Pan
M1758, 1888
Millchester, Lam Pan
MP29211, 1889
Millchester, Lam Pan
MP29327, 1892
Millchester, Lam Pan
MP15444, 1906
Millchester, Lam Pan
MP29528, 1906
Millchester, townscape
MP15171, 1895

Normanton
N1486, 1862
Normanton
N1483, 1880
Normanton
Normanton, Brown Street precinct
Normanton, Mookie’s garden
Normanton, Mookie’s garden
Normanton, township
Normanton, township, CHUNG FUNG

Queenton
Queenton
Queenton
Queenton
Queenton
Queenton

Ravenswood
Ravenswood
Ravenswood
Ravenswood
Ravenswood
Ravenswood
Ravenswood
Ravenswood
Ravenswood
Ravenswood
Ravenswood
Ravenswood
Ravenswood
Ravenswood
Ravenswood
Ravenswood
Ravenswood
Ravenswood
Ravenswood, Chinaman Huts, Chinatown
Ravenswood, township, Ah Pong

Richmond
Richmond, Lum Sing
Richmond, Lum Sing
Roma, Cemetery reserve, town edge M5320, 1871
Roma, Reserve Area R 867, 1886

Townsville, Flinders Street West RP701839, 1918
Townsville, Flinders Street West T11823, 1873
Townsville, Flinders Street West T11853, 1880
Townsville, Flinders Street West RP707864, 1906
Townsville, Flinders Street RP701720
Townsville, Flinders Street T1181, 1865
Townsville, Flinders Street T11823, 1874
Townsville, Flinders Street T11864, 1882
Townsville, Flinders Street T11853, 1885
Townsville, Flinders Street RP707864, 1904
Townsville, Flinders Street MP17906
Townsville, Flinders Street, Flinders Lane T11860, 1881
Townsville, Kissing Point, Chinese Gardens RP701820
Townsville, Kissing Point, Chinese Gardens T1186, 1867
Townsville, Kissing Point, Chinese Gardens T118104, 1887
Townsville, Kissing Point, Chinese Gardens T118112, 1889
Townsville, Monkey Island, Chinese Gardens T118105, 1881
Townsville, Monkey Island, Chinese Gardens K1143, 1865
Townsville, Monkey Island, Chinese Gardens T118106, 1888
Townsville, Monkey Island, Chinese Gardens T118116, 1889
Townsville, Ogden Street, Chinese Precinct T118133, 1890
Townsville, Ogden Street, Chinese Precinct T118212, 1921
Townsville, Ross Island, South Townsville T118136, 1895
Townsville, Ross Island, South Townsville T118653, 1983

Winton RP706680, 1927
Winton RP880561, 1994
Winton, Special Lease W2408, 1917
Winton, Town map W2401, 1880
Winton, Town map W2402, 1881
Queensland State Archives (QSA)

i.) Queensland Public Records Historical Resource Kit

Application for Naturalisation, Ah Shay COL/74, 03/8015
Application for Naturalisation, Gee Kee SCT/CF 34, No. 84/3581
Application for Naturalisation, Jang Lum COL/72 after 01/18843
Application for Naturalisation, Kom Moy COL/74, 03/6473
Application for Naturalisation, Laen Yaen COL/74, 03/6595
Application for Naturalisation, Lee Gun COL/72, 01/12750
Application for Naturalisation, Pang Ah Young COL/72 see after 01/18843
Application for Naturalisation, Tam Gee Wah COL/74, 03/6845
Application for Naturalisation, Thomas Hong COL/72 No.84 & No.85
Certificate of Naturalisation, Andrew Leon, Bowen SCT/CF 34, No.861
Certificate of Naturalisation, Chin Pack SCT/CF 34, No. 152
Certificate of Naturalisation, Chung Chang SCT/CF 34, No. 132
Certificate of Naturalisation, Lee Gong SCT/CF 10, 3218
Certificate of Naturalisation, Lee Liy SCT/CF 10, 3030
Certificate of Naturalisation, Louy Ah Moy SCT/CF 34, No. 123
Certificate of Naturalisation, Thomas Lin Kin SCT/CF 34, No. 122
Crown vs Willie Ah Duck, CPS 12E/P9
Enquiry by Cairns solicitor to the Home Secretary’s Office COL/72 No. 00086
Internal memo, “Issuing Certificates to Chinese” COL/72, No.275
Internal memo, “Re-issuing Certificate to Chinese” COL/72, No. 276
Oath of Allegiance, Chun Tie A/17813, No. 117
Oath of Allegiance, James Ah Lin A/17813, No. 110
Oath of Allegiance, Jimmy Lee Koo A/17813
Oath of Allegiance, Kwong Kee A/17813, No. 86
Oath of Allegiance, Sun Shum Lee A/17813, No. 113
Oath of Allegiance, Tom See Poy A/17813, No. 89
Oath of Allegiance, Willie Ming A/17813, No. 97

ii.) Immigration - Register of Arrivals

Ann Messervoy, “Samerang”, 1867, IMM/113, P10
Bridget Tierney, “Golden City”, IMM/113 P49
Christina Wilkie “Polmaise”, 1872, IMA3/4 P39
Emma Mary Costall, “Tara”, 1892, IMM/124 P360
Fanny Scarisbrick “Durham”, 1881, IMM/113 P271
James Dillon and wife and 7 children, “Saldanha”, 1863, Z31 P272
Jane Mathieson, “Bounty”, 1884, Z1960 IMM/117 P117
Lucy Lord, “Scottish Lassie”, 1879, IMM/116 P264
Margaret Hennesy “Wansfell”, 1863 IMM/113 P40
Mary Boddy, “Ramsey”, 1869, IMM/113 P27
Sara & Mary Brophy, “Clarence”, 1867, IMM/113 P47
Sarah & Alice Emery, “Queen of the Colonies”, 1861, Z31 P906
Sarah Cox, “Queen of the Colonies”, 1865, IMM/113 P2
Sarah Hadley, “Scottish Prince”, 1878, IMM/116 P162

iii.) School Registers
Cape River School Admission Register, 1915-1938, SRS 3016/1.
Charters Towers Boys School Admission Register, SRS1806/1/1.
Charters Towers Girls School Admission Register, 1896-1903, SRS1808/1/1.
Cloncurry State School Admission Register, 1896-1919, A/46065.
Cooktown Girls School Admission Register, 1919-1921, SRS 1630/1/1.
Halifax (formerly Herbert River) Admission Register, 1883-1939, A/43653.
Queenton State School Admission Register, 1907-1951, SRS3213/1/1.
Ravenswood School Admission Register, 1876, SRS1613/1/1.
Richmond School Admission Register, 1897-1918, SRS1542/1/1.
Winton State School Admission Register, 1888-1927, SRS 5546 M/F: 89402.

i.) Land Files, Divisional Board, Mining, Market Garden and Machine Area Registers
Burketown Hospital Admission Register, 1909-1923, B/3098.
Cairns Municipal Rate Book, 1885-1888, SRS4646-1-1.
Cairns Municipal Rate Book, 1889-1893; SRS4646-1-2.
Cairns Municipal Rate Book, 1891-1893, SRS4646-1-3.
Cairns Municipal Rate Book, 1893-1895, SRS4646-1-4.
Cairns Municipal Rate Book, 1896-1897, SRS4646-1-5.
Cairns Municipal Rate Book, 1902-1902, SRS4646-1-6.
Cairns Municipal Rate Book, 1903-1903, SRS4646-1-7.
Cairns Municipal Rate Book, 1904-1904, SRS4646-1-8.
Cairns Municipal Rate Book, 1908-1908, SRS4646-1-10.
Cairns Municipal Rate Book, 1910-1910, SRS4646-1-12.
Cairns Town Council, Valuation and Rate Registers, 1922-1922, SRS4704-1-6.
Cairns Town Council, Valuation and Rate Registers, 1923-1923, SRS4704-1-7.
Cairns Town Council, Valuation and Rate Registers, 1926-1926, SRS4704-1-10.

Charters Towers City Council Valuation Register. 1917-1918, 11 CHA/N23.
Charters Towers Mining Warden, Register of Claims, Homestead & Cape River Claims, 1887-1890, A/20704.
Charters Towers Municipal Council Valuation Register, 1877-1884, 11 CHA/N1.
Charters Towers Municipal Council Valuation Register, 1881-1884, 11 CHA/N2.
Charters Towers Municipal Council Valuation Register, 1885-1887, 11 CHA/N3.
Charters Towers Municipal Valuation Register, 1888-1892, 11 CHA/N4.
Charters Towers Municipal Valuation Register, 1893-1898, 11 CHA/N5.
Charters Towers Municipal Valuation Register, 1899-1902, 11 CHA/N6.
Charters Towers Town Council Valuation Register, 1904-1905, 11 CHA/N7.
Charters Towers Waterworks Board, 1887-1893, WBD 11A/2.


Laidley Valuation and Rate Book, 1902-1908, SRS479-1-3.
Laidley Valuation and Rate Book, 1904, SRS479-1-2.
Mackay Divisional Board Valuation Register, January 1899-December 1900, SRS4944/1.

Mackay Divisional Board Valuation Register, January 1901-December 1901, SRS4944/1-2.

Mackay Shire Council Valuation Register, January 1904-December 1904, SRS4944/1-3.

Mackay Shire Council Valuation Register, January 1905-December 1905, SRS4944/1.

Mackay Shire Council Valuation Register, January 1910-December 1910, SRS4944/1.

Mining Homestead Lease granted to Louisa Augusta YUNG, 1902, EXE/D87.

Mining Warden, Croydon: Register of applications market garden areas, 1887-1890, MWO14A/65/162.

Mining Warden, Croydon: Register of applications market garden areas, 1890-1911, MWO14A/67.

Mining Warden, Etheridge and Croydon: Index to register of applications for market garden and tailings areas, 1886-1911, MWO14A/69.

Mining Warden, Etheridge, Register of applications various; market garden areas 1880-1912, MWO/14B/41 (PRV10316).

Mining Warden, Etheridge: Register of applications, various; market garden areas, Etheridge District, 1888-1907, MWO/14B/31.

Mining Warden, Georgetown, Register of applications various; market garden areas 1887-1890, MWO/14B/40.

Mining Warden, Maytown, 1889, MWO 13B/9-17.

Mulgrave Shire Council Correspondence, Cairns, 1940, A/62799.

Petition for Police Magistrate to be appointed to town as well as Construction of Dam & Wells between Cloncurry and Boulia, and Cloncurry and Hughenden, COL/A338/82/3735.

Pine Divisional Board, Rate Book, 1888-1893, SRS623-1-1.

Pine Divisional Board, Rate Book, 1894-1897, SRS623-1-2.


Ravenswood Divisional Board Correspondence, 1880-1883, COL/063.

Ravenswood Divisional Board Correspondence, 1883-1914, WOR/N14-N16.

Ravenswood Divisional Board, Form of Valuation Return, 1882, WOR/N14-N15-N16.
Ravenswood Divisional Board, Form of Valuation Return, 1882, WOR/N14-N15-N16.
Ravenswood Divisional Board: Form of Valuation Return, 1882, COL/063.
Ravenswood Register of Business Licences, 1888-1908, MWO11/N3.
Ravenswood Register of Miners Rights, 1900-1908, MWO11/N5.

Register of Businesses and Residence areas, Gympie, 1872-1875, RSI 1640-1-2
Register of Businesses and Residence areas, Gympie, 1877-1886, RSI 1640-1-4.
Register of Businesses and Residence areas, Gympie, 1886-1889, RSI 1640-1-5.


Valuation Registers, Queenton Shire Council, QUE/N2 (PRV11288/1/2)

ii.) Colonial Secretary, Naturalisations, Home Office and Other

Aboriginal Lizzie Smith co habituating with Lee Soy, 1901, COL/145/01/17649.
AH CHIN, application for Certificate of Naturalisation, Cooktown, 1875, COL/B1 1872/3451.
AH CHIT HOBSON, application for Certificate of Naturalisation, Cumberland, 1898, JUS/A82/94/2195.
AH CHOW, application for Certificate of Naturalisation, Cairns, 1884 COL/A379/84/4370.
AH MING, Request for Exhumation remains for wife Wah Quay and baby, COL/A435.
AH SUE, A/18963.
AH TONG Memorial, application for Certificate of Naturalisation, Cairns, 1901, COL/72 01/210.
AH WOOD George, Certificate of Naturalisation, 1901, COL/7/0118843.
Andrew LEON Certificate of Naturalisation, Bowen, 1869, COL/A208/69/861.
Batch File, Correspondence relating to 1891 Shearers Strike, COL/422.
Benjamin INGHAM, Certificate of Naturalisation, Warwick, 1861, SCT/CF/84.
Charley Ah Foo, HOM A22/99/3266
Charlie AH LETT, application for Certificate of Naturalisation, Cairns, 1887, COL /A521/87/8284.
Child Polly WON YOUNG 1897, HOM A7/97/3293.
CHIN PACK, application for Certificate of Naturalisation, Cooktown, 1882, COL/A338/82/3166.
CHUNG CHANG, Certificate of Naturalisation, Cooktown, 1879, SCT/CF10 1879.
Correspondence regarding White Children with Chinese man in transit, 1877, COL/A250/77/5899.
DAN HAWK, Certificate of Naturalisation, 1874, COL/A208/74.
Died Intestate Jimmy AH MOY, late of Avon Downs, 1912, CUR/0 180.
Died Intestate, ASHNEY, Gayndah, 1898, CUR/017.
Died Intestate, Estate of AH LIN, 1912CUR/0 149 47-54.
Ecclesiastical (will) File, George HOON, Townsville, SRS6220/2.
Ecclesiastical (will) File, SUE YEK –Fred SING LUM, Innisfail, 1960, SRS6220/2/4248.
Ernest SUE in service to George Adams Aloomba from Reformatory, Lytton, 1888,
COL/A541/88/3009.
Exhumation Jane Mar, 1929, Cunnamulla, HOM /J72529/5208 (ID848344).
Exhumation Millchester, HOM/A22/04405/29.
George FOW, Certificate of Naturalisation, Drayton, 1861, COL/B1 1859-1860 Z4904.
GONG SING, Oath of Allegiance, Gympie, 1872, COL/B1 1872/1255/1232.
Henry LEE of ON WAR LOONG & CO, application for Certificate of Naturalisation, Cairns 1901,
COL/72 01/246.
Henry LEE of ON WAR LOONG & CO, application for Certificate of Naturalisation, Cairns, 1901,
JUS/A872/01/12774.
HOM YUEN, gardener, Marbuiag Island, HOM/J259/19.
HOP LEE, application for Certificate of Naturalisation, Bundaberg, 1901, COL/72/01/259.
Insolvency File, James AH CHING, Cairns, 1893-1897, CUR/T52.
Jane Mary LOW CHOY vs William STEWART, Supreme Court Townsville, 1916, A/28823.


John SING, application for Certificate of Naturalisation, Gayndah, 1875, COL/A208/75/1237.

KOM MOY, Application for Certificate of Naturalisation, Burketown, COL/74/0031.

KWONG KEE, Oath of Allegiance, Cairns, 1901, COL/72/01/4684.

LEE GUN, application for Naturalisation Refused, 1901, COL/72 1901/190.

LEE LIY, Butts of Oaths of Allegiance 1874-1874, Supreme Court Charters Towers 1874, SCT/CF10 3030.


Letter of support for AH HON for application for Certificate of Naturalisation, Charters Towers, 1901COL/72/221.

Letter to King Nam, Merchant Firm, and Thursday Island, COL/B36 6/7/96 3881 Item 8728.

Marriage of a Chinaman (Tommy Ah Low) with Aboriginal female granted, 1900. A/58764 (RSI15038/1/21).

Mr. and Mrs. GUIE, Letter to Colonial Secretary, St George, 1888, COL/A541/88/3139.

Petition for police magistrate to be appointed to Croydon 1882, COL/A338/82/3735.

Register of Pauper Relief 1892-1893, COL/466 (PRV 7152-1-1).

Removals and Deportations D- O 1922/1244, A/59005.

SAM AH BOW, Burketown, Application for Naturalisation, COL/72/01/18843.

Sam ASHEW application for Certificate of Naturalisation, Cooktown, 1882, COL/A338/82/3150.

SAM FONG, application for Certificate of Naturalisation, Pentland, 1895, JUS/A87/95/7207.

SEEN FUNG GOON, Oath of Allegiance, Brisbane, 1875, COL/B1 1872/1255/3369.

SUE YEK, Certificate of Naturalisation, 1877, COL/A306/81/285.

TIM AH SING, application for Certificate of Naturalisation, Brisbane, 1875, COL/A209/75/1541.

TOM TIP, application for Certificate of Naturalisation, Georgetown, 1885, COL/A435/85/6412.

Tommy AH CUM, application for Certificate of Naturalisation, Muttaburra, 1888, COL/A532/88/499.

TONG letter to Home Secretary Office re client, Cairns, 1899, COL/72 1899/0086.

TONG MOW, application for release of son from Reformatory, 1887, COL/A529/87/10075.

William SHIN, application for Certificate of Naturalisation, Townsville, 1885, COL/A428/85/2590.

William SING BUNDERIN, Application for Certificate of Naturalisation, Roma 1883, COL/A365/83/3390.

William SING, Windorah, 1883, COL/A365/83/3590.

William YEK LOONG, Certificate of Naturalisation, Brisbane, 1872, COL/A437/85/6960.

WONG HING, application for Certificate of Naturalisation, Cooktown, 1876, COL/B1 1876/3769.

iii.) Police, Court of Petty Sessions, Justice Records, Inquests, Dunwich Asylum

Ah Sang vs Bridget Ah Sue, Thursday Island, JUS/A59.
Assault by CHIAM on Ann Price, Brisbane, 1858, CRS/ 157/ 58.
Brown vs SEE CHIN, Cairns, 1922, CRS/156/36/3661.


Charters Towers Mining Warden Register of Claims 1887-1890, A/20704.

Chin Fat, Letter to Protector of Aborigines, A/58735.

Chinese Disturbances, POL/J29.

Clerk of Petty Sessions, 10 February 1885-23 May 1888, Ingham, CPS 12B/U2.
Clerk of Petty Sessions, Ah Chong, Kennedy River, Cooktown, CPS 13E/R 2.
Clerk of Petty Sessions, Ah Ting, Kennedy River, Cooktown, CPS 13E/R 2.


Clerk of Petty Sessions, Cash Book, Tabletop, 30 July 1888-12 Sept 1890, CPS 14 H/M1.
Clerk of Petty Sessions, Ingham, 10 February 1885-23 May 1888, CPS 12B/U1.
Clerk of Petty Sessions, Register of Business licences, Cooktown, 1889-1912, CPS 13 E/ R2.

Clerk of Petty Sessions, Register of Firms, Cooktown, April 1906- August 1915, CPS 13 E/6.
Clerk of Petty Sessions, Register of Proceedings, Thornborough, CPS 129/U1.

Cloncurry: Police Summons Sheet 1897, A/70475-A/70498.

Correspondence including “Black trackers”, Richmond District, 1894-1935, A/44884.
Correspondence, Register of Firms, Winton, 1902, CPS9H/AC1-3.

Court of Petty Sessions Record Book, Gayndah, 1850-1857, A/4870.

Court of Petty Sessions, Irvinebank, 1899-1914, CPS 12C/51.

Court of Petty Sessions, Maryborough, 1894, PRV 6750-1-20.

Criminal Deposition, Ah Hing, Springsure, 1876, JUS S2 91.

Criminal Deposition, Ah Jung alias Ingham, Clermont, 1870, JUS S2 164.
Criminal Deposition, Ah Kin, Blackall, 1885, JUS S2 185.
Criminal Deposition, Ah Ming, Brisbane, 1880, JUS S2 118.
Criminal Deposition, Ah Sam, Roma, 1880, JUS S2 272.
Criminal Deposition, Ah Wah, Maytown, 1881, JUS S2/221.
Criminal Deposition, Ah Young, Brisbane, 1877, JUS S2 217 & 94.
Criminal Deposition, Chan Quay Chan, Cooktown, 1880, JUS S2 203.
Criminal Deposition, George Toe, Toowoomba, 1872, JUS S2 60.
Criminal Deposition, Ing Beechere Dabee, Brisbane, 1877, JUS S2 111.
Criminal Deposition, Nora Chong Hoi (alias Nora O’Donnell), Brisbane, 1880, JUS S2 303.
Criminal Deposition, Pon Don, Linwood, Dalby, 1878, JUS S2 156.
Criminal Deposition, Tee Kong, and Toowoomba 1877, JUS S2 100.
Croydon Register BDM sent to Normanton District Office by Court House Registrar, 1900-1908, CPS 14A/44.
Croydon, June 1892-August 1893, CPS 14A/M20.
Enquiry into death of Florence Small, 1938, JUS/1056.
Enquiry into Fire at Wong Hoy’s, Cairns, 1927, JUS/N837.
Gee Hoy and Gail Lottie, Charlie Gee Hoy, Cherbourg, 1931, File 1, JUS/N1093/40/864.
Im vs Im & Wong Gyp, Brisbane, 1895, JUS/A90/95/4708.
Index to Register of Liquor Licenses, 1913-1935, Ingham, A/35850.
Inquest into death of Emily (baby), Alibilbah Station, 1907, JUS/N381/07/454.
Inquest into death, Ah Sing, Auburn Station, Chinchilla, 1885, JUS/N119/85.
Inquest into death, Arnold Lee Bow, Innisfail, 1931, JUS/N923/31/111.
Inquest into death, Ayee Chun, Thursday Island, 1894, JUS/N226/94/337.
Inquest into death, baby daughter of Din Dek and Bijelli, Nebo, 1919, JUS/N683/19/83.
Inquest into death, baby Shang, Innisfail, 1932, JUS/N41/32/106.
Inquest into death, Bridget Ah Sue, Waverly Station, St Lawrence, 1886, JUS/N129/86/114.
Inquest into death, Cape River, 1913, JUS/N541/13/667.
Inquest into Death, Charlie Ah Kee, Babinda, 1936, JUS/N1016/36/590.
Inquest into death, Charlie Hong, 1936, JUS/N1141/36/5/1135.
Inquest into death, Charlie Sing, Winton, 1924, JUS/N773/24/43.
Inquest into death, Eva Fong, Richmond, 1937, JUS/N1021/37/21.
Inquest into death, George See Hoe, Atherton, 1920, JUS/N704/20/194.
Inquest into death, Georgetown, 1918, JUS/N657/18/113.
Inquest into death, girl, Brisbane, 1910, JUS/N437/10/54.
Inquest into death, Go Lum, Cloncurry, 1939, JUS/N1073/39/770.
Inquest into death, Grace See Chong, Chillagoe, 1923, JUS/N763/23/509.
Inquest into death, infant, Maryborough, 1887, JUS/N139/87.
Inquest into death, Jimmy Ah On, Le Quay’s garden, Burketown, 1918, JUS/N666/18/329.
Inquest into death, Julia Eliza Hargraves, Brisbane, 1900, JUS/N289/00/438.
Inquest into death, Kathleen Ah Sam, Cloncurry, 1955, JUS/N1254/55/223.
Inquest into death, Kim Sing at Bamford, 1926, Mareeba, JUS/N817/26/323.
Inquest into death, KOCHO, Toowoomba, 1884, JUS/N104/85.
Inquest into death, Lee Fong, 1917, JUS/N624/17/92.
Inquest into death, Lee Fong, Cloncurry, 1917, JUS/N624/17/92.
Inquest into death, Lily Ah Kim, Glen Isa homestead, Cloncurry, 1934, JUS/N977/34/172.
Inquest into death, Lily Tam See, Innisfail, 1920, JUS/N714/20/654.
Inquest into death, Lim Kin, Normanton, 1918, JUS/N679/18/735.
Inquest into death, Maggie Gee Hoy, Augustus Downs, Cloncurry, 1932, JUS/N943/32/224.
Inquest into death, Margaret Buckingham, Cairns, 1926, JUS/N817/26/314.
Inquest into Death, Mary Rodda Ah Hee, Pentland, 1912, JUS/N513/12/694.
Inquest into death, Omasse Frank, Mackay, 1891, JUS/N199/92/145.
Inquest into death, Peter King Lee, Mackay, 1937, JUS/N1021/37/21.
Inquest into death, Phillip Kum Yuen, Mossman, 1917, JUS/N625/17/157.
Inquest into death, Rosie Bing Chew, Oakland Park Station, 1918, JUS/N678/18/684.
Inquest into death, stockman, Morestone Station, 1938, JUS/N1040/38/40.
Inquest into death, Susan Fet, Sandy Creek, Clermont, 1893, JUS/N263/93/213.
Inquest into death, Vincent See Poy, Innisfail, 1931, JUS/N923/31/110.
Inquest into death, William JACKSON, Lolworth Diggings, 1914, JUS/N1118/42/418.
Inquest into death, William John Phillips, Jericho, 1935, JUS/N990/35/68.
Inquest into death, woman, Halifax, 1907, JUS/N376/07/309.
Inquest into Fire, Ada Ah Shay, Innisfail, 1927, JUS/N841/27/262.
Inquest into Fire, Bridget Ah Sue, Townsville, 1908, JUS/N398/08/253.
Inquest into Fire, Chinatown Cloncurry, 1922, JUS/N739/22/345.
Inquest into Fire, Criminal Deposition Ang Wong, Rockhampton, 1881, JUS S2 232.
Inquest into Fire, evidence by Jimmy Ning and wife Bessie, Lawn Hill Station, 1917, JUS/N648/17/689.
Inquest into murder/suicide, Japanese wife/husband, Ingham, 1914, JUS/N548/14/150.
Inquest, Ah Fat, Townsville, 1929, JUS/N896/29/743.
Inquest, Ah Sing, JUS/A87/95/7207.
Inquest, Croydon, 1926, JUS/N816/26/274.
Inspector of Nuisances Report re Disease Outbreaks, Queenton, 1910-1914, PRV 11286-2 (QUE/17)
Inspector of Nuisances Report, Queenton, 1906, PRV 11286-1(QUE/16)
Kondo, Thomas, married to Wright Nellie, 1919, JUS/N701/20/3.
Lee Liy Wing On, Millchester, SCT/CF10 3030
Mary Ann Ah Cum, PRE/A616 (SRS5402/1/605)
Mary Young vs Regina, Charters Towers, 1892, JUS/A62/92/726.
Mrs. Charlotte Ah Bow, JUS/A59.
Murder Jack See Kar, Charleville, 1895, JUS N341/05/348.
Northern District Court, Minute Book, Croydon, 1889-1910, DCT/14 A/D1.
Police Court Record - Eliza Jane Ferris, JUS/96.
Police Department, Cairns Station, Letterbook 20 June 1899-20 June 1906, POL 12M/G3.
Police Department, Commissioner’s Office: Miscellaneous Correspondence Report 1898 (number of Chinese in districts) POL/J2.
Queensland Police investigation into immoral behavior, Brisbane Botanical Gardens, A/44848.
Rape of Eliza Ferris by Thomas Lester, Charters Towers, 1896, CRS/157/96.
Regina vs Annie Lang, Deposition, Cooktown, 1884, A/18484.
Register of Firms, Gayndah, 1922-1949, A/24864.
Register of Firms, Hughenden, 1903-1933, A/73399.
Register of Firms, Mackay, 1903-1933, CPS 10B/26.
Register of Firms, Thursday Island, 1903-1961, OS 744/1.
Register of Licences, Irvinebank, 1895-1901, CPS12C/R2.
Return of work performed by the police at Laura in connection with Aborigines for month of October 1903, POL/J1/7.
Sam Yick vs Vera Gray, Cairns 1921, A/28842.
Small Debts Court, Draft Minute Book, Croydon, 1886-1887, CPS 14A/U1.
The King vs Lillie Thomas, Innisfail, 1929, A/28872.
Treasury Department, Licensing Matters: postage and petty cash, 1901-1920, A/67975-A67979.
Watch house Charge Book, Taroom, 1875-1893, A/36342.
Photographs of Prisoners, 1899-1891, Z26843.

iv.) Maps, Queensland State Archives
Town of Port Kennedy, Thursday Island, 1907, SRS 2022-1-11.
Torres Strait Island and Somerset, 1894, SRS 2175-1-1.
Halifax, 1915, PRV 14282-1-776
Queensland census and sub district, Mackay, 189, SRS 4949-1-225.
Cape River, 1868, SRS 2029-1-60.
Survey of Crocodile Creek Goldfields, 1866, SRS 1761 -1-202.
Cania Goldfield by W.H.Rands, 1890, SRS 2029-1-57.
Town of Gayndah, 1852, SRS 4314-1-6.
Town of Miles, 1900, SRS 1869-1-69.
Roma, 1865, SRS 1860-1-73.
Town of Dalby, 1864, SRS 1754-1-30.
Census Districts, Queensland, SRS 4949-1.

*State Library of Queensland: John Oxley Library (JOL)*

i.) **Documentary Records**

- OM 81-53: Foot Family, Private Letters between sisters
- OM 75-91: H. Ferguson, Personal Book/Diary
- OM 92-78: John Kerr Cutting Book
- OM 80-7/20: Kathleen Bruce, Folder

**Unnumbered**

- “Chinese in Queensland”, Blackall’s Chinatown, loose pages

*Local Government Authority Records – by Town*

i.) **Cairns (Held at Cairns Historical Society, Cairns)**

- Minutes, Cairns Municipal Council, 1885-1890.
- Minutes, Cairns Municipal Council, 1898.
- Minutes, Cairns Town Council, 1916.

ii.) **Cloncurry (Held at Cloncurry Historical Society, Cloncurry)**

- Cloncurry Ambulance Attendance Records, 1931
- Cloncurry Ambulance Attendance Records, 1932
- Cloncurry Shire Council, Sanitary Register and Charge Book, 1924-1926
- Cloncurry Shire Council, Sanitary Register and Charge Book, 1927-1928
- Cloncurry Shire Council, Sanitary Register and Charge Book, 1929-1931
- Cloncurry Shire Council, Sanitary Register and Charge Book, 1931
- Cloncurry Shire Council, Sanitary Register and Charge Book, 1932
- Cloncurry Shire Council, Sanitary Register and Charge Book, 1934
- Cloncurry Shire Council, Sanitary Register and Charge Book, 1948
- Cloncurry Shire Council, Register of Notices, 1939
iii.)  Croydon (Held at Croydon Shire Council, Croydon)

Croydon Divisional Board/Croydon Shire Council Amended By-Laws. 1898, 1903, 1905, 1907
Croydon Shire Council, Rate Cash Book, 1935-1955
Croydon Shire Council, Register of Miner’s Right Listings, 1917-1928
Croydon Shire Council, Sanitary Charges Register, 1913
Croydon Shire Council, Sanitary Fees and Receipts, 1916-1936
Croydon Shire Council, Sanitary Fees and Receipts, 1936-1955
Croydon Shire Council, Sanitary Ledger, 1951-1953
Croydon Shire Council, Valuation Register and Rate Book, 1921-1937

iv.)  Hughenden & Richmond (Held at Flinders Shire Council, Hughenden)

Hughenden Divisional Board, General Ledger, 1882-1887
Hughenden Divisional Board, General Account Ledger, 1896-1899
Hughenden Divisional Board/Flinders Shire Council, Valuation Register, 1888-1903
Hughenden Divisional Board/Flinders Shire Council, Rate Register, 1888-1903
Hughenden Divisional Board/Flinders Shire Council, Rate Register, Rates received, 1888-1907
Hughenden Divisional Board/Flinders Shire Council, Valuation & Rates Register, 1901-1908
Flinders Shire Council, Valuation Register, Richmond Water Authority, 1905-1906
Flinders Shire Council, Minute Book, 1911-1916
Flinders Shire Council, Valuation & Rate Register, 1943-1945
Flinders Shire Council, Valuation & Rate Register, 1948-1953
Wyangerie Shire Council, Water Authority Minute Book, 1913-1915
Wyangerie Shire Council, Richmond Minute Book, 1921-1923
v.) Georgetown (Held at Etheridge Shire Council, Georgetown)

Einasleigh Divisional Board Register, 1882
Einasleigh Divisional Board, Rate Register, 1882-1884
Einasleigh Divisional Board, Rate Register, 1888-1896
Einasleigh Divisional Board, Rate Register, 1889
Einasleigh Divisional Board, Rate Cash Book, 1882-1886
Einasleigh Divisional Board, Rate Cash Book, 1888-1896
Einasleigh Divisional Board and Shire Council, Letterbook, 1883-1914
Einasleigh Divisional Board, Valuation Register, 1887
Einasleigh Divisional Board, Letterbook, 1892
Einasleigh Shire Council, Rate Register, 1904-1905
Einasleigh Shire Council, Rate Register, 1906-1908
Einasleigh Shire Council, Rate Cash Book, 1906-1908
Einasleigh Shire Council, Valuation Register and Rate Book, 1911
Einasleigh Shire Council, Letterbook, 1911-1913
Einasleigh Shire Council, Valuation Register and Rate Book, 1916
Einasleigh/Etheridge Shire Council, Market Garden Areas, 1915-1920
Einasleigh Shire Council, Mining Homestead Leases, Etheridge & Oak fields, 1914-1918
Etheridge Shire Council, Valuation Register and Rate Book, 1921

vi.) Innisfail/ Geraldton (Held at Cassowary Coast Regional Council, Innisfail)

Johnstone Shire Council, Valuation Register and Rate Book, 1910
Johnstone Shire Council, Valuation Register and Rate Book, 1920
Johnstone Shire Council, Valuation Register and Rate Book, 1922

vii.) Normanton (Held at Carpentaria Shire Council, Normanton)

Carpentaria Divisional Board, General Cash Book and Bank Account, 1883-1889
Carpentaria Divisional Board, General Cash Book, 1886-1891
Carpentaria Divisional Board, Rates Received, 1883-1887
Carpentaria Divisional Board and Shire Council, Rate book, 1886-1903
Carpentaria Divisional Board, Ledger, 1886-1889
Carpentaria Divisional Board, Cash Book, 1897-1899
Carpentaria Shire Council, Account Book, 1910
Carpentaria Shire Council, Rate Cash Book, 1914-1919
Carpentaria Shire Council, General Ledger and Rate Register, 1920
Carpentaria Shire Council, Carpentaria Improvement Board, 1934
Carpentaria Shire Council, General Cash Book, 1927-1942
Carpentaria Divisional Board and Shire Council, Rate Register, 1887-1903
Carpentaria Shire Council, Rate Register, 1906-1908
Carpentaria Shire Council, Rate Register, 1940-1941
Carpentaria Shire Council, Rates and Valuations, 1926-1929
Carpentaria Shire Council, Sanitary Rate Register, 1932
Carpentaria Shire Council, Sanitary Rate Register, 1942-1959
Carpentaria Shire Council, Sanitary Rate Register, 1955
Carpentaria Shire Council, Valuation Register and Rate Book, 1914-1916
Carpentaria Shire Council, Valuation Register and Rate Book, 1917-1919
Carpentaria Shire Council, Valuation Register and Rate Book, 1922
Carpentaria Shire Council, Valuation Register and Rate Book, 1923-1924
Carpentaria Shire Council, Valuation Register and Rate Book, 1926-1928
Carpentaria Shire Council, Valuation Register and Rate Book, 1948-1949

viii.) Townsville City Council (held at the Townsville City Council CityLibraries,
(Microfilm, Family History Association of NQ and Townsville City Council
Millennium Project 2000)

Townsville Municipal Council, Council Minute Book, 19 October 1876 - 24 January 1879
Townsville Municipal Council, Council Minute Book, 9 January 1879- 11 April 1881
Townsville General Rate Book, Book 1, 1879.
Townsville Municipal Council, Townsville General Rate Book: Book 2, 1881, 1882, 1883, 1884, 1885, North Ward
Townsville Municipal Council, Townsville General Rate Book: Book 4, 1884, 1885, 1886, 1887, 1888, 1889, 1889/90, West Ward
Townsville Municipal Council, Townsville General Rate Book: Book3, 1884, 1885: 1888, Ross Island
Townsville Municipal Council, Townsville General Rate Book: Book 6, 1886, 1887, 1888, West Ward
Townsville Municipal Council, Townsville General Rate Book: Book 7, 1884, 1885, West Ward
Townsville Municipal Council, Townsville General Rate Book: Book 13, 1900, West Ward
Townsville Municipal Council, Townsville General Rate Book: Book 14, 1900, East Ward
Townsville Municipal Council, Townsville General Rate Book: Book 15, 1900, South Ward
Townsville Municipal Council, Townsville General Rate Book: Book 18, 1901, West Ward
Townsville Municipal Council, Townsville General Rate Book: Book 19, 1901, East Ward
Townsville Municipal Council, Townsville General Rate Book: Book 20, 1901, South Ward
Townsville Municipal Council, Townsville General Rate Book: Book 23, 1901, North Ward
Townsville City Council, Townsville General Rate Book: Book 25, 1902, East Ward
Townsville City Council, Townsville General Rate Book: Book 26, 1902, West Ward
Townsville City Council, Townsville General Rate Book: Book 29, 1903, West Ward
Townsville City Council, Townsville General Rate Book: Book 31, 1903, South Ward
Townsville City Council, Townsville General Rate Book: Book 32, 1903, East Ward
Townsville City Council, Townsville General Rate Book: Book 39, 1904, West Ward
Townsville City Council, Townsville General Rate Book: Book 40, 1904, South Ward
Townsville City Council, Townsville General Rate Book: Book 46, 1905, West Ward
Townsville City Council, Townsville General Rate Book: Book 47, 1905, East Ward
Townsville City Council, Townsville General Rate Book: Book 48, 1905, North Ward
Townsville City Council, Townsville General Rate Book: Book 49, 1905, South Ward
Townsville City Council, Townsville General Rate Book: Book 54, 1906, North Ward
Townsville City Council, Townsville General Rate Book: Book 58, 1907, East Ward
Townsville City Council, Townsville General Rate Book: Book 59, 1907, South Ward
Townsville City Council, Townsville General Rate Book: Book 60, 1907, West Ward
Townsville City Council, Townsville General Rate Book: Book 81, 1909, North Ward
Townsville City Council, Townsville General Rate Book: Book 82, 1909, South Ward
Townsville City Council, Townsville General Rate Book: Book 87, 1910, North Ward
Townsville City Council, Townsville General Rate Book: Book 88, 1910, West Ward
Townsville City Council, Townsville General Rate Book: Book 89, 1910, East Ward
Townsville City Council, Townsville General Rate Book: Book 90, 1910, South Ward
Townsville City Council, Townsville General Rate Book: Book 95, 1911, West Ward
Townsville City Council, Townsville General Rate Book: Book 97, 1911, East Ward
Townsville City Council, Townsville General Rate Book: Book 119, 1915, South Ward
ix.) Winton - (Held at Winton Shire Council, Winton)

Winton Divisional Board, Rate Book, 1888-1896
Winton Shire Council, Rate Book, 1910-1912
Winton Shire Council, Rate Book, 1915-1915
Winton Shire Council, Rate Book, 1916-1918
Winton Shire Council, Rate Book, 1928-1931
Winton Shire Council, Rate Book, 1946-1947
Winton Shire Council, Sanitary Rate Register 1939-1940
Winton Shire Council, Sanitary Rate Register, 1909-1910
Winton Divisional Board, Valuation Books, c. 1882
Winton Shire Council, Valuation Register, 1904-1905
Winton Divisional Board and Shire Council, Water Rate Book, 1900-1904
Winton Shire Council, Water Rate Book, 1911-1917
Winton Shire Council, Water Rate Book, 1925-1929
Winton Shire Council, Water Rate Book, 1933
Winton Shire Council, Water Rate Book, 1941-1942

Burial Records

Held in local towns and districts.

Carpentaria Shire Council Burial Register, held at Carpentaria Shire Council, Normanton
Cloncurry Shire Council Cemetery Records, 1917-1970, held at Cloncurry Shire Council
Croydon Burial Registers, Select Pages, held at Croydon Information and Historical Centre, Croydon
Etheridge Shire Council Burial Register & Monumental Inscription Database, Georgetown, held at Etheridge Shire Council
Goondiwindi Cemetery Records, held at Dalby Family History Society
Hughenden Burial Register, held at Hughenden Historical Society
Richmond Shire Council Burial Register, 1886-2002, held at Richmond Family History Society
Richmond Shire Council, Index A-Z,Burial Register, held at Richmond Shire Council
Richmond Shire Council Old Cemetery Register, 1970s, held at Richmond Shire Council
Richmond Shire Council Pioneer Cemetery Records, 1886-1921, held at Richmond Shire Council
Townsville Cemetery West End, Cemetery Index 1874-1997, held at QSA, Item 1460222
Townsville Cemetery West End, Cemetery Register 1874-1972, held at QSA, Item 1460220
Banking Records

i.) Held at Cloncurry Historical Society, Cloncurry

Bank of New South Wales, Cloncurry: 1905-1911
Queensland National Bank, Burketown, 1885-1928
Queensland National Bank, Cloncurry Branch, 1884-1945

ii.) Held at Winton Historical Society, Winton

Queensland National Bank: QNB register Winton, 1881-1890
Queensland National Bank: QNB register Winton, 1890-1898
Queensland National Bank: QNB register Winton, 1898-1912
Queensland National Bank: QNB register Winton, 1916-1923

iii.) Held at Hughenden Genealogical Society, Hughenden

Queensland National Bank: QNB Signature Register, Hughenden, 1880-1883
Queensland National Bank: QNB Signature Register, Hughenden, 1884-1888

Almanacs and Directories

Queensland Post Office Directories, 1860-1910
Willmetts North Queensland Almanac, Willmetts and Co, Townsville, 1883, 1885, 1888, 1892, 1898.

Church Records

i. Methodist Church: 1891-1960, Marriage Registers, Cairns Methodist Church, Cairns, accessed 2002

ii. Anglican Church (Church of England): Northern Registers held at the St James Cathedral Archives, accessed 2002, as follows:
- Townsville Marriage Records
- Townsville Baptism Records
- Charters Towers Baptism Records
- Normanton Marriage Register
- Normanton Baptism Register

**Northern Churchman**, 1904-1910

*Year Book of the Diocese of North Queensland: 1901-1902*, The Bishops Registry, 1902, Townsville

*Year Book of the Diocese of North Queensland: 1904-1905*, Church of England Book Department, 1905, Townsville

*Year Book of the Diocese of North Queensland: 1907-1908*, Church of England Book Department, 1908, Townsville

**Other**

Andrew, Cedric, Recollections, undated ms held at Mackay Historical Society and Museum Inc.

Court of Petty Sessions, Register of Stock, Register of Brands, Croydon, 1920-1940, held by Croydon Shire Council

Department of Public Instruction, Admission Register, Golden Gate School, held by Croydon Shire Council

Keong Family Records, Assorted papers, Queensland, date unknown, in possession of Steven Keong.


Register of Corporal Punishment, Croydon State School, 1923-1936, held by Croydon Shire Council

School Document, Croydon No. 165, 1 May 1922-31 December 1930, held by Croydon Shire Council

Birth Register in the District of Burke in the Colony of Queensland, Registered by Clement Arnett Collard District Register numbers 895, 899,898, held by Carpentaria Shire Council

Report and diary of the Government Medical and Health Officer, Thornborough Police District 1888-1889, held by J. Wegner, James Cook University

**Oral History Interviews**


2001, Estelle Kingsley, Cairns, 2 May 2001, Tape 1
2001, George Gong, Cairns, 5 April 2001
2001, George Wah Day, Cairns, 5 April 2001
2001, Greta Yin Foo, Norma Lee and Thyra Lin Foy, Cairns, 21 March 2001
2001, Jenni Campbell, Cairns, 8 May 2001
2001, Phoebe Mow, Daphne Wong Hoy and Judith Chiu Chong, Cairns, 3 May 2001
2002, Bethel Barton, Melbourne, 14 March 2002
2002, Bill Sue Yek, Innisfail, 29 July 2002
2002, Carl Richardson, Mareeba, 8 August 2002
2002, Des Leswell, Mareeba, 8 August 2002
2002, Dr. Lindsey Sue Sue, Atherton, 8 May 2002
2002, Greta Yin Foo, Cairns, 27 February 2002
2002, Janie Edwards, Cairns, 24 May 2002
2002, Len Leon, Tolga, 6 June 2002
2002, Major General Darryl Low Choy, Brisbane, 8 July 2002
2002, Neelima Lee, Melbourne, 15 March 2002
2002, Vincent Lee, Cairns, 9 May 2002
2002, Jeanie Whelan, Cairns, 16 May 2002
2002, Marilyn McDonald, Cairns, 5 August 2002
2002, Mary Lee, Cairns, 16 May 2002
2002, Mrs. Dawn Stiff, Cairns, 21 June 2002
2002, Mrs. Go Sam, Atherton, 6 May 2002
2002, Mrs. Mabel Garvey, Cairns, 26 June 2002
2002, Neil Lee Leong, Atherton, 8 May 2002
2002, Eleanor Chun Tie, Townsville, 21 May 2002
2002, Ena and Arthur Chu Lun, Townsville, 21 May 2002
2002, Val Kum Yuen, Cairns, 9 May 2002
2002, Sadie Fong On and Ruby Cahill, Atherton, 8 May 2002
2002, Tiger See Hoe, Innisfail, 29 July 2002
2002, Vincent Lee, Cairns, 14 August 2002
b.) Personal Communications (Pers. comm.)

2000, Alice Robb, Sandford.
2002-2017, Ray Poon, various topics.
2002-2018, Kevin Rains, Various topics.
2002, Professor Yuen-Fong Woon, 18 August 2002.
2004, Jim Harris, Gladstone and Eidsvold, letter 21 March 2004; artefacts.
2012-2014, Claire Faulkner, Ayr
2012-2015, Gordon Grimwade, Yungaburra.
2013, Marilyn Dooley, Sydney.
2014, Glenda Morris.
2015, Ely Finch, email translation of Mackay Temple couplets, 22 October 2015.
2016-2018, Juanita Kwok, various dates.
2018, Shirley Hune, Wuyi, 10 December 2018.
2018, Anthony Leong, Caobian village, China, 3 December 2018.

2018, Mrs Chen, former Head of Overseas Chinese Bureau, Zhongshan Province, China, Zhongshan, 4 December 2018.


**Newspapers**

**Microfilm**
- Brisbane Courier, Brisbane
- The Cairns Argus
- Cairns Post, Cairns
- The Cleveland Bay Express, Townsville
- The Cooktown Courier, Cooktown
- The Cooktown Herald, Cooktown
- Croydon Mining Register, Croydon
- The Herbert River Express, Lower Herbert, Ingham
- The Mining Register, Charters Towers
- Morning Post, Cairns
- North Queensland Herald, Charters Towers
- North Queensland Register, Charters Towers
- The Northern Miner, Charters Towers
- The Port Denison Times, Bowen
- The Queenslander, Brisbane

**Online through TROVE**
- The Argus, VIC.
- The Australian News for Home Readers, VIC
- Australian Town and Country Journal, NSW
- Bathurst Free Press and Mining Journal, NSW
- The Border Watch, SA
- Brisbane Courier, QLD
- Bendigo Advertiser, VIC.
- Cairns Post, QLD
- The Canberra Times, ACT
The Capricornian, Rockhampton QLD
Daily Mercury, QLD
The Daily Northern Argus, Charters Towers, QLD
Darling Downs Gazette and General Advertiser, QLD
The Evening Telegraph, Sydney, NSW
The Goulburn Herald and Chronicle, NSW
The Gregory News, QLD
Illustrated Australian News for Home Readers, Melbourne, VIC.
Illustrated Sydney News, NSW
The Inquirer and Commercial News, WA.
The Kapunda Herald, SA.
Mackay Mercury and South Kennedy Advertiser, QLD
Maryborough Chronicle, Wide Bay and Burnett Advertiser, QLD
The Mc Ivor Times and Rodney Advertiser, Heathcote, NSW
The Morton Bay Courier, Brisbane, QLD
Newcastle Chronicle, NSW
The North Australian, QLD
North Queensland Register, Charters Towers, QLD
Northern Argus, Charters Towers, QLD
The Northern Mining Register, Charters Towers, QLD
Ovens and Murray Advertiser, Beechworth, VIC
Queensland Times, Ipswich Herald and General Advertiser, QLD
The Queenslander, Brisbane, QLD
Rockhampton Bulletin and Central Queensland Advertiser, QLD
South Australian Advertiser, SA
South Australian Register, Adelaide, SA
South Australian Weekly Chronicle, SA.
The Sydney Morning Herald, NSW
The Sydney Mail and New South Wales Advertiser, NSW
Telegraph, Brisbane, QLD
Townsville Daily Bulletin, QLD
Truth, QLD
Warwick Examiner and Times, QLD
Photographs and Images: Selected Sources

“Cairns Chinatown, c. 1895”, Cairns Historical Society, Image: P03743

“Chinese Gardener, Bowen”, JCU Library Image 15892.

“Chinese Orchards, Charters Towers”. JCU Library Image 11263

“Cooktown” c. 1887 [crop], JOL: Negative No. 38755


“Grave of Ah Hee Cape River”, JCU Library Image 11147

“Grave of Mary Rhoda Ah Hee, Cape River”, JCU Library Image 11150

“Greetings from Ravenswood”, JOL: Negative No. 164766


“Interior of Mackay Temple, 1908”. “Our Illustrations”, *North Queensland Herald*, 4 April 1908, p. 7.


“Japanese woman, Gard’s Lane”, *North Queensland Register*, 4 May 1903, p. 39.


“Open-air theatre on Douglas Street, Thursday Island, 1920s”, JOL: Negative No. 69844

“Offices and Works of the New Ravenswood Mines Ltd., Ravenswood”, JOL: Negative No. 108627


“Reception to honour the Chinese Consul in Townsville, 1913”. Townsville City Council Image, No. 303144


St. James Cathedral, Rectory and Chinese Church after Cyclone Leonta, Townsville, 1903. Townsville City Council Image.


“Tommy Ah Fat”, Cloncurry, date unknown. Private Collection, Pearl Connolly, Cloncurry, 2007.

“Townsville Chinese district Flinders Lane and Hanran Street, c.1890”, University of Queensland Image: UQFL243_b1_0189a & UQFL243_b1_0188a, Fryer Library

“Yet Hoy, Luk Yet Ho and family”, Croydon, date unknown. Private Collection, Estelle Kingsley.

SECONDARY SOURCES:

Books, Articles, Journals, Websites, etc

____. “A History of the Burdekin”, unpublished typed manuscript, author unknown, date c. 1982, private collection

____. “Burnett Country, 150 years”, for the Burnett Country Development Council, Mc Taggart Printers, date unknown.

Hawkins Creek State School, 75 Years 1912-1987, Hawkins Creek State School, held at Hinchinbrook Shire Council Library Local History Collection, Ingham.


Cuttings Book of Ravenswood, undated, held at Ravenswood Court House Museum

“Souvenir Charters Towers, 1872-1950”, author, date and publisher unknown.

The History of Caboolture And District, Caboolture: Caboolture Historical Society, 1989.


Allingham, Anne, Taming the Wilderness: The First Decade of Pastoral Settlement in the Kennedy District, Studies in North Queensland History, No. 1, Townsville: History Department, James Cook University, 1977.


Bagnall, Kate, “The Tiger’s Mouth, thoughts on the History and Heritage of Chinese Australia”, DECRA Research Fellow in the School of Humanities and Social Inquiry at the University of Wollongong exploring paths to citizenship for Chinese migrants in colonial New South Wales, British Columbia and New Zealand before 1920, Blog website, http://chineseaustralia.org/


British Nationality Summary Britain:


Ching, Henry, ”Neither East nor West: A Historical account of a Family, Compiled and Edited by Henry Ching”, private family history document. Date unknown.


Couchman, Sophie, In and out of focus: Chinese and photography in Australia, 1870s-1940s, PhD. Thesis, La Trobe University, 2009.


Couchman, Sophie and Bagnall, Kate, Chinese Australians: politics, engagement and resistance, Leiden: Brill, 2015.


Field, Emily, “Lum So San Family Saga”, private document Lee Long, date unknown, Cairns


Foley, Yvonne, interview on Mixed Britannica, BBC2, http://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/p00kx84x


Gibson–Wilde, Dorothy, Gateway to a Golden Land. Townsville to 1884. Townsville: History Department, James Cook University, 1984.


Grant, Musqueam (Elder), Guest Speaker address, delivered at 9th International Society for the Study of Chinese Overseas Conference (ISSCO), Vancouver, July 6-8, 2016.


Jones, Dorothy, Trinity Phoenix: a History of Cairns and District, Cairns: Cairns and District Centenary Committee, 1976.

Jung, Moon Ho, Coolies and Cane: Race, Labor and Sugar in the Age of Emancipation, Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2006.


Kemp, Alec S., “History of the Herbert River”, ms. held in Hinchinbrook Shire Council Library Local History Collection, Ingham.


Kennedy, Kett H., Readings in North Queensland Mining History, Volume II, Townsville: History Department, James Cook University, 1982.


Lannercost State School, School Reunion Lannercost State School, 1929-1962, author and date unknown, Held in Hinchinbrook Shire Council Library Local History Collection, Ingham.


Lee Wah Bow, Edmund, “The Lee’s Family Tree of Larm Har Village, Lundo, Zhongshan, China”, unpublished manuscript, date unknown.

Lee Wah Bow, Edmund, “My Memories of Times in Places I call Home: Shekki, Cairns and Hong Kong, China,” unpublished ms, date unknown.


L'Estrange, Jan, Belle of the Barcoo: Tambo: genesis of Queensland's Central West, Tambo, Qld.: J. L'Estrange, 1996.


Lizzio, Santina, Basilisk, Township of South Johnstone, Mena Creek, Qld.: Santina Lizzio, 2006.


Masterton, S., Cedar Camp/Atherton Chinatown: conservation report, unpublished report for Queensland Department of Environment, date unknown.


McGowan, Barry, Dust and Dreams: a regional history of mining and community in South East New South Wales 1850-1914, PhD thesis, Department of History and Faculty of Arts, Australian National University, Canberra, 2001.


Mitchell, Gwen, Clare Centenary: The First Years 1882-1892, ms. held Burdekin Shire Council, 1982.


*N*o Place for Snapdragons: Memories of Cairns, Cairns: Living History Sub-Committee, 1999.


Pearce, Howard, Pine Creek Heritage Scheme Report, unpublished report to the National Trust of Australia, Northern Territory, 1982.


Potts, John, *One year of Anti-Chinese Work in Queensland with incidents of Travel*, Brisbane: Davidson and Metcalf, 1888.


Real, Jo, Assorted Papers and Powerpoint for Family Reunion, Richmond, 2007.


Reflections on Dragons of the Pool (Chinese Sailors in England)  
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HipWOCop0Us&sns=em


Ripple Creek State School, “Ripple Creek State School Centenary 1893 – 1993”, c. 1993, held in Hinchinbrook Shire Council Library Local History Collection, Ingham.


Robb, Sandi, “‘One is tempted to ask….whether one is in an English Colony, or in a Chinese town, the pig tails are so plentiful,’” Chinatowns and Market gardens: Chinese precincts across North Queensland,” paper presented at Dragon Tails Conference, Ballarat, Victoria, October 10-12, 2009.


Rolls, Eric C., Citizens: Flowers and the Wide Sea, St. Lucia, Qld.: University of Queensland Press, 1996.


Ryan, Jan, “‘She lives with a Chinaman’: Orient-ing ‘White Women’ in the Courts of Law,” Journal of Australian Studies, No. 60 (1990):149-159.


Ryan, Jan, Chinese Women and the Global Village, St Lucia, Qld.: University of Queensland Press, 2003.


Shepherd, Robert L., “The Herbert River Story” Books 1-3, ms held at the Hinchinbrook Shire Council Library Local History Collection, date unknown.


Slocomb, Margaret, Among Australia's Pioneers: Chinese indentured pastoral workers on the Northern Frontier 1848 to c.1880, Bloomington: Balboa Press, 2014.

Smith, Anne, Roberts Leu and North: A Centennial History, Townsville: History Department of James Cook University, 1986.


Taam, Sze Pui,*My Life and Work*, Hong Kong: 1926.


The Village Database, Village Surname Identification. [http://villagedb.friendsofroots.org/search.cgi](http://villagedb.friendsofroots.org/search.cgi)


Vance, Diane and Copeman, Gai, *It was a different town: being some memories of Townsville and District 1942-1945*, Townsville: Thuringowa City Council, 1989.
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Appendix A.

Chinese Family Landscape, North Queensland: 1860 – 1920
Consisting of 110+ families, Appendix A provides a unique database by “putting the face to a name” of a select number of primary couples who settled and raised families in north Queensland. Families and individuals in Appendix 1 have been selected for a range of reasons: type of migrant, places where lived, and success or failure in Queensland. No family is preferred over another. They are selected to represent the broadest possible range of what it means to be a “family” within the Chinese Family Landscape in North Queensland. The database is limited to primary couples only, which remains a decision of logistics rather than exclusion of the first-generation couples. Their story has yet to be told in the detail it deserves.

The settlement story of North Queensland’s Chinese Family Landscape, 1860-1920, emerges through a narrative of duty, violence, migration, family disruption, separation, love, and loss. The creation of family is reflected in the diverse range of marriages and de-facto relationships which formed between Chinese settler men and White, Chinese and Aboriginal women. Most families appeared to be happy, long lasting, stable and loving relationships, resulting in the birth of many children and evidenced by the large descendant population across north Queensland. However, not every couple was happy and many women suffered from the stress of cultural dislocation, isolation, the death of children, post partum haemorrhage, opium use, domestic abuse, murder, violence, or suicide. For Aboriginal women, unhappiness could be caused by cultural stress: an unspoken and never ending ‘sorry business’ brought on by partnering with an unapproved male in the absence of suitable living totem partner. This was the result of frontier violence, intergenerational dispersal and systematic subjugation. Young Chinese women on the other hand could face deep cultural sadness, brought on through homesickness, loneliness, and lack of Chinese female companionship in an environment which was foreign in all aspects. These elements, the hurts, joys and sorrows, all impacted on the “success” of a family unit.

The methodology for finding information about individual families in Appendix A is through using and analysing a range of sources, starting with information contained on microfiche from four different copies of Queensland’s Births, Deaths and Marriages. This base was supplemented by immigration records, school attendance records, burial registers, local council rates and valuations, market garden licences, and justice records, including inquests into trials, deaths, suicides and deaths intestate. This information enabled a chronology including places of residence for individuals and couples to be formed. Newspaper extracts (made easier through the National Library of Australia digitisation of newspapers through TROVE), books, journal articles, family history accounts and oral history contributed to the social context of lives once lived. The digitisation of the Certificates of Exemption to the Dictation Test (CEDT) by the National Archives of Australia provided near the end of the thesis was, for me, the most exciting visual resource as it provided a face to women associated with the Chinese Female Diaspora to North Queensland and in its larger context, to Australia.

However, relying on these resource materials for a correct couple, time, or location remained problematic and can still result in inaccuracies. While every effort has been made to ensure information is correct through document, event, and family story cross-referencing, my interpretation of data may be different to that of families passing down information from one generation to another. Appendix A is intended as a short overview of select couples and not a detailed family history. My role is intended to provide basic information from reliable and credible sources, upon which others may build and create meaningful representations of their families. It is imperative that voices come from within the community to amend the way the narrative is interpreted by historians, and that historians in turn bridge the divide between family, community and society.

Please note: sources relating to family biographies are incorporated in the main bibliography. For polygamous marriages, wives have been referred to as First Wife, Second Wife etc. to differentiate them from first or second consecutive wives.
LAI FOO an Mary Lai Foo (Chin Ow/ Chin On), m. 17.05.1902 THURSDAY ISLAND

Lai Foo was born in Canton in 1867. He travelled to Queensland with his brother Lai Fook and the men settled in Cooktown in approximately 1893. Lai Foo spent the next four years in Cooktown, four years at Coen, and ended up on Thursday Island in 1901. Lai Foo set up business as a merchant under the trading name Kum Hing Chong, located on the corner of Douglas and Hastings Streets, Thursday Island. He diversified into pearl shelling and was part owner of a lugger fleet in partnership with his brother Lai Fook, who remained at Cooktown. In 1903 Lai Fook applied for a CEDT to travel to Hong Kong to bring out his wife and family. His family consisted of First Wife Kee Kew, two boys Ah Fook and Mee Fook, and a daughter, Ah Ho, age 8 years old. He was 36 years old. However, Kee Kew did not travel to Thursday Island and instead arrangements were made for Lai Foo to have a Second Wife.

Born in Hong Kong, Mary Lai Foo was “adopted” as a baby into a wealthy family who treated her unkindly, making her work very hard. She was a Mui tsai. At age 16 she was married off as Second wife to Lai Foo. When Mary arrived to Thursday Island they were married again in a Western ceremony, 17 May 1902. Mary, who was only 5 feet tall, went on to have 10 pregnancies, raising 9 children. She lost a set of twins. She taught herself to read and write and spoke only English in the family home. She never wished to return to Hong Kong or visit First Wife. She lived on Thursday Island until her death in 1947 at age 75.

HOP WOH/WAH SING and Mrs. Hop Wah Sing, c. 1897 THURSDAY ISLAND

Hop Woh Sing, born in China, 1864, arrived in Port Darwin where he conducted a storekeeping business before expanding his commercial interests to Thursday Island. Mrs. Hop Who Sing was only two years younger than her husband, and was born in 1866.

Mrs. Hop Who Sing had the first of her seven Australian born Chinese children, Ah Ting, in 1898 with at least another four of seven children born in Port Darwin and the youngest three born on Thursday Island. In 1912 the Hop Who Sing family applied for their CEDT and left for China.

Hop Who Sing returned to Darwin six months later in 1913. Mrs. Hop Who Sing remained
behind in China. At the time she departed, she had a baby daughter with her, age two: Sue Yock. Mrs. Hop Who Sing extended her visit in China for a further 3 years but subsequently died while still there. After the death of their mother, all of the girls remained in China.

The boys however returned to Australia, with Charles returning to Darwin in 1915, and Chin Quan to Thursday Island in 1920.

TAI YET HING and WONG SHEE, m. 10.03.1895, CANTON: Lived THURSDAY ISLAND

TAI YIT HING, born 20 July 1874, arrived in Australia to Port Darwin in 1894 at age 20. He remained there for two and a half years before he moved to Thursday Island where he became an accountant and manager of a general store. The strength of his business prowess was evident in 1897, when leading Merchant of Thursday Island LEON KING NAM trading as TUNG SEN WOH & CO entrusted TAI YIT HING with the final selling and putting into order of his business interests on Thursday Island when King Nam left for China.

His wife, Wong Shee, was born in Canton, China, in 1882, and married Tai Yit Hing in China in 1895 when she was 15 years old. By the middle of 1899 she was living on Thursday Island and gave birth to her first daughter, Ah Sue, who was born 15 August 1901. A second daughter, Shoy Ling, was born the following year, 20 March 1902. Both of their girls were born in the family home in Normanby Street, Thursday Island, with local midwife and boarding house keeper Mrs. Mary Bowers acting as midwife. That same year Tai Yit Hing became a naturalised British subject.

In 1903 Tai Yit Hing and his wife Wong Shee and two daughters applied for their Certificate of Domicile to sojourn to China for three years. By then Tai Yit Hing had been living in Australia for 9 years while Wong Shee had lived in Queensland for 3 1/2 years. While it is not known if Wong Shee or the girls returned to Thursday Island, Tai Yet Hing returned for a few more years.
Hor Lin Sing was born in China in 1846 and arrived in Cooktown in the late 19th century, where he remained until he married and later moved his family and business interests to Thursday Island.

Ah Bow, born 1877, arrived in Cooktown in 1893, at age 16 to “work” for Hor Lin Sing in an arrangement put in place in China. They married in a Western ceremony in 1900. He was 54 years old. George Sing and Ah Bow went on to have 16 children in 17 years. Her daughters remembered her crying for days on end as she struggled with her life in the colony and from the physical difficulty presented by her bound feet. The couple moved to Thursday Island and her life improved. Able to hire amahs (servants) to cook and help with the children, Ah Bow worked in the shop and developed her skills as a business woman.

In time, Ah Bow started her own pearl buying business and sent pearl shell back to Hong Kong. It was somewhat of a relief when her husband died (“no more children”) and she sold the business and later moved to Innisfail. By then she was only in her early 30s. She had a few friends in the Chinese community and took solace in the Catholic Church on Sundays. She died in Innisfail, 1930.
LEONG KING NAM and CHUN AH YEE, m. 1893, THURSDAY ISLAND
Prominent and successful business man Leon King Nam had a lucrative merchant firm in Normanby Street, Thursday Island, trading as TUNG SENG WOH & CO. In 1893, a young wife was sent to him from the village in China. Chun Ah Yee, born in 1872, in Quong Lai, China arrived to Thursday Island in 1893, where she was married in a Western ceremony to her husband. She quickly fell pregnant and a baby was born during the year. However, Ah Yee was very unhappy and she never settled in the colony. In 1894 she complained to her husband that Thursday Island was too hot for her and she begged him to return to China. Unfortunately, due to the global economic downturn, King Nam could not sell his business. As a result, they quarrelled.

King Nam did not realise the extent of her unhappiness until a week later. Early one morning Ah Yee took some of Leon King Nam’s opium out of the top drawer of the bedroom table. She had never taken opium before, and with a large supply of opium at her disposal, she took a quarter of an ounce – enough for a fatal dose. Despite the doctor being summoned, she died at 2pm in the afternoon after a long and agonising demise which included an injection of morphia to wake her up and her stomach washed/pumped out several times.

Three years later, in 1897, Leon King Nam published an open letter to his friends and business associates to say goodbye, noting his final return to China. He stated that he had tried to sell off his business but things were so bad that even in that he failed. He entrusted his friend TAI YIT HING with putting his affairs in order and departed for China.

LAI CHONG and CHUN KEW/KUM KEW, married c. 1908 THURSDAY ISLAND
Lai Chong was born in China c 1874 and was a storekeeper on Thursday Island. He was married to Chun Kew.

Chun Kew, born c.1882, was a petite 4 foot 10 ½ inches tall. She resided on Thursday Island with her husband for short periods and together they applied for their Certificate of Exemption to the Dictation Test to sojourn to Hong Kong on at least two occasions, 1909 and 1915. On the first occasion she remained in a Hong Kong village for 5 years, returning in 1914. She left Thursday Island in 1915 and applied for two extensions while in the village, eventually remaining there and never returning to Thursday Island.
**FUNG AH SANGE / ASSANGE and MARY WHYTE, m. 14.09.1887 THURSDAY ISLAND**

Fung Ah Sange was born in Canton, China, in 1858. By 1887 he was residing in north Queensland and married to a White woman, Mary Whyte. A year later, the first of approx. 9 children was born: John Joseph.

Fung Ah Sange and Mary were a hard-working couple managing both a Market Garden Area and Bakery. Mary herself was independently granted a Special Lease for an allotment of land for gardening purposes. In 1893, at age 31, Ah Sang took his Oath of Allegiance and became a naturalized British subject. In 1908, John Joseph (19) went to Hong Kong where he remained for two years. He visited China again in 1918 when nearly 30 years old.

In 1912 Fung Ah Sange made an application for a CEDT for himself and two sons William and Francis, and they departed for China where they lived for the next two years. They returned in early 1914. It is not known if the girls went to China.

---

**COOKTOWN**

**FAT KEE and Li Ha (Second Wife), m. 1903, COOKTOWN**

Prominent storekeeper FAT KEE was the owner / manager of merchant firm HIP ON & CO of Cooktown. He supported a wife in the village in China and started his family in 1885 with the birth of a son. Fat Kee made regular trips back to the village, and fathered two more children: a boy and girl. In 1902, on one of his visits to the village, he took a Second Wife, Li Ha, and she journeyed to Cooktown to run the second household and attend to his needs.

Li Ha, otherwise also known as Leu See, was born c.1880. On her arrival, at age 22 in 1902, to Cooktown she was accompanied by the sons and daughters of First Wife HA KAM. The two sons, LAU UN / LIN, age 18, and LAU KIU, age 16, were already old enough to learn their father’s business. The young daughter, LAU TSAI WING, was still only 12 years old.

Li Ha went on herself to have three daughters, Mary, Alice and Lucy, in the next few years. Fat Kee and Li Ha took the girls to the village in China in February 1909, and their CEDT was extended a further three years until 1913 while there. It is not known if they ever returned to Cooktown or Queensland.
CHUNG CHANG/ CHING CHANG and CHANG LIME aka Hang Lime/ or Ah Chin , m. 13.04.1879, COOKTOWN (First Wife)

Chung Chang was born in Canton, China, c. 1848. He arrived in Queensland in 1871, first landing in Townsville before moving to Ravenswood, Georgetown and finally Cooktown. In Cooktown, he commenced commercial business as storekeeper and traded under the name Sun Kum Fung.

Ching Chang was married at age 22 in Canton to AH CHIN also known as Hang Lime. She was his First Wife in Queensland.

Chang Lime was sent out to Cooktown where she married Chung Chang in a church ceremony which took place on 13 April 1879. Ching Chang and Chang Lime had 6 children: 5 boys, two of whom died, and a daughter named AH LOY. Very little is known about Ah Chin. She quite possibly arrived in Queensland circa 1881 as her first son, Ah Hun, was born in 1882. Chang Lime’s children were Edmund Ernest, Loy Goon, Kew Wan, and Richard Pomeroy. It is not known what happened to Chang Lime but it is assumed that she died or returned to China. Their three boys were sent at a young age to China for their education and they did not return to Queensland until they were in their early 20s.

CHUNG CHANG/ CHING CHANG and Wong Hae, m. 15.10.1887, COOKTOWN (Second Wife)

In 1887, a second wife, Wong Hae/Hay, married Chung Chang on 15 December 1887, Cooktown. A year later a son, Montague, was born in their Charlotte Street residence with the birth attended by midwife Mrs. Brennan. Chung Chang was then 39 years old and his wife 17. In January the following year Montague was baptised a Christian with the full rites of the Church of England.

A month after he was married, Chung Chang took his Oath of Allegiance and was granted naturalisation. He was a prominent civic leader in the community and also acted as a local Interpreter.

In 1905, Ching Chang had been sick with a bad stomach for some months. Business was very quiet, and he was losing his sight and could not see to write. On top of that he was despondent about the future of the business. Sending his sons for a Chinese education had had unexpected issues. His sons could not help him with the business as they could not write in English. Furthermore, they were prone to going to Chinatown to smoke opium, and Ching Chang was cross with his sons as he did not want them to smoke.

With his brother-in-law Low Dong working with him for 10 years, and his wife and family around him, it came as a surprise that he died from an overdose of opium. However, his friend of 30
years, King Kee Chong, noted in the inquest that Ching Chang was a heavy opium smoker and speculated Ching Chang had lost the will to live.

JAK GEE and NEE HOW, married 16.06.1880 COOKTOWN
Born in 1829, Jak Gee arrived in Cooktown where he commenced business as a storekeeper before he moved to Cairns. In 1880 he took his Oath of Allegiance and became a Naturalized British subject at age 48. He went on to become one of the nominal managers of the Hap Wah Plantation, and owned a large selection of land near Cairns himself.

His wife, Nee How, married Jak Gee when he was in Cooktown. Like many couples they married in the Cooktown Registrar’s Office with their marriage witnessed by prominent Interpreter Samuel Ashew. Samuel Ashew and his White wife, Emma Knight, witnessed a number of local marriages. At the time of marriage Nee How was 22 years old. Jak Gee and Nee How welcomed their first child, a boy called Farmer, who was born the following March, 1881.

LEE LIY and SUE SEE, married c. 1874 CHINA, lived COOKTOWN
Born approx. 1848, China, Lee Liy arrived in the colony in the late 1860s/ early 1870s, where by July 1874 he had established the merchant firm, Wing On and Co., and established a network of provisioning stores for Chinese miners across two major ports and multiple northern diggings. He took his Oath of Allegiance and applied for Naturalisation. It was in Millchester (Charters Towers) that his wife Sue See gave birth to their first child, a daughter called Milly.

Sue See, born c. 1852, arrived in the colony in the early 1870s and resided with her husband Lee Liy, at Wing On and Co, Millchester. Sue See was the first Chinese woman to arrive in north Queensland, and the first Chinese woman on the Charters Towers Goldfield. She was also the first Chinese woman in the north of the colony to have an Australian born child. Unfortunately, she was also the first Chinese mother to lose a child when Milly, aged 3 months, died from measles. The couple departed for Cooktown shortly after the burial.

Lee Liy was instrumental in the setting up of key provisioning stores under the trading name of Wing On and Co. in Georgetown, Palmerville and Cooktown. Cooktown’s Wing On and Co. was owned by partners Lee Liy and Lee Gong in conjunction with another partner, Sun Kum On, who lived in George Street, Sydney. However, a large fire in the Cooktown store saw the company lose the majority of its goods and he turned his attention to other ventures when the company dissolved in 1876. He went on to diversify his commercial interests and purchased a large tract of land approximately 6 miles (9.5 kilometres) up the river from Cooktown. There he experimented with rice production. In 1887, his farm was described as
“a very well-kept farm, and the buildings would be a credit to anyone”. Together Lee Liy and Sue See had six children: four boys and two girls. Very little is known about Sue See except that she and her husband arranged the marriage of their first-born daughter Mary Jane to a man called Low Choy, in 1903, and the young woman moved to Cairns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lee Gong</th>
<th>Mrs. Lee Gong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Image unavailable</td>
<td>Image unavailable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LEE GONG and Mrs. LEE GONG, 1875, COOKTOWN
Lee Gong arrived in the colony in 1874. He entered a partnership with Lee Liy in the firm Wing On & Co and took his Oath of Allegiance when he applied for Naturalisation. He was quickly joined by a wife who arrived in Cooktown mid 1875.

Mrs. Lee Gong, born in China c. 1859, was described in the Cooktown Herald as “A Chinese Lady”- By the “Brisbane”, [ship] there arrived here, one of the fair daughters of Flowery Land, who was curiously gazed upon by a large crowd of Europeans, all eager to push forward to see her tiny feet, painted lips and eyebrows, crowned above with a magnificent head dress, accompanied with a female servant. The lady was brought ashore in Norris’s Violet, but was soon conveyed up the creek in Mr. Baird’s Cutter out of the public gaze. It is hoped this feminine stranger to our shores is but the precursor of many to follow, for there is a great outcry against the Celestials that they did not bring their wives as an indication of intention to settle down. But we believe this cry will soon be heard no more as we have been informed that many of the Chinese are sending home for wives and female relatives. We further believe this will add greatly to settling up the north with the necessary means of labour, etc. as well as accustom these people in the ways and civilization of European Christianity.”

However, in 29 January 1876 the following year, an advertisement was placed in the newspaper providing public notice that Lee Gong, of Cooktown, storekeeper, was insolvent. Lee Gong’s private business went into liquidation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tom Ah Hing (Tam Hung)</th>
<th>Si Lan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

TOM AH HING (Tam Hung) and SI LAN, c. 1898, COOKTOWN
Tom Ah Hing, born in China c. 1850, commenced business as a storekeeper when he arrived in Cooktown in the 1890s. A wife was arranged for him while in the colony and Si Lan migrated with her husband to Cooktown.

Si Lan, born in 1870 and 20 years younger than her husband, arrived in Cooktown around 1898. She was particularly obvious due to her small bound feet and the special tiny shoes which she wore, despite being confined to the private quarters which lay at the back of the shop. Together with her husband she had three children in Cooktown. Their first child, a girl called May, died just one month after she was born in 1899, but at least two more girls were born after that: Mee (Mee Yong Tom), born in 1902, and Annie Evelyn, born in 1909.

In 1915 Tom Ah Hing and Si Lan took their family
and left for China, from which they never returned. Before they left they had a family portrait taken in Cooktown with Tom Ah Hing’s nephew William Forday, who later settled in Rockhampton.

**LEE KEE and Mrs. Lee Kee, m.? COOKTOWN**

Lee Kee was born in Canton, China, in 1866. When he arrived in Queensland he went into business as a grocer until 1920. A young woman was sent from the village in China to him and they were married. She was 24 years younger than him. Very little is known about Mrs. Lee Kee, born in 1890 in Canton. In 1919 the couple made an application for CEDT and departed the following year to Hong Kong. They did not return to Queensland.

**CHIN HOCKTEIN / CHEW HOCK TEIN and MON QUE / AH KIEN / May, married 13.07.1904 COOKTOWN**

Chin Hocktein was born in China on 13 October 1854. At age 21 he arrived in Queensland on 15 April 1876 on the steamship ‘Brisbane’, where he disembarked at Cooktown. Initially occupied as a storekeeper in Cooktown, he later became a leading merchant. He was one of the managing partners of the firm Yee Wing & Co, a prominent import/export business located conveniently in Charlotte Street, Cooktown. He married his Second Wife, Mon Que, in China in the late 1890s before she arrived in Cooktown.

Mon Que was born in Canton, China, in 1881. It is thought that she was Hocktein’s Second Wife, as he had three sons who continued to reside in China after her and their baby daughter Ah Moy arrived. Upon arrival, Chin Hocktein remarried Mon Que again in a Western ceremony in 1904. In 1905 he applied for Naturalisation but was refused due to the White Australia policy. In 1918, Mon Que and Ah Moy applied for their CEDTs and returned to China. They remained in China for two years but had returned to Cooktown by 1920.

**CHIN PACK (CHEN PACK) and Ju Sue/ Sin, married 16.05.1882 COOKTOWN**

Born in 1837, China, Chin Pack arrived in Queensland in 1870 at the age of 33 as a widower. He lived in Brisbane for two years before moving to Townsville for three, later settling in Cooktown in 1882. Upon arrival Chin Pack was occupied as a commercial gardener and land selector. At the same time, he took out his Oath of Allegiance. He owned a property near Cooktown at Eight Mile, and had also purchased town allotments including Allotment 4, Section 1, Cooktown for £8. In that same year he was joined by Second Wife, Ju Sis, who was 25 years his junior.
Ju Siu was born in China, 1862, and was married in Cooktown on 16 May 1882 upon her arrival. Chin Pack and Ju Siu lived on his property at Eight Mile near Cooktown and a son was born in July the following year. Duck Fat was the first of two children born in North Queensland and he was followed by a second child, Yue Han, in 1885. Ju Siu and the children returned to China and Chin Pack remained in Cooktown. In 1899, Chin Pack’s health had deteriorated and he travelled to Hong Kong to seek treatment. He subsequently died in China.

LOW KEE of Cooktown was born in China in 1864. No information is known about him or his life in Queensland, with even less known about his Aboriginal partner.

What information exists states that in November 1926, Low Kee applied for a CEDT for himself and his son Edward, to return to China. Whether it was for health reasons, or whether it was to fulfill filial obligations remains unknown. However, it is sure that Low Kee wanted Edward to accompany him to China.

However, disaster befell them. Eight days after receiving the approval for CEDT, Low Kee unexpectedly died at Cooktown, just a day or so before departure. He was 62 years old. The CEDT was immediately cancelled for Edward and it is not known what happened to him thereafter. It is most likely he was taken charge of by authorities, because he was an under-age child of Aboriginal descent and subject to the Protection Act.

Lai Fook was born in China, c.1874. He travelled to Queensland with four brothers including Lai Foo, and the men settled in Cooktown in approx. 1893. While Lai Fook remained in Cooktown, his brother Lai Foo went to Thursday Island. Lai Fook set up business as a Merchant under the trading name Tommy Ah Kum. He diversified into the lucrative pearl shell industry and was part owner of a lugger fleet in partnership with his brother. In 1902 he took out his Oath of Allegiance and became a naturalised British Subject.

Yong Leong, born in the 1880s, was sent to her husband in 1902. She became busy as a homemaker and mother to a family of seven children.

In 1917 Lai Fook and Yong Leong made preparation to take all of their children to the village in China. After spending time in the village visiting family, they nearly all returned to Cooktown, including Yong Leong who gave birth to their seventh child, Ivy. Three girls, Ellie, Florrie and Lily, remained back in China and it is presumed they married local village men.
**On Lee / Ah Shay (Leong Hoong) and Ada Cameron, m. 17.09.1894 COOKTOWN**

Leong Hoong, also known as On Lee or Ah Shay, married White woman Ada Cameron in 1894 in Cooktown. They resided for a while in Cooktown before they moved to Geraldton, which was renamed Innisfail after 1910. When in Geraldton, Ah Shay was a banana grower and he also had commercial interests in storekeeping and sugar cane production.

Ada Cameron (who may also have been known as Ada RACKSTRAW) and Ah Shay had at least 4 children together, two whom died at infancy. Together they lived on the river and accessed the town via canoe before the roads were formed. In 1908, at age 13 and a half, their eldest son William was sent to China. He made the journey unaccompanied. By 1926 Ada was a widow. She lived alone at Bamboo Creek near Innisfail in a little cottage located opposite her daughter and son in law, Mr. A. C. Eshek. Attached to the house block was 21 acres (8.5 hectares) of land. Ada rented this out to a Chinese market gardener as well as a little room in the cottage in exchange for part of the proceeds of the sale of vegetables. However, things took a turn for the worst in 1927 when a fire destroyed her property and she was forced to live with her daughter and son in law.

---

**MAYTOWN**

James Ah FUN and Mrs. Ah Fun, married c. 1877, CHINA, arrived 1878 MAYTOWN

James Ah Fun arrived in Cooktown and proceeded to the Palmer River Goldfield where he purchased land and settled in Edwardstown, which later became Maytown. In 1878 a wife and child servant were sent to him and they became the first Chinese women to arrive on the field.

By 1883 James and Mrs. Ah Fun had two children, Quong Chong and Melend/Melena. The Ah Funs were well known shopkeepers in the community but they were also known as cruel masters to their servant girl. This made the male Chinese community upset and in response they arranged for another storekeeper to marry the girl to break her bond. This he did in 1883.

Mr and Mrs. Ah Fun departed in 1885/6 taking their family of four children – two boys and two girls - with them. It seems that Mr and Mrs. Fun did not return to Queensland but their children all returned over the following years. Melina Ah Fun arrived back in Queensland in 1904 and married prominent merchant Wah Poo of Cooktown. By 1905, her brothers had also returned and became residents of North Queensland.
Tam Gee Kee (Tam Gaun Sit) and Wun Toong Yuan, married 28.07.1884, MAYTOWN WUYI / SZE YUP

Tam Gaun Sit was born in the Sze Yup district of China to a poor peasant family. He fled his home due to the civil unrest in China and made his way to Hong Kong. From there he secured passage as a crewman on a boat which headed to Cooktown. When he landed, he worked for a merchant firm before making his way to the Palmer River goldfields. By 1880, he was established as a greengrocer and storekeeper in a business he called Gee Kee. He was well liked and respected in the community and the Chinese men turned to him when they saw Ah Fun’s mui tsai girl in distress.

Born 1866 Doon Goon county in Guangdong province, China, Wun Toong Yuan, otherwise known as Ah Faun, Hoong Fong, Houng Faun, Won Hoong Font, Won Hung Faun, May Hung Faun and Hanny Fanny, migrated to North Queensland as a young bonded servant or Mui tsai to the Ah Fun storekeeping family from Maytown. Her family did not look after her very well and they abused her regularly. Often when she went for goods to Tam Gaun Sit’s shop, she would be in a distressed state. It was too much for the Chinese men in the community when Wun Toon Yuan arrived one day to Gee Kee’s Shop with a broken arm. The Chinese men implored Tam Gaun Sit to do something about the situation and suggested he marry her. Tam paid £100 to break the girl’s bond and the couple were married in August 1884. They had a splendid wedding, which cost over £250, attended by 200 Chinese and 50 European guests including the Mining Warden, Hodgkinson Goldfield. It was noted at the time, “The bride, Hung Fann, being escorted to the court house by one of the European lady residents, was very handsomely dressed after the style of a Chinese merchant’s wife. A large fan however, carried in her right hand effectually hid every part of her face.”

The couple had a boy, which was celebrated with an 8-course dinner, 100 guests and fireworks. Chinese miners matched the baby’s weight with gold a total of 6 pounds. They went on to have a large family of 9 children – six boys and three girls. The family moved to Cairns in 1898 and then to Innisfail in 1904. In 1906 Gee Kee (as he was now known) and Wun Toong Yuan took their family, all except the eldest, back to China.
Tomm Ah Toy, born in China, 1855, arrived in Australia as a boy and made his way to Queensland in the late 19th century where he went to the Palmer River goldfields and took out a Market Garden lease. He gardened on the Palmer River Goldfield for at least 30 years. In 1916, as part of his Alien Registration, he was noted as a tall man at 5 ft 6 inches and was living at Mossman Creek.

At some point in time, Ah Toy made an application to the Northern Protector of Aborigines, Walter Roth, to marry a local Aboriginal woman Jimmy Rooker, aka “Topsy”, but his application was denied. Instead, Roth instead offered to register the relationship in a “‘special’ register for such persons”: an offer rejected by Ah Toy who objected to Roth’s refusal. Together they had a son called Tommy.

In 1921, their son Tommy Toy was accused of entering a hut at Maytown with an Aboriginal friend and stealing two shotgun cartridges and a magazine. This behavior drew the attention of the authorities and a removal order was prepared for mixed heritage Tommy Toy. He was put on the steamer to Yarrabah Aboriginal Mission, Cairns in 1922, some 700 kims away from Maytown. It was there that Tommy was baptized “Edward William Tommy” Ah Toy in 1924, after which little else is known of him. His father, Ah Toy, continued to garden on the Palmer until his death in 1933. He was buried in a pauper’s grave in the Cooktown cemetery. “Topsy” remarried and remained in the district.

Ah Lin was born in China c. 1870 and migrated to north Queensland, where he took up shopkeeping at Cooktown and Coe, trading under the name Hip Wah. In early to mid 1904, a wife was sent over to him: Choy Ying.

Choy Ying, born in 1883, was 18 years younger than her husband. She was married to him again in north Queensland in a Western ceremony at Cooktown, on 14 October 1904. Nine months later, the couple welcomed their first child, Edith, in 1905. The couple frequently travelled between the home village and north Queensland, with separate extended stays undertaken by Ah Lin and Choy Ying. Each took two of the children back and forth between the village and Queensland, with Ah Lin taking sons Quai Sang and Harry, while Annie stayed with Choy Ying. Ah Lin, or Hip Wah as he was known, shifted his interests from Cooktown to...
In 1926 Hip Wah made an application to go to China for two years after which he returned to Cairns in late 1928. By 1931 all of the family had returned to north Queensland permanently. His daughter Annie was married to William Ah Wee, who was a member of the local firm, Hip On and Co, and gave birth to a son who she also named William.

Choy Ying lived with and assisted her daughter with the family in Sachs Street, Cairns Chinatown. They lived next door to women who worked as sex workers. One day, Mrs. Hip Wah and grandson, Kevin Awee, were injured when a hand grenade was thrown by a soldier into the yard of a brothel which adjoined their yard. She was on the other side of the fence when it occurred. Mrs. Hip Wah was hospitalised with her injuries but she made a full recovery afterwards. She died in 1970. Her son, William, died the following year. It is not known what happened to her husband Ah Lin.

PORT DOUGLAS

WONG SEE HOE and AH TITY /LYN WAI MUI, m. 22 July 1902, PORT DOUGLAS WUYYI / SZE YUP

Wong See Hoe, born 1870, China, arrived in Queensland in the late 1890s where he settled and became a prominent merchant in Port Douglas. He had migrated with Ah Sam, his brother, and the two were joined by two young wives - sent from the village - a couple of years later. See Hoe’s wife, Ah Tity, was born c. 1881, and arrived with Sam Yu/Yen Goo to north Queensland in 1902. The two women were married to See Hoe and brother Ah Sam, in a Methodist ceremony on 22 July 1902 by Rev. J Prouse. They later went to the Chinese Temple to pay their respects.

See Hoe and Ah Tity had a large family of 8 children, commencing with For Quay who was born in Port Douglas. In 1906 Ah Tity gave birth to a daughter, Theodora. Traditional in outlook, Wong See Hoe, on being interviewed in reference to the event, made no effort to conceal his disappointment. He summed up angrily, “Too muchee clothes, too muchee hair, plenty libbons. Cost plenty money.” In 1908 the birth of a second daughter, Edna, provoked a similar response.

In 1912 a severe cyclone destroyed Port Douglas, prompting the family to move. See Hoe, his wife and family moved to Atherton, where he became a corn farmer. The family consisting of Ah Tity and 7 children lived in Chinatown where in 1920 tragedy struck, when their son (2 years old) and daughter (4 years old) died from dysentery. The children had been sick for some days and while See Hoe had given them some medicine they had not improved. Ah Tity was unable to attend to her children as she was confined (about to give birth) and unable to look after them.
See Hoe and Ah Tiy eventually settled in Innisfail where he returned to storekeeping. However, Ah Tiy was extremely unhappy. She retired to her bed where she remained for 40 years with a “Mystery illness”, her youngest daughter taking on a carer’s role. By 1933 Wong See Hoe was an old man (80 years). He died after being impatiently shoved by a White man and knocked his head on the ground. See Hoe and Ah Tiy’s children remained in Innisfail, with Dora marrying into the See Poy family, and other members of the family worked in See Poy’s Department store, Innisfail.

PANG AH WAY (AH WAY) and Jane Goodwillie: m. 20.08.1890, PORT DOUGLAS
In 1874, three brothers Pang migrated from China to north Queensland: Pang Ah Way, Pang Muen (Ah) Young, and Pang Ah Cum. They landed first in Townsville, before they moved to Ingham and Charters Towers before finally settling in Port Douglas and Cairns districts. All three brothers married: two to White women, and one to a China born wife.

Pang Ah Way married Jane Goodwillie on the 20th August 1890. Two years later, at age 32, he took an Oath of Allegiance and became a Naturalised British subject. Ah Way lived in Port Douglas, where he was a storekeeper and butcher from the 1880s to the early 1900s. Specialising in butchering, he had his own herd of cattle to supply his business. Standing out from the rest of the community, Pang Ah Way was described as “a cut above the others”. He was a civic leader and advocated for his countrymen on every opportunity. A letter to the Sub Collector of Port Douglas pointing out the deficiencies in the new regulations which were causing hardship to his countrymen, reveals that he was fluent in written English and able to articulate complex argument to further the cause of his countrymen.

Very little is known about Jane Goodwillie other than she had one son, Allen Douglas, in February 1891. The boy died ten years later in 1901 but no record of Jane’s death has been found.

MOSSMAN

Tommy KUM YUEN (WONG KUM YUEN) and LUM SEE married 5.08.1901, MOSSMAN
Tommy WONG KUM YUEN, born c.1869, Canton, China, arrived in Cooktown and quickly redirected his interests from mining to hawking. He moved to Port Douglas where he owned a herd of cattle and worked as a butcher. During the 1890s he relocated to Mossman, where he became a cane farmer. In 1901, Wong Kum Yuen took out his Oath of Allegiance and became a Naturalised British Subject. In 1901, at age 34, he was married to a young woman from the home village: Lum See.

Lum See was born in 1879, China and travelled out to Queensland to marry Wong Kum Yuen when she was 22. They married at the private residence in
Cairns of Fong, according to the Primitive Methodist rites. Two children were quickly born: Pearlie and Henry. In 1906, Wong Kum Yuen and Lum See took the children back to the village. Upon their return, Lum See lived in Mossman while her husband lived on the cane farm at nearby Saltwater Creek. Together they had at least six children, two girls and four boys, one of whom died. Lum See lived close to the school while Kum Yuen was able to concentrate on farming. The boys divided their time between their mother’s place for school and their father’s farm to help with the work. However, the dangers associated with unassisted traveling became evident when son Philip was thrown off a horse while ‘dinking’ behind his brother on his way to his mother’s to commence school the next day. It was a ride of 7 miles. The family eventually moved to Cairns where Wong Kum Yuen was a member of the Cairns-Atherton Nationalist League, a branch of the National Kuomintang Association. In 1940, at age 71, Tommy Kum Yuen, then of Draper Street, died in Cairns. His funeral was a very large affair, attended by representatives of nearly all the Chinese families in the district.

## CAIRNS

**AH TONG (LOO HUNG TONG) and LEONG AH WAN, CAIRNS/ ALOOMBA, 1908**

Ah Tong (Loo Hung Tong) was born in 1858, China and migrated to Queensland in 1875. He lived in a number of places across north Queensland before settling in Cairns and taking up storekeeping and later, cane farming at Aloomba. Taking out his Oath of Allegiance and gaining Naturalisation in 1902, he was able to purchase 200 acres (80 ha) at Aloomba where he put 100 acres under sugar cane and supplied the Mulgrave Mill. He also had over 100 acres of land under cane at Mulgrave. Ah Tong was involved in the Greenhills Plantation, firstly in partnership with Ah Lin and Gee Wah until 1905-1912, when he was an independent grower. Ah Tong was a well-known leader of the community at Aloomba and he was referred to as the “Mayor” of Aloomba.

Leong Ah Wan was born in 1868 and it is not known when she arrived, but it was noted in Ah Tong’s application for naturalization that his wife was living with him in Cairns in 1894. Leong Ah Wan undertook a Queensland marriage with Ah Tong in Cairns on 6 April 1902 when their first son, William, was 2 years old. By the time they were married, they were living at Aloomba where she had at least three more children: Mabel, Frederick and Nellie. In 1908 the family sojourned to China. It is believed William, Frederick, Mabel and Nellie returned in 1910, with William at least taking multiple journeys over the next 15 years.
Willie Ming (Kwok Yin Ming) and Yuen Day, Cairns, 1896

Willie Ming (Kwok Yin Ming) was a prominent Cairns storekeeper during the early 1890s. He began as a clerk in the firm Lee Yan Kee before entering sugar cane farming and contracting. Ming shifted his business interests to Aloomba. On application for his Certificate of Naturalisation in 1900, Ming stated he had been in the Colony for 20 years.

Yuen Ming, born 1882, had her marriage contracted to Kwok Yin Ming in China before she arrived in Cairns, 1896. The Mings lived in Sachs Street opposite the Lit Sung Goong Temple. Yuen gave birth to a son, Herbert Soy Key in September 1900. He was the second fully Chinese boy to be born in Cairns. A lavish banquet was held in the baby’s honour, catering for fifty-seven tables at a total cost of £150. A total of five hundred and twenty guests attended the celebration with tables extending through the store and into the backyard. Guests enjoyed 62 English ducks, 35 Muscovy ducks, 50 fowls, 3 pigs, beche-de-mer soup, Chinese mushrooms, Chinese shellfish, birds nest soup, and shark fins. However, fortune did not smile on the Mings and the baby died a week later; a loss the whole community felt. The Mings went on to successfully raise a family of 7 children.

The Mings sojourned to China on at least three occasions as a family to fulfil filial duty, attend to cultural education and honour ancestors. Yuen Ming had a final sojourn to China in March 1939 where she remained for four months before returning to north Queensland.

James Ah Lin (Tam Lin) and Ma See m.
26.08.1901, Cairns

Tam Lin/ James Ah Lin was born in China in 1861. He travelled to north Queensland and became a prominent storekeeper and banana farmer at Hambledon, near Cairns. He successfully grew bananas from 1896, until he switched to sugar cane and went into partnership with Ah Tong and Gee Wah at Greenhills a few years later.

In late 1899/ early 1900 he welcomed his wife Ma See to Queensland. Ma See, born in 1881, was slight in stature at 5 feet 1 inch, and very beautiful. She took up residence with her husband at Hambledon and gave birth to a son, William, on 3 September 1900. Tam Lin and Ma See remarried in a Western ceremony on 26 August 1901. That same year, Tam Lin took out his Oath of Allegiance and applied for Naturalisation to become a British subject – he was 42 years old.

However, things went downhill for Tam Lin. He began to experience financial difficulties which led to bankruptcy. He was admitted to the Goodna Asylum (Brisbane) where he died in August 1905. The men in the community arranged for a subscription to assist Lin Ma See to return to China.
with her infant son William. As her husband died intestate, an application was made by the administrator of the estate to direct £1000 of the estate (worth in total £2001) to be paid in part shares to the infant son William and Ma See as mother of the child. This order was directed to be carried out and Ma See did not return to Queensland.

**LEE CHIN and AH LICE (Mr and Mrs. Lee Yan), CAIRNS, 1895 ZHONGSHAN / CHUNGSHAN**

Lee Chin, born in China 1855, arrived in Queensland at age 23. He worked first as a miner on the Gilbert River diggings for 4 years before moving to Charters Towers for 3 years; Ravenswood for 4 years, and finally Cairns for 24 years. He was a storekeeper. An educated man, he could sign his name in both English and Chinese characters. Lee Chin was a partner in the prominent firm Lee Yan Kee along with four brothers. Their shop was one of the longest running Chinese commercial firms, trading in flour, sugar, rice, groceries, and drapery as well as operating as fruit exporters. Lee Chin was office bearer of the Chung Shan Club and a Naturalised British subject. Lee Yan Bros. continued trading until the mid-1920s.

Ah Lice, also known as Ah Lie Young or Mrs. Lee Yan, arrived in Cairns on the “Airlee” from Hong Kong on 29 August 1895, accompanied by 12-year-old servant Chou Young. Born in 1874, she married Lee Chin in a traditional Chinese ceremony before undertaking a Western marriage in 1903. Residing in the private quarters behind the shop, Ah Lice gave birth to the first of four children, a baby boy, in 1896. The Cairns Argus noted, “A remarkable event is to be celebrated tomorrow, viz the birth of the first thoroughbred Chinese boy in Cairns. Mrs. Lee Yan arrived from China about a year ago, and with the advent of a son, Mr. Lee Yan, who is one of the leading storekeepers, is delighted, and his countrymen rejoice with him. The event is to be celebrated in grand fashion and is expected several hundred Chinese will put in an appearance, and as it is customary for guests to bring along presents, the little fellow should certainly have an excellent start in life.”

In 1907 Ah Lie Young took her young family over to China while her husband remained in Cairns. She died in a year or so after returning to the village. By 1908 Lee Chin, at age 53, began to experience financial difficulties. Lee Chin became insolvent and bankrupt, whereupon he returned to his family in China, October 1910. He returned 8 years later in 1918 with his son Frank, but his daughter Jessie remained in the village. Son Robert James, born 1906, eventually returned to Queensland in the late 1920s.
Ah Young and Guong Dee, Aloomba, 1901

Born in 1861, China, Ah Young arrived in Queensland but it is not known when and where, other than that by 1900, he lived with a China born wife, Guong Dee, at Aloomba near Cairns. His appearance suggested that he had experienced a frightening occasion as a younger man, as he sported a large scar over his left eye which rendered it sightless.

On 22 December 1901 a son, Charles, was born in Aloomba to the couple. When he was ten years old, Ah Young and Charles travelled to the home village, China in 1911, with both returning two years later. Charles made another unaccompanied journey to the village as a 14-year-old lad in November 1915, and remained for three years. He returned in November 1919 and resided in Cairns from then on.

Lum Sou San and Bow See, Cairns 1899

Lum Sou San was born in Hong Kong in 1867. He married Bow See in a traditional Chinese ceremony in China on 6 January 1896. In 1899, Bow See arrived to join her husband Lum Sou San who conducted an Herbalist business in Cairns, trading under the name Gee War Tong. After the loss of two baby boys early in the marriage, Bow See gave birth to William John on 19 December 1901. Lum Sou San and Bow See went on to have 18 children in 23 years. Two were reputed to have died due to breast feeding problems, so the rest of the babies were then brought up on “Glaxo”. Lum Sou San and Bow See lived behind his herbalist shop and were extremely busy with all of their children. The children did very well at the local State School and a number of the boys and girls were awarded annual school prizes.

Lum Sou San was an active member of the Chinese community, extending his generosity to the broader Cairns Patriotic Fund, 1916-1918, as a regular donor. They fostered and maintained cultural traditions within the family, as shown when their son Willie wielded the lion’s head as part of the Chinese community’s contribution during a public procession in 1918. He was accompanied by George Kwong, son of Kwong Sue Duk, who manipulated the body and tail as the lion danced down the street to the local Chinese orchestra beating drums and cymbals while Chinese crackers exploded.

Bow See was an extremely well organised woman, running the domestic household while raising her children. Both parents made every effort to bring their family up with respectable values and when Bow See found out that her son was living with a woman in Atherton, she insisted that they marry. The couple duly married and moved back to Cairns to live in the Sou San family home. In 1922, Bow
See died suddenly one night after tucking the mosquito netting around each child and ascending the stairs to her room. Her spirit was believed to have stayed around the house and visited a son later on in his life. Lum Sou San was devastated at the time and, left to raise a large family on his own, sojourned with his children to China in April 1923. Eventually most family members returned to Queensland.

**TAM GEE WAH and SAN GOCH LAN, married 11.02.1903, CAIRNS**

TAM GEE WAH was born in 1851, China. On his arrival to Queensland, Tam Gee Wah lived in Cooktown before settling in Cairns, where he opened up a store. In 1903, Tam Gee Wah married China born San Goch Lan in a Western ceremony. In 1903, at age 51, he took his Oath of Allegiance and became a Naturalised British subject. This enabled him to form the Gee Wah company which controlled a large land holding at Green Hills estate.

On an application for Domicile Certificate, Tam Gee Wah’s commercial interests were valued at: Store £1200, and sugar cane farm, £5000. He was a very wealthy man on paper.

**KWONG SUE DUK & GEE SHEE (First Wife); CHEN NGOR GWEI (Second Wife); YUEN LUK LAU (Third Wife); WONG KWEI FA (Fourth Wife), Port Darwin (Palmerston) / Cairns/ Townsville, 1903 WUYI/SZEYUP**

Kwong Sue Duc and his family moved to Cairns from Palmerston (Darwin) in 1903 where he commenced a herbalist practice in Sachs Street, Cairns Chinatown. He lived with three of his four wives and large family which continued to grow in Cairns. His First Wife, Gee Shee, had by then returned China. Kwong Sue Duc resided in Cairns for three years before sojourning to China for two years in 1906 to visit First Wife, fulfill filial obligations and pay respect to his ancestors. Most of his family including his three wives and children joined him, including 11 months old baby girl KWONG LEE HAW, born in Cairns, and her pregnant mother Yoon See (Yuen Shee). On his return, Kwong Sue Duc moved to Townsville and commenced a herbalist practice where he remained for the next 16 years. Kwong Sue Duc practiced across Australia, including Melbourne in the early 1920s. His family were raised as Christian, most notably Methodists. He returned to Townsville and died in February 1929.

Gee Shee, First Wife, was born in 1853 and married Kwong Sue Duc in 1874 before they departed for Palmerston. She returned to China where she remained. Gee Shee and Kwong had four children. Chen Ngor Kwei/Chin Lee/ Shee, Second Wife, was born in China, 1867 and was married to Kwong in 1886. First living in Palmerston, she moved with Kwong and his extended family and lived in Cairns.
Together they had five children.

Yuen Luk Lau (Yuen Shee), born in China, 1870, became Third Wife of Kwong Sue Duk in 1887 at 17 years. By this time Kwong himself was 34 years old. She lived with his large family in Palmerston before moving to Queensland. Yuen Shee went on to successfully raise 9 natural children and 2 adopted children. A traditional woman, she bound the feet of her first daughter, 2-year-old Lykin, while in Darwin. Yuen didn’t bind any other daughters’ feet. Yuen Shee was responsible for the cooking and washing in the extended household. In later years she moved to Hong Kong where she lived until she died in 1936. Wong Kwei Far / Wong Shee was born in 1878 in China and married Kwong Sue Duk in 1899 as his Fourth Wife. Together with Kwong, she had four children. She died at age 50 in 1938.

WONG FONG and LON SEE, married 10.03.1902, CAIRNS

In 1849 Wong Fong was born in China. At age 15 he is noted to have arrived in Queensland (1864) and resided at Stanthorpe, the Gilbert River, Gympie, Georgetown and the Palmer River goldfields before returning south - first to Townsville, and then north again to Cairns in the 1890s.

Wong Fong married Lon See in Cairns in March 1902, having first taken out his Oath of Allegiance the same year at age 53. They lived at the back of his shop in Chinatown. Trading under the name Wong Fong Company, and in partnership with Chan Tin and Yet Fong, he had storekeeping interests in Cairns as well as Aloomba. However, in the Supreme Court Townsville in February 1906, a petition for liquidation by competition with creditors was filed on behalf of the Wong Fong Company with an debt amount estimated at £6568 9s.

Wong Fong’s health deteriorated, aided by a dependence on opium. With the knowledge that possession of opium was an offence, Mrs. Wong Fong did her best to dispose of the opium charcoal in a manner which would not be detected. Every morning she would take the chamber pot filled with the nightly duties and the additional opium charcoal to dispose of in the fowl house. They were the happiest of chickens until she was “caught” by police and fined for her efforts.
SAM SING and GUE LUN, married 14.01.1902, CAIRNS WUYI/SZE YUP

Sam Sing, born 4 October 1856, arrived at age 23 to Queensland in 1879, where he settled first in Cooktown for 2-3 years before moving to Cairns in the early 1880s. In 1895 he sojourned to China for two years before returning with his wife Gue Lun in 1897 to resume business in Cairns. In 1902, Sam Sing took his Oath of Allegiance and applied for naturalization. He bought 50 acres of freehold land and leased 200 acres more at Aloomba. He also had a store and land in Mareeba and carried out an import business. He grew large quantities of sugar cane and annually supplied the Hambledon Sugar Mill.

Gue Lun, born in 1874, was 21 years younger than her husband. She arrived in Cairns at age 23. Sam Sing and Gue Lun were re-married in a Western ceremony in Cairns, 14 January 1902. Sam Sing and Gue Lun were a benevolent couple. They adopted two children: 2-month-old baby Nellie of Charters Towers, of mixed Chinese/White heritage, whose White mother had died. The other was a boy, Edward, from Cairns, born 3 February 1904, who was later known as Edward Sam Sing or Edward Smith. The family lived on premises at the rear of Sam Sing’s two storied shop, Chinatown. In 1905 Sam Sing took a petition around Chinatown which was signed by prominent members of the Chinese community in support of the push to prohibit the importation of Opium into the Commonwealth.

In 1906 the family applied for a CEDT to sojourn to China for a period of three years. Sam Sing and Gue Lun were anxious to take Nellie and Edward with them and the children were described by authorities as “1/2 caste”. The family returned to Cairns in 1909. By 1911, Sam Sing had been in Queensland for approx. 33 years with 30 years in Cairns. The family travelled back to the village in China: Sam Sing, Gue Lun and Nellie remained, but Edward returned in 1923. Upon his arrival, having been away for so long, Edward Sam Sing had his identity questioned. The photograph of the boy who left did not match the young man who arrived. However, on verification from leading White members of the Cairns business community, he was allowed to land.

PANG AH CUM and YOUNG YEE (Young Pang Ah Cum), c. 1901, CAIRNS

Born in 1865, Pang Ah Cum arrived with his two brothers Pang Young and Pang Ah Way to north Queensland in 1874, landing first in Townsville before moving to Ingham to take English lessons. They then went to Charters Towers before finally settling in the Cairns/Port Douglas district. All three brothers married and went on to raise families: two brothers married White women (Pang Way married Jane Goodwillie, 1890, in Port Douglas and Pang Young married Annie Beechley in 1899, in Cairns), whereas Pang Ah Cum brought a wife out from China, around 1901, suggesting he
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was the eldest.

Young Yee, born in 1872, Canton, arrived in Cairns approximately 1901 and had her first child, Edward, in 1902. Young Yee and Pang Ah Cum went on to have 5 children, although what became of Edward is unknown. Originally living in Cairns, Pang Ah Way moved his interests down to Aloomba and the family followed. The two last children were born there. In 1914 Pang Ah Cum, his wife and family made an application for CEDT to visit China. For some reason the family did not make the journey and the CEDTs were cancelled. It was not until the early 1920s that the family was able to return to the village. Only some of the children returned to Queensland as a group. Bessie stayed the longest and returned to Queensland in 1937.

SUN SHUM LEE and HEE SUN HEE, married 12.06.1901, CAIRNS

Shun Shun Lee, born Canton, 1862, was associated with Chinese merchant import/ export firm Sun Shun Lee which supplied corn, bananas, fruit and vegetables of all descriptions, both wholesale and retail, to both a local and a shipping clientele. In 1898, as one of the large exporters associated with the banana industry, he was a signatory to a key petition by Chinese merchants in a letter to the Cairns Chamber of Commerce, requesting help in resolving issues relating to the rejection of bananas from Cairns due to fruit fly infestation. At the time, Sun Shun Lee estimated that Cairns Chinese merchants exported approximately 15,000 bunches a week, of which he contributed about 3000 bunches. Issues relating to banana transport led to his financial ruin. In January 1904, he went into liquidation with liabilities estimated at £3,369.

In late 1899 or early 1900, Hee Sum Hee, wife of Sun Shun Lee, arrived from China. Their first child Florence was born sometime in 1900. Sun Shum Lee wed Hee Sum Hee in a Western ceremony on 12 June 1901. This was the first marriage in Queensland for Sun Shum Lee. That same year, Sun Shun Lee took his Oath of Allegiance and became a Naturalised British subject. Between 1904 and 1908, three more children were born. It is not known what happened to Hee Sum Hee but it is assumed that she died, as she did not accompany Sun Shum Lee and family to China in October 1911.

By 1913, Sun Shum Lee was back in Queensland and he married for a second time to Amy Winifred Sing. It is not known where Amy met Sun Shun Lee, but she already had a 2 year old illegitimate son, born in 1910. In 1918 Florence, Ellen, Amy and Edward returned to Queensland after 7 years living in China with their extended family.
YEE/ WEE TUNG YEP and Maggie LEONG HONG m. 28.08.1914 CAIRNS WUYI/SZE YUP

Yee Tung Yep (Thomas) was born in China, 1878, and arrived in Queensland in 1895 at 17 years of age. He began work in an importing business firm, then working for Merchant firm Sam Sing until his appointment as manager in 1907. In 1911 Sam Sing sojourned to China and appointed Tung Yep as manager and attorney to his Queensland affairs. Tung Yep eventually went into business for himself and spent time cane farming near Babinda, as well as storekeeping in Cairns. The family lived at the back of Tung Yep’s store in Spence Street, Chinatown. Thomas Tung Yep continued to carry on his business throughout the Second World War. Having lived a full life, Thomas Tung Yep died at the Cairns Base Hospital on 19 February 1952 aged 74.

In 1914 a marriage was contracted to Maggie Leong, born in 1896. She arrived in Queensland as Second Wife for Wee Tung Yep. They married in an Anglican ceremony in the private residence of Taam Sze Piu and Chan Han, Innisfail. Maggie very quickly produced their first child, a boy, who died soon after birth. She then went on to produce 5 more children. She was a firm mother and a stabilizing force in the family. As a devout Taoist, she taught her children the meaning of spirituality and Chinese cultural rituals, yet raised her family as Anglicans. She was often sick, and it was discovered she had a kidney complaint and she died in 1938. She is buried in the Martyn Street Cemetery, Cairns.

It is highly probable that Maggie Leong Hong was actually the daughter of Leong Hong and Ah Cum of Geraldton. Although family stories say Maggie was born in China, her CEDT forms note her birthplace as “Geraldton”.

Andrew LEON (LEONG CHONG) and Mary PIGGOTT, m. 8.02.1869, lived CAIRNS ZHONGSHAN/CHUNGSHAN

Andrew Leon, born 1840, China, arrived in Queensland at age 21. He moved around Queensland, spending most of his life in north Queensland. In 1869, he took an Oath of Allegiance and became a Naturalised British subject which enabled him to become one of the most respected Chinese entrepreneurs of Queensland in the 19th Century.

Mary Piggott, a native of Ireland and a Roman Catholic, was born in 1846. She migrated to Queensland in the late 1860s and married Andrew Leon in Bowen on 8 February 1869. The first of three children, William, was born in Bowen, 1871 when at the time, Andrew was working as a cook.

As soon as news of the Palmer rush arrived, he moved to Cooktown, only to quickly move to Cairns in 1877. It was there that Andrew Leon was among the first to erect a store, next to Sun Chong Lee in Abbott Street, and was quickly joined by his wife Mary and their three children who arrived.
from Cooktown in 1877. In 1878, at age 7, William Andrew Leon was sent to the village family in China. It was not until 1903 that efforts were made by his father for his return to Queensland, but he was not successful.

In 1881 Andrew Leon formed with 100 other Chinese a co-operative of shareholders to cultivate a large selection of land. This became the first sugar plantation in the Cairns district, the Hap Wah Mill. As manager of the plantation, he tried growing cotton first and later sugar between 1881 and 1886. However, due to various reasons it was unsuccessful. Andrew Leon turned his attention to citrus growing and moved his family to the hinterland region of Kuranda.

Leon was a strong civic leader within the Chinatown community, and acted officially on many occasions such as presenting welcome addresses from the Chinese community to visiting dignitaries, and acting as official Court Interpreter for trials. He purchased land for the Chungshan temple, the Lit Sung Goong, and remained joint principal trustee for the temple until he died in 1920. He died at his residence in McLeod Street, at the ripe old age of 80, and as devout Catholics Andrew and his wife Mary were buried in the Catholic section of the Martyn Street Cemetery, Cairns.

JAN BUNG CHONG & Harriet PLUMMER, m. 15 August 1887 CAIRNS ZHONGSHAN/CHUNGSHAN

Jan Bung Chong was a storekeeper in the 1890s in Cairns Chinatown, and was one of the partners in the firm Chong Lee. He took out his Oath of Allegiance and was naturalised in 1887. That same year he married English migrant Harriet Plummer, the daughter of Thomas Plummer and Rebecca Grieves.

The Cairns Post newspaper noted at the time, “A marriage took place in Chinatown on Monday, a white woman and a Chinaman playing the leading parts. This is the lady's second husband, the last dear departed, also a Chinaman, dying up at Cooktown a short time since.” Their first daughter Edith was born in July 1888 but the baby died just three weeks later. A second child, Lil, was born in 1891 but she too died not long after. Harriet died in 1892. Jan Bung Chong was an active member of the community and second trustee for the Lit Sung Goong in Cairns Chinatown. He remained trustee until his death in 1923.

LIN HEE Tom ad Jessie Ann PATTERSON, married 24.02.1884 CAIRNS

Lin Hee married Jessie Ann Patterson, the daughter of Alexander and Elizabeth Patterson, on 24 February 1884. Two years later a girl, Georgina, was born in 1886 and a boy, Alexander Patterson, in 1899; and another son, Henry, in 1890. Together they lived in Sachs Street, Chinatown, Cairns until
Jessie Anne’s death in 1891. It was a rough place for a woman as experienced by Jessie. In 1888 Jessie Ah Hee was verbally and physically abused by Ah Sam in Chinatown after unwisely suggesting that the books he kept did not reflect regular commercial activity but were in fact those of the Fan Tan table. Lin Hee himself went on to become one of the three court interpreters for the community.

In 1901, Lin Hee celebrated the marriage of his daughter Georgina to Chen Fong Yan. At the time Georgina was only 15 and required his consent to marry Chen Fong Yan who was 29 years old. In 1904 his son Alexander (Alick), at age 15, caused concern for his father when he was gaolred briefly for assault. Perhaps it was because of this incident that the boy was sent to the village family in China, in 1908. Very little else is known about the family.

Quan Yock King, born 1859 to Soey Fing and Soe Ping, operated a commercial store in Cairns Chinatown from 1889 until his untimely death in 1894. Having a prominent position in the street, he gained renown at the time in the community for displaying an unusual pineapple which had been grown in the Barron River delta by his gardener supplier, Sam Get. He married Emma Mary Castell/ Costall, an Irish woman, in 1893. His uncle, John Quan Tim, also married a White woman. In 1894, calamity befell the family when their daughter Ruby died and Quan Yock King had an accident. He fell off his dray and the wheel of the cart ran over him. He succumbed to his injuries. Mary, also known as Emma Mary or Emma May, went on to marry another Chinese man, Thomas Kong, in 1895.

John Quan Tim arrived in Cairns when it was still in its early years. In 1885 he took his Oath of Allegiance and became a Naturalised British subject which enabled him to purchase a large area of land in the Kuranda district. There he had orchards.

Jane Loo Sing, migrant daughter of James Coliwold and Jane McCaslin, married John Quan Tim after her first husband Loo Sing died. However, her second marriage also ended in an untimely death when Quan Tim also died. In 1893 a notice appeared in the paper declaring that Jane Quan Tim, widow from Kuranda, was insolvent. Jane herself did not live much longer and died, still a young woman, just four years later.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ah Chow</th>
<th>Annie Churcher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Image unavailable</td>
<td>Image unavailable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marriage Certificate Ah Chow and Annie Churcher with name change to Archer, 1914.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AH CHOW and Annie CHURCHER, m. 10.05.1884, CAIRNS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ah Chow was born on 1 January 1850 and he arrived in Cooktown just as the Palmer River goldfield was opening up. He lived in Cooktown for two years and at Thornborough on the Hodgkinson goldfield for one year before moving to Cairns where he lived for the next seven.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annie Churcher arrived in Townsville in 1883 where she lived for five months before moving to Cairns. Having learnt the skills from her father, Annie worked as a bricklayer. She met and married Ah Chow on 10 May 1884, just nine months after arriving in the colony. As one of the first storekeepers in Cairns he was well positioned in Sachs Street for his business. However, when the Atherton Tablelands started to open up he took his family to Atherton in the mid-1880s. There they had a large family of nine children: one of whom died as a child. The Ah Chows anglicized their name to Archer in 1914 to avoid discrimination, and to enable at least one son to enlist in the Australian Imperial Forces; he served overseas in the Great War. At least one of the boys, Ernest Edward traveled to the village family in China 1905, and he did not return until 1913. Very little else is known about the family.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WAUGH HING and Mary O’ HALLORAN, m. 1876 MARYBOROUGH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AH YOUNG and Mary HING m.? CAIRNS (second marriage for Mary)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Mary O’ Halloran was born in County Clare, Ireland, in 1858. Immigrating at a young age, she was introduced to prominent Maryborough merchant Waugh Hing not long after she arrived. On 23 February 1876, the couple married at St. Patrick's Church, Gympie, with Waugh Hing baptized first before the ceremony. After the nuptials, the couple slipped out the back to the buggy which headed down the road to a reception at Waugh Hing’s establishment, where a placard had been posted on the door: "closed owing to a marriage in the family." The bride was dressed in white satin, and was accompanied by her bridesmaid. The following year a son, Patrick, was born and the couple may have left for China for an extended period after Waugh Hing became insolvent. Mary remained in China and Hong Kong for approximately 18 years but when her husband died, she returned to Queensland, living first in Townsville (where she met child Margaret Ah Foo, daughter of Caroline Tups) at a Chinese cook shop and boarding house kept by Lee Lang Quey. Mary Hing left for Rockhampton and by 1894, was periodically working as an interpreter in the courts as she was fluent in Chinese. She then moved to Mackay before settling in Cairns in the mid-1890s. Mary was a prominent member of the Chinese community in north Queensland as a boarding house proprietor in both Townsville and Cairns. Her boarding house in Cairns, Ah Young’s Boarding House, was a place where young Chinese
Australian girls were able to gain employment. Mary’s work as a court interpreter sometimes caused division within the community as she was often accused of bias. In 1903 Mary Ah Young, now wife of James Ah Young of Atherton (though living apart) made a statement in support of Margaret Ah Foo, to secure her entry back into Queensland by identifying her at the wharf. Mary Ah Young’s son Patrick married in St Monica’s Cathedral, Cairns, to English born Daisy Butler. The couple had in the wedding party his sisters Kathleen and May and his brothers Walter and Frank, who gave generously. Having led a very full life, Mary O’Halloran/ Waugh Hing/ Ah Young died in 1941 at 83 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lee Wah Shang and Mary Jane Noon, m. 21.02.1884 Rockhampton/ Brisbane/ Cairns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lee Wah Shang, born in China, arrived in Queensland in the early 1880s where he undertook a range of commercial activities including gardening and corn growing before branching out into cabinetmaking and building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Jane Noon was born 7 June 1867 at Irraway Station, Gayndah. Her father was Job Noon and mother Elizabeth Dumbleton, both of whom had emigrated from England on the ship “Sultana” in 1866. Job and Elizabeth worked on the station and he was employed as a shepherd. At age 17, Mary Jane commenced working as a domestic servant. She met and married Lee Wah Shang (who was said to be 27 years old but was really 36 years old) in a Methodist ceremony in Rockhampton. Two years later, the couple moved to Brisbane where they conducted a furniture business in Queen Street, Brisbane, in 1886. Later they ventured into corn farming in the south, and after many years of prospecting in the Rockhampton district, they finally moved to Cairns in 1904.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane and Wah Shang had 13 children: the first child was born in Brisbane where Wah Shang was working as a gardener. The next 8 children were born between Bundaberg and Rockhampton. Wah Shang supported the family by building houses and working as a cabinetmaker. Mary Jane Shang was a big woman, kind and quiet; she frequently made her home a community focal point, hosting social card nights on a Sunday night. She was instrumental in helping the Chinese Relief Funds which aided the war effort. Two of their sons, Caleb and Sidney, were highly decorated soldiers in the First World War, Caleb in particular being awarded a Bar to the Distinguished Conduct Medal for exemplary bravery in France.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a grandfather, Wah Shang used to sit and smoke his opium pipe, wagging his finger at his 8-year-old grandson - “Not good for little boys”. Around 1917, beloved Lee Wah Shang died at the family home. After the death of her husband, Mary Jane visited China where she went for health reasons. On 22 June 1945 Mary Jane Shang died at age 78. She</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
was survived by four sons, five daughters, thirty-nine grandchildren and fourteen great grandchildren.

William LESWELL and Mary Hannah FINN, THORNBOROUGH
Mary Hannah Peters was born in 1867 somewhere between camps on the Palmer Goldfield in the far north of Queensland. She led a colourful life; by 1886 she was a widow at 19 years, and she then married William Leswell who was a mining engineer on the Palmer in 1890. The couple moved south to Thornborough, but by then their relationship was on the wane. Later that year a child was born, a girl, Eliza. It was obvious to Leswell it was not his, as the girl was part Chinese. Another child was born which was Leswell's and then a third: Tom, again part Chinese.

Leswell cleared out to WA and committed bigamy, as did Mary Hannah in 1909 when she married Harry Finn. Her second child, Leswell’s child Jack, was killed in the Middle East as a soldier in WWI, and third son Thomas also died at an early age.

Mary Hannah never divulged who the father of the first and last children was. Daughter Eliza vaguely remembered that a Chinese packer used to visit and “stay” a while. Like all mining women, Mary Hannah was hardy and resourceful. She raised her grandson and was remembered later in life for her practice of reading tea leaves and forecasting the future. She died in 1960.

James AH CHING (JANG CHING) and Sarah HADLEY, married 1879 CAIRNS
James Ah Ching (Jang Ching) was born in 1837 and arrived in Queensland in the early 1870s. He lived and worked in Charters Towers and Ravenswood before moving to Townsville, where he met and married Sarah Hadley in the late 1870s.

Sarah Hadley, born in 1853 in Staffordshire, England, departed for Queensland on the “Scottish Prince” at age 25. On 16 December 1878, she arrived in Townsville. As a former cook in wealthy homes, she was not only literate but also a good organizer. Five months after her arrival, she married James Ah Ching, in a Methodist ceremony in Townsville. They moved to Cairns which was rapidly expanding as a key agricultural centre.

James Ah Ching was an astute businessman, entering the commercial market as a land speculator. Ah Ching made a habit of putting properties in his wife Sarah’s or his children’s names. Their first child, the first of seven, was born at their residence, a large place which was on a hill overlooking his land holding of market gardens, small rice mills and other crops.

The family later moved into Sachs Street. It was there that their first son James Ismael Stanley was born in 1885. Sarah was very English and James Ah Ching quite Westernised, and both entertained each community on a regular basis. However, he lost his fortune in the 1893 bank crash and just as he was recovering, he entered a bad business contract with a European man, which proved
financially disastrous. He lost everything. The White community turned their backs on Ah Ching. In 1915 James Ah Ching applied as a 78-year-old for his CEDT to return to China. He died and was buried at sea on his way back to China. Sarah died a few years later. She had produced 5 living children, two girls and three boys. The two girls went “European”, marrying European men, and the men remained single and went “Chinese”.

PANG MUEN YOUNG and Annie BEECHLEY: married 1899, Cairns
Pang Muen Young (Ah Young), born 1859, China, arrived with his two brothers Pang Way and Pang Kum in north Queensland in c. 1874. They landed first in Townsville before moving to Ingham to take English lessons and then onward to Charters Towers. It is thought he met Annie there.

Annie Beechley (Beachley, Beech el et), born on the Jersey Isle in 1860, allegedly ran away from her family when around 20 years old. In 1885, Annie Beechley married James Ah Wing on 10 September. James, a cook, was born in Hong Kong and was age 26 at the time of the marriage, while Annie was age 24. That same year a daughter Maud Ah Wing was born in Flinders Street, Townsville. However, Ah Wing unexpectedly died, leaving Annie and Maud alone.

After Pang Muen Young met Anne Ah Wing, they moved to Cairns where they lived together. He became a major storekeeper and land owner in Cairns and Aloomba/ Nelson (later Gordonvale) and was a member of the merchant firm Wing Hing & Company - a company owned by Tsip Nam and Pang Muen Young, with large sugar interests at Aloomba. Living together, but not married, Pang Muen Young and Annie Beechley had a baby girl Amy in 1887, born at home behind Wing Hing & Co, Sachs Street, Chinatown. After a while they moved to Nelson where they lived for a number of years before they married in a private Methodist ceremony at their residence in 1899. That same year, Pang Muen Young applied for his Certificate of Naturalisation, having been in the Colony for 25 years. Troubled by short sight, Pang Muen Young went to China for treatment. While he was there he died. In 1929 Annie also died at age 69.

CHUN KWONG KEE and Elizabeth (Bessie) DYKES, m. 15.11.1886, Cairns
Sun Kwong Kee was born in 1855 in China and immigrated to Queensland as a young man in 1874. First arriving in Rockhampton, he later moved to Mackay where he met his future wife Elizabeth Dykes.

Bessie Dykes, born in Somerset, England, migrated to Mackay from England with her mother Elizabeth and father William in 1883. Her father died soon after arrival. Elizabeth Dykes (Mrs. Dykes) was a midwife, and she taught her daughter Bessie so both women could be financially independent. In 1886, Bessie Dykes met Kwong Kee. At 16 years old she was half the age of Sun Kwong Kee aka Chun Kwong Kee or Harry Kwong Kee, yet they
married on 15 November 1886. The next year Bessie produced the first of five children. Kwong Kee and Bessie moved around from Mackay to Port Douglas before finally settling in Cairns. Bessie and her mother Mrs. Dykes resumed their midwifery practice and delivered many of the Sachs Street children, including all 18 of the Sou San family.

Kwong Kee became a well-known figure in the Chinese community. He took his Oath of Allegiance in 1901 and became a naturalised British subject. By then he had been in the colony for 27 years. Eventually he bought a store in the sugar town of Babinda near Cairns, and two of his sons, Albert and Willie, worked on nearby sugar cane properties after successfully applying for exemption from The Sugar Act. Bessie separated from Kwong Kee and moved to Cairns where she lived with her daughter, who had a dress making business. In 1919, Bessie posted a notice in the paper officially changing her name from Kwong Kee to Conkey.

Kwong Kee died at 68 years of age, and was described in the paper as an ‘old identity in North Queensland’.

ATHERTON TABLELAND

CHAN TIN and Mrs. CHAN TIN (AH YEE), m. 7.10.1901 CAIRNS/TOLGA

CHAN TIN was born in 1863 in Canton, China, and arrived in Queensland in 1883. He conducted a store keeping business in Sachs Street, Cairns, trading with business partner Wong Fong. In 1900 he applied for Naturalisation and had been in Cairns for 17 years. His wife Ah Yin had joined him approximately 18 months earlier, and was living with him in Cairns.

Ah Yin was born in China, 1867, and at age 31 was sent to her husband. In 1899 she gave birth to a son, Willie, and subsequently had four more boys, all born in Cairns. In October 1901 the couple were married in a Western ceremony in Cairns. In 1902 in the District Court of Townsville, the firm trading as Wong Fong and Co went into liquidation. After everything was settled the family moved to the Atherton Tablelands to start afresh.

In March 1914, Chan Tin and Ah Yin took their family of five boys to China. They remained in the village until May the following year, whereupon they all returned to Cairns. The family travelled between China and Cairns over the next few years and shared their time between each household.
WONG SO CHOY and Ah Hoe So Choy, m.
PORT DARWIN  KAIRI

Born in 1860, China, Wong So Choy arrived in Australia and landed in Port Darwin, where he spent some years before he travelled to north Queensland. Upon arrival he settled at Kairi on the Atherton Tablelands. While he was in Darwin, he was joined by a wife Ah Hoe, and together they had a number of children before they made the journey to the east coast.

Mrs. Ah Hoe So Choy was born in 1878, China. At 4 ft. 11 3/4 inches tall she was a petite woman who bore a large family of approximately 10 children. Most were born in Port Darwin with only a few born in Kairi.

In 1916, the family prepared to travel to China. Ah Hoe and Wong So Choy left for the village but not all of the children joined them. Despite applying for a CEDT, Charles remained in Queensland. Of those who did sojourn, the majority returned from China except for daughter Ah Kum and Ah Hoe. Ah Hoe remained in China for two years before she returned in 1918. She made a second visit to China in 1928 at age 50 with her two youngest children, Sing Quay and Emily May. Both Ah Hoe and Emily May remained in China.

By 1930 the family were settled around north Queensland including in the central west. One of their sons, Percy, had employment as a gardener at Hughenden but was accidentally killed in car crash when on holiday visiting Chinese friends in Townsville. He was just 20 years old. By 1937, Wong So Choy had died, leaving Ah Hoe permanently in the village in China.

MOW JUE SUE and OY CHIN (Second Wife),
married 1914, Port Darwin

Mow Jue Sue was born in Hong Kong in 1880. He was married as a young man prior to his departure and a son was conceived. In 1903, at the age of 23, Mow Jue Sue arrived in Darwin, Australia where he lived before moving to north Queensland. In 1913 Mow JUE SUE applied for a CEDT sojourn home to see his wife and son. By then he was 34 years old. It was decided that a second wife be procured and on his return to Australia, he was married in Darwin to Oy Chin, the Australian born daughter of a Darwin couple, on 3 September 1914. His was a ‘two primary wife’ family.

Oy Chin was born in 1898, Port Darwin, Northern Territory. She travelled with her new husband to north Queensland where they settled down on a farm near Atherton. It was there that a daughter was born, called Una. Oy Chin and Jue Sue brought up a large family (7 children) of boys and girls at the Tolga home.

Mow Jue Sue was well regarded as a storekeeper and maize grower. However, in 1918 the land he had leased was removed from him, as the soldier
settlement scheme resumed all leased land worked by Chinese residents. They took two children to Townsville and lived there for three years while she ran a shop there.

Jue Sue’s first son from First Wife came to Queensland to study in 1921 and later to work his father’s business. He moved to Townsville and set up a business there.

In April 1939, Mow Jue Sue died after being stricken with an illness he could not shake. He was survived by his widow, his brother (Jue Gun), and eight children: one to First Wife (James) and seven to Second Wife including Charles, Una, Philip, William, Minnie, George and Mary. He was buried according to the rites of the Church of England. Oy Chin, still a young woman, remarried to Wilfred Lee Long of Atherton and lived many more years until she died in 1954 in Atherton.

**Lee Pang**

Image unavailable

**Fanny Alice Scarisbrick**

Image unavailable

**Mary Agnes**

Lee Pang or Ah Sam /Ah Chung and Fanny Alice Scarisbrick, m. 30 December 1882, HERBERTON

Lee Pang or Ah Sam /Ah Chung was married to the elusive and colourful character known as Fanny Alice Scarisbrick. Fanny was described as a lady of "infinite variety in the choice of signatures: she uses any of her three names according to the whim of the moment."

Fanny Alice Scarisbrick was born in Lancastershire, England and arrived on the ship “Durham” to Cooktown in 1881. She married her husband, Sam Ah Chung, on 30 December 1882. Nearly twelve months to the day, her first child, a daughter Mary Agnes, was born in Port Douglas. Fanny and Sam Ah Chung went on to have 7 children, only two of whom survived to adulthood. Fanny moved to the Atherton Tablelands where she owned a little cottage, built on the water reserve in Herberton, valued at £70 pounds, under the name Fanny Lee Pang. There she worked nearly all her life operating a small commercial business as a laundress. In 1917 Fanny wrote a Will. At the time she had been married to her husband for 54 years and had only two surviving children: a son, John Ah Sam (age 19) and a daughter, Mary Agnes (married, age 31) who was living in the village in China. Neither children were dependant on her, nor had she seen her husband AH SAM for over 20 years. She signed her name scratchily as Fanny AH SAM. She bequeathed her house to Mrs. Mary Ann Pemrey of Herberton.

In 1919 a second Will was drawn up noting that her husband Ah Sam had left for China and she did not know if he was alive and she had not heard from her two surviving children. She changed her beneficiary of estate to Mrs. Eva Esther Standen, with funeral expenses to be taken out of her estate so that she can be provided with a "first class funeral". She relocated to Brisbane in 1923. By 1926, Fanny Alice Ah Sam was living at the
Salvation Army Women's Home, Stanley Street, South Brisbane. She had been approved for admission to the Dunwich Benevolent Asylum. She was 68 years old, a pensioner with rheumatism, and had no means to support herself. Her reason for admittance to Dunwich was because she was invalid, had no one to care for her, was too old to work, and was destitute. She died one year later on 11 August 1927. Upon enquiry the Public Curator found no relatives of the deceased and she was given a pauper's burial at Dunwich Benevolent Asylum for a total cost of 1 pound 15 shillings. Eventually the Wills were found and Mrs. Standen was awarded the cottage in Herberton.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Johnnie Go Sam/ Gow Sam</th>
<th>Polly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Image unavailable</td>
<td>Image unavailable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Johnnie GO SAM/ GOW SAM and Polly, HERBERTON

Gow Sam (Johnnie Go Sam) was born in China and had been living in Herberton since 1894. He had a mixed business store with a market garden out the back. It was there that he lived with his Aboriginal wife, Polly, who lived either in or near the garden or in the residence area at the rear of the shop. Either way, she did not work in the shop, serving customers.

Polly’s children were all of mixed paternity and this was of no consequence to Polly or Go Sam. Polly brought her seven children up in Aboriginal customs and they identified with their Aboriginality. The Protector of Aborigines in that region was particularly hard on mixed race relationships and they faced a lot of pressure. Luckily, Go Sam and Polly managed to evade his attention. In 1914, Gow Sam applied for Naturalisation but it was rejected due to a change in policy. In 1916, Gow Sam was registered in Herberton for his Alien Registration Certificate; it is thought that he died there.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEE TONG and HOW HOY, m. 25.06.1894, GEORGETOWN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Yee Tong was born in 1850 in China. He arrived in north Queensland in 1875, at 25 years old. He found his way to Georgetown by 1894, where he commenced storekeeping. He was there when arrangements were made for a wife to be sent to him, and How Hoy arrived in mid-1894. How Hoy, born in 1876, arrived in Cairns, north Queensland at age 18. Upon arrival she travelled overland to the Etheridge to meet her husband to be in Georgetown. She married Yee Tong on 25 June 1894, a man 26 years older than his bride. A year later, after a difficult labour, she lost her first child who died at birth. How Hoy and Yee Tong went on to successfully raise a family of four: two boys and two girls, all born in Georgetown.

Yee Tong traded under the name War Yuen Jang and Co. and was a prominent civic leader and
James                            Wing Chong                            Florrie

hospitable host to both Chinese and non-Chinese alike. At Chinese New Year, he would open his doors to the Georgetown community with guests arriving to his shop, to be greeted by Yee Tong with a welcoming champagne. One paper report noted "they drunk in the king of liquors to the usual 'For he's a jolly good fellow,' to which he [Yee Tong sic] suitably responded. The health of Mrs. Yee Tong and family was similarly honoured, and altogether the guests had 'a right, good time.'" It all came to a sudden end on 6 March 1906 when at age 56, Yee Tong unexpectedly died. With the death of her husband, How Hoy left Georgetown and took the family to Cairns before departing for China. However, she returned to north Queensland along with son James and daughter Nellie in the mid-1930s.

TOM TIP and AH FOOK, MARRIED 8.06.1885
DELANEY RIVER /GEORGETOWN

Tom Tip was born in China in 1849 and arrived at age 19 years to Australia, in 1868. He landed in Sydney and worked for six months as a store man. When his six months ended, Top Tip left to take up employment at Gowie Station near Charleville, Queensland where he worked as a station cook.

After three years, Top Tip moved further north to the Etheridge goldfields where he set up a supply chain of stores from Gilberton, to Georgetown and across to the Delaney River. He expanded his commercial interest by also cultivating vegetables to supply his stores with fresh produce. He was popular with the miners and covered all bases when he took out a butcher’s license. In 1885 Tom Tip took out his Oath of Allegiance and applied for Naturalisation. By then he owned considerable personal property in the Georgetown district including 5 allotments in Chinatown itself. He also supplied the land upon which the Chinese Temple was constructed at Mt Hogan from 1891.

Tom Tip married China born Ah Fook /Ah Foo in June 1885. However, it was not a successful marriage. Their first son, William, was born the following year but he died in 1887. Another child, a daughter called Louisa was born one year later but the couple suffered a second loss when she too died, at birth. Not long after Ah Fook also succumbed, leaving Tom Tip on his own. Tom Tip remained in the Georgetown district until at least 1915. After this it is not known what happened to him.

Ah Fook
Image unavailable

Tom Tip
CHUN TIE was born in 1855, in China. He arrived in north Queensland around 1893 and made his way to the Etheridge goldfields where he applied for a 1 acre (4046.9 sq.m) Market Garden lease on Lanes Creek near Georgetown, under a one year lease. That same year he purchased two allotments in the Chinatown area (Section 19, lots 14 & 15) of Georgetown. In the home village, arrangements were made to send a wife over to Chun Tie and in 1894 Yuen Qui Fa arrived in Cairns and made the journey out to Georgetown to meet her new husband.

At 18 years old, Qui Fa was a little older than most of the young girls who migrated to their husbands, but there was still a large gap in ages. Chun Tie was 39 when she married him in the district registry office, Georgetown, on 25 August 1894. Chun Tie was able to sign his name but like most Chinese brides at the time, Qui Fa could only put her mark on the paper. A year later in 1894, Jing Way was born. Chun Tie and Qui Fa went on to successfully raise 10 children. They first lived in Georgetown before moving to further west to Croydon by 1898, where they lived in Samwell Street.

Chun Tie took out his Oath of Allegiance and applied for naturalisation in 1898. His application noted that he had been in the colony for 26 years, indicating that he had arrived when he was 17 years old. Chun Tie and Qui Fa sent all of their children to school in Croydon. The family moved to Townsville and when the sons reached a certain age, they took the children back to the village for a Chinese education. Chun Tie left the business and property in the hands of his brother, but he gambled it away on the horses. Chun Tie brought the family back to Townsville in order to repay debts and recoup the family loss.

Qui Fa made many repeated trips home to the ancestral village. In 1931, at 54 years and accompanied by her eleven-year-old son Ing Lai, she made what was to be her last visit. She remained for 7 years and returned to Townsville in 1938 just before the war broke out. Due to a lifetime of raising a large family and living in remote and hostile places, Qui Fa became a strict and grim woman. When Chun Tie died she became a formidable matriarch, assuming and wielding a position of power in the family. She was said to be capable of giving “the Look” and cutting family members out, and kept a small black book where notes of misdemeanours were written down concerning members of the family. She maintained a traditional life of San cong, the Three Obedience’s, until she died in 1958 at age 82.
### Tommy Ah Foo and Caroline Tups, m. 18.02.1875 Townsville/Croydon

Born in 1853, China, Tommy Ah Foo migrated to Queensland where he worked first in Townsville and later in Croydon as a storekeeper. He married a White immigrant woman, Caroline Tups, in 1875 in Townsville and they welcomed their first child, a son, in 1876. The couple went on to have a family of 7 children including 5 girls and 2 boys. In 1885, Ah Foo took out his Oath of Allegiance and became a naturalised British subject. Very little is known about Tommy Ah Foo or Caroline Tups. However, when her eldest daughter Margaret was just 4 years old, Caroline was separated from her when the little girl was sent to the village in China with an uncle.

Margaret Ah Foo remained with her uncle in China and he arranged a marriage between her and a much older man who lived in north Queensland. He was from the same village. Margaret returned to Townville but authorities could find no trace of her parents or family, and her arrival caused some a stir as she was so young. She was eventually allowed to land and went on to marry Chen Quing Boo.

### Yet Hoy and Luk Yet Ho, married c. 1880 Cooktown/Croydon

Yet Hoy, born Canton c. 1841, immigrated to Queensland in 1874. He commenced commercial operations in Cooktown as a merchant and was married to Luk Yet Ho, a young woman sent over from China. Luk Yet Ho (Ah How), born in 1865 in China, had by the age of 16 married, migrated to Cooktown, north Queensland, and given birth to a daughter Mud Gee (Maggie) in 1881. Three years later, she was married to Yet Hoy again in a Western ceremony on 17 January 1884. Yet Hoy was 27 years older than her.

By 1887, Yet Hoy had a store on the Endeavour River in Marton, a small community on the railway line near Cooktown. He extended his commercial interests to the newly burgeoning settlement of Croydon and he juggled the two places until the family moved to Croydon in 1890. In 1892 a son, Quong Yake (Bill) was born in Sircom Street, Croydon.

Yet Hoy and Luk Yet Ho had 9 children: two of whom died. Ah How suffered great loss at the death of her second child Liang Gee, who died from convulsions a few months after her birth at Marton on 18 March 1887. Another tragedy struck the family in Croydon in 1899, when their little daughter Gum Lin died as a result of a terrible scalding. Little Gum Lin (incorrectly written into the cemetery ledgers as Pumpkin), unknowing of the terrible danger, took her clothing off and got into the copper of boiling water as if getting into a bath. Her blisters were so bad they covered her body, a vivid memory for her brother.

On 29 March 1904, when Yet Hoy was away droving, the older children were at school, and the younger two, a four-year-old and a two-year-old, at...
home, Ah How gave birth alone to a still born baby. She had a post-partum haemorrhage and died. She was 49 years old. She was buried in Croydon but her bones were later exhumed and sent back to China in 1918. She is only one of three Chinese women to have had her bones returned. Most of the adult children eventually moved to Ingham where they conducted bakeries and stores, but Yet Hoy remained in the Gulf country, in Normanton. By 1916 he was 75 years old and he travelled to China for one last time with his son Bill. Yet Hoy returned two years later and lived in the Normanton, Georgetown and Ingham districts. He died in August 1932 and was buried in Ingham. He was 90 years old.

Charley HANN & Mary Josephine SULLIVAN, m. 4.12.1884 CROYDON

Charlie Hann was born in China in 1851 and he migrated out to north Queensland, presumably with a male family member, as a child of 8. As he grew up he moved around the north and ended up in the Gulf country, residing for a time at Normanton. In 1884 he met and married English migrant Mary Josephine Sullivan.

Mary Josephine Sullivan was born in 1861, in Kent, in England. She immigrated to the colony of Queensland c. 1884 where she commenced work as a domestic servant. She met and married Charlie Hann on 4 December 1884 in Cooktown, according to the rites of the Primitive Methodist Church, in the presence of James CAN TING and his wife, fellow English emigrant woman Ellen CAN TING. At the time Mary was 23 years old and Charlie was 32 years old. Charlie was described as a storekeeper at Normanton and it was to there that the couple departed.

In mid-1886, their first child, a son called William, was born in Normanton. He was quickly followed by four more children roughly two years apart, making a family of five: three girls and two boys. The family moved to the gold mining town of Croydon and it was there that Charlie Hann was most successful and gained begrudging respect from the White miners for his excellent ability to mine. Not only was he a practical and innovative miner, he was an excellent prospector, taking up key mining leases around Croydon. He acted as an interpreter for Court matters and an advocate for the Chinese community. Charlie Hann died at age 68 yrs. and 8 months and was buried in the Atherton Cemetery. Mary moved in her older years to Kingsford, NSW, where she died at the age of 83 in 1942. She was buried with Catholic rites at the Roman Catholic Cemetery, Botany. Rather than from Kent, her death certificate noted Mary as from Queenstown, Ireland! Either way she had been 34 years in Queensland and 24 years in NSW, a total of 58 years in Australia.
Tommy BING CHEW and MINNIE, c. 1912
OAKLAND PARK STATION

Tommy Bing Chew was born in 1857 in China. He arrived in Queensland at a date unknown and made his way around north-west Queensland, working on pastoral stations as a cook. Some of the stations he worked at included Delta Downs, Strathmore and Oakland Park, all in the Croydon/Gulf districts. By 1893, he was casually engaged as an interpreter in cases before the court in Croydon.

Born approx. 1891, Minnie Bing Chew was described as a mixed heritage Aboriginal woman whose father Olfers was a stockman and mother Rosy lived on the station. In June 1909, Bing Chew requested permission from the Local Protector of Aborigines to marry a woman who was employed at Delta Downs. Minnie and Tommy married on the 11 September 1909. He and Minnie had their first child, Peter, in 1912 followed by Mary one year later. Their birth was followed by three girls and three boys. They lost only one baby, a girl Rosie, in 1918. Nine years after the baby died, Bing Chew left for China in 1927 at the age of 70 and did not return. By 1930 Minnie was living with Albert Edward Ah Foo and she gave birth to another daughter, Norma Beatrice. Her eldest son Peter looked after Minnie and the family from the time he was 14. His schooling was meagre, having only attended the Croydon Primary School until grade four. He left to seek work and employment as a stockman and drover on the stations. In 1940 Peter Bing Chew enlisted in the Army in Townsville. His mother Minnie was noted as his next of kin.

AH MOOK and ONATSU KASHIYAMA (Mary), m. 15.05.1900 CROYDON

Ah Mook was born in 1866 in China. When he arrived in north Queensland he made his way to Croydon, where he had a market garden lease. He met and married Onatsu Kashiyama, a Japanese woman, in 1900.

Onatsu Kashiyama was born in Targomura, Japan, in 1878. It is not known when she came out to north Queensland but it is possible that it was in the late 1890s - early 1900s, and that she may have arrived with the small influx of Japanese women who came to work as pillow women to service the sugar cane gangs and mining workers around Cairns, Innisfail, Charters Towers and Croydon.

Ah Mook and Onatsu were parents and raised a family of five children. However, the family was a blended one, and not all of the children are attributed to the union of Ah Mook and Kashiyama. In 26 March 1900 a boy, Yuen Loy, was born to Ah Mook and “Casadue”. A son, Willie, was born in 1909 and a daughter Annie in 1910. They went to school at the local Croydon State School.

By 1911, Ah Mook had been tending 7 acres (2.8 hectares) of Market Garden in partnership with Sam Ah Gum at Tabletop Creek. Later that year, the family sojourned to China. While in China, Lily was born in 1912 and Onatsu fell pregnant again. It is not
known what happened to Ah Mook but it does not appear that he returned to north Queensland. Onatsu returned alone to north Queensland with her family in late 1913. In October the following year, a third daughter, Dolly Ah Din, was born in 1914. Ah Din had been a market gardener in the Croydon district since 1888. By 1916 Onatsu was officially noted as a “widow” in Lily’s school enrolment.

In 1918 Onatsu, Yuen Loy, Annie, Willie, Lily and Dolly applied again for a CEDT to travel to China. However, the exemption certificates expired and were cancelled, with the journey for reasons unknown not taken. It is thought that Yuen Loy remained in Normanton where he had commercial interests as a baker, and Willie farmed a market garden near Normanton, remaining there all of his life until he died in the early 1950s.

AH MUCK & Kate CONNOLLY, c. 1892, CROYDON
Kate Connolly had a reputation as a ‘fallen woman’ for living in the Chinatown area of Croydon, a place situated on the edge of town. In 1891 she was living with Ah Muck with whom she had a child. The baby girl, also called Kate, died at or shortly after birth. Without a means of support, and suffering from the death of her child, Kate Connolly became addicted to opium and worked as a prostitute for money. It all ended badly. In November 1895, Kate was found dead from an accidental overdose of opium.

The local paper noted matter of factly, ‘The police are forwarding the contents of the stomach to Brisbane for analysis’ She was buried in the Croydon Cemetery: a forgotten woman of the north.

BURKETOWN & NORMANTON

Tommy AH GOW and Annie GEHLSEN, c. 1884 NORMANTON / MUTTABURRA

Tommy Ah Gow was born approx. 1855 in Chin. He arrived in north Queensland in the 1870s where he commenced market gardening around the Muttaburra, and Georgetown district, occupying Market Garden No. 5 in Georgetown. Later on he moved to the Gulf port of Normanton.

Tommy Ah Gow was married to White woman Annie Gehlsen. Their first child Julius was born in 1881 followed by Alfred in 1883 and Lillie, 1884, Jimmy and George, Normanton,. The children attended school in Normanton and remained in the district. Lillie later married another Chinese man, Jimmy Ah You, in 1901 and had a daughter Ivy.

Annie Ah Gow owned an allotment of land in her own right in Normanton, which she transferred in 1940 to Ah Chin. Tommy Ah Gow returned to China on at least two occasions, the first for a visit in 1911 and again in 1914. He died in Normanton at age 97 in 1955, and is buried in the Chinese section of the cemetery in grave number 29.
Willie SOU KEE and Annie GEE HOY, c. 1912, BURKETOWN

Willie Sou Kee was born in 1877, in Macau, China. It is not known when he arrived in north Queensland but he made his way to Burketown in the north-western Gulf country by 1893.

In 1896 a daughter, Annie, was born to Jimmy Gee Hoy and his Aboriginal wife Maggie at Burketown. At 16 years old, Annie was then married to 35 year old Willie Sou Kee who was working in the district as a station cook and gardener on Lawn Hill Station. In 1917, a child was born to the couple, a boy called Tommy. Six months later an application was made for Annie, Sou Kee and baby Tommy to travel to China. While little Tommy was allowed to leave with his father, it appears that wife Annie, now aged 22, possibly being female and part Aboriginal, was unable to depart. Sou Kee took Tommy with him to China and he and the baby remained there for a couple of years.

By 1921 Willie was working at Louie Creek near Lawn Hill Station as a gardener. A number of Chinese men worked the gardens at Louie Creek. Willie Sou Kee and his family had kinship connections with the Ah Kup, Ah Bow, Ah Fat and Ah Sam families who also worked around the Gulf stations of Lawn Hill, Louie Creek, Neumayer and Floriana. Willie made three further visits back to the home village, in 1925, 1929 and 1934. While he returned to Queensland after then, it is not known when he died or where he is buried.

Charlie AH CHONG and Maggie, c. 1913 BURKETOWN/ CAMOOWEAL

Charlie Ah Chong was born in 1868 in Hong Kong. He arrived in Normanton around 1888, where he gardened on an allotment of Crown Land on the outskirts of the town; it had a little house on it. By 1902 Charlie Ah Chong was working as station cook at Uungera Station. Like many Chinese men in the district, he moved around the stations and in 1908 he was employed as the station gardener at Granada Station.

In 1912 Charlie Ah Chong married Maggie. A year later a son, Bruce, was born in Burketown and the family moved to Camooweal, where Charlie Chong worked as a baker. Charlie Ah Chong expanded his
commercial interests in the remote town and worked a store as well as a market garden on the bank of the river near the township. While he worked in his store, On Cheong Leong Storekeeper and Baker Camooweal, he employed another Chinese man, Sam Leon, former cook of Lawn Hill station, in his market garden. This may indicate some kinship affiliation. In 1922, the remote distance caught up with Ah Chong when he was fined £2 and 3/6 costs for tax evasion or failure to supply the Federal Income return to the Acting Police Magistrate. He was not the only remote Chinese business to evade this tax as Tie Hop from Hughenden was also fined the same day.

In 1922 Charlie Ah Chong had taken up Market Garden No. 1 at Cloncurry, along the Coppermine Creek. Two years later he took his eleven-year-old son Bruce to China. Charlie remained with his son for two years in China before returning to north Queensland in 1926, but Bruce remained in China for a further 3 years, and did not return until 1929 when he was 16 years old. Bruce remained in the Camooweal district and worked as a stockman on the Gulf stations.

AH SAM / SAM AH BOW and Opal MAGINMARM, m 14.11.1898, LAWN HILL LOUIE CREEK

SAM AH BOW was born c 1860 in China and made his way to Queensland, arriving in 1878 when he was 18 years old. Ah Bow, also known as Ah Sam or Sam Ah Bow, worked on Gulf country stations from 1886 onwards, commencing first as a cook/gardener at Granada Station and progressing to Lawn Hill Station by 1893. In 1898 Sam Ah Bow married Opal Maginmarm in November that year. Opal's "country" was in the Northern Territory on Brunette Downs. It is not known how she came to meet Sam Ah Bow, but most likely on Lawn Hill or Punjab Station: both where he had worked. One year later, a boy, Jimmy, was born to them. In 1900 Sam Ah Bow took out his Oath of Allegiance and applied for his naturalisation as a British Subject. Four years later he made an application to return to his village in China and made the journey home in 1905. At the time his application was supported by two station managers, one from Lawn Hill and the other from Punjab Station. Sam Ah Bow returned to Queensland and worked for his family. 1910 Jimmy AH SAM journeyed to China to undertake a Chinese education. It remains unknown as to whether he returned. Sam Ah Bow was still gainfully employed as a gardener on Lawn Hill Station by 1924; he had been there for 21 years and was then in his mid-60s.
JOHNNY AH KUP and Dolly, c. 1916 LAWN HILL

Johnny Ah Kup was born in 1872 and he arrived at age 12 to the Northern Territory in 1884, where he worked for many years before he travelled to find work in the north-western Gulf country in Queensland. In 1916 he gained employment in Queensland as a station cook on Lawn Hill Station when he was required to apply for his Alien Resident registration. It was noted that he had only been at the station for 3 months, having been the last seven years in the Territory.

It is around 1916 that Johnny met Aboriginal woman Dolly, perhaps on Lawn Hill Station. The couple had at least three children, Harold, Rose and Ethel. The family moved around and by 1920 Johnnie Ah Kup was working as the station cook on Riversleigh Station near the Northern Territory border. Eight years later, he was again working as cook on Lawn Hill, perhaps in deference to his wife’s links to country. By the 1930s he was working his own market garden.

Drawing upon kinship relations and working on marriage negotiations for his daughters, Johnny Ah Kup arrived in Cloncurry in 1935 with his wife and family from Lawn Hill. His intention was to marry one of his daughters to Stanley Ah Wong, proprietor of the store On Sing Loong. A contractual marriage arrangement had been brokered through letters penned by Ah Wing of Camooweal as the middle man, but upon seeing the girl Ah Wong reneged on the agreement, claiming Ah Kup was to bring his eldest daughter but instead brought his youngest daughter, age 16 (the eldest one refused to come). Ah Kup sued Ah Wong for breach of contract for not marrying his daughter, costs in bringing her down along with himself and wife and for work he had undertaken around the shop and garden. He requested payment from Wong for the family to return to Lawn Hill. Wong counter-sued, claiming that he had paid for the journey to Cloncurry and all other costs. After much too-ing and fro-ing the case was dismissed.

In 1942, Johnnie Ah Kup died in Cloncurry at the age of 80. At the time of death, he was employed as a cook.

KOM MOY and Violet Mooroonbe, 1898, GULF STATIONS/ CAIRNS

Kom Moy, born in 1865 in Canton, landed at Port Darwin in the 1880s where he resided for five years before moving to the Queensland Gulf country in 1894. Kom Moy lived in the Burketown district for 16 years where he worked as a cook on various stations, including Lorraine, Augusta Downs and Lawn Hill. In 1898 he married his Aboriginal wife Violet Mooroonbe and the couple had three children, Ah Chee, Georgie and Harry. All the births were registered in 1903 despite being born prior to registration.

Kom Moy made the first of regular sojourns to
Ah Chee                                 George

China commencing in 1907, when he sojourned for 18 months to his homeland, returning in 1909. At the end of 1909 he again returned to China, whereupon he remained a further one and a half years. This suggests that perhaps he had a second family in China. From 1912, Kom Moy lived on the east coast around the Cairns and Atherton districts for two years, working on agricultural farms. It is unknown if Violet lived with Kom Moy along the east coast.

George was 17 years old and living with his father at Redlynch when he was sent to the village in China. His brother Ah Chee followed at the end of 1919. Both boys had returned by 1920.

During his settlement in north Australia, Kom Moy had undertaken diverse occupations as labourer, station cook and market gardener. He was described by various people as “honest” or “straightforward” and managed to divide his time between the village in China and north Queensland. He died in China at a date unknown.

---

**CLONCURRY**

Tommy AH CUM and Alice KEYES, married 8.02. 1881 CROYDON /CLONCURRY

Tommy Ah Cum was born in China on 4 March 1865. He arrived in Townsville in 1871 as a boy aged 7. Just who he travelled with and where he went remains unknown, but he eventually ended up in Croydon where he met and married Alice Keyes.

Alice Keys/Keyes was born in Banana, Queensland. She worked as a laundress around Queensland before she met and married Tommy Ah Cum on 8 February 1881. In 1887, Tommy Ah Cum applied for Naturalisation but his request was refused. The reasons were not stated. He wrote again to the Colonial Secretary’s Office one year later requesting his personal documents, the original Marriage and Baptismal records, to be returned to him and his wife. By 1892 Tommy Ah Cum and Alice Keyes were living in Sircom Street, Croydon. Tommy worked as a firewood collector after he took out a license to collect it in the Tabletop district. Tragedy struck the family in 1892, when their one year old daughter Ellen died from convulsions. A fortnight later another daughter was born and she too died from convulsions. Two years later, after Maude was born, the family moved to Cloncurry.

In 1910 Tommy was engaged as a labourer in Cloncurry. His three daughters Emma, Maud and Bella commenced schooling at the local Cloncurry School. In 1916, Tommy Ah Cum was working as cook and gardener. The couple had twelve children, 5 of whom had died at birth or in early childhood. He was unable to purchase land as an unnaturalised alien, so his wife Alice Ah Cum purchased an allotment of land in Landsborough.

---
Street in an area known as Cloncurry Chinatown, 1918. The allotment had an old shop which had been turned into a residence. Ah Cum and Alice resided there with their family while he rented another shop close by from which he operated his fruiterer business. That same year their youngest daughter May commenced school. By 1926 Tommy and Alice had consolidated their cottage into a shop residence. (Sec 18, All 3) and were selling produce from it.

It is not known what happened to Ah Cum but by 1934, Alice Ah Cum was regarded by the Council Rates Clerk as an “old age pensioner”. Alice must have felt anxiety for her youngest daughter May when she was caught up in a bigamy case whereby her new “husband” was brought to court. He was accused of being lawfully married to Mabel Ella Blunt, when he went through with his marriage to May Ah Cum. He pleaded guilty, and explained he was under the impression that his first wife was dead - a mistake easily made with a transient population and poor communication. Alice Ah Cum died in Cloncurry on 19 January 1944. She is buried in the Cloncurry Cemetery.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>HUGHENDEN</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fong Sam</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image unavailable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FONG SAM and Mary Ann McKEY, m. 1892, CAPE RIVER**

Sam Fong was born in 1855 in China; his father was Chen Fong. He arrived in Queensland in 1872 at age 17 and made his way north where he met and married red headed Scottish born Mary Ann McKey/ Mc Kay.

Mary Ann McKey/McKay, born in Scotland c. 1872, and her sister migrated to Queensland. At age 20 she met and married Fong Sam, now called William Samuel Fong, in 1892 and produced a daughter, Eliza Jane. In 1895, Fong Sam took out his Oath of Allegiance and applied for certificate of Naturalisation. A year later the family moved to Winton where Fong Sam worked a bakery. William Samuel was enrolled in his first year in the local state primary school and the family rapidly expanded by the birth of twin girls Mary and Florence in 1897.

Fong Sam continued working as a baker in Winton. In 1908 he sent his eldest child and only son William Samuel to China for one year. It is possible that William Samuel came back earlier than expected as Fong Sam had died in Queensland c. 1909. When he returned William went to work as a carrier between Winton and Boulia before he later moved to Richmond. He married Anna Louise Lum Sing and owned a bakery.

In 1910, Mary Ann Fong married for a second time to John Ah Gee and moved back to the Cape River district. They had a child, Mary, while Mary Ann’s elder daughter Florence attended the local school. Ah Gee was a fruit grower in the Cape River.
district and he and Mary Ann left for Cloncurry where he may have had business interests with the firm On Sing Loong in Ramsay Street. Mary Ann Gee died at 76 years of age in 1950 and her husband Ah Gee at 70 in 1957. Both are buried in the Cloncurry cemetery.

ELIZA JANE Fong was born in Hughenden of Chinese /British descent. The daughter of William Samuel Fong and Mary Ann McKey (m 1892), she moved with her family around the Cape River, Hughenden, Winton and Richmond districts. Eliza Jane met Taroichi in Charters Towers where their first son Thomas was born in 1910. A second son, Kutch, was born in Townsville where the family lived. Taroichi and Eliza raised their family within the Christian faith and they attended the Church of England. In 1915 they decided to take the boys back to Japan for their cultural education and to meet their relatives. While Taroichi and his younger son Kutch returned to Queensland, Thomas did not return until 1937. At the time both boys were described as Japanese.

GERALDTON / INNISFAIL

WONG YUI CHEUNG / Charlie AH MOON and CHOU YOUNG, married c. 1899, GERALDTON/ TOWNSVILLE

Wong Yui Cheung or Charlie Ah Moon, was born in 1874 in China and migrated to Queensland where he worked as a market gardener at Goondi near Geraldton (now Innisfail) in north Queensland. In 1899, a marriage was arranged and contracted locally in Queensland between himself and the young servant girl of Lee Yan: Chou Young

Born in Lung Dou, Chungshan, 1883, Chou Young arrived in Cairns at age 12 as the Mui tsai to the young bride of a wealthy merchant, Lee Chin, one of the four brothers of Lee Chan and Co., Cairns. She was one of the first two Chinese women to arrive in Cairns. At age 16, despite eligible marriage prospects among the storekeepers and merchants in Sachs Street Cairns, a marriage was arranged between Chou Young and gardener Wong Yui Cheung. The match to a market gardener maintained her social status as a person below the merchant class wives.

Chou Young went on to have 7 children in Cairns, and spent the next twenty-two years producing and rearing a total of eleven children, as Ah Moon struggled to support his growing family. A cyclone and flood destroyed his crops and house in 1912. The family moved to German Gardens (renamed Belgian Gardens) in Townsville where another three children were born, making 11 children, and Ah Moon recommenced his commercial gardening practice. The garden was backed by a swamp and was on the edge of the town common. He grew fruit and vegetables there with the help of two other Chinese men and they had 5 acres (2 hectares) of gardens. They also had a small shop, which sold
produce as well as other items such as lollies, cigarettes, soft drinks etc.

After many years of hardship and poverty, the family purchased a general business in Echlin Street, West End, and they lived in the house adjoining. Charlie Ah Moon could hardly speak English. At home the family spoke Chinese but as time went on, Chou Young used to translate between the children and their father. When the children grew up they remained in the district, working in Innisfail, Townsville, Ayr and Home Hill, many owning their own businesses. They made a couple journeys back to China to visit relatives, attend to the cultural needs of their children and to fulfill filial obligations. The Moons were a welcoming family and Chou Young often held luncheons and card games on a Sunday for new arrivals such as the Jangs, Tim So and the Leong families. Chou Young acculturated well, starting off as traditional but moving quickly to a Western style of dress. She encouraged integration of her children, baptizing the girls in St Albans Church of England, Innisfail. She made sure all of the children were well mannered, well dressed and clean so as not to attract negative comments when they attended school. She travelled with her ageing husband to China in 1930 but returned “home” to north Queensland after his death.

**JONG QUAN PO and LEONG GEE, m. 2.01.1902 GERALDTON/INNISFAIL**

Jong Quon Po was born in 1857 in China. When he arrived in Queensland he commenced commercial practice as a Chinese Herbalist Doctor and set up business in Geraldton (later to become Innisfail). In 1902 he married in a Western ceremony Leong Gee, who was 24 years younger than her husband. Leong Gee was born in 1881 in Canton, and was 21 years old when she married. Along with her husband, she went on to raise an adopted daughter, Mary Jane.

Mary Jane Lippertt was born in Geraldton (Innisfail) in 1904 as the illegitimate child of red headed Mrs. Mary Ann Burgess (nee Lippert) and an unknown Chinese father. When Mary Jane was three months old Jong Quon Po and his wife Leong Gee adopted her, to raise as their own daughter. On completion of the legal papers of adoption, Jong Quon Po assisted Mary Ann Burgess back to Brisbane by paying her steerage fare of £25.

In 1907, when Mary Jane was 3 years old, Jong Quon Po and Leong Gee took their daughter to live in Lung Dou, Chungshan, China. There they raised Mary Jane. While Jong Quon Po returned to Queensland three years later, his wife and daughter remained in the village. After settling his affairs in Innisfail, Jong returned to China in 1913, where he remained. In 1919, a marriage was contracted for Mary Jane with a man called Low Gun Inn of Babinda. She was sent to him and they left for Mossman, north of Cairns, where they lived and raised a family.
Taam Sze Pui arrived in north Queensland and headed for the goldfields on the Palmer River. He remained there before he moved to Geraldton to commence work in the growing banana industry. He opened up general store in Geraldton with three other Chinese partners but eventually became the sole owner. Taam Sze Piu displayed remarkable reticence when it came to committing to marriage. His family therefore made arrangements for a suitable woman to be contracted for marriage and she was sent over to Queensland.

Chiu Chan Han was born in China c. 1880 in one of the Sze Yap speaking districts. In 1897 her marriage was contracted to Taam Sze Pui. At the time she was around 17 years old and he was 43. A very bright woman, she readily understood the English that her husband taught her. She was well liked and the “personality” of the two. She was popular with the English clients in the store and took over the running of the ladies’ dresses and fancy ware departments.

Together Tam and Chiu Chan Han had five children, two girls and three boys, with Chan Han being a very strict mother. In particular she was very strict with her eldest daughter, punishing her if she stepped out of line or was too slow to complete a task. When her eldest daughter was 11 she was taken out of school to work in the family business. Although very acculturated to Westernized ways, she remained devout in her religious observance and often at the appropriate times sent food to the Chinese Temple to feed the men who were caretakers, and to place offerings of food for the gods. Taam Sze Piu was Christian and Church of England, and anglicised his name to Tom See Poy.

Chan Han and the family sojourned to China on a number of occasions. She lived most of her life in Geraldton (Innisfail) but retired with her husband to Ny Chuen in the NamHoi district of Guangdong province, China, where she died in 1925. Tom See Poy consolidated the business interests of his firm in 1924 with the transformation of his business into a company, See Poy and Sons. With a capital of £30,000, See Poy and Sons went on to become one of the most prominent firms in Innisfail and his sons constructed the first and largest department store in Innisfail.

In 1926 Tom See Poy died in Sydney and he was buried in Innisfail with ceremony. His sons and daughters went onto become highly regarded business men and women of Innisfail.
Leong Hong was born in China in 1859 and settled first in Cairns before moving later to Geraldton with his wife Ah Cum and three children.

Ah Cum (Mrs. Leong Hong) was born in China in 1876. She arrived in Queensland in the mid-1890s to join her husband, who was 16 years older than her. Their first child of three, Maggie, was born in 1897 followed by Sarah, 1899 and Howard, 1900. In 1903 Leong Hong and Ah Cum applied for their Certificate of Domicile and sojourned to China with their three children. Both Leong Hong and Ah Cum returned to Queensland and they resided in Cairns. In 1915 Ah Cum returned to China and remained there. She was 39 years old. Maggie Leong Hong, who was born c. 1896/7 Geraldton, left as a little girl to live in China. She later was contracted in marriage as the second wife to Wee Tung Yep of Cairns and returned to Queensland. They married a second time in a Christian ceremony in the private residence of Tom See Poy and Chan Han in Innisfail.

Ah Gang or Mah Gee Lim, also known as Mar Gee, was born in 1864, in China. At 22 years of age he left China for Queensland and by 1903 was a storekeeper at Tully River. There he negotiated with local farmers for the rights to excess fruits in local orchards and he picked and packed the fruit, sending away up to 50 cases at a time, to southern markets.

On the 17th December 1903 at the St James Cathedral, Townsville, Mar Gee aged 39 years married Ah Gang, aged 19, who was also known as Yung Keoee. Their marriage had been contracted in China and she had been sent out to Mar Gee, arriving at Townsville.

Ah Gang was born in Hong Kong, the daughter of Ng Yung Kwai, a gardener, and mother Lin Soo. On her wedding certificate she was noted as a "general servant". It is plausible that given her occupation, she was a former Mui tsai. Her arrival in Queensland was, by all indications, a new start.

Mar Gee and Ah Gang moved to Tully where two of their three children were born: Thomas (b 1907) and Ruby (b. 1910). The family then moved to the Lower Herbert area in 1911 where Mah Gee worked as a gardener at Macknade. It was there that Leslie, their third and youngest son, was born in 1912. At the time, Ah Gang was attended by midwife, Rose How Kee, the wife of Tam How Kee, a local storekeeper. All of the children attended the local school at Macknade, with
Thomas starting at Halifax State School in 1913 before moving to the Macknade School in April 1915. He remained there until July 1921. His sister Ruby attended Macknade from February 1916 to October 1921 and Leslie, 1918 to 1926. Both of the boys had eight years education up to scholarship, but Ruby only had five years education.

Ruby was just 14 years old when a marriage was contracted by her parents between her and 54-year-old Chin Check. She was to be his Second Wife. First Wife lived in the village in China. She departed with Chin Chek for Hong Kong in 1924 for a brief sojourn to China before she returned home late that year. Her husband remained in China until 1927 with the First Wife. After this, George returned and he and Ruby had a family of four children: George and Doreen, born in Townsville, and Harry and Joyce in Innisfail. In July 1937 Chin Chek took his second family to meet their siblings in China. The family remained in China for two years before returning in March 1939 to Ingham. All of Mar Gee’s children remained in north Queensland and by 1926 had become known as Mah Kee. One branch of the family later changed their name to Markey.

**Young Sun and Elizabeth Postill, Ingham 1885**

Young Sun worked as a jeweller at Lower Herbert Chinese Camp near Ingham, where he lived with his de-facto wife Elizabeth Postill. Although she was the legal wife of William Edwin Postill, she had been living with Young Sun as his wife for some time. In 1885 Elizabeth, who was feeling poorly, reached for what she thought was a drink of water which in fact was a concoction made from opium water and alcohol – a recipe Chinese used in the Herbert district to ward off malaria and other fevers such as Ross River and Dengue. Her autopsy noted she had died from Opium and alcohol poisoning, but at the inquest into her death it was not established that she had deliberately taken her life – rather, she was feeling poorly and fate had played a hand at the time.

Young Sun, distraught at the discovery of Elizabeth’s condition, had to run from the Chinatown area into Ingham proper to get the doctor, a distance of 5.5 miles (8.8 kilometres). By the time he got back it was too late and she was dead.

**AH SEE and Mrs. Alice CASEY nee Cantwell, c. 1895 Halifax**

Ah See was born 1856 in China, and migrated to Halifax in the late 19th Century. It was there that he met and lived with Irish migrant Mrs. Alice Casey (nee Cantwell) from Clonmel, Tipperary, Ireland. Together they had two children: Joseph, born 23 May 1898, and Lilly "Nellie", born 20 November 1899. At the time of Nellie’s birth Alice was aged 32.

The family lived at Macknade, where Ah See was a lease farmer on cane farms owned by white settlers.
Ah See

He was under agreement to supply the Colonial Sugar Company (CSR) with sugar cane for the mill. He worked as a cane farmer/lessee for some years while his two children attended primary school. Both Joseph and Nellie commenced school at Halifax in 1909, under the name of Ah See. However, they soon became known as Casey.

In 1916, they accompanied their aging father back to China and sailed from Townsville in February. Joseph remained in China for two and a half years, returning to Halifax in 1918. Nellie remained longer, returning eight years later in August 1924. By the time Nellie returned, Joseph had already married Italian Silla Erba on 23 January 1924. He had also entered a partnership in shopkeeping with his new brother-in-law, Frank Erba, and they had a shop at Trebonne, Erba and Casey. This enabled Joe, Nellie and Nellie’s husband Rupert to consolidate business and family links between the Chinese and Italian community of Ingham.

A year after she returned Nellie married Rupert Look Hop Lee, the son of Look Hop and Eliza Ah Bow on 12 August 1925. Rupert Lee Look Hop, now known as Rupert Lee, later went into business with his other brother-in-law Joseph (Joe) Casey. This resulted in a very successful business concern, Lee, Casey and Co Ltd. Joe and his wife eventually moved to Brisbane while Nellie and her husband Rupert remained in Ingham, where Rupert was a very well-known and successful businessman.

Dick Louk

Dick Louk [Dick Louk] was born in Canton in 1860, to parents Ah Ching and Mary Jae. He arrived in Queensland on 20 December 1873 aged 13. Twelve years later he was working as a cook in Cairns. He took his Oath of Allegiance and became a naturalised British subject on 8 May 1886. In 1887, Dick Louk (married as Dick Lank) married 26 year old English immigrant Annie Elizabeth Anstee at the St. John’s Church of England. Annie, the eldest daughter of Benjamin Anstee, a builder and Annie Buckle, had migrated to north Queensland from Hendon, Middlesex, England. Together they had five children: Arthur Richard, Frederick William, Charles Thomas, Benjamin James, and Georgina Mary.

The family moved around the north, living in Ravenswood and Charters Towers before finally settling in Ingham around 1921. Dick and another Chinese rented a shop where he set up a little pastry business, advertising “hot pies and pigs’ trotters every evening”. It was a hard life. His wife Annie died in 1931 leaving an ageing Dick Louk to look after himself. He worked for approximately 6 years until he suffered an illness and then a stroke. This left him with a paralysed arm and unable to work. Undeterred, he rented a smaller shop at the same address and placed a board in the window which read ‘Dick Louk Herbalist’. His income was modest.
and supplemented by growing and selling a few vegetables. On 9 January 1937, at age 77, he was found dead in his hut on McIlwraith Street after a second stroke.

James AH BOW and Bridget O’DALY, m. 8.12.1875 INGHAM
On 8th December, 1875 at the St James Church, Townsville James Ah Bow (Jimmy) married Ellen Bridget O’Daly in the Church of England. James, the son of Chong Pow and Gee Pow, was born in Hong Kong in 1845 and was 30 years of age at his marriage. Bridget, the daughter of Patrick O’Daly and Eliza Green, was born on 20th December 1854 in County Clare, Ireland and at marriage was not quite 20 years old.

James and Bridget quickly started their family of four, with Patrick Joseph born c. 1877, followed by Eliza Jane, Mary Ann and Ellen Bridget Florence. They were all born in Townsville before the family moved to the Lower Herbert district where Patrick was enrolled as one of the first pupils at the Ingham Rural School when it opened in May 1885. He was eight and half years old. It is not known if the girls went to school. At the time, the family lived at Chinatown (Cowden) near Ingham, and James had a market garden nearby. He died in March 1896 and his wife Bridget died eight months later on 28th November 1896 in her home at Chinatown, from tuberculosis. At 42, she had been in Queensland for 21 years.

Her second daughter Mary Ann, a housekeeper in Chinatown, died five weeks later from the same affliction on 7 January 1897.

The remaining two daughters married Chinese men. Ah Bow married his first daughter Eliza Jane off to a much older Lee Look Hop (Thomas). The marriage took place at the Planter’s Retreat, Cowden, Chinatown on the 5th June 1891. At the time her marriage, Eliza Jane Ah Bow was 13 years old but her age was registered as 14. This was questioned by the official registrar. Just four months later at their residence she gave birth to the first of nine children, Elizabeth See, followed by Thomas, John, Mary, Rupert, Ellen, Cecil, Barbara, and Cornelius. Two of the boys had Daley as their second name, a nod to their grandmother’s Irish roots. In 1899 the first of a number of sojourns to China commenced. Some of the children did not return until 10 years later, and they kept up their village connection.

Ellen Ah Bow married three years after the death of her father and one year after that of her mother, to William Munson from Kyneton, Victoria. They celebrated their nuptials on 14 March 1899, at her sister’s residence in Chinatown. Ellen and William had three children before they separated: William Archibald, Rupert Patrick and Mary Henrietta. She had another daughter, Elizabeth Rose, born 1907 before she married Scottish born Kinmaird Rose Campbell. Together they had four children. Patrick on the other hand never married. He went to China.
in early 1914 and returned the following May. He became a farmer at Stone River. However, he succumbed to throat cancer on 28 October 1928 and died in the Ingham Hospital at age 51.

TOWNSVILLE

SUE FONG and CHANG SUE, m. 5.07.1879, TOWNSVILLE
Sue Fong was born in 1836, in Canton. He departed for Queensland where he settled in Townsville in the 1870s and became a merchant. He was the first Chinese man to bring out a China born wife. Chang Sue was born in 1861 in China.

Very little is known about the couple or how long they remained in Townsville. In 1880 a daughter, Mary, was born in Townsville followed by a second child, George, born on 21 November 1882. She was attended by Mrs. O’Neill, a local midwife.

QUONG CHONG and LEE CHoy/ Maud Ah Foy, married in China 10.02.1899, TOWNSVILLE
Quong Chong was born in 1868 in China and by the mid-1890s was settled in Townsville, where he conducted a grocer’s store. He returned to China to marry Lee Choy on 10 February 1899 in Canton, and she accompanied him to live in Queensland. Just 10 years younger than her husband, Lee Choy was born in 1878 in China and was 21 years old at her marriage. Quong Chong and Lee Choy welcomed their first child, Lily, in 1900, followed by son Sidney two years later in 1902 and a third child Frances Maud in 1910.

Quong Chong was active in the Chinese community and he had a keen interest in the welfare of his countrymen and changes in China. In 1929, the Chinese Consul Mr. T. Sung visited Townsville. He was met by a party of leading merchants, led by Quong Chong who extended a hearty welcome. Sung was entertained by local children and taken into the Kuo Min Tang (Nationalist Party) rooms where speeches were made by Quong Chong, Marr Fann and Leong Lei Ming. By 1931 Quong Chong (also known as Yuen Chong and Sang Chong) was a leading Chinese merchant. He was president of the local branch of the Kuo Min Tang and had been appointed Chinese Consular Agent for North Queensland, Townsville. Recognition of his appointment appeared in the Commonwealth Government Gazette (No. 82). Mr. Quong Chong was the first person to be appointed by the Chinese Consul-General in this capacity. He assumed his duties in September and left for Taiping for the Canton and Nanking United Conference, as delegate/ representative of the Chinese of Australasia. He had been elected by the Australian Kuo Min Tang, Sydney.

In 1948, James Quong Chong, 78 was found dead in Ross Creek, Townsville, still wearing his
pjyamas. His health had suffered for some time and he had been missing from home since 5am that morning. There were no suspicious circumstances.

His son Sidney William moved to Innisfail where he became manager of a section of See Poy Department store. He married Ida Pearl See Poy, the daughter of See Poy and Chan Han.

Harry AH SEE and Lucy LORD, married 10.01.1881 TOWNSVILLE

Harry Ah See was born in China in 1851. He arrived in Queensland where he met and married new migrant Lucy Lord, in Springsure.

Lucy Bridget Lord, born in 1862, Essex, England arrived on the steamer the “Scottish Lassie” as a new immigrant to Queensland on 6 June 1879. She met Harry Ah See in 1880 and they married in Springsure on 10 January 1881. A son, William Henry, was born nearly nine months to the day later. At the time, Harry Ah See was 30 years old and working as a cook in the Springsure region. Lucy was just 19 and the birth was attended by Mrs. Fraser, who acted as midwife. Lucy certified the birth in writing, indicating she was literate. Between them Harry and Lucy raised a large family of 10 children, with the last child born in 1902 when Lucy was 40 years old.

Harry and Lucy moved their family north, first to Cairns and then to Townsville. Their eldest son William was sent over to China for his education in 1899. He returned in 1911. His mother Lucy died on 17 July 1914. She was only 52 years old.

William AH SHIN and Margaretha ANDERSON, m. 19.09.1873 TOWNSVILLE

William SHIN was born in China and journeyed to Sydney in 1857 where he lived for seven years. In 1864 he moved to the rapidly expanding colony of Queensland where he settled in Rockhampton in 1864 and commenced operation of a boarding house. After four years, in 1868, just four years after Townsville was proclaimed a port, he moved there and again went into commercial operation as a boarding house keeper. It was in Townsville that he met and married Margaretha Anderson.

Margaretha Anderson migrated from Copenhagen, Denmark to Townsville where she took up employment as a domestic servant. On 19 September 1873, William and Margaretha married at the Magistrate’s Court Townsville. She was 9 years younger than her husband. In April 1885 Ah Shin took the Oath of Allegiance and became a Naturalised British subject. No children have been found for the couple, although they could have been registered under variations to the names.

William and Margaretha Ah Shin’s boarding house in Flinders Street was well known and advertised as the place to stop at when in town. In 1888 his advertisement noted William Ah Shin “bega
inform his old friends, and the General Public that he has built a new and Commodious BOARDING HOUSE, which he purposes keeping in his well-known style...Opposite Grand Hotel”. Together they continued to operate their boarding house in the centre of Townsville CBD for over 27 years. Margaretha Ah Shin died on 17 May 1905 and she is buried in the Townsville Cemetery.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tommy Sowie</th>
<th>Bridget Fegan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Image</td>
<td>Image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unavailable</td>
<td>unavailable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tommy Sowie / Ah Sue and Bridget Fegan, m. 8.07.1868 CAPE RIVER / TOWNSVILLE**  
Tommy Sowie, also known as Ah Sue, was born in 1825, in Hong Kong. He arrived in Queensland in 1848 at the age of 23. Given that he arrived at a very early stage in the development of the colony, it is very possible that he arrived as indentured labour to work on the Darling Downs. By 1868, after 20 years in the colony, he travelled to the newly proclaimed gold fields of the Cape River district. On his journey there he met his future wife Bridget Fegan.

Bridget was born in 1826 in Glen Eden, Westmeath, Ireland. She migrated to Queensland in 1868 and met Tommie Sowie not long after arrival. They married in August 1868 and six months later their first child Mary Ann was born. Tommy and Bridget moved to Townsville. Tommy Sowie provided for them by working as a boarding house keeper and miner.

In 1888 Tommy and Bridget’s daughter Elizabeth married Joseph Minon from Ravenswood and five months later their first Grandchild, Arthur, was born. Tommy Ah Sue died at age 70 in 1895, just 8 years before Bridget lost her house and belongings when Cyclone Leonta came in 1903. The cottage was rebuilt for £50 as part of the Cyclone Leonta Relief Committee effort. However, from that point on, things got worse. She tried to support herself by sewing and she received a small pension; by then she was in her 70s. In 1908 Bridget’s one roomed cottage in North Ward, near Comerfords Lagoon, caught fire from a slush lamp which was left burning when she went to bed. Again, she lost what little she owned. A couple of months later she was charged with drunkenness. She pleaded guilty but the judge took pity on the 82-year-old, discharging her with a caution. In 1915 she died in Townsville at age 89. She had been living in South Townsville and supplementing her pension by taking in sewing.
AH MING and WAH GUIE/WAH GUAY, m. China c.1880? TOWNSVILLE

Ah Ming was born in China and departed to Queensland where he settled in Townsville in the early 1870s, later bringing out a young wife around 1880. Very little is known about the couple except that they were one of only two Chinese couples in Townsville at that time.

Wah Quey became pregnant in early 1881 but died as a result of complications when her baby daughter Mary Ann was born. The baby also died and together they were buried on 9 September 1881 and interred in the West End Cemetery, Townsville.

At that time Ah Ming remained in Townsville. He may have worked for or had business links with the firm On War Chong. After three years, he made an application for the exhumation and removal of his wife’s and child’s bones so he could take them to China. The standard fee of £1 was paid and the application granted. They were exhumed from the cemetery on 15 July 1885 and returned to China on 14 August 1885 after first being prepared by an appropriate Chinese specialist. Ah Ming accompanied the bones and gave On War Chong as his address for correspondence. His application for removal is the scant piece of information which acknowledges Wah Quey’s life, and that the couple lived in Townsville.

CHARTERS TOWERS / CAPE RIVER / PENTLAND / RAVENSWOOD

GONG LEE GOW and YOUNG SEE/YOUNG SEE, c. 1899 RAVENSWOOD

Gong Lee Gow was born in 1858 in China. He arrived in Queensland in the late 1890s and was joined, it is assumed, by his Second Wife Young See and three sons, Lee Tsong, Lee Kan, and Lee Mun, before the end of the century. Very Little is known about Young See other than she gave birth to a boy, Lee Hem (George), in 1901. This was followed by the birth of a daughter, Amy Lee, 1904, and another son, Jeo, anglicised to Joe, in 1905.

Lee Gow traded as Sam War and had commercial interests in a bakery and grocery store in Macrosson Street, Ravenswood, where he sold a range of goods. The business was large enough to employ other Chinese men including delivery men and carters. He was in partnership with two different men for a slaughter licence - one a White man, and the other Jang Lum Kee. Their slaughter house was situated in Nolan’s Gully.

Lee Gow was one of the civic leaders of the community and among other things supplied pigs for calendar events and festivities. The family also donated to charities such as the Patriotic War Fund, 1916, and to the local hospital in Charters Towers. The Lee Gow’s sent their children to the local Catholic Church School and when asked why, Lee Gow noted that the State School was “no good”.

Gong Lee Gow
Young See
Lee Tsong
Lee Kan
Lee Mun
Lee Hem (George)
Amy Lee
Jeo (Joe)
Lee Gow returned to China to visit family on at least two occasions while in Ravenswood. He made one last journey in 1918 with his children. Lee Gow at age 59 remained in China. George returned back to Queensland in 1920, Amy in 1927 and Joe, 1928. Joe or “CHONGA” as he was affectionately known, developed a passion for the sport of pugilism. He was a keen amateur boxer who went under the name Rud Kee. He eventually joined Jimmy Sharman’s boxing troupe and became well known as he toured north Queensland.

**JANG LUM KEE and LEE MOY / LEE HOCK LAN LEE MOY, RAVENSWOOD**

Jang Lum Kee was born in 1855 in China. He arrived in Queensland in the 1880s, and by 1888 had settled in Ravenswood where he had commercial interests as a storekeeper in Macrosson Street. He was in partnership with one other man for a slaughter licence – Lee Gow. Their slaughter house was situated in Nolan’s Gully. Along with Lee Gow, Jang Lum Kee was a key civic leader in the community.

Nothing is known of Lee Moy. The only evidence of her existence in Ravenswood is a document of entry, and the birth of four children: Gem, 1901, Jang Jock, 1903, Jang Hin, 1904 and Quan, 1906. By 1913, only Gem and Quan are able to be traced. Lee Moy, Jang Jock and Jang Hin cannot be found. In 1913, Jang Lum Kee applied to take children Gem and Quan to China for a visit. However, the Certificates of Exemption from the Dictation Test were cancelled and it does not appear they made the trip. Nothing else is known about the family.

**LEE JOW and Annie Isadora THICK, CHARTERS TOWERS 1907**

Lee Jow was born 1878, in China. He moved to Queensland where he settled in Charters Towers and married Annie Isadora Thick, a White woman, in 1907. They had their first child, Annie, in 1908 but the baby did not survive her first year. A second daughter, Gladys, was born in 1910, followed by two sons: William in 1912 and Arthur in 1915. Lee Jow provided for his family by working as a market gardener in the Sandy Creek area near Charters Towers. Annie Isadore secured tenure over a garden plot when she was granted a Mining Homestead Lease (MHL8147) with 5 acres (2 hectares) in 1914 at Sandy Creek.

In 1918 Lee Jow took his White wife and family to China to pay respects to his ancestors, fulfil filial obligations and attend to his children’s cultural education. While Lee Jow went for only a two-year sojourn in 1920, his family remained there. Only Arthur returned to Queensland nine years later, only to leave again the following year back to China for a further eight years, arriving back to Queensland in 1936. Both Gladys and William applied for rolling extensions to the dictation test until 1932 but never appear to return to Queensland. Lee Jow returned to Charters Towers where he continued to work his business. He left for China in 1924 to receive treatment for ill health, but was able to return thereafter. He continued to travel back and forth
between Charters Towers and the village in China. There is no evidence his White wife Annie Isadora Thick ever returned from China.

**AH HON and AH MOY, c. 1897, CHARTERS TOWERS**

Ah Hon was born in 1863 in China. When he arrived in Queensland he made his way to Charters Towers where by 1895 he was working a fruiterer’s shop in Gards Lane, trading under the name Ah Hon & Co.

Very little is known about his young Chinese bride, Ah Moy. She arrived in Charters Towers around 1896 and gave birth to her first child, a daughter, Ellen Mary, in the following year in August 1897. Ah Hon and Ah Moy’s family quickly expanded with the birth of son William in late November 1898 and two years later they welcomed the arrival of another son, Thomas. A final daughter, Lizzie, was born in 1902. After 1902 all trace of the women in the family disappears.

In 1908 Ah Hon took his boys back to China for their education. William, the eldest son, was by then 10 years old and Thomas, 8. Ah Hon remained with the family for two years after which he made regular and repeated sojourns to China, and worked in between visits in Queensland to support them. By 1917 Ah Hon was aged 54 and living in Townsville. Later that year Ah Hon left for China for the last time and did not return. Only Thomas Ah Hon, who left for China in 1908, had his CEDT extended a number of times and returned in September 1927. He went back to China the following year where he remained for two years as his last journey back to the village.
Thomas WING LUN and CHOCK LUN/JOCE, c. 1899 CHARTERS TOWERS
Thomas WING LUM was born in China on 30 October 1857. On his arrival to Queensland he made his way to Charters Towers where he went into commercial operations as a fruiterer.

It is not known when Chock Lun arrived in Charters Towers or even how long she stayed, but four children were born to the couple between 1899 and 1906, including three sons and one daughter: William, Thomas, George and Mary. After that there is no evidence of her in Charters Towers. When George started at primary school, Wing Lun was still operating a fruiterer’s business and the family were noted as Church of England faith.

Wing Lun and family lived in Charters Towers’ Chinatown. In 1907 he was brought before the court for having in his possession two cases of tobacco for which excise duty had not been paid, and he was fined. Between 1915 and 1930 all of the children, as well as Wing Lun, sojourned to China to visit their family, attend to filial obligations and further their education. They continued their transnational village connections later.

By 1916 Wing Lun had registered for his Alien Registration certificate and was living at Home Hill, working as a market gardener. The family were grown up and living around the region, including Charters Towers, Ingham and Townsville. In 1922 a fatal accident occurred to Wing Lun in Townsville on a Saturday morning. Estimated at around 60 years of age, he was delivering his produce when his horse bolted. Unable to pull it up, he jumped from the spring cart only to hit his head on the ground in what was a fatal blow. His children and descendants still live in north Queensland.

Jim AH YOUNG and Elizabeth ANSON/STEPHENSON, c. 1890, CHARTERS TOWERS
By 1904, it could be safely said that separated couple Jimmy Ah Young and Elizabeth Anson from Charters Towers were not on good terms. They were living together as husband and wife from as early as 1891 when they had a daughter, Mabel, followed by daughter Elizabeth in 1899. By 1902 they had separated and during the same year, their two-year-old daughter Elizabeth May died. Elizabeth set about making a new life for herself with Mabel and her son from a previous relationship with William Stephenson. She also started alternating her name between Elizabeth Ah Young and Elizabeth Stephenson. She entered a new relationship with Ah Kee in Leyshon Road, Charters Towers. However, Ah Young behaved badly and Elizabeth publically stated she wanted nothing to do with him.

What really happened on the evening of the 9 November 1904 may never be known except that Elizabeth Ah Young was remanded for discharging a firearm inside a domestic dwelling. She had allegedly taken Ah Kee’s revolver and threatened to shoot Jimmy Ah YOUNG saying “Come out.”
Jimmy Ah Young, till I blow your lights out.” As he was reticent in coming out of the house, it was alleged she fired four shots into it. In her defense she said she did not go near him and that she had not lived with him for a couple of years nor spoken to him. She was remanded on bail for a large sum of £50. It is not known what happened to the family after that.

William AH SANG/ SWEE SANG and Elizabeth PECKMAN, married c. 1866, Sofala NSW, RAVENSWOOD/CHARTERS TOWERS
Innkeeper William Swee Sang met and married Elizabeth Peckham in Sofala, NSW, circa 1866. Their first child, a daughter Theresa, was born in October 1867 and by the following year the family had moved to the newly opened Crocodile Creek gold mining field in Queensland. Swee Sang opened up a shanty house which served alcohol to both Chinese and Caucasian clientele. In June 1868 a Chinese man AH Koo broke into the shanty house of Elizabeth and William and threatened Mrs. Ah Sang. The matter was brought before the Police Magistrate. In his defense Ah Koo said she (Elizabeth) was a “bad woman”.

William and Elizabeth moved north to Ravenswood where their son Samuel was enrolled for the first time in the local State School. William took out a publican’s license and traded in Ravenswood before they moved to the more lucrative Charters Towers, where William purchased the license for the already established Canton Hotel. He later renamed it as Swee Sang’s Hotel. However, while William Swee Sang was successful in his occupation as a publican, he was unable to sustain a harmonious domestic life. In 1876 he placed a public notice in the newspaper noting that he would not be answerable to any debts that Elizabeth Swee Sang incurred as she “had left home without any justifiable cause”.

By 1880 Elizabeth Swee Sang found herself in court for larceny. By then she was receiving support from her sister Mrs. Ah Chee who had also married a Chinese man. In October 1881, Elizabeth took Swee Sang to court for maintenance. She requested £2 a week to look after the five children, aged 15, 12, 10, 6 and 3. In her submission she said she was not living with the defendant and said she had left because he had threatened to “shoot her” so she left on her own free will. Swee Sang offered to take the children and support them himself which she agreed to and the couple went their separate ways. Theresa had a baby in 1888 which died in infancy. Agnes married and moved to Cooktown, and Swee Sang allegedly ended up in the Gulf Country.
Kwok Lin Ding was born in 1862, in Chungshan/Zhongshan, China and grew into a tall man of 5ft 10 ½ inches. He arrived in Queensland around 1884 and lived for 16 years in Charters Towers before he relocated to Cairns. In both places, Lin Ding was well known to key community leaders and it was in Charters Towers that he met and entered a relationship with Mary Tully.

Mary Phillips nee Mary Tully emigrated from England to Mackay with her husband Charles Phillips before they moved to Charters Towers where a daughter, Alice, was born in 1891. A second daughter, Jeanette, was born in 1892. The child did not live past infancy and in 1893 a death notice was placed in the paper mourning the loss of “Jeanette Phillips, daughter of Mary Tully and Charles Phillips age 7 months, 1893”. The following year Charles Phillips died, leaving Mary Phillips with little Alice. It is thought she then returned to her former name as she had already formed a relationship with Lin Ding.

Kwok Lin Ding maintained that he met Mary Tully and formed a de facto relationship with her in 1890 and that Alice was really his daughter! Lin Ding and Mary had seven children; Alice, Frank, Margaret, John, Alexander, an unknown male child and a daughter, Ellen, born on 8 April 1901. A week later Mary died from post-partum hemorrhage. She is buried in the Brandon cemetery presumably alongside her son Alexander, who died three months earlier. Two months later, Kwok Lin Ding took the four remaining children Alice, Frank and Maggie to China to be raised by his family. He returned to north Queensland briefly c.1905 to wind up his business interests in Charters Towers and he moved to Cairns. While three of the children returned it is almost certain baby daughter Ellen died while in China.

Alice Phillips, Mary’s first daughter, was ten years old when she left for China. She lived there for 7 years until a marriage was contracted for her to Edward Lee Sye in 1907. She returned with him to Atherton, having lost all of her English-speaking skills. Her brother Frank and sister Maggie remained behind in the village with the new stepmother as Lin Ding had remarried. The village family lived together for 10 months before Lin Ding returned to Cairns and planned for his son Frank to arrive. In late 1907, Frank LING DING, age 12, was taken to court as an illegal immigrant by the Sub collector of Customs at Cairns for having failed the dictation test (he had left Queensland when he was 4 years old). Prior to young Frank landing, an anonymous telegram had been sent to Cairns from Brisbane which stated that the ‘real’ Frank Ling Ding had died in China. Action was immediately taken by the Customs officer.
Witnesses from Charters Towers and Cairns were called, including his sister Alice who verified that her brother was not dead, but had gone to China with her and they had lived together for 7 years with their sister and father. At the time Kwok Ling Ding stated he was Alice’s real father and that he had seven children total - four children living and three children dead. Two other children remained in China (Maggie and a new baby) with his new wife.

Kwok Lin Ding made regular journeys back to China to visit his second wife over the next 10 years. His daughter Maggie had her marriage contracted in China to a man from the same village, Joy Lee Yan, in 1912 and she returned to Queensland and lived on the Atherton Tablelands. It is not known what happened to Frank.

Moe Ung Hing romanised his name to George Hing when he travelled to Maryborough from China to seek his fortune. It was not long before he met young Christina Wilkie who had emigrated from the British Isles.

Born in June 1855, Christina Wilkie emigrated as a free passenger from Plymouth, England on the “Polmaise” as a single 17-year-old woman. She left behind her Coachman father, mother and seven siblings. The “Polmaise” left London on 16 June 1872 and arrived in Maryborough on 12 September 1872, a journey of a little over three months. Upon the ship also were 80 single women, 35 married couples and 95 single men. She gained employment very quickly as she could read and write and was a respectable Scottish girl. Her employer was John Marshall, who employed Christina for 6 months at £20 per annum, which was the usual rate for a housemaid (between £20-25 p.a.) Not long after she commenced working for Marshall, she met Moe Ung, and they were married in the residence of the Baptist Minister one month later on 27 October 1872, a total of six weeks since she stepped foot in Queensland.

They moved to the booming mining town of Millchester in Charters Towers where she produced 12 children, nine of whom survived beyond infancy. George kept a small shop, and worked as a cook in hotels. He also acted as an interpreter for the community when required. Christina, small in stature and with flaming red hair, was well known in the Chinese community and often acted as “guarantor” to baptisms and marriages of other Chinese couples in the Church of England. As part of her family tradition, the name Christina has been passed down through the generations and continues today.
In situ graves of William Ah Hee and Mary Roda Bailey Cape River.

William AH HEE and Mary Roda (Rodda/Rhoda) BAILEY, married 22.02.1897, CAPE RIVER

William Ah Hee was born in China on 22 September 1860 and arrived in Queensland in 1874 at age 14. He travelled inland to the Upper Cape near Pentland where he went to work as a gardener and later, storekeeper. 5ft 4 inches tall, he was educated, and could sign his name in English.

William married White woman Mary Roda Bailey in February 1897. Mary was age 26 and had emigrated from Hertford, England. She married in the house of Mrs. Fong (Mary Ann McKey) according to the rites of the Church of England, which suggests the White wives were friends. The family lived at Cape River goldfields the whole of their married life.

William and Mary had a large family of up to six children. Cape River was a long way from any midwife assistance and a month before births, Mary journeyed into Charters Towers where she remained until four weeks after the baby was born. In 1912, a tragedy occurred when Mary died from haemorrhage at home after the unexpected preterm arrival of her last child. William, having attended to his wife during the birth, buried the baby in the back yard and Mary died shortly afterwards. She was buried in the Upper Cape Cemetery.

William was left to raise the family on his own. He continued as a gardener at Upper Cape with the assistance of his son George as a gardener, and youngest daughter Mary Jane who kept house and cared for William, particularly as he aged. By 1937 William was an old and ailing man of 86 years and 7 months. He had been confined to his bed due to poor health for two years and he knew that he was dying, and wanted to be left to die at home to be buried alongside his wife in the Upper Cape River Cemetery.

Since arriving in the colony, he had spent his life at Upper Cape River and working to raise his Australian born family.

LAM PAN and Mary Jane McDonnell, 8.08.1876 MILLCHESTER

Dr Lam Pan was born in 1841 in China. He arrived in Queensland in 1870 and after staying in Townsville for six months, he travelled to Gilberton via the Cape River gold fields and on to Charters Towers by 1876. He met and married his first wife, Mary Jane McDonnell, and they moved to Charters Towers.

Mary Jane McDonnell was born in 1852. She married Dr William Lam Pan at the age of 24 on 8 August 1876. The family lived in Charters Towers before they moved to Millchester. On the 27 September 1879 Lam Pan took his Oath of Allegiance at age 38, stating that he was a Chinese doctor. His Oath of Allegiance and naturalisation enabled Lam Pan to purchase land and secure a town allotment adjoining his house where a Chinese Temple was subsequently constructed. In

Lam Pan
Image unavailable

Mary Jane McDonnell
Image unavailable
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>Lam Pan put a death notice in the local paper noting the passing in Millchester of Mary Jane, his wife, at their residence. She was 29 years old.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1884 | **LAM PAN and Sarah MOLONEY, 08.07.1884 MILLCHESTER**  
Lam Pan married his second wife, Sarah Maloney, on the 8 July 1884 in his house at Millchester. Married according to the rites of the Church of England, their marriage was witnessed by friend William Wan Chap. Sarah was born in Wolverhampton, Staffordshire, England in 1865 and immigrated to Queensland in 1882. Lam Pan and Sarah went on to raise a family of six children, four girls and two boys. The first daughter Ellen was born in 1885 with the birth notice announcing "On the 7th May [sic], the wife of Dr. Wm. Lam Pan, of a daughter." |

Dr Lam Pan was a well-known civic leader within the community, consulted by both the White and Chinese community for a range of views. He actively sought to enhance the standing of the Chinese community within the broader community, as the civic leader welcoming visiting dignitaries as well as attending to the burial requirements of deceased kinsmen in the repatriation of bones to China. Utilised for both his medical and linguistic ability, he was a regular interpreter in the courts and was brought in at the inquests of deaths of Chinese men, particularly if it involved opium poisoning.

Around 1900 Lam Pan travelled to China at age 60 to fulfil filial obligations, visit his family and visit his Chinese wife who he had not seen for a number of years. At the time of return, he wrote to authorities to request his re admittance along with two sons born in China, Ah Tiu and Ah Gee. Approval was granted and they all returned under Sec 5 of the Chinese Immigration Act 1890.  

Sarah Lam Pan died in September 1901 from exhaustion and pulmonary tuberculosis. She was buried with Catholic rites in the Charters Towers Cemetery, leaving behind her six children ranging from 16 years down to 3 years old.  

On 8 October 1910 Lam Pan died at age 69. He was buried in the Charters Towers cemetery in the Church of England section. Their first son, William George, went to live on a farm in Ayr with his sister, who had married Mr McAllister. They had taken the young 14-year-old William with them so that he would have a place to live. Having a Chinese boy/man on the farm possibly jeopardised Mr McAllister’s Sugar Bonus under the Sugar Bounty Act. Clarification was sought from authorities to determine if he was allowed to stay without disrupting payment.  

In 1915 William George Lampan enlisted at age 19 to the Australian Imperial Forces on 21 March 1915. On 2 August that year he joined his battalion at Gallipoli and was killed in action six days after his arrival on the Gallipoli peninsula, on 8 August 1915. His personal effects included only a cork-
screw and a chain, which were sent to his sister in Ayr.

**SUN KLINE KEE and Minnie BOATWRIGHT, m. 1893, CHARTERS TOWERS**

Minnie Boatwright was born in 1866, Surrey, England. She migrated to Queensland in 1891 at age 25 and travelled on the ship the “Nerkara”, as a single female free passenger. The ship left London on 30 September 1891 and had a speedy voyage of less than three months to arrive in Townsville on the 23 November 1891. On arrival she hoped to gain employment as a domestic servant and it is possible that she migrated on advice from her sister Susan Boatwright, who landed in Cooktown 7 years prior. Like most English women who migrated to north Queensland, she was literate and identified as Protestant.

Sometime in the early part of 1892, Minnie Boatwright met Sun Kline Kee. They married a year later on 24 July 1893 after which Sun and Minnie moved to the gold mining town of Croydon. It was there that they welcomed the arrival of their first baby, a girl whom they called Mabel.

After Mabel was born the family moved to Charters Towers where they were friends with George Hing and Christina Wilkie. They lived at Torphy’s /Porphyry Creek, where Sun Kline Kee had a garden. Minnie Kline Kee, also known as Minnie Sang Lee, was friends with the other gardeners around her. As a woman of justice, she spoke up in defence of Ah Haw in court and outlined the injustice to Ah Haw by a white man who beat him.

She was a practising Christian, and asked Mrs. Hing to be guarantor for Mabel when she was baptized in the St Paul’s Church, Charters Towers. Mabel grew up and moved to Cairns when she married George Wong Gong.

Very little else is known about Sun Kline Kee or Minnie Boatwright.

---

**AYR / BRANDON**

**William CHING DO and Annie LEEDS, married 4.12.1889, BRANDON**

William Ching Do was born in China in 1870. He arrived in Queensland as a young man and had met and married his wife Annie Leeds by the time he was 19. In 1895 he took his Oath of Allegiance and became a naturalised British subject.

Annie Leeds married young William Ching Do on 4 December 1889. A devout Church of England woman, she went on to raise a family of six children over the next fifteen years, three girls and three boys. The family was a well-respected and charitable family noted for their regular church
donations. Within the small farming community of Brandon, the Ching Do family participated in and hosted a number of functions, including soirees at which all of the children entertained the guests, either singing or playing the violin together.

Near their residence at Brandon was the family store as well as 45 acres (18 hectares) on the Haughton River. This was under sugar cultivation contract to supply cane to the Pioneer Mill located nearby. Ching Do was a progressive and innovative farmer – a fact which brought both admiration and jealousy from some in the community. In the year 1907 he cut 1300 tonnes of cane averaging 26 tons to the acre, a feat admired in the local paper. To support the logistics of transportation to the mill, he constructed a tramway siding that same year, using his own finances. Despite overtures to the Divisional Board for assistance, they refused to subsidise the construction of it on the basis that he was Chinese. Eventually the siding turned out to be so successful that the Divisional Board was forced to refund the money to Ching Do in order to save face. Ching Do Siding, as it was known, was renamed Poopoonbah in 1917 to mollify anti-Chinese sentiment which had swept across in the district at the time.

Ching Do continually developed entrepreneurial opportunities in the lower Burdekin district, demonstrated by his trialing of banana cultivation in the Burdekin. Despite planting 25,000 plants, the crops failed to produce and banana cultivation was eventually abandoned. He provided opportunities for his home village and not only employed a large number of countrymen on his farm, but also supported a number of applications for kinsmen to work in the region.

In 1910, William and Annie Ching Do took their six children to China for their first and only visit. The holiday lasted for only four months and the boys did not receive a Chinese education: quite opposite to the trend of most north Queensland families. Ching Do and family continued with the store in Brandon, but he died six years later in 1916. He is buried in the Ayr Cemetery. What happened to the family after that is unknown but it is rumoured they changed their surname to Brandon.
AH GAIM / AH GEIM and Theresa May FUN, married 15.02.1909, BOWEN

Ah Geim was born in 1864 in China and arrived in Queensland as a young man to settle near Bowen, where he worked as a market gardener. It is not known how long he had been in the colony before his marriage but at age 45, a marriage was contracted between himself and Australian born Chinese Theresa May Fun. They married on 15 February 1909 in Bowen. However, from the start it was clear that Theresa May was unhappy with the marriage partner. While the couple managed to reside together for one month after the marriage, Theresa May left soon after, preferring instead Japanese laundryman Mr Harry T. Hirota from Mackay. Hirota and Theresa commenced living together from that point onwards, and she never returned to her legal husband.

In 1912 Ah Geim applied for a dissolution of his marriage to Theresa May AH GEIM, on the basis that she was conducting an adulterous relationship with a Japanese laundry man.

The divorce was granted in the Northern Supreme Court, March 1913. Theresa said at the time "Oh, I'll be glad when it's all over. I'll be able to get married to Harry."

When questioned if Ah Geim had beat her (providing the reason for her leaving him), she said, "Oh—no, he has been very good to me, but he's too old for milk."

Ah Geim sojourned to China in 1923 where he remained for 10 months. With health failing, he made arrangements for a second journey four years later in late 1928. By then he was 64 years old and did not return to Queensland.

GEE WAH and TI YU, married 28.06.1900
CHARTERS TOWERS / MACKAY

Gee Wah was born in China in 1855 and he arrived in Queensland c. 1874 as a young man, not yet 20 years old. By 1900, at age 45, he resided and worked a store in Charters Towers. His family arranged for a young wife to be sent to him and Ti Yu made the journey from the village in China and was married to him in June that year, in a Western ceremony.

Ti You was born in Shanghai in 1878. At the time of marriage she was already a mature woman of 23 years. Together they lived in Charters Towers, Chinatown, at a place situated in its main street of Gards Lane. Wasting no time, it was there that their first child, daughter Nellie, was born in 1901. Mrs. Lee Wood, a very respectable Chinatown resident,
acted as midwife to Ti Yu and later on Nellie was baptized Church of England with the other respectable women in the Chinese community. Mrs. Hing acted as a Guaranor. Gee Wah and Ti You expanded their family with two sons, Edward (1904) and William (1907) (later called Rupert), but by 1908 the family had moved and were settled in Mackay where Gee Wah had a store.

Marital happiness was rocky in the Gee Wah household and by 1909 Ti Yu undertook an unusual step for a China born migrant wife: she left her husband, taking considerable steps to conceal her departure.

Ti Yu prepared to flee Mackay with her daughter Nellie. She first took a steamer to Cairns and onward to Thursday Island before leaving for China, under the assumed identity of Mrs. Ross. Because she was escaping from an unhappy domestic arrangement, she had no time to seek a CEDT for herself or her daughter, and was unable to do so without her husband’s knowledge. Thinking ahead and seeking help along the way she had a photograph taken of herself and daughter in Cairns, so that Nellie could be identified if she ever returned to Queensland. The female community in Cairns and Thursday Island remained tightlipped on the matter, with Ti Yu receiving help from many unexpected quarters. It was at Thursday Island that she adopted her pseudonym Mrs. Ross, and Ti Yu and Nellie were able to discreetly slip away to presumably her village in China, where Nellie grew up. The two boys remained with their father.

Nellie grew up in China and married when she was 17 in Hong Kong. However, her first husband died and she made an application to be reunited with her brothers, who were financially supporting her from Queensland. After some protracted investigation as to her identity, Nellie was allowed to return and she settled in Townsville, where she attempted to do missionary work in the Chinese Community.

Charles CHING and Agnes CRANG, m. 20.01.1886, MACKAY

Charles Ching was born in 1855 in an unknown village, China. Upon his arrival in Cooktown he met Agnes Crang and they arranged to get married.

Agnes CRANG was born in 1866, at Bishops Tawton in Devonshire, England. She migrated out to the colony just short of her 20th birthday and landed in Cooktown. It is there that she met Charles Ah Ching but they moved south and got married in the home of Rev. T.J. Riddle, according to the rites of the Presbyterian Church in Townsville on 20 January 1886. Seven months later their first child Florence was born. Charles and Agnes eventually had a large family of 11 children and they moved around the colony for work. Children were born in the different locations where they worked, with births registered in Brisbane, Rockhampton and
Family history suggests that despite being a hard worker, Charles was either not fortunate, or possessed no natural business acumen. Charles tried storekeeping in Rockhampton before he turned his attentions north to Mackay, where he went farming. In both occupations he was not successful nor did they bring much money to the growing family.

In 1912, a heinous crime was carried out on the family which left lifelong scars on those who survived. An itinerant worker, a casual Cingalese employee, murdered Agnes and five of their children, Maud, Hugh, Dolly, Eddie and Winnie, in a calculated and violent homicide as reprisal for a jilted marriage proposal he made towards 14-year-old daughter Maud. It was the most violent case of homicide in Queensland at the time and it rocked the family and broader community to the core. The deceased are all buried together in the cemetery at Sarina.

The tragedy was catastrophic for Charles and the remaining adult children. Charles sold up the farm and returned to China. Ada May and Henry departed with their father in 1915. It is not known if Ada May returned, but Henry returned briefly in 1921 before departing again for Hong Kong. When Charles arrived in China he remarried and retired in the village. The family lived in Ashley Road Kowloon and remained there until the Second World War and Japanese occupation of Hong Kong.

Charles’ son Henry went on to become the most successful editor of the leading Hong Kong newspaper, the South China Morning Post. His story has yet to be told but it was highly intellectual, successful, brave and stoic, particularly when the Japanese occupied Hong Kong and he and his family suffered terrible deprivation and torture under occupation.

Florence Lucy met and married Charles Wong Kee on 19 December 1905. The first of three sons was born the following year and together they had five children, three boys and two girls, four of them born in Mackay and one born in Hong Kong.

During the war years great hardships were felt by the Wong family as well as their brother Henry Ching and his family. Both families were not considered locals as Florence and her children (now young adults) were born in Australia. Unable to write or fluently speak Chinese, this made them vulnerable and a target for investigation. Considered “Third Nationals” they were required to carry a certificate and swear that they would obey any order or instruction the Imperial Japanese Army issued. Florence and her daughters were mobilised in the Auxiliary Nursing Service in Hong Kong and Frederick became a warden.
James AH FOO and Elizabeth COWLAND, m. 4.09.1889 CROYDON/ WINTON

James Ah Foo was born in 1862 in China. On his arrival in Queensland he headed out west to the mining district of Croydon, where he met his wife Elizabeth Cowland.

Elizabeth Cowland, migrant woman from England, married James Ah Foo on 4 September 1889. The following year a son, Albert Edward, was born in November 1890, at Croydon. James and Elizabeth went on to have four boys. It is not known how long they stayed in Croydon before the family moved to Winton, but James worked around the district first as a cook and upon reaching Winton, a gardener and fruiterer. Some years had passed and Elizabeth and James spent amicable times apart with Elizabeth living in Mackay and James living in Winton. This arrangement suited them both.

In 1917 James Ah Foo applied for his CEDT to visit China. At the time the Customs officers requested reasons as to why he refused to support his wife while he was gone. They threatened Ah Foo that if he didn’t pay towards the upkeep of his wife, the CEDT would not be issued.

This request seemed ridiculous to Elizabeth. She signed a document noting that her husband had paid her £10 and that he had agreed to contribute to her support and the support of her boys. At the time James Ah Foo was in Mackay and residing with his wife. Prior to his departure from Winton, Ah Foo made arrangement with solicitors that the rent of his business was to be paid by AH FAT at 17 shillings and 6 pence, and the money sent through the solicitors to Mrs. Ah Foo in Mackay. Having tied up considerable police resources chasing the matter, the last local police report noted that Mr. and Mrs. Ah Foo were "knocking about this district visiting friends here and there.” In her statement Mrs. Ah Foo stated "I don’t know why the police should be so keen on the matter. They need not worry about it. He is supporting me now and if he don’t my boys will keep me.” The police went on to dryly remark "His wife does not seem to be grateful for what the Authorities are doing for her and don’t seem to care if he supports her or not.”

Charlie AH SING and Helen AH SAM/ Ellen, m. 14.10.1903 WINTON

Charlie was born c.1869 in China. He arrived in Australia in the early 1890s and travelled out to the pastoral districts where he looked for station work. He met mixed heritage Chinese – Aboriginal Ellen Ah Sam in Cloncurry, and the two were married.

Ellen Ah Sam was born in Normanton, the daughter of Sam Leon and Lorna Ah Bow. She was baptized as a Methodist and she married Charlie Ah Sing in Cloncurry on 14 October 1903. He worked in Cloncurry first as a cook and then as a storekeeper.
Around 1909, the family moved to WINTON where Charlie went into market gardening. Charlie and Ellen had at least three children, two boys and a girl, all of whom were enrolled and attended the local State Winton School.

Charlie Sing’s market garden was in a good location on Mistake Creek, about 2 miles from Winton. He supplemented his income by also working as a cook. In 1923, his wife Ellen, on a visit to family in Cloncurry, died from pulmonary tuberculosis. She was buried in the Cloncurry Cemetery. A year later, in 1924, Charlie died by accidental drowning in the Mistake Creek waterhole when he went to bathe. He was 57 years old. He is buried in the Winton Cemetery.

LAW NYEE / YEE and Antonina Salkiewisz, m. 1905 Winton

Born in China, 1865, Law Yee (also known as Law Nyee and Law Nee) arrived in Queensland in 1884. A young man 5 ft. 5 inches tall, he headed to the pastoral districts of the Central West where he started work at the large Chinese gardening community of Hughenden. With banking options scarce in the district, he chose to bank his savings at the Queensland National Bank in 1887. His profession at the time was noted as “gardener”. Three years later he had started employment as a cook on Cork Station.

Polish born Antonina Salkiewisz migrated to Queensland where she worked as a governess on a station managed by the Parson family. It is thought she met Tommy on the station where he possibly worked as the cook. In 1905, Antonina married Tommy Law Nyee and together they moved into Winton.

Tommy took over the bakery of Yee Hap (possibly a countryman) on Section 12, Allotment 3. By 1907 he had expanded it to include a market garden on the side. In 1909 they welcomed their first and possibly only child, Jessie.

The connection with the Parsons family was very strong with Agnes Parsons owning the allotment on which the couple lived and worked. There is some family speculation that Parsons is a pseudonym for the Salkiewisz family who had left Poland during times of political trouble. They chose a framework to fit into the community, and they rented off the Parsons for some time. In 1917 Law Nyee suffered the terrible loss of his wife from cancer. Antonina was only 47 when she died and she is buried in the Roman Catholic section of the Winton Cemetery.

In 1918 after the death of his wife Tommy went back to cooking on stations, ending up in Boulia on Lucknow Station in 1918. However, by 1919 he was back at Winton, having incurred a fine for failing to register his intent to relocate from Boulia to Winton under the “War Precautions (Alien Registration) Regulation 1916”. Tommy Law Yee died in Brisbane in 1938, having spent his adult life
in north Queensland, never having visited his village in China in that time.

CHARLIE AH FOO and Kate McENROE, m. 4.04.1892 WINTON

Charlie Ah Foo was born c 1866 in China. He arrived in Queensland as a boy in 1876, presumably with a family member or village kinsman, and lived on the Palmer River Goldfields. Four years later he headed south to the pastoral districts of the Central West and commenced storekeeping in Hughenden in 1880. He was there for 15 years before he moved to Winton and took over the bakery and store owned by three Chinese business partners, including one who lived in Cooktown. While in Hughenden, he met and married Kate McEnroe in 1891. He was by then 25 years old.

Kate McEnroe was a spinster living in Hughenden at the time she got married to Charlie. However, the marriage was not a happy match and she left him less than ten years later, in 1898.

A report into his character at the time of his application for naturalization in 1899 noted that “Charley AH FOO and his wife lived very unhappily together. She left him and it is said that she resides either in Clermont or Longreach.” In fact she was living in Townsville.

Trading under the name Sun Kum Wah in Winton, Charlie provided goods to the community as a baker, fruiterer and retail dealer. The store was in a prominent position in Elderslie Street and he lived on site. Winton at the time was a parochial, class-divided town, and its Chinese residents suffered from rumours and innuendo, fueled by the occasional gambling charge. Sum Kum Wah as he was known attracted the attention of the police for alleged illegal activities, including the purchase of town allotments from the chemist’s assistant, to be used for “immoral purposes” by three Japanese women. There was no evidence to substantiate the rumour.

In 1901 an application was made by Charlie of Sun Kum Wah to purchase a lease of land at Mistake Creek that he had been using as a market garden for 23 years. The application was made through a lawyer’s firm to the Winton Shire Council but the application was refused on the basis that the council feared it would lose a valuable source of water for the community. Water was a premium resource in the parched Central West and its security paramount to the town’s administrators. As a gardener, storekeeper, and baker, Charlie Ah Foo maintained a presence in Winton for 28 years. He extended his generosity to the community by holding banquets to celebrate Chinese New Year and he gave generously to the hospital fund.

Charlie Ah Foo or Sum Kum Wah returned to China on at least three occasions in the early 20th Century. He died in 1918 at age 52 from an asthma attack and was buried in the Winton Cemetery. It is not believed he had any children or family in
Queensland and not known if he had a wife or family in China. Nothing else is known about his wife Kate McEnroe.

**William AH GOW and Annie GEYLESEN, m. 13.6.1872, MUTTABURRA**

William Ah Gow was born in China in 1841 and by age 32 he was living in Maryborough, Queensland, where he met Ann Geylesen in 1872.

German born Ann Geylesen, born in 1843 in Hamburg, migrated to Maryborough where she married Ah Gow on 13 June 1872. It is not known how long they remained in Maryborough, but by 1881 Ah Gow and Anne moved inland to the sheep district of Muttaburra in the Central West near Winton, where Ah Gow worked as a cook.

Ah Gow and Anne suffered the loss of three babies in succession before, at age 38, Anne gave birth to a healthy baby boy who they called Julius. His Western name reflected Anne’s German roots. Baby Julius was born at their home in Muttaburra, where Anne was attended by the local midwife, Mrs. C. E. Williams. Registration of the birth in Muttaburra was impossible owing to it being a very small community, and the birth was registered some 200 miles away at Winton.

Very little is known about the couple or the early years of family life. However, Ah Gow took Julius back to the village in China when he was a child, returning to Queensland as a young man. However, life as a mixed-race man in a very white and class orientated pastoral society must have been troubling and difficult. He was convicted and sentenced in 1914 for horse stealing, and spent time in St Helena Gaol.

**William YOUNG KIN and Annie MURPHY, c. 1880 WINTON**

Born in China, 1838, immigrants William Young Kin and Irish Annie Murphy met in Rockhampton before moving north-west in the mid-1880s. Their relationship and interaction with others was robust and often involved the judicial system. In 1880, Young Kin took Margaret Haynes to court in Rockhampton for assault. Mrs. Haynes was kindly accompanying a less than optimal Mrs. Young Kin home to Bolsover Street, Rockhampton. She knocked on the door and when Young Kin opened it he started calling her names. This resulted in Mrs. Haynes hitting him with her bag, an act which resulted in a fine for her.

Six years later Young Kin and Annie moved inland, first to Muttaburra, and later to Winton where he worked as a cook. By 1886, they had produced at least two daughters with their eldest, Lucy, just starting school with the Roman Catholic Sisters of Mercy. Her sister, Eleanor, started school two years later in 1888. Young Kin expanded his business to storekeeping and purchased an allotment of land (Section 14 allot 3) in Elderslie Street.
The family’s affair with the courts continued. Annie Young Kin was charged with larceny and brought before the Police Magistrate in 1889. She was discharged at the time with a caution so that she could attend to home duties. A few years later, William was charged consecutive times for supplying opium to Aborigines. Between 1896 and 1898 he came before the Police Magistrate on three separate occasions and spent time in the Rockhampton Gaol. In 1899, just a few months after his release, their 23-month-old baby Ethel died.

The family’s difficult life was made worse by the relationship they had with the broader community which sometimes led to acts of physical violence. In 1900, quite unprovoked, daughter Lucy, still a child, was “King hit” by a man using a clenched fist. He was later sentenced to two months gaol for assault. In 1905, aged 67, Young Kin died from senile decay and was buried in the Winton Cemetery. It is not known what happened to Annie but most of the children remained in the district.
Appendix B.

Couples or individuals identified in Select Newspapers
Prior to the digitalization of Births Deaths and Marriage records, alternative methods of data collection were used to research and identify couples. This included newspaper accounts. The next couple of pages provide a brief noting of the couple or individual and description about the account. It also includes the source.


1863, Identification Newspaper, procured underage White wife, *The North Australian*, Saturday 3 October 1863, page 3. SUE Samuel and GRAY Mary Ann, young girl who was married off to Chinese man.


1873, Identification Newspaper, Assault on Wife by member of public, *Rockhampton Bulletin*, Wednesday 10 December 1873, page 2. ANG WONG Thomas and Emma ANG WONG.


1876, Identification Newspaper, Arrival Chinese woman and 13 year old servant, *The Cooktown Herald*, 13 September 1876, page 2. Mrs. Quong Hing “Two Chinese women arrived per “Mecca”, the eldest being the wife of Mr. Kwong Hing a Merchant residing here; the youngest being her servant.”


1880, Identification Newspaper, *The Capricornian*, Saturday 27 April 1889, page 22. Identification LIMKIN Mary Button /Mrs. LIM KIN / Mary Brittain & Sexual Assault on child, Child identified: Catherine Louisa b. 1879 C674.


1881, Identification, Newspaper, Larceny on Family by member of public, *The Capricornian* Saturday 17 November 1894, pages 33 & 34. AH MOY and Minnie Freddy.
1885, Identification Newspaper, Selling Liquor without a license, ‘THURSDAY, DEC. 17.’ Warwick Examiner and Times 19 December, page 2. LEE KONG and Ada LEE KONG.


1891, Identification Newspaper, The Brisbane Courier, Thursday 10 September 1891, page 3. Ellen Hayes arrested for liaising with a Chinaman in an outhouse. She was “just visiting” Nine Holes.

1892 Identification Newspaper, Assault 'ROCKHAMPTON POLICE COURT.', Morning Bulletin, 21 May, page 6. DUBOW/ DU BOW DU BOW HAPOO Harry. Elizabeth Ann KING SIN. King Sin assaulted DU BOW, the local Chinese INTERPRETER in Rockhampton over allegation that Du Bow said KING SIN and his wife were Lepers.


1894, Identification Newspaper Adoption, Morning Bulletin, Friday 22 June 1894, pages 4 & 5. AH KITT and Mrs. AH KITT a White woman: adopted white child born approx. 1890.

1895, Identification Newspaper suicide, Rockhampton Bulletin, Wednesday 6 October 1875, page 2. AH FAT and Mrs. Ah Fat. Mrs. Ah Fat committed suicide with Poison Strychnine. Mrs. Ah Fat had been bullied by some women in the community just prior to the act.

1895, Identification Newspaper, Libel against Mrs. Ah Bing, Morning Bulletin, Wednesday 19 June 1895, page 6. AH BING and MORAN Annie. Ah Look falsely told police that Mrs. AH BING had given birth to baby and had committed infanticide on it. Scrubby Creek near GRACEMERE. He made it up.

1895, Identification Newspaper, The Capricornian, Saturday 20 April 1895, page 21. CHINAMAN and ANDERSON Bessie. A verbal abuse attack by White people on the White wife (Bessie) prompts her to speak in public with indecent language for which she is charged.

1896, Identification Newspaper, Drunkardness, charged under Vagrancy Act, The Western Champion and General Advertiser for the Central Western Districts, Tuesday, 4 February 1896, page 12. Sarah Ann Haywood is charged with “living with Chinaman”.

1896, Identification Newspaper, Family rejection marriage proposal, 'ROCKHAMPTON POLICE COURT.', Morning Bulletin, 29 January, page 5. KOK FAT made a failed attempt to convince WING WAH that he was a suitable future husband for WING WAH’S daughter Jenny. WING WAH Alexander/ Alick and Unknown White Wife MRS WING WAH with daughter “Jenny”.


1899, Identification, Newspaper Death, Intestate, *The Capricornian*, Saturday 24 June 1899, page 25. MAH CHUT Storekeeper BLACKHALL whose wife is LEE SUE.


1905, Identification Newspaper, “night-owling”, *The North Queensland Register*, Monday 30 October 1905, page 1. SEE KAN night owling with Mrs. HOWLETT.


